



01.

From the Library of  
Professor Samuel Miller  
in Memory of  
Judge Samuel Miller Breckinridge  
Presented by  
Samuel Miller Breckinridge Long  
to the Library of  
Princeton Theological Seminary

1851







Handwritten scribbles and marks at the top of the page, possibly including a signature or initials.

THE  
O R I G I N  
O F *Samb: Mo*  
A R I A N I S M  
D I S C L O S E D.

---

By *JOHN WHITAKER, B. D.*  
RECTOR OF RUAN LANYHORNE, CORNWALL.

---

L O N D O N:  
PRINTED FOR JOHN STOCKDALE, PICCADILLY.

---

1791.





TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

*SAMUEL*

LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

MY LORD,

I *publicly* request you to accept a copy of the present work, in order to show your Lordship and the world, my strong sense of the service which you have done to the cause of Christianity, by your late writings against a well-known Heretick. Your writings will continue to be serviceable to the cause, as long as the memory of that Heretick continues in the church. The bane and the antidote will go on, in an useful union together.

With abilities much less vigorous, and with learning much more contracted, I have here engaged in assertion of the same cause. But I have acted differently from your Lordship. I have entered di-

rectly into the heart of the controversy. This you declined to do, because the arguments on both sides had been repeatedly canvassed, you thought, and nothing new could be advanced upon the subject. I flatter myself, that I have advanced something new and just upon it; and have introduced a train of historical argumentation, which is at once novel in its direction, comprehensive in its scope, and decisive in its efficacy.

I shall think myself singularly fortunate, if it should appear to others as it does to me. I shall be particularly pleased, if it meets with your Lordship's approbation. And, in hopes it will, I subscribe myself with great respect for your talents, your spirit, and your application of both,

My Lord,

Your most obedient Son and Servant,

*April 27, 1791.*

K. L. Parfonage.

J. WHITAKER.

THE  
ORIGIN OF ARIANISM  
DISCLOSED.

---

CHAPTER THE FIRST.

— I. —

NATIONS assume different characters at different times. Some secular or spiritual causes interpose, to change the general tone of thinking. These are apparent as they arise, to the philosophical surveyor of man. And they soon become visible in their effects, to every eye.

In this kingdom, and at this period, we may mark a rising aversion to theological controversy. We see it stealing upon the minds of scholars, and giving a tincture to their sentiments. It is only *beginning* at present. It carries, therefore, a faint and dubious appearance with it. But it *is* beginning. And the operations of it, if not checked, will speedily show themselves in a frigid apathy of moderation, concerning all the fundamental articles of our religion.

This new and degenerate sort of stoicism may be attributed perhaps by some, to the surfeit which the nation has taken of such controversy; from the long

and sharp disputes, that have been maintained among us for more than a century past. The human mind is very apt, in its weakness, to be influenced by accidents, to catch the colour of the objects passing beside it, and to reflect them back in its practice. But this is evidently *not* the cause, of that aversion to theological controversy; which is beginning to shoot up in the nation, at present. The disputes about *civil* points during the same period of time, have been as sharp and as long, as concerning articles of theology. Liberty, in particular, has been even more earnestly contended for, by the three or four last generations of Britons; than any one doctrine in the creed of Christianity. Yet we can discern no aversion to such disputes, starting up in the mind of the nation, and preparing to betray the cause which has been so firmly supported. We see indeed the very reverse. The flame of liberty, which has burned so fiercely in the bosom of this kingdom, still keeps up its ardours there; while the warmth for the leading doctrines of religion, is gradually cooling in the heart. And this striking contrast in the two parts of the national character, serves strongly to show us the real reason for the latter. Religion is losing its weight, in the scale of the public opinions. A rectitude of sentiment in religion, therefore, is no longer considered of so much importance, as it was. Where the substance is sinking, in its efficacy upon the heart; the inci-

8

dents

dents must necessarily fall off, in their consequence with the mind. And political objects still appear momentous in the eyes of our people, still agitate their understandings, and inflame their spirits; because temporal interests still retain their original hold, upon their affections.

While there is any life of religion, actuating the great body of this island; there must and will be controversies in theology. While the grand code of Christianity exercises the attention, and fastens upon the passions, of our people; there will be weakness of intellect to be set right, and perverseness of conduct to be corrected, by the clergy. These are to stand around the altars of the Gospel, to keep up the fire of religion there in all its power, and to maintain it in all its purity. Nor will they be found unfaithful to their charge, while there is any spring of theological activity, in the clerical mind; and while there are any energies of religious zeal, in the clerical heart. When they come to nod beside the altar; to slumber over the dying flame; or to look on with a stupid unconcern, while wretched men are heaping false and unhallowed fuel upon it; then irreligion has finished its course among us. A spiritual frost has spread its influence, through the body. It has benumbed the extremities. It is come to the heart. And, like a poor man stretched out upon the snows of the Alps, the nation will then be angry at those, who disturb its rest in order to save it; will

then beg to be allowed a little longer repose, upon its bed of ice; and feel a kind of pleasing serenity, gliding gradually through all its veins, stopping up one by one all the avenues of life, and hastening on to quench the last spark of vitality, by seemingly lulling it into a gentle sleep.

To this state, thank God, the clergy are not reduced at present. I trust, they never will be. They will always, I trust, be a national ministry active of intellect, and vigorous in religion. In spite of the siren song of moderation, I hope, we shall ever be alive to the spirit of our institution, and ever bending forward to "the prize of our high calling in Christ Jesus." And we shall thus continue to be, what our ancestors have always been, the most learned and the most zealous of Christian Divines, the honour of our kingdom, the glory of the reformation, and the admiration of all Christendom.

In this sound and solid view of theological controversies, the first object of all controversy is the doctrine of the TRINITY. This concerns the very foundation-stone of our religion. This affects "the very pillar and ground of the truth<sup>a</sup>." If this doctrine be *false*, then nine tenths of the Christians through every age and in every country, have been guilty of *idolatry*; of an idolatry indeed, not so gross as that of the Heathens, because not the worship of *devils*

<sup>a</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 15.

in the place of God<sup>b</sup>; yet of an idolatry more gross than that of the Papists at present, because not merely the worship of *saints* and of *angels*, in *subordination* to God; but the worship of a *creature* along *with* the Creator, placing him *equally* with God upon the throne of the universe, giving God a *partner* in his empire, and so *deposing* God from *half* his sovereignty. And, if the doctrine be *true*, then the opposers of it, the Arians of antient and modern days, are bold and blasphemous abusers of the faith; are, like the giants of old, brandishing their arms directly against heaven; and are vainly endeavouring to tear down our blessed Redeemer, from the throne of the Godhead there.

That this doctrine *is* true, I am fully convinced. I read it recorded in the pages of Scripture. I see it attested by the writings of the fathers. And I find it displayed, in the generally uniform and unvarying faith of the church of Christ, from the days of the apostles to the present period. All these rays of light, in my opinion, unite to form such an orb of lustre in favour of the doctrine; as shines out with a sun-like blaze of evidence, upon the world.

To add to this evidence, may seem equally superfluous and rash. It may seem to be holding up a taper to the sun. Yet, when the sun retires, we light our tapers. We consider them as so many radiations, derived from the great body of light that

<sup>b</sup> 2 Cor. x. 20. "I say that the things, which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *devils*, and not to God." See also Deut. xxxii. 17.

is absent. While therefore that orb is withdrawn for a while, we may usefully, I trust, contemplate a derived ray. This is one, I think, which has never been sufficiently observed. I hope to recommend it to the public notice. And I wish to consider the doctrine of the Trinity, in a light equally new and striking; for the stronger confirmation of our mutual faith.

— II. —

A candid and thinking mind must be startled at first, on reflecting that the JEWS oppose themselves to the doctrine of the Trinity. This is certainly very startling, when we consider the providential character, if I may so express myself, which God has stamped upon the Jews in all the earlier ages. They were then the grand instruments of God, for the operations of his providence upon the world. They were, particularly, his great lamp of light to their human brothers; to shew forth the central unity of his nature, in their own belief; and to oppose the folly of that polytheism, which was in theirs. But it is still more startling, when we still further reflect; that the Jews were thus the church of God upon earth, and the depositaries of the true faith; and that, if *they* had not the doctrine of the Trinity, the Patriarchs had it not. Then the church, from Adam to our Saviour, must have had a belief in the *nature* of the Redeemer; very different from that, which has been professed by the church, from our  
Saviour



Saviour to the present moment. And the Sun of Faith, in the essential and capital point of all, must have been *continually* under an eclipse; only one *half* of it *ever* communicating light, and the other being *perpetually* covered with a thick darkness.

But the fact is just the reverse. The Jews professed the same faith in this point, that we do. They derived it at first, from their ancestors the Patriarchs. They retained it through all the ages of their history. And they have only lost it now, as they have lost their title to the favour of God, and as they have lost other articles in the creed of their fathers.

That they do *now* set themselves in direct opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity, is very clear. They have always acknowledged the Redeemer of the Christians, to be displayed in the authoritative writings of Christianity, under the appellation and with the attributes of God<sup>c</sup>. They thus confess, what

<sup>c</sup> In that wretched fiction of Jewish malignity, which is entitled *Tholedoth Jesu*, or the Generations of Jesus, a kind of anti gospel, published by Huldrik; they state our *Saviour* and his *disciples* to have *taught*, that he was *God*, born of a *virgin*, who had conceived him by *the Holy Ghost* (Mod. Un. Hist. xiii. 513. octavo).—In *Tanchuma*, a famous book among the Jews, is a passage to this effect; “that Jesus Christ, whom they call wicked Balaam, *taught* “*that he was God*: and R. Tauchuma argues, that he was a mere “man”. (Allix’s Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians, p. 430, written in vindication of something said by Dr. Bull; a work of very extensive erudition in the antient and modern theology of the Jews, very judicious, and very convincing; formed in part upon the same plan with the present work, but executed even in

what all the laws of construction, all the principles of evidence, and all the possibilities of language, have been supposed by us Christians to proclaim, as the suggestion of *our* Scriptures. And they put our Arians to the blush, for presuming to deny it in contradiction to all. This they have always considered too, as the predominant opinion of Christians in all ages. They thus add one attestation more, to the many which we have already; for the fixed and established creed of Christianity, from the beginning. They oppose the doctrine of the Trinity, as the primogenial principle of our religion. And they therefore consider themselves, to be the witnesses of God against it; witnesses with their fathers, against the still remaining, though differently directed, idolatry of the Gentiles<sup>d</sup>.

But

that part after a very different manner). “The learned Jews know well, that that prayer, which in the Christian countries is called the prayer against the Sadducees, and in other countries the prayer against the heretics and apostates, was truly and originally written against the *Christians*, for being teachers of a *Trinity* and of *Christ's Divinity*” (Ibid. p. 431).

<sup>d</sup> Mo. l. Un. Hist. xiii. 454, and Phenix ii. 406. In the former, xiii. 430, it is said, that at the grand council of Jews assembled at Ageda in Hungary 1650, on some Christian clergymen announcing to them Jesus Christ, as their Messiah; they cried out, “No Christ, no *God-man!*” But this is a mistake. The clergymen were papists, and announced the *Virgin Mary* as an object of worship. “They affirmed—the invocation of saints, praying to the *Virgin Mary*, and her commanding in heaven over her Son.” Then the Jews cried out, “No Christ, no *woman-God!*” So says the very narrative, which the Universal Historians cite; Phenix i, 552. And  
this

But that this was *not* the *original* faith of their nation, may be satisfactorily shown; in opposition equally to the present opinions of most Christians, and to the hereditary prejudices of all the Jews. We can show it from those antient writings of the Jews, which now constitute the Evangelical History of the New Testament. We can show it from other writings of theirs, that are wholly or nearly coeval, and even prior, in antiquity. And we can point out with a *general* exactness, *when* the Jews first abandoned this faith of their fathers, and went over to their present opinions.

In this mode of considering the Gospels indeed, we appeal not to them as treasures of theology brought from heaven, or even as histories of the Jews divinely suggested. We appeal to them merely as common histories. And considering them even in this degraded light, stripped of their infallibility, and reduced to a level with compositions merely human; they prove decisively, that the Jews expected their Messiah to be a GOD, to be the SON OF GOD, and to be CO-EQUAL with GOD the FATHER.

In this mode also of appealing to the Gospels, we may see other disputes that have agitated the church, determined at once by authority; and the truths of

this narrative, though branded as "fabulous" by a cotemporary Jew in Phenix ii. 401, carries all the marks of authenticity with it; and is very curious,

theology

theology fettered, by the sure attestation of history. I shall accordingly notice one, in order to throw a fuller light upon the present subject. We all know the controversy that WARBURTON excited a few years ago, concerning *no* futurity being held out in the Jewish law. This singularly able man, who without the customary aids of an academic education, and merely by the inherent vigour of his heaven-born genius, raised himself from the desk of an attorney, to the rank of a manly critic upon Shakspeare, to the honour of an eminent scholar in general literature, and to the dignity of a deep, sagacious, and judicious divine; with all that bold self-confidence of spirit, which is the very spring of such an intellect, and is heightened by its own exertions, asserted the doctrine of a future state to form *no* part of the law. This was certainly a very bold position, even for the adventurous soul of paradox to maintain; when “the law was our school-master, to bring us to Christ.” Yet the law carried an appearance with it, very analogous to this position; exhibiting no promise of future reward, and presenting no threat of future punishment, upon the *face* of

<sup>c</sup> Gal. iii. 24. When our Saviour in John v. 39. says, “Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have *eternal life* ;” he means only the promise of a happy eternity, through a Redeemer. This the words immediately following show, “and they are they which testify of me.” But the words additionally prove, that the Jews thought they had “*eternal life*” in the Scriptures.

it. And yet St. Paul says of himself and his cotemporaries: “so worship I the God of my fathers, *believing all things that are written in the Law and the Prophets*; and have hope towards God, *which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection, both of the just and the unjust*.” Here then we have a lively hope of futurity, professed by the nation; while the national theology appears not to brighten, with a single ray of it. The truth is, that the national theology *did* hold out this, though the law does not insist upon it. The law was calculated only to hedge the Jews round from the nations of the world, to keep up a purity of practice and worship, and to maintain an unbroken faith concerning the coming Redeemer. But then it did not extinguish the grand principle of all religion before, the firm expectation, and the powerful dread, of an awful scene of retribution after death. This appears even *before the flood*, to have actuated the souls of the religious; from the striking prophecy of Enoch, concerning the coming of God with his angels, to judge the world in form, and to assign its inhabitants their deserved rewards and punishments<sup>§</sup>. Indeed it is the life and soul of all religion; that, without which the Christian, the Jewish, and the Heathen, the Patriarchal, and the Ante-diluvian, must equally have been each of them a mere corpse. The Jewish

<sup>f</sup> Acts xxiv. 14—15.

<sup>§</sup> Jude 14—15.

actually

actually appears to have received the same vital energy of belief into it, as had animated the Antediluvian and Patriarchal before. This was still the *nucleus* inclosed within, which showed it was inclosed, by the influence of its moral magnetism upon the Jews. This was still the central fire of the whole globe, which lent a warmth of spirit to all its operations, and imparted a vigour of vegetation to all its productions. And we see this internal power disclosing itself perpetually, in the dramatic history of the Gospels. At one time a Jew asks our Saviour, “are there few that are *saved* ;” and at another, his disciples cry out with amazement, “who then “can be *saved* <sup>h</sup>.” They thus mark the full conviction of their minds, concerning the future salvation or future damnation, of every individual of the human race. The very simplicity of the language, shows it the more fully. But they are not acquainted merely with the general doctrine. They know some grand circumstances of it. They know of a *judgment* that is to be passed by God, antecedent to either punishment or reward; and “every idle “word that men shall speak,” says our Saviour in a direct reference to this idea, “they shall give account thereof in *the day of judgment* <sup>i</sup>.” They know also of a *resurrection* to it, and of a *heaven* and a *hell* consequent upon it. The Sadducees were

<sup>h</sup> Luke xiii. 24 ; and Mat. xix, 25.

<sup>i</sup> Mat. xii. 36.

distinguished

distinguished *from the rest of the nation*, by “ saying “ there is no resurrection:” but our Saviour “ put “ the Sadducees to silence;” even “ certain of the “ scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well “ said;” and “ the multitude were astonished” with admiration and delight, “ at his doctrine<sup>k</sup>.” Accordingly we find in the further progress of the gospel, that St. Paul at one time asserts the whole body of his countrymen in general, to have “ hoped” and expected a “ resurrection;” and, at another, engaged the prejudices of the generality in his favour, though he was an avowed Christian, by declaring himself “ a Pharisee” and “ the son of a “ Pharisee,” and “ of the hope and resurrection of “ the dead” to be then “ called in question<sup>l</sup>.” When our Saviour also tells them, “ that, in the “ end of this world, the Son of Man shall send “ forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his “ kingdom all things that offend, and them which “ do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of “ fire;” and that then “ shall the righteous shine “ forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father:” he plainly speaks *in general*, to their previous conceptions concerning all; he therefore asks the people, “ Have ye understood all these things;” and they correspondently “ say unto him, Yea, Lord<sup>m</sup>.”

<sup>k</sup> Mat. xxii. 23, 33; Mark xii. 28; and Luke xx. 39.

<sup>l</sup> Acts xxiii. 6.

<sup>m</sup> Mat. xiii. 40--43, and 51.

These

These and a thousand passages beside, that occur in the narration of the Gospels, show evidently whenever they are *historically* considered, the abiding sense of the Jews concerning a grand hereafter; and indeed represent the Jews to us, as equally convinced of this important truth, with us Christians ourselves. And all the preachings of our Saviour to them, all the hopes that he holds up, and all the terrors that he displays, are wholly founded on this known and certain conviction in them.

— III. —

When we can thus fit down to the Scriptures, taking off our minds (as it were) from the familiarity of the language and ideas, and reading them merely as a new and unknown book; we equally see our Saviour, in his conduct before the Jews, and in his addresses to them, assuming all the port of a God. To prove this, I shall not dwell on his repeated predictions of little and contingent events, contingent upon the precarious fancy of a moment in the mind, and yet drawn out into a train by *his* prophecy and in *their* accomplishment; thus giving precision to uncertainty, counting *beforehand* (as it were) the fluctuations of the waves in a storm, and tracing the *future* combinations of the clouds with an unerring pencil. These may be considered as transmitted powers of divinity, as essential in some degree to the very gift of prophecy, and as exercised



cified in part by all the prophets. I shall rest upon points more discriminative of his character.

Let us first look at the *air* and *manner*, in which he executes his greater acts of miraculous might. He speaks to the leper, “ I will, be thou clean <sup>n</sup>.” He says to the man with the withered hand, “ Stretch forth thine hand <sup>o</sup>.” He tells the blind man, “ Receive thy sight <sup>p</sup>.” He says to him who had now been crippled in his limbs, for eight and thirty years; “ Take up thy bed, and walk <sup>q</sup>.” He calls to Lazarus, lying in the vault of rock before him, and swathed round with sepulchral linen; “ Lazarus, come forth <sup>r</sup>.” And he finally takes upon him, to “ rebuke” the most unruly elements of nature, the winds and the waves <sup>s</sup>; and to address these words to the sea, then wildly agitated with a storm, “ Peace, be still <sup>t</sup>.” These are all imperial acts of authority. They are all executed too, with an imperial tone of authority. They are obviously in their manner, the operations of inherent and essential Deity. The pointed brevity of the sentences, is the genuine sublimity of power; the easy language of a mind, reposing upon its own dignity, and familiar with exertions of Divinity.

This dignity of Divinity we accordingly see our Saviour, expressly assuming to himself at times. He

<sup>n</sup> Mat. viii. 3.

<sup>o</sup> Mat. xii. 13.

<sup>p</sup> Luke xviii. 43.

<sup>q</sup> John v. 5, and 8.

<sup>r</sup> John xi. 43.

<sup>s</sup> Mat. viii. 25—26.

<sup>t</sup> Mark iv. 39.

generally describes himself indeed, by a title derived from his *humanity*; and calls himself THE SON OF MAN. But then this is the *human* appellation of the *Messiah*, and is used as such by Daniel. “ I saw in the night-visions,” says this prophet, who was allowed to look farther into the mystery of our Saviour’s awful visit to earth, than any of the other prophets except Isaiah; “ and behold one, like *the Son of Man*, came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him: and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away; and his kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed.” In so magnificent a manner, is the Messiah described by Daniel; even when he is spoken of only, as “ the Son of Man.” The humanity is deeply incased, as it were, in the Divinity. Our Saviour is accordingly represented in the Revelations of St. John, as “ one like unto *the Son of Man*;” as declaring himself expressly, to be “ he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore;” and yet as equally saying, “ I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last.” And the Jews appear to have understood our Saviour clearly, when he denominated himself “ the

\* Daniel vii, 13—14.

x Rev. i, 13, 18, and 21.

“ Son of Man;” and, even amid all the grandeur which he threw around himself under that denomination, to have seen he was adopting the appellation and assuming the grandeur, ~~as~~ the august Personage in Daniel’s prophecy, as their Messiah now actually come upon earth<sup>v</sup>. But he frequently describes himself too, as THE SON OF GOD. Nor is it easy to determine, whether he takes most state and consequence to himself, under *that* appellation or under *this*. Only he takes very much, under Both. And, as the numerous instances of this arise before us, we need not be inquisitive under which he takes them. Humanity is annexed by him to the Son of God, and divinity is attached by him to the Son of Man; because both were to unite in the Messiah, and both actually united in our Saviour.

He asserts, that *he* alone knows the Father; and that mankind have no other knowledge of the Father, than what they derive from *him*<sup>z</sup>. He presumes to pronounce the FORGIVENESS OF SINS, when we are sure from every principle of religion, that “ no one can forgive sins but God alone;” and

<sup>v</sup> There is only one time, in which they pretend *not* to understand the title. But this very pretence confirms my observation. “ The people answered him, We have heard out of the law, that “ Christ abideth for ever; and how sayest thou, The Son of Man “ must be lift up? Who is this Son of Man?” (John xii. 34). And the question is merely a captious one, tending to insinuate he could not be the Messiah or Son of Man, because he spoke so differently from Daniel concerning his continuance.

<sup>z</sup> Mat. xi. 27.

to show by the appeal of a miracle to their senses, that he had such power<sup>a</sup>. He goes on in the same strain of authority, to proclaim himself “greater than Jonas,” “greater than Solomon,” “greater than the Temple,” and even “the Lord of the Sabbath<sup>b</sup>.” He avers himself also, to be *the Lord of David*; to have existed *before Abraham*; to be *the sower of the good seed, in the field of the world*; to be *ever present* to the prayers, of only *two or three* of his disciples assembled together in prayer; and to be a *co-worker with God*, in the exercise of divine power<sup>c</sup>. His power he asserts to be derived from God the Father, but to be *actually commensurate with his*; saying “the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do;” and affirming, “*what things soever he (the Father) doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise<sup>d</sup>*.” He speaks of himself thus, in one place; “I will send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes, and some of them ye shall kill and crucify:” and in another actually *quotes himself*, after this remarkable but un-observed manner; “Therefore said also *the wisdom of God*, I will send unto them prophets and apostles, and some of them ye shall slay and persecute<sup>e</sup>.” He thus exalts himself into the dignity, of being what

<sup>a</sup> Mat. ix. 2; and Luke v. 21.      <sup>b</sup> Mat. xii. 41, 42, 6, and 8.

<sup>c</sup> Mat. xxii. 43—45; John viii. 58; Mat. xiii. 37; Mat. xviii. 29—30, and John v. 17.

<sup>d</sup> John v. 19.

<sup>e</sup> Mat. xxiii. 34; and Luke xi. 49.

we shall find him familiarly denominated by others hereafter, no less than the very WISDOM OF GOD. He declares himself too to be *in the Father*, and *the Father* to be *in him*<sup>f</sup>; and himself to be consequently, and even in *his own* language, ONE WITH THE FATHER<sup>g</sup>. He describes himself to have come down *from* heaven, and yet to be still *in* heaven<sup>h</sup>; so vindicating the OMNIPRESENCE of God to himself. He affirms *he* has *all* power committed to him, in *heaven* and in *earth*<sup>i</sup>; so attributing to himself the OMNIPOTENCE of God. In consequence of the whole, he orders the admission of disciples into his religion, to be in *his* as well as in the Father's name<sup>k</sup>; and by the order ensures the ADORATION of his Christians, equally to *himself* as to the Father. And at last he promises his Christians, his *continual protection to the end of the world*<sup>l</sup>; taking into his own hands, the SUPREMACY of God over his church, and the PROVIDENCE of God over his creatures.

In this manner do even the meekness and modesty of the man Christ Jesus, invest him with all the ensigns of the Godhead. But he does so still more explicitly, in a single, though peculiarly awful, exertion of divine power. He informs us, that the grand exercise of God's sovereignty over man, at the consummation of his human world; and in the assignment of his human probationers, to their de-

<sup>f</sup> John x. 38.

<sup>g</sup> John x. 30.

<sup>h</sup> John iii. 13.

<sup>i</sup> Mat. xxviii. 18.

<sup>k</sup> Mat. xxviii. 19.

<sup>l</sup> Mat. xxviii. 20.

served places of existence for eternity; is *all committed to him*. This, he adds, is done expressly by God the Father, in order to throw a distinguished lustre of glory around our Saviour's head; and to exhibit him before the eyes of all mankind, as a *joint sharer*, and an *equal partaker*, of all their reverence for God <sup>m</sup>. He accordingly assures us, that, at the last day, all who lie in their graves shall hear *his* voice, and at *his* call come forth to judgment <sup>n</sup>; that *he* shall send *his* angels, to collect all offenders out of *his* kingdom <sup>o</sup>; that *he* shall also send *his* angels, to gather *his* elect from the four winds, and from one end of heaven to another <sup>p</sup>; that *he* shall *himself* come in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory <sup>q</sup>, with HIS OWN glory, with the glory of HIS FATHER, and with the glory of *all* his holy angels <sup>r</sup>; that *he* shall then sit upon the throne of *his* glory <sup>s</sup>, and all nations shall be assembled before *him* <sup>t</sup>; that *he* will then deliver to every man, according to his works <sup>u</sup>; that *he* will confess, and *he* will deny, those who confessed and denied *him* by their conduct in life <sup>x</sup>; that even his *twelve apostles* shall sit upon twelve subordinate thrones of judgment with him, judging the twelve tribes of their countrymen <sup>y</sup>; and that *he* will finally send away

<sup>m</sup> John v. 22—23.

<sup>n</sup> John v. 25, 28, 29.

<sup>o</sup> Mat. xiii. 41.

<sup>p</sup> Mat. xxiv. 31.

<sup>q</sup> Mat. xxiv. 30.

<sup>r</sup> Mat. xxv. 31; xvi. 27; and Luke ix. 26.

<sup>s</sup> Mat. xix. 28, and xxv. 31.

<sup>t</sup> Mat. xxv. 32.

<sup>u</sup> Mat. xvi. 27.

<sup>x</sup> Mat. x. 32—33.

<sup>y</sup> Mat. xix. 28.

the wicked into eternal punishment, and *he* will lead off the good into eternal happiness<sup>z</sup>.

— IV. —

Drest up in these appropriated robes of God's state, wearing God's crown, and wielding God's scepter; does our Saviour repeatedly exhibit himself to our mind's eye. Nor could a particle of these high assumptions, have been borne by the Jews, have been received by the apostles, and have been uttered by our Saviour; if *they* had not expected their Messiah to come forward to them, and if *he* had not *therefore* represented himself to them, with all these circumstances and qualities of divine sovereignty. This alone can account for our Saviour's conduct, in claiming such grand prerogatives of power, and claiming them in so easy and familiar a manner. This alone, too, can account for the behaviour of the apostles, in receiving them without amazement. They considered them as essential parts of that venerable character, which they attributed to our Saviour. And this alone can additionally account, for the demeanour of the Jews under them; hearing them without showing any indignation at the *general* positions, even while they showed much at the *particular* application of them to himself. They acknowledged them to be the

<sup>z</sup> Mat. xxv. 46, 41, and 34.

authoritative marks of the great Messiah; but thought it blasphemy in *him* to challenge them, because they owned him not for the Messiah.

Yet we need not rest the point, merely upon this strong basis of evidence. We see it positively settled by the very history. There the Jews appear expecting their Messiah, to be the SON OF GOD, and, *as such*, to be EQUAL with GOD, an ASSESSOR with God upon his throne of Heaven, and the grand JUDGE of all the universe.

“Thou art,” says Peter to him, “Christ, *the Son of the living God*;” and our Saviour adds in reply, “Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.” “I believe,” says Martha to him, “that thou art the Christ, *the Son of God*, which should come into the world<sup>b</sup>.” Nathaniel addresses him in the same strain of compliment, when he breaks out into that sudden burst of conviction; “Rabbi, thou art *the Son of God*, thou art THE KING OF ISRAEL<sup>c</sup>.” All the disciples, on his successful rebuke of the winds and waves, came to him worshipping and crying out; “Of a truth thou art *the Son of God*<sup>d</sup>.” Thomas also, on a similar flash of conviction darting rapidly across his mind, exclaims in a similar but superiour style, “My LORD and my GOD<sup>e</sup>.” And as Zecharias,

<sup>a</sup> Mat. xvi. 16, 17.

<sup>b</sup> John i. 49.

<sup>d</sup> Mat. xiv. 33.

<sup>b</sup> John xi. 27.

<sup>e</sup> John xx. 28.



propheſying that John the Baptiſt ſhould be the harbinger of our Saviour, ſays, “Thou, child, ſhalt be called the prophet of THE HIGHEST, *for* thou ſhalt go before the face of THE LORD to prepare his ways;” ſo Elizabeth, the miraculous mother of the Baptiſt, ſays to the virgin mother of our Saviour, “Whence is this to me, that the mother of MY LORD ſhould come to me<sup>f</sup>?” The Jews therefore expected their Son of God, who was coming into the world; to be their *King*, their *Lord*, their *Higheſt*, and their *God*.

The apoſtles accordingly attribute to him, without heſitation, the very OMNISCIENCE of God. “Lord, thou knoweſt ALL things, thou knoweſt that I love thee;” is Peter’s unequivocal declaration to our Saviour, ſtating at once the cauſe and the effect, and urging from his univerſal to his particular knowledge<sup>g</sup>. All his diſciples too, on his ſpeaking to ſome ſecret converſation among themſelves, and ſo ſhowing them “he knew they were deſirous to ask him;” broke out in an equal declaration to him, “Now are we ſure that thou knoweſt ALL things, and needeſt not that ANY MAN SHOULD ASK THEE; by *this* we believe, that THOU CAMEST FORTH FROM GOD<sup>h</sup>.” And “many,” adds St. John, “believed in his name, when they ſaw the miracles which he did; but Jeſus did not commit

<sup>f</sup> Luke i. 76, and 43.

<sup>g</sup> John xxi. 17.

<sup>h</sup> John xvi. 30.

“ himself unto them, because HE KNEW ALL MEN,  
 “ and NEEDED NOT THAT ANY SHOULD TESTIFY OF  
 “ MAN, FOR HE KNEW WHAT WAS IN MAN<sup>i</sup>.”

The Baptist also tells the Jews concerning him, that “ one mightier than himself was coming after  
 “ him,” the very “ *latchet of whose shoes* he was not  
 “ worthy to stoop down and unloose<sup>k</sup>.” He adds  
 too concerning him: “ He that cometh *from above*  
 “ is ABOVE ALL; he that is of the *earth*, is earthly,  
 “ and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from  
 “ *heaven*, is ABOVE ALL<sup>l</sup>.” He also subjoins, that this  
 wonderful personage is to be the mighty JUDGE of  
 the world. He does not do this indeed, by assert-  
 ing his judicial authority in a direct and positive  
 manner, as if he was opening a *new* truth to their  
 understandings; but as speaking upon a point, that  
 was well known to their minds, and familiar to their  
 spirits; therefore sliding over the *fact*, and resting  
 only on the *circumstances*. His “ fan is in his hand,”  
 he says; “ and he will throughly purge his floor,  
 “ and will gather his wheat into his garner, and  
 “ will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire<sup>m</sup>.”

But this judicial authority of the Son of God, is  
 insisted upon still more in these first annals of Chris-  
 tianity. “ Art thou,” says the high-priest to our  
 Saviour, “ the Christ, *the Son* of the Blessed? And  
 “ Jesus said, I AM; *and* ye shall see the Son of Man

<sup>i</sup> John ii. 23—25.

<sup>l</sup> John iii. 31.

<sup>k</sup> Mark i. 7.

<sup>m</sup> Mat. iii. 12.

“ SITTING ON THE RIGHT HAND OF POWER, and  
 “ COMING IN THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN.” The  
 high-priest asked our Saviour, with all the reigning  
 ideas of the Jews at the time; and our Saviour spoke  
 to those ideas, in his reply. The Jews, therefore,  
 were in full assurance at the moment; that their  
 Messiah, “ the Son of the Blessed,” was to “ fit  
 “ on the right hand of Power,” as a COLLEAGUE  
 with God in the supremacy of the universe, and as  
 an ASSOCIATE with God in the throne of heaven.  
 This is St. Mark’s account. But let us see St.  
 Luke’s. “ They carried him,” says the latter,  
 “ to the judgment-seat, saying, Art thou *the Christ?*”  
 “ Hereafter,” says our Saviour in reply, “ shall  
 “ *the Son of Man* SIT ON THE RIGHT HAND OF THE  
 “ POWER OF GOD. Then said they all, Art thou  
 “ then *the Son of God?* And he said unto them, YE  
 “ SAY THAT I AM.” This shows us very clearly  
 concerning that Being, who is here denominated  
 with such a ready transition from title to title, “ the  
 “ Christ,” “ the Son of Man,” and “ the Son of  
 “ God:” that to sit on the right hand of God the  
 Father, was so much the exclusive and characteris-  
 tick privilege of the Messiah, in *their* opinion and in  
*his*; as, to claim the privilege was to assume the  
 character, in *theirs*; and to assume the character was  
 to claim the privilege, in *his*. And, from both these

† Mark, xiv. 61—62.

° Luke xxii. 67, 69, 70.

passages united, the Jews appear plainly at the time, to have expected in their Messiah an awful and revered Being, who was to be *the Son of Man* and *the Son of God* united in one; who should at the last day, as both, COME VISIBLY FROM THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD THE FATHER, and VISIBLY DESCEND THROUGH THE OPENED CLOUDS TO JUDGE THE WORLD.

Yet they went even farther, in their opinions. We have already seen our Saviour, receiving without reprehension the appellation of GOD, and the attributes of OMNISCIENCE, from *some* of the Jews. We shall now see *all* the Jews acknowledging, that their Messiah, *as* the Son of God, was to be GOD, and so to be EQUAL with God.

“Your father Abraham,” says our Saviour to the Jews, “rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad.” Our Saviour thus proposes himself to his countrymen, as their Messiah; that grand object of hope and desire to their fathers, and particularly to this first father of the faithful, Abraham. But his countrymen, not acknowledging his claim to the character of Messiah, and therefore not allowing his supernatural priority of existence to Abraham; chose to consider his words, in a signification merely human. “Then said the Jews unto him, “Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou “seen Abraham?” But what does our Saviour reply, to this low and gross comment upon his intimation? Does he retract it, by warping his language

guage to their poor perverseness, and so waying his pretensions to the assumed dignity? No! To have so acted, would have been derogatory to *his* dignity, and injurious to *their* interests. He actually repeats his claim to the character. He actually enforces his pretensions, to a supernatural priority of existence. He even heightens both. He mounts up far beyond Abraham. He ascends beyond all the orders of creation. And he places himself with God, at the head of the universe. He thus arrogates to himself all that high pitch of dignity, which the Jews expected their Messiah to assume. This he does too in the most energetick manner, that his simplicity of language, so natural to inherent greatness, would possibly admit. He also introduces what he says, with much solemnity in the form, and with more in the repetition. "Verily, verily, I say unto you," he cries, "BEFORE ABRAHAM WAS, I AM." He says not of himself, as he says of Abraham, "Before he WAS, I WAS." This indeed would have been sufficient, to affirm his existence previous to Abraham. But it would not have been sufficient, to declare what he *now* meant to assert, his full claim to the majesty of the Messiah. He therefore drops all forms of language, that could be accommodated to the mere creatures of God. He arrests one, that was appropriate to the Godhead itself. "Before Abraham *was*," or still more properly, "Before Abraham was MADE," he says; "I AM."

“ I AM P.” He thus gives himself the signature of *un-created* and *continual* existence, in direct opposition to *contingent* and *created*. He says of himself,

That an eternal now for ever lasts

with him. He attaches to himself that very stamp of *eternity*, which God appropriates to his Godhead in the Old Testament; and from which an apostle afterwards describes “ Jesus Christ” expressly, to be “ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever<sup>q</sup>.” Nor did the Jews pretend to mis-understand him now. They could not. They heard him directly and decisively vindicating, the noblest rights of their Messiah, and the highest honours of their God, to himself. They considered him, as a mere pretender to *those*. They therefore looked upon him, as a blasphemous arrogator of *these*. “ Then took they “ up stones, to cast at him” as a blasphemer<sup>r</sup>; as what indeed he was in his pretensions to be God, if

ρ Πρὶν Ἀβραάμ ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ, ἐγὼ εἰμι. The Ethiopick version accordingly renders the words, “ priusquam Abraham *nascetur*, “ fui ego;” and the Persian, “ nondum Abraham *factus erat*, cum “ ego eram” (Pearson on the Creed, p. 111, in that treasury of knowledge his Notes. Edit. 12th, 1741). So likewise does the Syriack version run: “ ante quam *FIERET* Abraham, ego sum” (P. 333. a Martino Trostio. 1621. Cothenis Anhaltinorum).

<sup>q</sup> Heb. xiii. 8.

<sup>r</sup> Lev. xxiv. 16. “ He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, “ he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly *stone* him: as well the stranger as he that is born in the “ land, when he blasphemeth the name of the Lord, shall be put to “ death.”

he had not been in reality their Messiah and their God in one. But he instantly proved himself to their very senses, to be both; by exerting the energetick powers of his Godhead, upon them. For he “*hid himself; and went out of the Temple, going through the midst of them; and so passed by*”<sup>s</sup>.

“I and my Father,” spoke our Saviour upon another occasion, “ARE ONE. Then the Jews took up stones *again*, to stone him;—saying, Because that thou, being a Man, MAKEST THYSELF GOD. —Jesus answered them;—Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I AM THE SON OF GOD?—Know and believe, that THE FATHER IS IN ME AND I IN HIM. *Therefore they fought again to take him; but he escaped out of their hand,*” by the exertion of the same powers of Godhead<sup>t</sup>.

Thus did the Jews expect a *Son of God*, who was to be *intimate in union*, and *one in essence*, with God the Father; and so to be GOD himself, the great I AM, and the very JEHOVAH of the Old Testament.

In the same tenour of opinions among the Jews, concerning the substantial divinity of the promised Messiah; and on the same sort of instant appeal to their opinions, by another declaration of our Saviour’s; we see the Jews a *third* time resolving to murder him. “Therefore,” as we are told, “the

<sup>s</sup> John viii. 56—59.

<sup>t</sup> John x. 30, 31, 36, 38, and 39.

“ Jews fought the more to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath, but also called GOD HIS FATHER, MAKING HIMSELF EQUAL WITH GOD.” In strict fidelity of translation, he “ called God,” not merely “ *his* Father,” but “ HIS OWN PROPER Father,” *his* in a *proper* and *peculiar* degree of filial relation; and *so* made himself *equal* with God “ his Father.” And the Jews evidently appear at the close, to have considered the Deity, as consisting *at least* of GOD THE FATHER, and of GOD THE SON; a SON, who was equally GOD with the Father, and equal with the Father in GODHEAD.

In this state of the Jewish opinions concerning the Divinity, we see plainly what we cannot see at all without a reference to them. We understand, why the very *dæmons* address our Saviour, as “ the Son of God,” as “ the Son of the Most High God,” as “ the Son of God Most High,” and as the future configner of them to their torments in hell \*. We perceive

\* John v. 18. *πατέρα ΙΔΙΟΝ ελεγε τον θεον.*

\* Mark iii. 11, v. 7; Luke viii. 28; and Mat. viii. 29. These extraordinary personages in the New Testament, are not called *dæmons*, *Διαβολοι*, in the original; that word never occurring in the Christian scriptures, but in the singular number, and as applied to one Being alone. They are called *dæmons*, *Δαιμονες* or *Δαιμονια*. Yet they are plainly devils in fact; being called Unclean Spirits, though sometimes only Spirits (Mark ix. 20; and Luke x. 20); and showing themselves to be devils, by their whole history. In Mat. xii. 24 and 26 particularly, the Pharisees say “ our Saviour casts out devils (*dæmons*) “ by Beelzebub the prince of the devils (*dæmons*);” and our Saviour replies,



ceive also, why the very *angels* speak of him, as one to be called “ the Son of God;” as “ the Son of the “ Higheft;” as “ EMMANUEL, which, being interpreted, is GOD WITH US;” and as one whose harbinger, John the Baptist, was to “ turn many of “ the children of Israel to THE LORD THEIR GOD, “ and to go before HIM in the spirit and power of “ Elias.” Angels and devils thus speak, because they were speaking to Jews; because *those* were speaking to men, who expected the Son of God to appear immediately among them, who knew he was to be “ the Lord their God,” and who therefore knew, that, when he came, he would be “ Emmanuel” or “ God among men;” and because *these* were addressing themselves to that very Being,

replies, that then “ Satan casts out Satan.” See also Luke x. 17—18; where the apostles rejoicing declare, “ even the devils (dæmons) “ are subject unto us;” and our Saviour says “ unto them, I beheld “ Satan as lightning fall from heaven.” So very false in itself, and directly contradicted by the very words of our Saviour, is that hypothesis of Dr. Campbell’s in his new translation of the Gospels; which asserts these possessions of the New Testament to be nowhere attributed to the devil, and which avers the dominion or authority of the devil to be nowhere ascribed to the dæmons! Beelzebub is expressly called the *prince* of the dæmons, the dæmons are expressly denominated *Satan* with him, and these are only inferior devils subordinate to the great one. And though the word *dæmons* (as Dr. Campbell urges) might critically be more exact in a translation; yet the word *devils* better accords, with the usages of our language and the course of our ideas. Exactness therefore has been properly sacrificed to utility.

† Luke i. 35, 32; Mat. i. 23; and Luke i. 16—17.

now

now actually come, under his all-comprehending title of “ the Son of God.”

Thus does the whole history of the Jews, in the days of our Saviour; and thus do all the agents in it, our Saviour himself, his apostles, and the whole nation of the Jews, men, devils, and angels; all unite to blazon forth the faith of the Jews cotemporary with our Saviour, as a faith of DIVINITY in their Messiah. The Jews, whatever they may *now* say or think, were *originally* as much believers in the DIVINITY of their Christ, as we are in that of our Jesus; and never revolted from this faith, which they had received from their fore-fathers the Patriarchs, till they revolted from *their* Christ and *our* Jesus in one, till they rejected the King of Israel, and till they crucified the God of the Patriarchs upon Mount Calvary.

---

## CHAPTER THE SECOND.

## — I. —

HAVING now established the belief of the Jews in this article, let me endeavour to ascertain; *when* they relinquished it, and adopted their present opinion. This it may be difficult to do, history taking little notice of variations of sentiment in theology, and such a variation as that being sure to be slowly and silently effected. Yet we *can* ascertain the point. We can show the Jews, as I shall show them in this and the following chapter, still retaining their antient creed for some time after our Saviour. We can also prove them, as in the succeeding chapter I shall; at a particular period afterwards, ceasing to retain it any longer. And we can thus circumscribe that point of time, which was the grand pivot of the Jewish faith; and which is signalized to the world, by such an extraordinary movement upon it.

We have several writings of Jews, within a century after our Saviour's death. At the head of these, are the works of PHILO JUDÆUS. This author, as we are informed by that early and valuable historian of Christianity, Eusebius, "flourished  
 " in the reign of the emperor Caligula; being a

D

" man

“ man of great eminence with the generality, not  
 “ merely of our Christian brethren, but also of such  
 “ as have been bred in Gentile literature: in his  
 “ descent he was a Hebrew, and yielded to none  
 “ of those at Alexandria, who were distinguished  
 “ for their consequence: *what and how great ad-*  
 “ *vances he made, in the knowledge of the divine*  
 “ *and Jewish religion; is evident to all from his*  
 “ *writings: and, in the philosophick and liberal*  
 “ *parts of Gentile literature, I need not say how*  
 “ *great he was; for studying with peculiar zeal the*  
 “ *discipline of Plato and Pythagoras, he is reported*  
 “ *by history to have surpassed all his cotempora-*  
 “ *ries*.” Philo’s acquaintance with *the doctrines of*  
*the Heathens*, was known only by *historical report* to  
 Eusebius; while the *writings* of Philo displayed his  
 knowledge, in *the religion of the Jews*. Philo was  
 also sent at the head of a Jewish legation, from  
 Alexandria to Rome; in the time of Caligula<sup>b</sup>.  
 But he was sent on a second, in the succeeding days

<sup>a</sup> Eusebius (Reading’s edit. vol. i.) Hist. ii. 4. p. 51. Κατα δε  
 τελον, Caligula, φιλων εγνωριζελο, πλειστοις ανηρ θ μονον των ημετερων,  
 αλλα και των απο της εξωθεν ορωμενων παιδειας επισημοδιδας· το μεν  
 εν γειος αιεκαθεν Εξραιος ην· των δ’ επ’ Αλεξανδρειας εν τελει διαφανων,  
 εδενος χειρων· περι μεν εν τα θεια και πατρια μαθηματα, ποσον τε και πη-  
 λικον εισειρηκεται πορον, ΕΡΤΩ πασι δηλος· και περι τα φιλοσοφα δε και  
 ελευθερια της εξωθεν παιδειας οις τις ην, εδεν δει λεγειν· οτε και μαλιστα  
 την κατη Πλαωνα και Ηυθαγορων εξηλωκως αγωγην, διενεργειν απαυλας  
 της καθ’ εαυτον ΙΣΤΟΡΕΙΤΑΙ.

<sup>b</sup> See his work De Legatione ad Caium, p. 992, in Philonis Ju-  
 dæi omnia quæ extant opera. Paris, 1640.

of Claudius <sup>c</sup>. He was therefore a cotemporary with the apostles. And the *writings* of such a man as this, must be a full evidence of the opinions of the Jews, at the moment.

He was a Hellenist Jew of Alexandria, considerable in his family and fortune <sup>d</sup>; and, what was much more to his honour, actuated with a lively spirit of religiousness. He spent a long life, in writing a variety of treatises upon points of the national theology, and giving them afterwards to the world. So early as the reign of Claudius, and during the lifetime of the author, his works were in the possession of the publick, and even repositied in the libraries at Rome <sup>e</sup>. They have been since published in the modern way, from the press: and with two fragments of works that have perished, three correspondent passages from other authors, and that almost necessary adjunct to every Greek work at present, a Latin translation; form a folio of twelve hundred pages <sup>f</sup>. And Eusebius, in his curious collection of opinions which he calls an Evangelical Preparation, has preserved several other passages, that ought to have been added as fragments to the rest <sup>g</sup>. In all these writings, Philo has shown a

<sup>c</sup> Eusebius ii. 4. p. 51. and ii. 17. p. 65.

<sup>d</sup> Eusebius before, and Josephus's testimony prefixed with it to Philo's works.

<sup>e</sup> Eusebius ii. 17. p. 72.

<sup>f</sup> In the Paris edition.

<sup>g</sup> P. 190, 195, 198, 209, 213, and 223—235. Paris, 1544. Stephens.

pleasing, and yet puzzling, disquifitivenefs of genius. His mind, all the while, is bufily operating upon itfelf. And, like the filk-worm, he is fpinning a multiplicity of fine threads out of his own bowels, and is continually burying himfelf in his own web of filk.

In thefe exertions of his fancy at the expence of his judgment, which were occafioned probably by his making them in the early and lively period of his life<sup>b</sup>; Philo throws out a number of declarations, that fhew his own and the Jewifh belief in a fecondary fort of God, a God fubordinate in origin to the Father of all, yet moft intimately united with him, and fharing his moft unqueftionable honours. Philo thus coincides directly, with all that we have feen pointed out to us already, by the evangelical hiftory of our religion. Only there is a ftriking difference, in the conduct of the evangelical hiftorians and of him. They are continually hiftorians; hiftorians indeed of the moft fimple and unaffected kind, that ever came forward for the inftruction of man; and hiftorians therefore, calculated peculiarly to be the annalifts of Him, who was Simplicity itfelf, who was Greatnefs without the flighteft tincture of affectation, Majefty without arrogation, and Deity without affumption. But Philo is hiftorical only in two of his pieces, the behaviour of

<sup>b</sup> See a note ch. iii. feft. 2.

Flaccus, and the embassy to Caligula. In his other pieces, however they may be historical in their nature; he instantly deserts the path of history, and ranges freely through the wilds of imagination. And, in all his pieces, he is continually affecting a strain of critical subtlety, that disgusts us with its injudiciousness, while it strikes us with its ingeniousness; and creates an equal sensation of wonder and of condemnation, in our minds. He is a perpetual allegorist. Every incident in the history, every name in the narrative, and almost every word in either, that he has occasion to cite from the Old Testament; grows up in his warm and forming hand, into an allegory. “Being copious in language,” says Eusebius of him very justly, “and taking a large compass in his sentiments, and mounting to a high and extraordinary pitch in his speculations on the word of God; he hath made a variegated and multifarious exposition, of Holy Writ<sup>i</sup>.” “There are,” adds Photius still more justly of him, “many and various compositions of his, containing essays on morals and comments on the Old Testament; mostly forced out of the letter, into an allegory: from which, I think, even every allegorical discourse upon Scripture, now

<sup>i</sup> Eccl. Hist. ii. 18. p. 70. πολυς γε μεν τῷ λογῷ, καὶ πλατὺς ταῖς διανοαῖς, ὑψηλὸς τε καὶ μείζωνος ἐν ταῖς εἰς τὰς θείας γραφὰς θεωρηταῖς γεγεννημένος, ποικιλήν καὶ πολυτρόπον τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων πεποιθὴς τὴν ὑφήγησιν.

“ in the church, took occasion to break in <sup>k</sup>.” Photius thus considers him as the father of that mode of allegorizing Scripture, which, in the hands of a superiour intelligence like an apostle, may become an useful species of exposition at times, just as lions and tigers have been made to draw the car of a triumph; but was proving itself vain and foolish in other hands, so early as the days of Photius; and, in our own country, has shown itself as dangerous as it is visionary, extending its operations over the New Testament equally with the Old, and going on to catch the rectified spirit of both in its alembick, till the very letter began to evaporate away. Philo has not pursued his allegorical propensities, to so extravagant a length as this. But he has pursued them very far. He has spread a cloud of allegory, over the popular belief of his countrymen and cotemporaries at Jerusaleme, in the positive divinity of the Son of God; which prevents us from beholding it in so strong and full a blaze of light, as we see playing upon it before in the biographers of our Saviour. Yet we still see it. No cloud could intercept this bright effulgence, entirely from our view. It breaks through every impediment in its way. It travels down, like the light of a distant

<sup>k</sup> Photius prefixed to Philo: *Φερεται δε αυτη πολλα και ποικιλα συνταγματα, ηθικης λογου περιεχομενα και της παλαιας υπομνηματα, τα πλειστα προς αλληγοριαν τε γραμματος εκδιαζομενα: εξ υ, ομαι, και πιασ ο αλληγορικος της γραφης εν τη εκκλησιας λογος εσχεν αρχην εισρηται.*



star, to our eyes. And it thus makes us to see the more, the vigour and vividness of the orb from which all proceeds<sup>1</sup>.

— II. —

In this humour of allegorizing, Philo uses not the name for his derivative Being in the Godhead, which we see the other Jews of the time using in the Gospels. He speaks not of him, by his natural appellation of the Son of God. No! He takes up another title for him, which indeed was known equally to other Jews, or Philo could not possibly have adopted it; which was known equally to the Gentiles, as I shall show hereafter; but which was known only to the scholars of either. He calls him “the *Logos* of God.” This is a name, that can be borrowed, together with the idea annexed to it, only from the Jews, or from the common ancestors of them and of the Gentiles; that answers exactly to the *Dabar* of Jehovah in the Hebrew Scriptures, and to the *Memra* of Jehovah in the Chaldee paraphrasts upon them; and signifies merely “the *WORD*

<sup>1</sup> “The Jews themselves, finding every thing in Philo so agreeable to the notions, that their ancestors had in his age; do own them (his writings) to be the writings of a Jew, and of Philo in particular: as we see in Manasseh Ben Israel, who in many places alledges his authority; and (in Exod. p. 137) shews, that his opinions do generally agree with those of their most ancient authors” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 73).

“ of God <sup>m</sup>.” This name has been since introduced into our religion, by one of the inspired teachers of it. And notwithstanding the ductility of the Greek language in this instance, which would allow it to be rendered either the *Word* or the *Reason* of God; yet the English Bible, with a strict adherence to

<sup>m</sup> That the *Memra* of Jehovah (a Chaldaick word which superseded the *Dabar* of David in Psalm xxxiii. 6, and of some Jews since our Saviour, Allix’s Judgment, p. 344 and 366) means this very Logos; is too evident to leave any possibility of doubting it. In Levit. xxvi. 9, “ I will be your God,” is in Jonathan’s paraphrase, “ *My Word* shall be unto you *God the Redeemer* ;” and *ibid.* ver. 11, “ My Soul” is in Onkelos’s paraphrase “ My Word, shall not abhor you.” “ To the *Word* are attributed the great things predicted of the *Messiah*, If. ix. 7 ; *Jehowab* himself is expounded “ by the *Lord’s Christ*, If. xxviii. 5 ; this *Word* of the Lord is called “ the *Redeemer*, Jer. xlii. 5 ; and his *Redemption* is called *Ewerlast- ing*, If. xlv. 17 ; and *the creation of the world is imputed to him*, “ Jer. xxviii. 5.” See Kidder’s Demonstration of the Messiah, part iii. p. 107—108. edit. 2, and preface to this part p. xi, for these and other instances: only in iii. 108 he writes by a mistake, “ the Lord said *by*,” instead of “ the Lord said *to*,” “ his *Word*.” “ Wherever the words *Jehowab* and *Elohim* are read in the Hebrew, “ there Onkelos commonly renders it in his Chaldee paraphrase, “ *the Word of the Lord*.—The Targums commonly describe the “ same person under the title of *Shekinab*.—And—we see—the most “ famous writers of the synagogue,—looking upon the *Memra* and “ the *Shekinab*, as the same. So doth R. Moses Maimonides, R. “ Menachem de Rakanaty, and Ramban, and R. Bachaye” (Allix, p. 150). And, what adds very strongly to this argument, the Arians are now come to own its truth. See Essay on Spirit, p. 49—50. edit. 2d, 1752 ; and what is only a large expansion of it in the *Arianism*, without any reply to the decisive answers given it, the Apology of Ben Mordecai by H. Taylor, A. M. vol. i. p. 340—345. edit. 2d. 1784.

propriety, and in full conformity to the antient Christians and antient Jews, has rejected the accidental signification, and embraced only the immediate and the genuine. Yet, even now, the name is confined in its use to the more improved intellects among us. And it must therefore have peculiarly been in the days of Philo, the *philosophical* denomination of Him, who was *popularly* called the Son of God.

The use of the name of Logos or Word, by Philo and by St. John in concurrence; sufficiently marks the knowledge of the name, among the Jews. But the total silence concerning it, by the Jewish writers of the three first Gospels; the equal silence of the introduced Jews concerning it, in all the four; and the *acknowledged* use of it through all the Jewish records of our religion, merely by St. John himself<sup>n</sup>; prove it to have been familiar to a few only. It is indeed too mysterious in its allusion, and too reducible into metaphor in its import, to have ever been the common and ordinary appellation, for the Son of God. Originating from the *spiritual* principle of connection, betwixt the first and the second Being in the Godhead; marking this, by a *spiritual* idea of connection; and considering it to be as close and as necessary, as the *Word* is to the energetick *Mind* of God, which cannot bury its intellectual energies in

<sup>n</sup> See hereafter for two instances of its use by others, that are not acknowledged.

silence,

silence, but must put them forth in speech; it is too *spiritual* in itself, to be addressed to the faith of the multitude. If with so full a reference to our *bodily* ideas, and so positive a *filiation* of the Second Being to the First, we have seen the grossness of Arian criticism, endeavouring to resolve the doctrine into the mere dust of a figure; how much more ready would it have been to do so, if we had only such a *spiritual* denomination as this, for the second? This would certainly have been considered by it, as too unsubstantial for distinct personality, and therefore too evanescent for equal divinity.

St. John indeed adopted this philosophical title, for the denomination of the Son of God; only in one solemn and prefatory passage of his Gospel, in two slight and incidental passages of his Epistles, and in one of his Book of Revelations. Even there, the use of the popular instead of the philosophical name, in the three Gospels antecedent to his; precluded all probability of misconstruction. Yet, not content with this, he formed an additional barrier. At the same instant in which he speaks of the Logos, he asserts him to be distinct from God the Father, and yet to be equally God with him. "In the be-

\* There is only one acknowledged, that of 1 John v. 7. But *this* is evidently another; "that which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have *seen with our eyes*, which we have looked upon, and *our hands have handled*, of THE WORD of life" (1 John i. 1).

“ginning,” he says, “was THE WORD; and THE WORD was *with* God; and THE WORD was GOD.” Having thus secured the two grand points relating to the Logos, he can have nothing more to say upon the subject; than to repeat what he has stated, for impressing the deeper conviction. He accordingly repeats it. His personality he impresses again, thus; “THE SAME was in the beginning *with* God.” His divinity also he again inculcates, thus: “ALL THINGS WERE MADE BY HIM, and WITHOUT HIM WAS NOT ANY THING MADE THAT WAS MADE.” Here the very repetition itself, of enforcing his claim to divinity, by ascribing the creation to him; is plainly an union of two clauses, each announcing him as the Creator of the universe, and one doubling over the other. And the uncreated nature of his own existence, is the more strongly enforced upon the mind; by being contrasted with the created nature, of all other existences. These were MADE, but he himself WAS; *made* by Him, who *was* with God and *was* God<sup>P</sup>. Nor would all this precaution suffice, in the opinion of St. John. He must place still stronger fences, against the dangerous spirit of error. He therefore goes on to say, in confirmation of his personality and divinity, and in application of all to our Sa-

P Ο λογος ΗΝ προς τον θεον, και θεος ΗΝ ο λογος; and παντα δι' αυτου ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ, και χωρις αυτου ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ εδε εν ο ΓΕΤΟΝΕΝ.

viour: “ HE was in the world, and THE WORLD  
 “ WAS MADE BY HIM, and the world knew him not;  
 “ HE came unto HIS OWN [PROPER DOMAINS], and  
 “ HIS OWN [PROPER DOMESTICKS] received him  
 “ not<sup>q</sup>.” And he closes all, with judiciously draw-  
 ing the several parts of his assertions before, into  
 one full point; and with additionally explaining his  
 philosophical term, by a direct reference of it to  
 that popular one, which he uses ever afterwards:  
 “ and THE WORD was made flesh, and dwelt among  
 “ us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of THE  
 “ ONLY BEGOTTEN OF THE FATHER, full of grace  
 “ and truth<sup>r</sup>.”

Yet, when such guards were requisite, what in-  
 duced St. John to use this philosophical title at all?  
 The reason was assuredly this. The title was in high  
 repute, and in familiar use, among the refined spi-

<sup>q</sup> So τα ἴδια in Luke xvi. 32, xix. 27, and Acts xxi. 6. signify  
*the proper home*. Εἰς ΤΑ ΙΔΙΑ ἦλθε, καὶ Οἱ ΙΔΙΟΙ αὐτοῦ ἐπαρελάβον.

<sup>r</sup> Yet Arius, with all that unfeelingness of assurance, which was  
 first introduced into the heresy, I believe, by this Patriarch of it;  
 and is carefully preserved by his heretical posterity, at present; took  
 advantage of the *term*, to deny the *theology*. “ Well said John,”  
 he cries, “ In the beginning was the Word, *that is the speech of God*;  
 “ for he said not, In the beginning was the Son, but *the pronounced*  
 “ *word of God* :” καλῶς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰωάννης, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, τὸ εἶναι τὸ  
 ῥῆμα τὸ θεῶν· ἢ γὰρ εἶπεν, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ υἱός, ἀλλ’ ὁ λόγος ὁ προφορικὸς  
 τὸ θεῶν (Anastadius’s Hodegus 330, Fabricius’s Index to it in Bib.  
 Græ. ix. 315). Perhaps a stronger instance of Arian audacity, can-  
 not be produced; of audacity in asserting, to the very face and front  
 of evidence.

rits of the age; and his Gospel was peculiarly calculated, for the service of *such*. The almost perpetual recurrence of the appellation in Philo's works, shows evidently the use and the repute in which it was, among the more spiritualized of the Jews. St. John therefore adopted it himself, for the more easy access to *their* conviction. It was also congenial probably of itself, to the spiritualized state of St. John's mind. He, who has dwelt so much more than the other Evangelists, upon the *doctrines* of our Saviour; and who has drawn out so many of them, in all their spiritual refinement of ideas; would naturally prefer the *spiritual* term of relationship for God the Son and God the Father, before the *bodily*; whenever the intellect was raised enough to receive it, and whenever the use of it was sufficiently guarded from danger. These were two reasons, I suppose, that induced St. John to use it a *few* times. And these were equally (I suppose) the reasons, that induced him, with all his guards, to use it *only* a few.

Nor let us be told in the rashness of Arian absurdity, that we misunderstand St. John in this interpretation of his words. If reason is capable of explaining words, and if St. John was capable of conveying his meaning in words to the ear of reason; then we may boldly appeal to the common sense of mankind, and insist upon the truth of our interpretation. Common sense indeed hath *already* determined

mined the point, in an impartial person, in an enemy, in a Heathen. I allude to that extraordinary approbation, which was given by a Heathen of the third century to this passage of St. John. “Of modern philosophers,” says Eusebius, “*Ame-*”  
 “*lius* is an eminent one; being himself, if ever  
 “there was one, a zealot for the philosophy of  
 “Plato; and he called the Divine of the Hebrews  
 “*a Barbarian*, as if he would not condescend to  
 “make mention of the Evangelist John by name<sup>s</sup>.”  
 Such is Eusebius’s account of our referee. But what are the terms of his award? They are these. “And  
 “such indeed was the Logos,” he says, “by whom,  
 “a perpetual Existence, the things created were  
 “created, as also Heraclitus has said; and who by  
 “Jupiter, *the Barbarian* says, being constituted in  
 “the rank and dignity of a Principle, is with God  
 “and is God, by whom all things absolutely were  
 “created; in whom the created living thing, and  
 “life, and existence, had a birth, and fell into a  
 “body, and putting on flesh appeared a man;  
 “and, after showing the greatness of his nature, and  
 “being wholly dissolved, is again deified and is  
 “God, such as he was before he was brought down  
 “into the body and the flesh and a man. These

<sup>s</sup> Eusebius’s Prep. Evang. 317. Των νεων φιλοσοφων διαφανης γε-  
 γωνως Αμηλιος, της Πλατωνος και αυτος, ει και τις αλλος, ζηλωτης φιλοσο-  
 φιας, πλην αλλα Βαρβαρον ονομασας τον Εβραιων θεολογον, ει και μη επ’  
 ονομαλος ηξιωσε τε Ευαγγελιστη Ιωαννη μνημην ποιησασθαι.

“ things,



“ things, if translated out of *the Barbarian's* theology, not as shaded over there, but on the contrary as placed in full view, would be plain<sup>t</sup>.” In this very singular and very valuable comment, upon St. John's Gospel in general, and upon his preface in particular; we may see, through the harsh and obscure language of the whole, some circumstances of great moment. The bold air of arrogance in the blinded Heathen over the illuminated Divine, must strike at once upon every eye. But the Logos appears from him, to have been known to the *philosophers* of antiquity *later* than the Gospel; and known too, as a perpetual Existence, and the Maker of the

<sup>t</sup> Eusebius 317—318. Και τέλος αρα ην ο λογος, καθ' ον, αι ουσιας τα γινόμενα εγενετο, ως αν και ο Ηρακλειος αξιωσει· και, η Δι', ον ο Βαρβαρος αξιοι εν τη της Αρχης (not, as the words are exhibited by Stephens here, ταξει και αλαξια, which form an opposition of language and a contradiction of sentiment, that destroys the consistence of the whole, but as Vigerus reads the words “ ex manuscripto, “ cui similes Theodoretus et Cyrillus,” ταξει και αξια) καθεσηκολα (a designed interpretation of the words εν αρχη ην ο λογος in St. John, as signifying, In the Principle or Cause of all things, was the Logos; just as Methodius explains the η Αρχη here, to be “ the Father and Maker of all things,” Bull, p. 147) προς θεον ειναι, και θεον ειναι· δι' ε πανθ' απλως γεγενησθαι· εν ω το γενομενον ζων και ζωνη και ον πεφυκεναι, και εις τα σωμαλα (for which σωμα is used below) πιπλειν, και σαρκα ενδυσασμενον, φανιλαζεσθαι ανθρωπον· μελα και τε τηνικαυλα δεικνυειν της φυσεως το μεγαλιον, αμειλι και αναλυθενικα, παλιν αποθεσθαι, και θεον ειναι, οιος ην προ τε εις το σωμα και την σαρκα και τον ανθρωπον καταχθηναι· ταυτ' εκ ειλ' επεσκιασμενως, αλλ' ανικρυς ηδη γυμνη τη κεφαλη, μελαπεφρασμενα εκ της Βαρβαρε θεολογιας, δηλα αν ειη.

world. St. John also is witnessed by a Heathen, and by one who put him down for a Barbarian, to have represented the Logos as THE MAKER OF ALL THINGS, as WITH GOD, and as GOD; as one likewise, “ *in whom* the created living Thing,” or the human soul of our Saviour, “ and” even “ Life and “ Existence” themselves, those primogenial principles of Deity, “ had a birth, and fell into a body, “ and putting on flesh appeared a man,” who was therefore man and God in one; who accordingly “ showed the greatness of his nature” by his miracles, was “ wholly dissolved,” and then “ was “ again DEIFIED and IS GOD,” even “ SUCH AS HE “ WAS, before he was brought down into the body and “ the flesh and a man.” And St. John is attested to have declared this, “ not even as shaded over, but “ on the contrary as placed in full view.” We have thus a testimony to the plain meaning of St. John, and to the evident Godhead of his Logos, a Godhead equally before and after his death; most unquestionable in its nature, very early in its age, and peculiarly forcible in its import. St. John, we see, is referred to in a language, that shows him to have been well known to the Grecian cotemporaries of Amelius, as a writer, as a foreigner, and as a marked assertor of Divinity for his Logos<sup>u</sup>.

— III. —

<sup>u</sup> We have also another attestation from a Heathen and from an enemy, even from one who is generally the bitterest of all enemies,  
an

## — III. —

The conduct of Philo on this point, was at once similar to St. John's, and different from it. He chose

an apostate from Christianity; to the divinity of our Saviour being positively asserted by St. John. In Cyrill, viii. p. 262. Spanheim, Julian is introduced citing three passages out of Deuteronomy for the unity of the Godhead, and contrasting them with the words of St. John above: μαρτυρημενος Ιωαννην λεγοντα, Εν αρχη ην ο λογος κ. λ. λ. "How then," he remarks, "do these passages agree with those of Moses?" πως εν ομολογει ταυτα τοις Μωσσεως. He next goes on to Isaiah's prediction, "A virgin shall conceive, &c." "He says not," adds Julian, "God shall be born of the virgin," μητι θεον φησιν εκ της παρθενου τεχθησεσθαι: "yet ye cease not calling Mary the mother of God," θεολογον δε υμεις ε παυεσθε Μαριαν καλευντες: "and this is said by John, All things were made by him," &c. αλλα το λεγομενον υπο Ιωαννης, Παιδα δι' αυτης εγενετο κ. λ. λ. In Cyrill also, x. p. 327, the same Emperor is introduced writing thus: "this Jesus then neither Paul dared to call God," του γαρ Ιησουν ειπε Παυλος εισημικησεν ειπειν θεον [though in p. 262 above he evidently refers to an expression of St. Paul's, and blames it as implying DIVINITY for Jesus, asking triumphantly if Isaiah "calls him who was to be born of the Virgin, "the only-begotten Son of God," an expression of St. John's, "and the first-born of every creature," an expression of St. Paul's; η μη φασι τον εκ της παρθενου γεννωμενον υιον θεου Μονογενη και Πρωτοτοκον πασης κτισεως]; "nor Matthew nor Luke nor Mark," ειπε Ματθαιος ειπε Λυκαας ειπε Μαρκος: "but the good John," αλλ' ο χρηστος Ιωαννης, "perceiving now a large multitude in many of the Grecian and Italian cities, seized with this disease" of Christianity, αισθομενος ηδη πολυ πληθος εαλωκος εν πολλαις των Ελληνικων και Ιταλιωτικων πολεων, υπο ταυτης της νοσε; "and hearing also, I think, of the [literary] monuments of Peter and Paul, which were kept secret indeed, but hearing of them as kept with care," ακουων δε, οιμαι, και τα μνηματια Πιερρε και Παυλου, λαθρα μιν, ακουων δε θεραπευομενα [so inconsistent is Julian here with what he says immediately before and after, and so consist-

chose the philosophical term for the Logos, because it was philosophical. He chose it also, because it indicated

ent with what he intimates in p. 262 before]; “was the first who “dared to call him” GOD, πρώτος ἐβόλησεν εἰπεῖν. In Facundus too iv. 2. p. 59. Paris. 1679, we have a letter of the same emperor and apostate, preserved in a wretched translation into Latin; and addressed to the same Photinus the heresiarch, whom he mentions in p. 262, as understanding St. John of somebody different from the Son of Mary. “You indeed, O Photinus,” he says to him in the letter, “seem likely for and very near to salvation, who do right in not placing him within the womb, whom you believed to be GOD;” “tu quidem, O Photine, verisimilis videris et proximus salutare [perhaps salvari], bene faciens nequaquam in utero inducere quem credidisti DEUM.” In this, no doubt, he particularly opposes St. John by the mention of Photinus, as he has done before. He then speaks of one Diodorus, as “Nazaræi magus,” and “acutus—sophista religionis agrestis,” as “the wise man of the Nazarene,” and “the acute sophist of a rustick religion.” He calls his Saviour “that new GOD of his, the Galilean, whom he fabulously preaches “to be ETERNAL;” “illum novum ejus DEUM, Galilæum, quem ÆTERNUM fabulosè prædicat.” And this man, he tells us, had derived “his fictitious DEITY,” “confictæ a Diodoro DEITATIS,” from *St. John* he particularly means, but from the *Apostles* in general he says; thus again contradicting his grand position, that *St. John* was the first who dared to call our Saviour God, and again referring the ascribed Godhead of our Saviour, to *St. John* and other *Apostles* in conjunction. Diodorus, he says, “armed his hateful tongue against the celestial gods, being very ignorant of the mysteries of the pagans, and having wretchedly imbibed, as they report, “all the error of his degenerate and unskilful theologues the Fishermen;” “odibilem adarmavit linguam adversus cœlestes Deos, usque adeo ignorans paganorum mysteria, omnemque miserabiliter imbibens, ut aiunt, degenerum et imperitorum ejus theologorum Piscatorum errorem.” We see apostates thus uniting with heretics, against the doctrine of *St. John*; but, in the very act of so doing,

indicated a spiritual relationship in the divine nature, by a reference to spirit. And he chose it too, because it gave such scope to the natural ingeniousness of his temper, and enabled him to wander so much over the fields of figure.

“ The animal life then,” says Philo, “ is shared even by the irrationals,” *τα αλογα*; “ and the rational,” *της δε λογικης*, “ is not shared but caused by God, the fountain of—the Logos<sup>x</sup>.” Here he speaks of the Logos, as the personified, not personal, Reason of God; alluding to the secondary signification of the word *Logos*; taking in also the title which we shall see his Logos actually to bear, that of the Wisdom of God; and from both compounding a kind of middle idea, that esteems a *Word* to be the external image of *Reason*, and considers *Reason* as the internal *Word* of the *Mind*. Thus does he in the present passage, and in a variety of others,

doing, flying off from the hereticks, and acknowledging the plain import of that very language, which the hereticks would wire-draw into their own absurdities. A Julian joins hand in hand with an Amelius, to show against a Photinus and the whole fraternity of modern Photinians, that we understand St. John just as they understood him. And indeed this preface of St. John's has proved such a powerful and irresistible weapon in the hands of orthodoxy, that some antient and modern Photinians have been obliged to take refuge from it, in that last effort of despair, that sullen and involuntary confession of indefensible absurdity; a denial of the authenticity of the whole.

<sup>x</sup> P. 170. *της μεν εν ζωικης μελεχει και τα αλογα, της δε λογικης η μελεχει μεν, αρχει δε, ο θεος, η τε λογικη—πηγη.*

enshrine his Logos behind such a veil of fancy and allegory; that we can scarcely discern his person in the sanctuary. In other passages, however, he draws aside the veil, and shows him to us in his full proportions.

He refers us to the *bodily* term of relationship, between these two Beings in the Godhead. This ascertains the personality at once; and therefore lays a foundation, for the superstructure of divinity. He who is distinct from God, may be a God himself. He may be, as St. John positively states him to be, “God with God.” “If yet indeed,” says Philo, “no one chances to be sufficiently worthy, of being called the Son of God; endeavour to be ornamented, like his *first-begotten* Logos<sup>y</sup>.” “There are (it seems) two temples of God,” he adds; “one indeed this world, in which his *first-begotten* the Divine Logos is also High-priest; and the other the rational soul, &c<sup>z</sup>.” “This world,” he tells us, “is the younger Son of God, as being a sensible object; for he mentioned not *the Son* that is older than this, and *he* is an intellectual Being; and *he*, considering himself as worthy of equality, thought proper to abide with God him-

<sup>y</sup> P. 341. και μηδεπω μετει τι γαγγλη τις αξιοχρεως ων ο υιος θεου προσαγορευεσθαι, σπουδαζε κοσμεισθαι κατὰ τον πρωτογονον αυτην λογον.

<sup>z</sup> P. 597. Δυο γαρ, ως εσικεν, ιερα θεου· εν μεν οδε ο κοσμος, εν ω και αρχιερεις ο πρωτογονος αυτην θειος λογος· ετερον δε λογικη ψυχη κ.τ.λ.

“ self<sup>a</sup>.” “ Him,” Philo further says, “ the Father of existence produced as *his eldest Son*, whom at other times he has named his *first-begotten*; and who indeed on being generated, in imitation of his Father’s ways, and looking upon his archetypal patterns, molded forms<sup>b</sup>.” And, to cite no more passages, God is said to have given an authority peculiarly high, to “ his right Logos his *first-begotten Son*<sup>c</sup>.”

Nor let my reader startle, at any expressions seemingly foreign and strange, in these extracts from Philo. Such must be continually expected, in the exuberance of his allegorical refinements.

<sup>a</sup> P. 298. Ο μὲν γὰρ κόσμος τέλος νεώτερος υἱὸς θεοῦ, ἀλλ’ αἰσθητὸς ἀντὶ τὸν γὰρ πρεσβύτερον τέλος εὐδέναι εἶπε, νοήσιος δ’ ἐκεῖνος· πρεσβύτων δ’ ἀξιώσας, παρ’ ἑαυτῷ καλαμενεὶν διηνοήθη.

<sup>b</sup> P. 329. τέλος μὲν γὰρ πρεσβυτάτων υἱὸν ὁ τῶν οὐτῶν ἀνεῖλε πατήρ, οὐ εἰρωθεὶ πρόωτογονον ἀνομαστῆ· καὶ ὁ γεννηθεὶς μένοι, μιμημένος τὰς τῶν πατρὸς ὁδοὺς, πρὸς παραδειγματικῶν ἀρχέτυπα ἐκεῖνα ἔλεπων, ἐμορφῶν εἶδη. So Methodius speaks of the Son of God, as a Second Person “ ornamenting the things already made, *in imitation of the First*; and this “ is the Son, the all-powerful and strong hand of the Father:” κατὰκοσμησάν καὶ ποιικίλλεσαν, κατὰ μίμησιν τῆς πρότερας, τὰ ἡδὴ γεγονότα· ἐστὶ δὲ ὁ υἱὸς, ὁ παντοδύναμος καὶ κράτεια χεὶρ τῶν Πατρὸς (Bull, p. 148). And Gregory Nazianzen adds, that “ the Father indeed forms the “ stamps of the things themselves,” τῶν αὐτῶν πραγμάτων τὰς τυπὰς ἐνσημαινεῖται μὲν Πάτερ; “ but the Logos finishes them, not servilely, “ not ignorantly, but with knowledge and with dignity, and (to “ speak more properly) like the Father,” ἐπιτελεῖ δὲ ὁ λογὸς, ὡς ἀδελφικῶς, εἰ ἀμαθῶς, ἀλλ’ ἐπισημονικῶς τε καὶ δεσποτικῶς, καὶ (οὐκ ἐπιτελεῖται εἰπεῖν) πατρικῶς (Ibid. Grabe’s Opera Bulli).

<sup>c</sup> P. 195. τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτῶν λογὸν πρόωτογονον υἱόν.

But his general sentiments, are plainly those of his church at the moment. His manner of proposing them, shows this. He considers the existence of a Son of God, for instance, as a certain and acknowledged truth. He therefore does not anywhere *assert* his existence. And I have found it impossible to produce any passages from him, that barely affirmed the fact. He considers this Son of God, to be confessedly superiour to all created things, to have formed them originally, to be the manager of them now, and to be intimately present with God. He has therefore mentioned his existence, only as incidental to his power. And I have been compelled to anticipate my future remarks, by producing passages that note him, as the High-priest of the temple of the world to God the Father, as One abiding with God himself, and as One who created from the archetypes of God; while I meant merely to ascertain his being. I shall now go on, however, to show him in a still stronger irradiation of Philo's light, as the Maker and Manager of the creation, the dignified Representative of God to his creatures, and "very God of very God<sup>d</sup>."

<sup>d</sup> We read in the Targum of Jerusalem, Gen. iii. 22, "The *Word* of Jehovah said, Here *Adam*, whom I created, is the *only-begotten Son* in the *world*, as I am the *only-begotten Son* in the high *Heaven*" (Allix's Judgment, p. 268). Hence in Luke iii. 38, we have "*Adam*, which was *the Son of God*."



## — IV. —

That the Logos was the acting existence in the original creation of all things, is affirmed in a variety of places by Philo. I shall produce several of them, that one ray may lend a brightness to another, and all may unite to dissipate the mist of metaphor upon them.

“ God as God foreseeing, that a fair imitation  
 “ could never be made without a fair pattern; and  
 “ that none of the sensible objects could be without  
 “ defect, unless it was molded to an archetypal and  
 “ intellectual idea; when he willed to fabricate this  
 “ visible world, previously configured out of him-  
 “ self the intellectual world; that, by using an un-  
 “ bodied and most godlike pattern, he might work  
 “ off the bodily world, the younger an image of  
 “ the elder, to contain as many sorts of sensible ob-  
 “ jects in it, as there were to be intellectual in the  
 “ other: but the world composed from ideas, it is  
 “ not lawful to say or to understand as in any  
 “ place—: the world framed from ideas can have  
 “ no other place, than the Divine Logos who set  
 “ these things in order; for what other place could  
 “ there be for his powers, which should be sufficient  
 “ to receive and take in, I say not all, but any  
 “ simple one of them? And he is the power which  
 “ also made the world, having the True Good for

“ his fountain <sup>e</sup>.” “ That invisible and intellectual  
 “ Being, the Divine Logos and the Logos of God,  
 “ he [Moses] calls the image of God; and the  
 “ image of this image that intellectual light, which  
 “ was made the image of the Divine Logos, who  
 “ [in Genesis] has explained the generation of *it*:  
 “ and *it* is a super-cœlestial star, the fountain of the  
 “ sensible stars, which not improperly one may call  
 “ Universal Light, from which the sun, and the  
 “ moon, and the other wandering and unwandering  
 “ stars draw, according to the power of each, their  
 “ proper splendours of that pure and unmixed light,  
 “ which is darkened over when it begins to turn in  
 “ the transformation, from intellectual to sensible <sup>f</sup>.”

God

<sup>e</sup> P. 3—4. Προλαβων γαρ ο θεος αλε θεος, ελι μιμημα καλον εκ αν ποτε γενεσιο καλεσθαι παραδειγματις, εδε τι των αισθητων ανυπαισιον, ο μη προς αρχηλυτον και νοητην ιδεαν απεικονισθη, βεληθεις τον ορηλον τελου κοσμον δημιουργησαι, προεξευπε τον νοητον· ινα χρωμενος ασωματω και θεοειδεστω παραδειγματι, τον σωματικον απειργασηται, πρεσβυτερον νεωτερον απεικονισμα, τοσαυτα περιεξωτα αισθητα γενη, οσαπερ εν εκεινη νοητα· τον δε εκ των ιδεων συνεστωτα κοσμον, εν τοπω τινι λεγειν η υπονοειν, ε θεμιλον·—εδ' ο εκ των ιδεων κοσμος αλλον αν εχει τοπον, η τον θεου λογον τον ταυτα διακοσμησαι· επει τις αν ειη των δυναμεων αυτη τοπος ετερος, ος γενοι' αν ικανος, ε λεγω πασας, αλλα μιαν ακρατον ηλινεν, δεξασθαι τε και χωρησαι. δυναμις δε και η κοσμοποιητικη, πηγην εχουσα το προς αληθειαν αγαθον.

<sup>f</sup> P. 6. τον δε ακρατον και νοητον, θεου λογον και θεω λογον, εικονα λεγει θεω και ταυτης εικονα το νοητον φως εκεινο, ο βειω λεγη γεγονεν εικων, τω διερμηνευσαιως την γεγεσιν αυτη. και εστιν υπερφρανιος αστης, πηγη των αισθητων των αστερων· ην εκ απο σκοπευ καλεσειεν αι τις παναυγειαν, αφ ης ο ηλιος και η σεληνη και οι αλλοι πλανητες τε και απλανεις, αρουσαι καθ' εσον εκαστω δυναμις, τα πρεπουλι φεγγη της αμιγους και καθαρας εκεινης αυγης,

God “ was willing, that the First Man should appear with beauty of the highest degree,” in his body: “ and that he was superexcellent in his soul, “ is evident; for it seems he used no other pattern of “ things in creation, for the formation of it, except “ only (as I have said) his own Logos:—but it is “ necessary, that the imitation of an all-beautiful “ pattern, should be all-beautiful; and the Logos “ of God is superiour even to beauty itself, what- “ ever beauty there is in nature; and is not ornamented with beauty, but (if we may speak the “ truth) is himself the most becoming ornament of “ beauty s.” “ Every man is related to the Divine “ Logos, in his understanding; being made the express image of the blessed Nature, or a particle “ of it, or a radiation from it h.” “ This created “ world is one, as the fabricator is one, who assimilated the work to himself in his unity, and used

αυτης, αμαυρωμενης οταν αρχηται τρεπεσθαι καλα την εκ νοησε προς αισθησον μεταβολην. This passage has been misunderstood, by some of our writers in defence of the Trinity; and the Logos has been confounded with his creature. See Bull, p. 14.

§ P. 31—32. Βελομενος ως ενι μαλιτα καλλιςον οφθηναι τον πρωτον ανθρωπον· οτι δε και την ψυχην αριστος ην, φανερων· εδενι γαρ ειερω παραδειγματι των εν γενεσει, προς την καλασκευην αυτης, εοικε χρησησθαι, μονω δ', ως ειπον, τω εαυτω λογω. — αναγκη δε παγκαλε παραδειγματος παγκαλον ειναι μιμημα· θεος δε λογος, και αυτω καλλης (οπερ εστιν εν τη φυσει καλλος) αμεινων, ε κοσμημενος καλλει· κοσμος δ' αυτωσ ων, ει δει ταληθεσ ειπειν, εκπρεπεσαλος εκεινω.

h P. 33. Πας ανθρωπος, καλα μεν την διανοιαν, ωκειωται θεω λογω, της μακαριως φυσειωσ εκμαγειον, η απουσπασμα, η απαυγασμα, γεγωνωσ.

“ all

“ all his essence in the creation of the whole <sup>i</sup>.” Then speaking of the river which went out of Eden to water Paradise, he says: “ Generous virtue takes  
 “ its beginning from *Eden*, the Wisdom of God;  
 “ she joys and rejoices and delights, exulting in her  
 “ only father, and glorying in her God—: the river  
 “ is this generous goodness; it proceeds out of the  
 “ Wisdom of God, and this is the Logos of God;  
 “ for this generous virtue was made according to  
 “ him <sup>k</sup>.” “ *Beseleel* then is interpreted God in a  
 “ shadow: but the shadow of God is his Logos,  
 “ whom he used as his instrument in making the  
 “ world <sup>l</sup>.” “ By his Logos, God wrought out  
 “ the universe <sup>m</sup>.” In one place he speaks of “ a  
 “ double Logos, one indeed an archetype above us,  
 “ and the other an imitation which abides among

<sup>i</sup> P. 39. Εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ γενηλὸς κόσμος τέλος, ἐπεὶ καὶ εἰς ὁ δημιουργὸς, ἐξομοιωσας αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν μονωσιν τὸ ἔργον, ὁ παση κατεχρησατο τὴν ἑσῆα ὡς τὴν τῶ ὅλων γενεσιν.

<sup>k</sup> P. 52. λαμβάνει μὲν ἐν τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡ γενικὴ ἀρετὴ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐδέμ, τῆς τῶ θεῶ σοφίας ἡ χαιρεῖ καὶ γαννύται καὶ τρυφᾷ, ἐπὶ μόνῳ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῆς ἀγαλλομένη, καὶ σεμνυνομένη θεῷ.—πόλιμος ἡ γενικὴ ἐστὶν ἀγαθότης· αὐτὴ ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τῆς τῶ θεῶ σοφίας· ἡ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ θεῶ λογος· κατὰ γὰρ τέλος πεποιθῆναι ἡ γενικὴ ἀρετὴ. I render γενικὴ ἀρετὴ and γενικὴ ἀγαθότης, not (as it has been always rendered) *general*, but, as propriety requires, and as p. 93 and 1103 in γεννηκάλως demand, *generous* virtue and *generous* goodness. It thus carries the same import, as it has the same origin, with γενναῖος and γενναϊκάλως.

<sup>l</sup> P. 78—79. Ἐρμηνεύεται ἐν Βεσελεὴλ, ἐν σκίᾳ ὁ θεῶς. σκία θεῶ δὲ ὁ λογος αὐτῆς ἐστὶν, ὃ καθάπερ ὄργανῳ προσχρησαίμενος ἐκκοσμοποιεῖ.

<sup>m</sup> P. 131. τῷ αὐτῆς λόγῳ καὶ τὸ παν ἐργαζόμενος, καὶ κ. ἱ. λ.

“ us; and Moses calls that above us, the image of  
 “ God, and that with us, the stamp of the image;  
 “ for God, he says, made man, not an image, but  
 “ according to an image<sup>n</sup>.” And he finally notices  
 “ the Saviour and merciful God, holding out as  
 “ peculiar to the race of men, the very great gift of  
 “ relationship to his Logos, by whom as an arche-  
 “ type was formed the mind of man<sup>o</sup>.”

Here we see the creation attributed at once, to the Son and to the Father. The Son is exhibited, as the operative Being in the work. Yet the act is referred to the Father. The Son is positively said, to be “ the Power which made the world,” and the “ Divine Logos who set these things in order.” But then the Father is with equal positiveness said, to have “ used the Son as his instrument in making “ the world.” And our own religion teaches us exactly the same doctrine: ascribing the creation, equally to the Son and to the Father; but asserting the Son in the operation, to have been merely instrumental to the Father. This is well known. Yet it may be proper to dwell briefly upon it, for the

<sup>n</sup> P. 512. Δυο λογος, ενα μεν αρχετυπον υπερ ημας, ειρον δε μιμημα, τον καθ' ημας υπαρχουσα. Καλει δε Μωσης τον μεν υπερ ημας, εικονα θεου, τον δε καθ' ημας, της εικονος εκμαγειον. Εποιησε γαρ, φησιν, ο θεος τον ανθρωπον, εκ εικονα, αλλα και εικονα.

<sup>o</sup> P. 936. Το σωτηριος και ιλω θεου, τω γενει των ανθρωπων εξαιρειον παρασχομεν μεγαστην δωρεαν, την προς τον αυτη λογον συγγενειαν, αφ η καταπερ αρχετυπου γεγοεν ο ανθρωπος υης.

fuller resolution of this seeming contradictoriness in Philo. There is a passage of Scripture, that has never yet been referred to the Son, but that plainly points at him in my opinion, and ascribes the creation to him as the Logos. “ This they willingly “ are ignorant of,” says St. Peter of such kind of scoffers, as our own experience too sadly exhibits to us; “ that by *the word of God* the heavens were of “ old, and the earth standing out of the water and “ in the water.” “ To us,” we are told by St. Paul, “ there is but one God, the Father, *of* whom “ are all things, and we in [*to*] him; and one Lord “ Jesus Christ, *by* whom are all things, and we *by* “ him.” And, as St. Paul further assures us, “ God, who at sundry times, and in divers man- “ ners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the “ prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us “ by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all “ things, *by* whom also *he* made the worlds.” And as the dignity of divinity in the Son, is strikingly sustained in the personal act of creation; so the majesty of divinity in the Father, is carefully supported in making the Father, to be the creator by the instrumentality of the Son.

Accordingly, Philo says a number of magnificent things concerning the Logos or Son, as in the act

† 2 Peter iii. 5. τῷ τε θεῷ λόγῳ.

‡ 1 Cor. viii. 6. εἰς αὐτόν.

‡ Heb. i. 1—3.

of exerting his creative Divinity on the universe. "The world composed from ideas" by the Father, he tells us, "*it is not lawful to say or to understand, as in any place.*" "The world framed from ideas," he adds, "*can have no other place, than the divine Logos—; for what other place could there be for his powers, which should be sufficient to receive and take in, I say not all, but any simple one of them?*" And "he is the Power, which also made the world." The Logos therefore is held out to us, as a Being uncircumscribed in space, and commensurate in extension with infinitude. But the reason assigned for this, gives additional energy to the intimation. He is represented to have a comprehensiveness of capacity, sufficient to take in the creative power of the Father. He is spoken of as the only Being in the universe, capable of this. And this sufficiently proves him to be, uncircumscribed in place; a Being capable of containing the creative power of God, being undoubtedly God himself; commensurate with him and with infinitude, in general attributes, and in particular creativeness.

But Philo adds in the same strain of philosophizing, upon this double personality of God; that the Logos or Son is "an image" of God, and, as such, is "all-beautiful," is "superiour even to beauty itself, whatever beauty there is in nature," and "is not ornamented with beauty, but (if he may speak the truth) is himself the most becoming ornament

“ nament of beauty.” Philo thus labours to blazon forth the glory of the Son of God, till he has actually darkened it. But then, like the Father himself, the Son only becomes

Dark from excessive bright.

And the words very strongly remind us, of the correspondent words of St. Paul; that the Son of God “ is the brightness of his glory, and the express “ image of his person <sup>s</sup> ;” and very forcibly suggest to us, that *therefore* he is so capable of taking in the divinity of the Father, as to retain the very image of his person, and to reflect the very beauty of his glory.

Thus invested with the brightness, and thus armed with the power, of the Godhead; the Son came forth (in Philo’s and the Jewish belief) to create the world. He was “ the intellectual world,” which the Father “ configured *out of himself*.” He was, therefore, of the very essence of the Father; and might well be sufficient, to take in the powers of the Father, to retain his image, and to reflect his glory.

From the “ intellectual objects” within himself, which were as numerous as the “ sensible objects” intended to be in the universe; using himself as “ an archetype,” and *so* “ using an unbodied and

<sup>s</sup> Heb. i. 2.



“ most godlike pattern;” he “ worked off the bodily world.” Thus did “ the younger” world become “ an image of the elder.” Particularly “ that intellectual light,” that “ super-cœlestial star,” which is “ the fountain of the sensible stars,” and from which “ the sun, and the moon, and the other wandering and unwandering stars, draw their splendours;” this elegant creation of Philo’s fine fancies, which he represents to be “ Universal Light,” “ pure and unmixed” in itself; “ which is darkened over, when it begins to turn in the transformation, from intellectual to sensible” light; and which is therefore placed in a kind of middle state betwixt sensible and intellectual objects, bright and intellectual in itself, but darkening as it mixes with matter, a kind of lucid screen between matter and spirit: this first received, as most congenial for the reception, “ the image of the divine Logos” upon it<sup>t</sup>.

The next, that received this reflected image of the Godhead, was “ the soul” of man. Accordingly Philo speaks of “ the Saviour and merciful God, holding out as peculiar to the race of men, the very great gift of *relationship* to his Logos; by whom, as an archetype, was formed the mind of

<sup>t</sup> So Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 78, Potter, speaks of ο θειος λογος, φωλιος αρχετυπον φως, “ the divine Logos, light the archetype of light.”

“ man.”

“ man.” He tells us also, that “ every man is “ *related* to the divine Logos, in his understanding; “ being made the express image” of him. He adds however what is very striking, that man is thus made “ the express image,” not merely of the Logos, but of what? “ of THE BLESSED NATURE.” Nor does he mean this, only of man’s becoming an image of Him, who is an image of God. He instantly shows he has a higher view. He says, that man is either “ an image, or a *particle*, or a *radiation*, of the blessed Nature.” The Logos, being “ all-beautiful” in himself, when he “ formed the “ mind of man” from “ himself as an archetype,” necessarily made the mind “ a radiation,” or “ a “ particle,” or “ an image,” of that “ blessed Nature;” “ out of which he had been configured” himself, and of which he was sufficient to receive and take in the creative power. The essence of Divinity in this Creator, enabled him to impart a kind of Divinity, to so spiritual a creature as the soul of man; to make it a “ radiation” from the great Sun of the universe, a “ particle” from the mighty Mind of the heavens, and an “ image” of the glory of the Godhead<sup>u</sup>.

As such, the Logos is properly styled by Philo,

<sup>u</sup> Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 78, says similarly, that “ the Logos “ of God is the image of him;—and the image of the Logos is the “ true man, the mind in man:” *η μεν γαρ τε θεα εικων, ο λογος αυτε* —*εικων δε τε λογου, ο ανθρωπος αληθινος, ο νους ο εν ανθρωπω.*

“ the

“ the Shadow of God;” that is, the substance of God, represented in a secondary form. Yet this shadow is as substantial, as the Godhead itself; the Logos being absolutely what our Saviour has represented himself before to be, “ the Wisdom of God;” and being as necessary to the Father, as wisdom itself to the Godhead\*. Nor is “ generous goodness” on earth, any thing more than the stamp or character of the Logos; “ being made according to *him*,” and “ proceeding out of *him*,” as “ the Wisdom of God;” wisdom and goodness being (as it were) incorporated in the Logos, and substantiated in the Father. And, to crown all, while the Logos has been affirmed to have “ made the world,” and to have “ formed the mind of man” from

\* The Jews in their writings “ attribute to the *God absconded*,” God the Father, “ to have acted in the creation by his *Wisdom* and by “ his *Understanding* [the Logos and the Holy Ghost]. R. Menach. fol. 1. from Bereschit Rabba.—They say that this *Wisdom* is called “ *the Beginning*, although she is but the second *Sephirah*” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 164). Indeed the name of *Wisdom* for the Logos was so common among the Jews, that the Jerusalem Targum on Gen. i. 1, instead of translating *Beresbith* as a mark of time, *in the beginning*; and by taking it personally to mean the Logos, as the Beginning or Cause of all creation; rendered the clause thus, “ *By the Wisdom* God created the heaven and the earth.” And the author plainly shows, whom he meant by *the Wisdom*; “ saying elsewhere, ver. 27, The λογος or the Word of the Lord created man after his “ image” (Allix, p. 131, 162, and 127—128). Onkelos also has rendered the word by “ *Bekadmin*, which signifies the Ancient or “ the First; which is the title they give to Wisdom, according to the “ same place of Solomon.” See also the Fathers to the same purpose, in Bull, p. 149 and 185.

F

“ himself

“ himself as an archetype;” while the Father has been also said to have used the Logos, as “ an un-  
 “ bodied and most godlike pattern,” in framing the universe; and while both are thus said to have molded all nature, into a likeness with the Logos: Philo very consistently and very appositely asserts, that “ this created world is one, as the fabricator is  
 “ one; who assimilated the work to *himself* in his  
 “ *unity*, and used *all his essence* in the creation of the  
 “ whole.” So completely united are the Father and the Son, that what is done by the Son, is equally done by the Father; that what is assimilated to the Father, is also assimilated to the Son; that they have an unity of essence, between them; and that either used all the essence of the other, in the creation of the world”.

— V. —

Having shown the faith of Philo in this leading point of all, I shall now proceed to show it in another point. He, who was the operating Creator of the world, is equally the acting Manager of it at

y For a full explanation of those only un-explained words, “ when he willed to fabricate this visible world, [he] previously configured” &c.; see Section VIth hereafter. “ Jonathan on Is. xlv. 12, declares his opinion, that *the Word* created the *earth*; and again “ on Isa. xlviii. 13. Thus Onkelos assures, that the *heavens* were “ made by *the Word* of the Lord, on Deut. xxxiii. 27. And he al-  
 “ most constantly distinguishes the *Logos*, as another person from the “ father” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 126).

present.

present. He presides as a Sovereign over his own universe. He officiates as a High-priest in his own temple. Such at least was the belief of Philo and the Jews. Such also is the belief, of the Apostles and of us Christians. And I shall thus prove the principles of Jewish theology, to have been equally Christian in this consecutive article of faith; as I have proved them to have been, in the primary one before.

“ Is not the Logos of God,” asks Philo, “ similar also to the pupil in the eye? For as this, though only a very small part, beholds the whole zones of existence, and the unbounded sea, and the expanse of the air, and as much of all the heaven as the rising and the setting sun terminates; so likewise the divine Logos is very sharp-sighted, even to be a Being sufficient for the inspection of all things.” Philo thus gives to the Logos that fundamental faculty of controul over the universe, the power of inspection. The globe lies all under the ken of his sharp eye. He is “ a Being sufficient for the inspection of all things.” And “ the Word of God,” says St. Paul with a remarkable similarity concerning *this very Logos*, “ is quick

<sup>2</sup> P. 92. Ο θεος λογος—μηποτε—ομοιειται και τη καλια τον οφθαλμω κορη; ως γαρ αυτη, εραχυλιατον εσα μερος, τας των οντων ορα ζωνας ολας, και θαλατταν απειρον, και αερος μεγαθος, και τε παντος θρανθ οσον αναλιλλων και δυομενος ο ηλιος οριζει' ελω και ο θειος λογος οξυδερκηςταλος εστιν, ως παντα εφοραν ειναι ικανος.

“ and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged  
 “ sword; piercing even to the dividing asunder of  
 “ soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow;  
 “ and is a DISCERNER OF THE THOUGHTS AND IN-  
 “ TENTS OF THE HEART; neither is there ANY  
 “ CREATURE, THAT IS NOT MANIFEST IN HIS SIGHT;  
 “ but ALL THINGS ARE NAKED AND OPENED UNTO  
 “ THE EYES OF HIM, WITH WHOM WE HAVE TO  
 “ do <sup>a</sup>.”

Man in misfortunes, as Philo tells us, “ throws  
 “ the whole blame upon what are the causes of no  
 “ evil, Agriculture, Traffic, or the other Employ-  
 “ ments, which he thought proper to use for the  
 “ procurement of money. But these, though never  
 “ partaking of the organs of speech, will by the  
 “ very facts break out into a voice, more powerful  
 “ than that by the tongue. “ Are not we then,  
 “ O calumniator,” they will say, “ those very  
 “ things on which thou rodest in lofty pride, as on  
 “ beasts of burden? Have we, with insolence in  
 “ return, wrought out calamity for thee? Behold  
 “ him who stood opposed to thee, the armed  
 “ Logos of God; to whom it is given to fix the  
 “ bounds of well and ill. Seest thou not this?  
 “ Why therefore dost thou now blame us; whom

<sup>a</sup> Heb. iv. 12—13. Ζων γαρ ο λογος τε θεος, και ενεργης, κ.τ. λ.  
 So Philo, p. 500, speaks of “ God having sharpened his Logos, who  
 “ can cut through all things;” ο θεος ακοησαμενος τον τομα των  
 συμπαιλων αυτη λογος.

“ thou didst not censure before, when thy affairs  
 “ went well? For we are the same, being noways  
 “ altered from our own nature, in the smallest  
 “ point at all. But thou, using judgments that are  
 “ unsound, art unreasonably agitated. For if thou  
 “ hadst learned from the beginning, that, even  
 “ though thou hadst an employment, this is not  
 “ the cause of thy participating in good or evil;  
 “ but that He is, who is the rudder-holder and  
 “ governor of the universe, the Divine Logos:  
 “ thou hadst more easily borne what has befallen  
 “ thee, ceasing to calumniate us, and to ascribe to  
 “ us what we could not do<sup>b</sup>.” Here we mount  
 a step higher, in the scale of the Jewish faith. We  
 see the Inspector of the universe, exalted into the  
 Controuler of it. The Logos we behold seated at  
 the helm of the world, and steering it as he thinks  
 proper. He thus stands forth the mighty Governor

<sup>b</sup> P. 113—114. Τα δ' εθνος αιλια κακω τοπαρπαπαι αιλιαται, την  
 Γεωργιαν, την Εμποριαν, τας αλλας Επιηθηδουσεις, αις προς αργυρισμον  
 ηξιω χρησθαι· αι δε, και ται Φωνηθηριαν οργανων αμειρεσαι, την δι' αυτων  
 των πραγματων ρηξισι Φωνην, εναργεσεραν εσαν της δια γλωττης· Αραγε,  
 ω συκοφαντα, εχ' ημεις εσμεν εκειναι (λεγεσαι), αις καθαπερ υποζυγιοις  
 υψαυχενων επεδεδηκεις; μη καθ' υπεροψιαν αλλως ειργασμεθα σοι κικο-  
 πραγιαι; ιδε τον αιθεσιωλα εξεναυτιας, θεσ λογον ενωπλισμενον, παρ' ου το τε  
 ευ και το μη συμβεβηκε τελειωσθαι. εχ' ορας; τι εν νυν αιλια ημας, προ-  
 ληρον, οτε ευωδει σοι τα πραγματα, εχ'ι μεμφαμενος· ημεν γαρ αι αυται,  
 μηδεν της αυτων Φυσεως μελαδασσαι το παρπαπαι σιγμη· συ δε κρητηριος  
 χρωμενος εχ' υγιεσιν, αλογως σφαδαζεις. Ει γαρ εξ αρχης εμαθες, οτι  
 εχ' ατι' αν επιηθηδουης αγαθων μειεσσιας η κακων εστιν αιλια, αλλ' ο πηδα-  
 λιεχος και κυβερνητης τε παυλος, λογος θειος, ρρον αν εφερες τα συμπιπ-  
 λοια, παυσαμενος τε συκοφανειν και επιγρραφειν ημιν α μη δυναμεθα.

of the creation. Prosperity and adversity are both under the guidance of his hand. He prescribes them their movements. He assigns them their limits. And to the unfortunate he rises (as it were) from his throne over the creation, comes forth with his weapons of punishment, and stands opposed as an antagonist to them.

“ God,” Philo adds in another place, “ as a  
 “ Shepherd and a King, by right and law leads, as  
 “ it were a certain flock, the earth, and water, and  
 “ air, and fire, and whatever is planted or lives in  
 “ them, some mortal and some divine; and also the  
 “ nature of heaven, and the periods of the sun and  
 “ moon, and the harmonious turns and dances of  
 “ the other stars; having set over the whole his  
 “ First-begotten Son, the right Logos; who will  
 “ accept the charge of this sacred herd, as in some  
 “ measure the Governor under a Great King<sup>c</sup>.”  
 Here, as in the creation before, the majesty of Divinity in the Father is secured, by referring the *authority* to *him*. But then, as before, the dignity of Divinity in the Son is equally secured, by attributing the *exercise* of this authority to *him*. The

<sup>c</sup> P. 195. Καθαπερ γαρ τινα ποιμνιν, γην και υδωρ και αερα και πυρ, και οσα εν τελεις φιλα τε αυ και ζωα, τα μεν θνητα τα δε θεια· ει δε ερανα φυσιν, και ηλια και σεληνης περιουδης, και των αλλων ασερων τροπας τε αυ και χορειας εναρμονιως, ως ποιμνι και βασιλευς ο θεος αγει καλα δικην και νομον, προσησαμενος τον ορθον αυτη λογον πρωτογονον υιον, ος την επιμελειαν της ιερας ταυτης αγελης, οια τι μεγαλης βασιλειως υπαρχος, διαδεξιται.



Son has been previously noticed by Philo, as the only Inspector, and the only Controuler, of the affairs of men. And if he is here noticed, for the Governor under the Father; he is noticed to be as much the actual Governor of the universe, as he previously was to be the actual Creator of it.

“ Examine,” says Philo in a just strain of religious thoughtfulness, “ the changes of whole countries and nations, to better and to worse. Greece was formerly in the vigor of youth, but the Macedonians robbed it of its strength. Macedonia then flourished; but, being broken into parts, decayed till it utterly withered away. Before the Macedonians, the Persians were in prosperity; but one day destroyed their large and mighty kingdom. And now the Parthians, who were then subject to the Persians, rule over *them* who a little while ago were their governors. Egypt formerly looked illustrious and very stately; but her great happiness has passed away, like a cloud. What are the Ethiopians? What is also Carthage and the power of Libya? And what are the kings of Pontus, what is Europe and Asia, and (to speak briefly) all the globe? Is it not agitated up and down, and vibrated about, as a ship at sea; and has now prosperous, and now adverse, gales? For the Divine Logos, whom the many of mankind denominate Fortune, leads the dances in a circle. Then, passing at

“ his ease through cities, and nations, and coun-  
 “ tries, he distributes the possessions of these to  
 “ those, and of all to all; which only vary in the  
 “ times themselves to each: *so that* the whole world  
 “ is as one city, which exhibits the best of all de-  
 “ mocratic policies<sup>d</sup>.” We here see the Logos  
 again exalted, into that supremacy of Godhead  
 over the affairs of the world; which the ignorance  
 of Heathenism attributed to fortune; which the  
*tongues* of Christians, continuing a language contra-  
 dictory to their *sentiments*, still attribute to the same  
 blind deity; and which Christianity attributes, with  
 Philo and his cotemporaries, to the presiding Son  
 of God. The Logos is thus the PROVIDENCE of  
 God. The rises and the falls of cities, kingdoms,  
 and empires; all that has marked the public

<sup>d</sup> P. 318. [Εξέλαξε] τας χωρων ολων και εθνων προς το ευ και χειρον  
 μεταβολας· ηκμασε ποτε η Ελλας, αλλα Μακεδονες αυτης την ισχην αφει-  
 λουλο· Μακεδονικα παλιν ηνθησεν, αλλα, διαιρεισθεισα κατα μοιρας, ησ-  
 θειησεν εως εις το πανιλες επεσδισθη. Προ Μακεδωνων τα Περσων εν ευ-  
 τυχηα ην· αλλα μια ημερα την πολλην και μεγαλην βασιλειαν αυτων καθειλε.  
 Και νυν Παρθυνοι Περσων, των προ μικρω ηγεμωνων, επικρατησιν, οι τοτε  
 υπηκοοι. Επνευσε ποτε λαμπρον και επιμηκισον Αιγυπτιος, αλλ' ως νεφος  
 αιλης η μεγαλη παρηλθεν ευτραγικα. Τι δ' Αιθιοπες; τι δε και Καρχηδων,  
 και τα προς Λιβυην; τι δε η Ποιη βασιλεις; τι δ' Ευρωπη και Ασια, και  
 (συνελουσι Φρασαι) πασα η οικουμενη; η ανω και κατω κλονουμενη και τι-  
 νασσομενη, ωσπερ ναυς θαλαττευσα, τοτε μεν δεξιοις τοτε δε και εναντιοις  
 πνευμασι χρηται; χορευει γαρ εν κυκλω λογος ο θειος, ου οι πολλοι των αν-  
 θρωπων ονομαζουσι τυχην· ειλα αει ρεων κατα πολεις και εθνη και χωρας, τα  
 αλλων αλλοις και πασι τα παιων επινεμει, χρονος αυτης μονον αλλατ-  
 τιλα παρ' εκασοις· να ως μια πολις η οικουμενη πασα την αριστην πολυειαν  
 αρχη δημοκρατιαν.

fortunes of man, with many and awful revolutions,  
and

. . . . . billowed high  
With human agitation,

the public history of man; result from the controuling superintendence, of this God at the pole of the universe. He there, with his strong hand, turns the globe as he pleases. Now one side is uppermost, and now another; as he sees will be best, for his general plans of wisdom. And he makes his sun of prosperity, to shine upon this side; then to resign it up again, to the darkness of adversity; and so to pass and illumine another: just as easily, just almost as regularly, and only not in so short intervals of continuance, as he causes the returns of day and night. And “the whole world,” under the ruling power of the Logos, “is as one city, which exhibits the best of all democratic policies.” This doctrine indeed is strikingly curious in itself, and highly confirmatory of the imputed divinity of our Saviour. Yet I know not, that it is any where displayed in Scripture, so apparently as it is here. It is intimated, however. He who is represented (as we have already seen) to be the present Inspector, must be also the present Controuler, of the wild and tumultuous transactions of man, on the face of this globe. He also, who is described (as we shall instantly see) to be the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, must be the raiser of kingdoms from  
the

the dust, and the reducer of them again to the dust from which they came. And as St. Paul requires Timothy, to keep a command which he had given him, “ until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, “ which in his time *he* shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and “ Lord of Lords;” so the angel saith to St. John in the Revelations, concerning princes opposed to Christianity, “ the Lamb shall overcome them, *for* “ he is Lord of Lords, and King of Kings <sup>e</sup>.”

But let us now go from his inspection and controul of nature, to his support of it. “ The Logos “ of He Who Is,” as Philo tells us, “ being the “ bond of all things, both keeps all the parts together, and constringes them, and forbids them “ to be loosened or disjoined <sup>f</sup>.” Philo also bids us “ say with boldness, that there is no matter so “ hard, as to be able to bear the burden of the “ world: but the Logos is the very strong and very

<sup>e</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 14—15. and Rev. xvii. 14. See also Rev. xix. for one who “ is called the *word* of God,” and “ hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND “ LORD OF LORDS” (13 and 16); and Philo, p. 398. for the Logos being the *helm* of the universe. The Jews in their writings “ maintain, that it is the Shekinah or Wisdom [that is, the “ Logos] which *rules the world*, according to Solomon’s words, “ Prov. viii. R. Men. fol. 35. col. 1” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 164).

<sup>f</sup> P. 466. Ο τε γαρ τε ολος λογος, δεσμος ων των παντων—, και συνεχει τα μερη παντα, και σφιγγει, και κωλυει αυτα διαλυεσθαι και διαρτασθαι.

“ firm support of the universe. He, reaching  
 “ from the middle to the ends, and from the sum-  
 “ mit to the middle, runs the long unconquered  
 “ course of nature, constringing and constringing  
 “ all the parts together. For the Father, who be-  
 “ gat him, made him the unspeakable bond of all.  
 “ Well then may not all the land be dissolved away  
 “ into all the water, which its bays have taken in ;  
 “ nor may the fire be extinguished by the air, nor  
 “ again may the air be fet in flame by the fire; the  
 “ Divine Logos placing himself, as a vocal boundary  
 “ to the un-vocal elements: so that the whole shall  
 “ harmonize together, as in a musical scale ;  
 “ which mediates between the threats of the con-  
 “ trary principles, and by its melodious persuasive-  
 “ nefs conciliates them <sup>ε</sup>.” We thus see the Logos  
 described, with all the energies of the Godhead on  
 his arm. The vast frame of the universe rests and  
 gravitates upon him, as the central pillar of it.  
 The principle of adhesion, which pervades the parts,

<sup>ε</sup> Eusebius's Prepar. Evang. p. 190. Λεγέτω μέγα παρερησίας, οτι εδεν  
 των ενυλων κραταιον εβας, ως τον κοσμον αχθοφορειν ισχυσαι. Λογος δε  
 — το οχηματιον και εββαιωτατον ερεισμα των ολων εστιν. Τελος απο των  
 μεσων επι τα περατα, και απο των ακρων επι τα μεσα, ταθεις, δαλιχχει τον  
 φυσικως αητητοι δρομον, συναγων τα μερη παντα και συσφιγγων. Δεσμον  
 γαρ αυτον αρητιον τε παλιος, ο γεννησας εποκει παληρ. Εικοτως εν εδε γη  
 πασα διαλυθησεται προς παντος υδατος, οπερ αυτης οι κολποι κεχωρηκασιν.  
 εδ' υπο αερος σβεσθησεται πυρ, εδ' εμπαλιν υπο πυρος απρ αναφλεγηθησεται,  
 τε θεης λογος μεθοριον ταπεινός αυτον φωνηεν, στοιχειων αφωνων. ινα το ολον,  
 ωσπερ επι της εγγραμμω μωσικης, συνηχηση, τας των εναντιων απειλας  
 πευθοι τη συνοδω μεσιτευουλος τε και διαιωλιος.

and

and binds them into a whole, is nothing more than the application of his plattick hand to them. Or (to borrow an image from Heathenism, the grandest which it ever conceived of the Godhead) the whole world hangs in a golden chain before him, the links of it being lapped round the sides of the creation, and the ends being hooked to the feet of his throne. This evidence of the divinity of our Saviour, is carefully *continued* in our Scriptures; our Saviour being there declared, to be “upholding all things “by the word of his power,” and to be He “by “whom all things consist<sup>h</sup>.” And that this awful truth is only *insinuated* in our Scripture, and yet is dwelt upon *circumstantially* in Philo; is a fuller and firmer proof of the conviction of the Jews, in the positive divinity of their Logos.

— VI. —

BUT let us now observe the high pre-eminence of titles, which the Jewish theology attributed to its Logos. These of course must be correspondent, to the exalted honours which it has conferred upon him. The stream must receive a tincture from the fountain. And these titles will naturally be accommodated; as to the creative, the inspecting, the controuling, and the supporting efficacy of his power; so likewise to the derivative quality of his

<sup>h</sup> Heb. i. 3, and Coloss. i. 17.

divinity, and to the official subordination of his character.

“ Endeavour to be adorned,” says Philo in the same tenor of exhortation, which calls upon us in the Scriptures to assimilate ourselves to the Son of God, “ according to his First-begotten Logos, “ the most ancient Angel, who exists as the Arch- “ angel of Many Names: for he is denominated the “ Principle, and the Name of God, and the Logos: “ —if we are not yet worthy to be reckoned sons “ of God, still we are of his image, the most holy “ Logos; for the most ancient Logos is the image “ of God<sup>i</sup>.” This elevates our Saviour into a wonderful rank in the universe, as “ the Most Ancient” of angels, as “ the Archangel of Many Names,” as “ the Principle” of existence to the creation, as the “ Most Holy,” the “ Name” and the “ Image” of God. We can hardly mount beyond this. There is scarcely any discernible interval, between this and God. But Philo is still more explicit. In other places he speaks of “ the Logos of God,” as “ above all “ the world, and the most ancient and most noble “ of the things that have been made<sup>k</sup> ;” and ac-

<sup>i</sup> P. 341. Σπευδαζε κοσμεσθαι καλα τον πρωτογονον αυτην λογον, τον αγγελον πρεσβυτατος, ως αρχαγγελον πολυωνυμον υπαρχουσα. και γαρ Αρχη, και Ονομα, και λογος—προσταγορευεται.—Ει μηπω ικανοι θεα παιδες νομιζεσθαι γεγοισαμεν, αλλα τοι της—εικοτος αυτη, λογε τε ερωτατε. Θεα γαρ εικων, λογος ο πρεσβυτατος.

<sup>k</sup> P. 93. Ο λογος δε τε θεα, υπερανω παιδος εστιν τε κοσμε, και πρεσβυτατος και γεννητατος των οσα γεγονε.

tually describes the “Logos,” as “he who is *older* “*than* the things which have received creation<sup>1</sup>.” The last clause shews Philo, when he speaks before of the Logos, as the *most* ancient of created things; to mean one *more* ancient than they. Here, therefore, we not only attend our Saviour up the great scale of creation to the topmost round of it; but also pass with him through the infinite altitude beyond it, and push up to the very height of the Creator, and the very mount of God.

But, what is singular, this mighty Being is exhibited to us also, in the Christian character of *Mediator* for man. “To the Archangel, and most “ancient Logos, the Father who created the universe has given the peculiar grant; that he should “stand as a bounding line, to distinguish that “which was made from him who formed it. And “he is the continual supplicator for the perishing “mortal to the Immortal, and the ambassador of “the Sovereign to the subject. And he exults in “the grant, and glorying explains it, saying, “And “I stood betwixt the Lord and you, neither un- “begotten as the existing God, nor made as you, “but the middle of the extremes, an hostage to

<sup>1</sup> P. 339. Ο λογος ο πρεσβυτερος των γενεσιν ειληφοδων. So Origen's account of our Saviour in his reply to Celsus, p. 257, “πρεσβυτατος “γαρ αυτων παλιων των δημιουργηματων ισασσι οι θεοι λογοι;” is properly translated thus, “novit enim hunc sacra scriptura creaturis omni- “bus vetustiore” (Bull, p. 173).

“ both:



“ both : to him who planted you, to assure you he  
 “ will not ever destroy or desert your whole race,  
 “ and introduce disorder in the room of order ;  
 “ and to you plants, for your happy hope, that  
 “ the benevolent God will never overlook his  
 “ own work. For I will be the proclaimer of  
 “ peace to the creature, from that God who is  
 “ always the guardian of peace, and knows how  
 “ to take away wars <sup>m</sup>.” Here we have the top-  
 stone (as it were) laid to the fabrick of the crea-  
 tion, and the Logos standing erect above it. He  
 is discriminated in the most express manner from  
 the creatures ; and he appears as a Mediator be-  
 twixt the Father and them. Being neither “ unbegot-  
 ten” as the Father, nor “ made” as the creatures,  
 he shares a kind of middle nature, and is essentially  
 qualified for the office of Mediator. In this office all  
 his grandeur is softened and tempered down, by his  
 still superior amiableness. He comes forward, exactly

<sup>m</sup> P. 509. Τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτέρῳ λογῷ δόξαν ἐξαιρέτων  
 ἐδώκεν ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννησας πατήρ, ἵνα μεθορίας σας, τὸ γεννημενον διακριθῆ  
 τὴ πεποιθηκότος. ὁ δ' αὖτος κείνης μὲν ἐστὶ τὴ θνήσκῃ κηραμινοῦς αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ  
 ἀφθαρτον, πρεσβευτής [πρεσβευτής] δὲ τὴ ηγεμενος πρὸς τὸ ὑπηκοον.  
 ἀγαλλίεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ δόξῃ, καὶ σεμνυτομενος αὐτὴν ἐκδηγεῖται, φασκων,  
 Καγῶ εἰσήτηκεν ἀνα μεσον κυρίας καὶ ὑμῶν, εἰς ἀγενήτος ὡς ὁ θεός ὢν, εἰς  
 γενήτος ὡς ἡμεῖς [ὑμεῖς], ἀλλὰ μεσὸς τῶν ἀκρῶν, ἀμφιτέρους ὁμηρεῦν·  
 παρα μὲν τῷ φύλευσανί, πρὸς πίσιν τὴ μὴ συμφῶν ἀφανισαὶ πόλις καὶ  
 ἀποσηναὶ τὸ γενος, ἀκοσμιαν ἀνὶ κοσμῷ ἐλομενον· παρα δὲ τῷ φύλι,  
 πρὸς εὐελπισίαν τὴ μηπόλι τον ἰλεων θεον περιῖδον τὸ ἰδιον ἐργον. Ἐγῶ γὰρ  
 ἐπισηρυκευσομαι τὰ εἰρηναία γενεσει, παρα τὴ καθαιρειν πολέμους ἐθιωκότος,  
 εἰρηνοφιλακος αἰε, θεῷ.

like

like the ever-gracious Redeemer of the Christians, to supplicate the Immortal in favour of us mortals, and to intercede with our Heavenly Sovereign for us his subjects. And, like him too, he comes proclaiming "peace to the creature, from that God " who is always the guardian of peace, who knows " how to take away wars," and who had actually taken them all away, when the Prince of Peace appeared upon earth. This certainly carries a very close resemblance, to the historical reality. Yet it is such only, as shews the antecedent shade to be very like to the substance, in all its general proportions. The likenesses can hardly be improved, by other passages of Philo. But it is repeated; and every repetition serves to confirm the similarity. Philo accordingly speaks of "the Mediator, the divine " Logos, who exhorts us to the best things, and " again and again teaches us as many, as are adapted to the times";" of "the holy Logos, who to " some, as a king, announces in a command what " they ought to do, and to others, as a master to " his scholars, suggests things for their profit";" of "the angel, who is the Logos, as the physician " of diseases";" and of "those who honour the

<sup>n</sup> P. 575. Τῷ μεσῷ λογῷ θεῷ τα ἀριστα υφηγημένοι, καὶ ὅσα προσφορὰ τοῖς καιροῖς ἀναδιδασκεῖν.

<sup>o</sup> P. 593—594. Ὁ ἱερός λογος, τοῖς μὲν ὡς βασιλεὺς, ἀ χερὶ πραττεῖν ἐξ ἐπιταγμᾶτος παραγγέλλει· τοῖς δὲ, ὡς γνωριμῶς διδασκαλός, τὰ πρὸς ὠφελείαν υφηγεῖται.

P. P. 93. Τὸν δὲ ἀγγέλου, ὅς ἐστὶ λογος, ὡσπερ ἰατρὸν κακῶν.

“ right

“ right Logos as their one Father, admiring the  
 “ well-harmonized and wholly musical symphony  
 “ of virtues,” as “ living a calm and quiet life,  
 “ not indeed one idle and inactive, as some think,  
 “ but very manly, and much provoked against  
 “ those who attempt to break in upon their la-  
 “ bours.” All serves to fill up the great outline  
 of *his* character; who, when he was the Lord of  
 Nature, condescended to become the instructor of  
 man, the healer of his maladies, and the fosterer of  
 his virtues.

Nor is this all. We have even hints given us, of  
 the *incarnation* of the Logos. “ How is it, good  
 “ sirs, that ye will not grow weary indeed of war,  
 “ and love peace; when ye belong to one and the  
 “ same parent, who is not mortal but immortal,  
 “ the man of God, who, being the Logos of the  
 “ Eternal, is of necessity also himself incorruptible?”  
 The Logos is equally called in another passage,  
 “ the man after the image of God.” But perhaps  
 some one “ will say,” Philo adds in another place,

¶ P. 326. Ενα πατέρα τον ορθον τιμῶντες λογον, την ευαρμοστον και  
 ταμιαστον συμφωνιαν αρίων τεθραυμακοτες, ευδιον και γαληνον βιον ζωσιν,  
 η μεν αργον και αγεννη τινα, ως ενιοι νωμιζουσιν, αλλα σφοδρα ανδρειον,  
 και λιαν ηκοημενον καλα των σπαθδας λυειν επιχειρησιν.

† P. 326. Πως ηκ εμελλειε, — ω γενναιοι, πολεμω μεν δυσχεραινειν, ει-  
 ρηνην δε αγαπαν, ενα και τον αυτον επιγεγραμμενοι πατερα, η θνητον αλλ'  
 αθανατον, ανθρωπον θεη, ος τε αιδιε λογος ων, εξ αναγκης και αυτος εστιν  
 αφθαρτος.

‡ P. 341. Λογος — ο κατ' εικονα ανθρωπος — προσαγορευεται.

G

“ why

“ why then does he who hath believed any thing,  
 “ admit a vestige, or a shade, or a moment, of un-  
 “ belief at all? But he seems to me to mean no-  
 “ thing else, than to prove the created one to be  
 “ un-created, and the mortal one immortal, and  
 “ the corruptible one incorruptible, and the man  
 “ (if it is lawful to say so) God: for the faith, which  
 “ man has got, he says ought to be so firm, as to  
 “ differ in nothing from the faith in a reality, that  
 “ is perfect and entire in every part<sup>t</sup>.” And these  
 passages carry so clear an allusion to that wonderful  
 circumstance, which the Jews of our Saviour’s days  
 (as we have seen before) fully expected, and which  
 the Christians of our own (as we all know) firmly  
 believe, to be realized in the person of *their* Messiah  
 and *our* Christ; when only, in all the periods of the  
 human history, the Logos was expected or is be-  
 lieved to have become, “ a *man* of God,” “ a *man*  
 “ after the image of God,” a “ mortal” in an “ im-  
 “ mortal,” a “ corruptible” in an “ incorruptible,”  
 and “ man” in “ God:” that no doubt can be en-  
 tertained, but they all refer to the grand formation  
 of the Logos, into an IMMANUEL OF GOD-MAN<sup>u</sup>.

Let

<sup>t</sup> P. 1073. Αλλ' ἴσως ἀν τις εἴποι, τί ἔστιν ὁ τί πεπιστευκὸς ἰχθῆς, ἢ σκῆψον, ἢ ὡραν ἀπιστίας δεχέσθαι τοπαράπαν; τῆλος δ' ἔθεν ἕλερον μοι βεβλησθαι δοκεῖ, ἢ τὸν γενομένον ἀποφανεῖν ἀγεννήτον, καὶ τὸν θνήσκον ἀθάνατον, καὶ τὸν φθαρτὸν ἀφθαρτὸν, καὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπον (εἰ θεμῆμις εἴπειν) θεόν· τὴν γὰρ πιστὴν, ἢς ἐλάχεν ἀνθρώπος, εἶω βεβαίον φησὶ δεῖν εἶναι, ὡς μηδὲν διαφέρειν τῆς περὶ τὸ οὐ τῆς ἀρίθου καὶ περὶ παλῆα πληρῆς.

<sup>u</sup> “ That sense was so well known in the synagogue, that you see

Let us now, however, proceed from the descent of the Logos upon earth, and return with him to his native element of heaven again. There we find him spoken of by Philo, in these exalted terms. "Hesitate not," he cries, "if that which is older than the things existing be unspeakable; since his Logos is not to be spoken to us, by his proper name; and indeed, if that is unspeakable, it is also incomprehensible\*." Both the members of this sentence are referred to the Logos. That he is "older than the things existing," has been his repeated description before. Philo therefore declares the Logos to be, "unspeakable" in his name, and "incomprehensible" in his nature. "The Logos of him who made the world, is the seal by which

" in Midrash Tehillim upon Psal. xxxiii, that the Shekinah [or "Wisdom], which was in heaven, was to leave them [it], and to be upon the earth; and that, although it was not possible for any mortal to see her in this life, in the future age (which is the second coming of the Messias) she is to be seen by Israel, who are then to live for ever, and to say as you see in Isa. xxv. 9, "Here is your GOD." And according to Pf. xlvi. 15, "He is GOD our GOD;" as it is observed by Tanchuma, and many others" (Allix's Judgment, p. 263—264). "The Messias—was to bless all nations,—as is acknowledged by the author of the book Chafidim § 961; and that could not be done but by the Shekinah dwelling among them, as the Jews acknowledge it" (p. 266). "The salvation of Israel is to be made by GOD himself;—and—the Shekinah shall be their Redeemer. R. Men. fol. 19, col. 4, and fol. 58, col. 4, and fol. 59, col. 1" (p. 336).

\* P. 1046. Μηδ' εν διαπορει, ει το των οντων πρεσβυτερον αρητον\* ποτε ο λογος αυτη κυριω ονοματι ερητος ημιν\* και μεν, ει αρητον, και περιουσιον.

“ each of the things existing was figured: accord-  
 “ ingly also, the things created have from the be-  
 “ ginning kept a perfect form, as being the stamp  
 “ and image of the perfect Logos. For the living  
 “ thing created, is indeed imperfect in quantity;  
 “ and its growth in every period of life, is a witness  
 “ of this: but it is perfect in quality; for the same  
 “ quality continues, as being stamped by *him who*  
 “ *continues, and who is never changed,* the Divine  
 “ Logos.” Philo thus assigns to “ the perfect  
 “ Logos” that attribute of the Godhead, which pe-  
 “ culiarly gives it perfection in the eyes of man;  
 which makes it to be so respectable and dignified as  
 it is, a nature sufficient to itself, and steady in its  
 purposes; that has, at every moment of its opera-  
 tions, all the possible reasons for the act and for the  
 mode before it; and that therefore can admit into  
 it, “ no” possible “ variableness, neither shadow of  
 “ turning.”

This is ceding a kind of moral eternity to the  
 Logos. But Philo also cedes to him a positive and  
 physical one. We see Philo indeed declaring be-  
 fore, that the Father, “ *when* he willed to fabricate

\* Υ Ρ. 452. Ο δὲ τὴ ποιητὸς λογῶς, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἡ σφραγίς, ἡ τῶν οὐλῶν  
 ἑκάστον μεμορφῶται· παρ’ οὗ καὶ τελειὸν τοῖς γινόμενοις ἐξ ἀρχῆς παρα-  
 κολυθεῖ τὸ εἶδος, ἀτε ἐκμαγείου καὶ εἰκῶν τελείῃ λογῶς· τὸ γὰρ γινόμενον  
 ζῶον, ἀτελες μὲν ἐστὶ τῷ ποσῷ· μαζύρες δ’ αὖ καθ’ ἡλικίαν ἑκάστην παρα-  
 αὔξησις. Τελειὸν δὲ τῷ ποιῶ· μένει γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ ποιούσης, ἀτε ἀπο μενούσης  
 ἐκμαχθεῖσα, καὶ μηδ’ ἀμὴ τρεπομένη, δεῖα λογῶς.

z James i. 17.

“ this visible world, previously configured out of  
 “ himself” the Logos, as a pattern for it<sup>a</sup>. This  
 seems to imply, that the Logos was only just a little  
 prior to the existence of the world. But this is  
 only a seeming implication. The real import is  
 very different. Philo, like some Christian writers  
 since who use the same language, means only the  
 deputation of the Son from the Father, for the crea-  
 tion of the world. This is demonstrably plain,  
 from his and their language upon other occasions.  
 Him whom they metaphorically notice, as generated  
 from the Father just before he created the world;  
 they actually pronounce to be ETERNAL<sup>b</sup>. Thus  
 Philo tells us, that Moses “ called the soul the  
 “ image of the Divine and the Invisible; consider-  
 “ ing it to be the approved image, as being sub-  
 “ stantiated and moulded by the seal of God, of

<sup>a</sup> See sect. iv. before, from Philo, p. 3.

<sup>b</sup> See Bull's *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, Grabe, p. 118—119, 170—171, 190—194, and 278—279; a work, the chief of all Dr. Bull's very capital works in favour of the Trinity, which lies unhappily buried in its manly, generally transparent, but occasionally dark, latinity, to the leaders of heresy among us; which therefore that principal leader, Dr. Priestley, has in great humility called upon each of his two grand adversaries, Mr. Badcock and Dr. Horsley, to translate for him into English; and which, in pure charity to his infirmities, I could wish somebody to translate, that he may at last have the advantage of surveying so clear, so convincing, and so spirited a composition, the faithful summary of ancient orthodoxy, and the invincible bulwark of modern.

“ which the character is the *eternal* Logos<sup>c</sup>.” “ If we are not yet fit to be thought the fons of God,” adds Philo, “ we may be at least of his *eternal* image, the most holy Logos<sup>d</sup>.” And Philo at last attributes to him the *very same* eternity, which he also attributes to the Father; by styling him, “ the *eternal* Logos of the *everlasting* God<sup>e</sup>.”

Philo accordingly tells us, that “ no one ought to swear by God, because he cannot know the nature of God; but it is well, if we are masters of his name, which was that of the interpreter Logos; for this Being to us imperfect persons would be God, but to the wise and perfect the First One<sup>f</sup>.” “ The most noble of things is God,” he adds still more precisely, “ and the second God is

<sup>c</sup> P. 216—217. Εἶπεν αὐτὴν τὴ θεῖα καὶ ἀοράτη εἰκόνα· δοκιμὸν εἶναι νομισσας, ἐσιωθῆσαν καὶ τυπωθεῖσαν σφραγιδί θεῶ, ἧς ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστὶν αἰδῖος λογῶ.

<sup>d</sup> P. 341. Εἰ μὴ πῶ ἱκανοὶ θεῶ παῖδες νομιζέσθαι γεγόναμεν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς αἰδῖα ἐμὸν αὐτῶ, λογῶ τῶ ἐξῶτα.

<sup>e</sup> Eusebius's Prepar. Evang. p. 190. Λογὸς—ὁ αἰδῖος θεῶ τῶ αἰωνίῳ. The *eternity* of the Messiah was formally announced to the Jews, in this passage of Micah v. 2: “ But thou, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be RULER IN ISRAEL; WHOSE GOINGS-FORTH HAVE BEEN FROM OF OLD, FROM EVERLASTING.” See this passage appropriated to the Messiah, by Mat. ii. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Philo, p. 99. Εἰκότως γὰρ εὐδαίς ὀμνῶσι καθ' ἑαυτῶ [αὐτῶ]· οἱ γὰρ ἔπερὶ τῆς φύσεως αὐτῶ διαγινώσκειν δύναται. ἀλλ' ἀγαπητόν ἐστι τῶ ὀνοματῶ αὐτῶ δυνήθημεν, ὁπερ ἦν τῶ ἡρμηνεύοντι λογῶ. τέλος γὰρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἀτελῶν ἀνέστη θεῶ· τῶν δὲ σίφων καὶ τελειῶν, ὁ πρῶτος.

“ the



“ the *Logos* of God<sup>s</sup>.” “ Why,” he asks in the same language, “ does he say this, as of *another God*, “ In the image of God made I the man,” but not “ in his own? This was delivered as a very fine “ and wise oracle. For nothing mortal could be “ moulded to the image of Him, who is the Most “ High and the Father of all; but of *the second God*, “ who is his *Logos*<sup>h</sup>.” Philo thus speaks in a style, that may sound to some ears as not theologically just; but that conveys sufficiently to our minds, his ideas of the Divinity (though subordinate) of the Son of God. Nor is it in reality very different, from the *canonical* language of our principal creed; which equally states him, to be “ God off God” and “ very God off very God.” But Philo goes on to repeat the same truth, in different forms. This is of considerable moment, to the weakness of the human intellect. It adds not to his testimony, but it convinces us of his meaning. It augments not the force of the truth, but it increases its impression upon our minds and spirits. To pure defecated intellect, one single assertion would be suffi-

<sup>s</sup> P. 1103. Το δε γενικώτατον εστιν ο θεος, και δευτερος [not δευτερον] ο θεος λογος. So Origen calls the Son “ the Second God,” τον δευτερον θεον (Bull, p. 232). So also Julian in Cyrill viii. p. 262.

<sup>h</sup> Eusebius, Prepar. Evang. p. 190. Δια τι, ως περι ετερον θεου, φησι το, εν εικονι θεου εποιησα τον ανθρωπον, αλλ' ουχι τη εαυτου; παγκρατως και σοφως τεβι κεχρησμηωδηται: δυνατον γαρ εδεν απεικονισθηναι προς τον ανωτατον και πατερα των ολων εδυνατο, αλλα προς τον δευτερον θεον, ος εστιν εικων λογος.

cient; but to intellects like ours, shackled by passions, and clouded with prejudices, an iteration of the assertion in other language, but to the same signification, is useful, is important, is necessary. That the Logos was *eternal*, would be enough to convince us he was *God*; but yet to find him called *God*, to find him so called in different manners and in distant passages, enhances greatly the conviction. And he, who considers the nature of man from what he feels in himself, will rather multiply his proofs than abridge their number. “Invisible,” Philo tells us in another place, “and a sower of seed, “and a fabricator and divine, is the Logos, who “will lie up close to the Father<sup>i</sup>.” This is placing our Saviour, who is similarly avowed in scripture to be “he that soweth the good seed” in the world; exactly as St. John the apostle places him, “in “the” very “bosom of the Father<sup>k</sup>.” But Philo tells

<sup>i</sup> Philo, p. 497. *Αοράτος, και σπερματικός, και τεχνικός, και θεός, εστι λογος, ος προσηκοίως ανακεισεται τῷ πατρι.* That the Logos is called *σπερματικός*, reminds us of Mat. xiii. 37, *ο σπειρων το καλον περμα, εστιν ο υιος τῶ ανθρωπου.* Concerning the last clause let me observe, that the word *προσηκοίως*, in its original import, means *coming up to*, and so signifies as I have here rendered it, *close to*. The word *ανακεισεται* too, which was peculiarly applied at the time (see the Greek Gospels every where) to guests lying down on a couch at table, restrains *προσηκοίως* to its *native* sense. And the passage immediately cited by the text, coincides with and illustrates it completely. See also Bull, p. 83, 272, and 274, *προσεχεσεται*, in a passage that at once gives and receives light, to and from the present.

<sup>k</sup> John I. 18. *Ο μονογενης υιος, ο ην εις τον κολπον τῶ πατρος.*  
“This

tells us in another place, what indeed cannot give the Logos a higher rank of honour in nature, but what will more positively assure him of this. “ He “ that is above these,” he informs us, “ the divine “ Logos, came not into a visible form; as being to “ be compared with none of the sensible objects, “ but being himself the image of God, the *most* “ *ancient* of the universe of intellectuals, the nearest “ (there being no boundary of distinction between “ them) to the only one who is fixed without fal- “ hood<sup>1</sup>.” In a passage more obscure than this, and very distant, Philo speaks of a Being “ musi- “ cal and grammatical, and also just and sober, “ wise too and manly, the very one only Most “ High, differing nothing from the archetypal idea, “ by whom these many and incredible things were “ formed<sup>m</sup>.” The Being spoken of in the first part of this latter sentence, and characterised as

“ This is exactly what the Jews teach of—the Logos, whom they “ conceive to have been *in the bosom* of God, and being *so* the *Amon*, “ the *Son*, or (as it is) the *Omen*, the Creator of all things; R. Me- “ nach. fol. 1. col. 1—2: where he quotes the most authentick au- “ thors of the synagogue, who agree exactly upon that notion” (Al- lix’s Judgment, p. 332).

<sup>1</sup> P. 465. Ο δ’ υπερανω των, λογος θεος, εις ορατην εν ηλθεν ιδεαν, ατε μηδενι των κατ’ αισθησιν εμφανης ων, αλλ’ αυτος ειπων υπαρχων θεος, των νοητων απαξαπαντων ο πρεσβυιατος, ο εγγυιατω (μηδενι οντος μεθορις διασηματος) τε μονος ο εστιν απευδως αφιδρυμενος.

<sup>m</sup> P. 1067. Αυτο δε εστι το μουσικον και γραμματικον, ετι δε δικαιον και σωφρον, φρονιμον τε και ανδρειον, εν αυτο μονον το ανωιατω, μηδεν ιδεας αρχετυπη διαφερον, αφ’ η τα πολλα και αμυθητα εκεινα διεπλασθη.

“ the

“ the very one only Most High,” is plainly the Father; and “ the archetypal idea, by whom these “ many and incredible things were formed,” we have seen before to be the mystical title of the Logos. Yet the Father is here declared expressly, to “ differ nothing” from the Logos. In *origination* of existence, the Son “ lies up close to,” or is “ in “ the bosom of,” the Father. He is thus “ the “ nearest” to him, and there is “ no boundary of “ distinction between them.” But in the *quality* of his existence, in the *nature* which he thus received by origination from the Father; the Son “ differs “ nothing” from the Father, and the Father “ dif- “ fers nothing” from the Son. They are *substantially* the same, though they are *relatively* different; and the *very next* to each other, *because* they are relative-ly different, and yet substantially the same. And I shall close all my proofs out of Philo on this head, with one that seems to close them completely; by declaring the Logos to be so substantially one with the Father, as to be called the One only self-sufficient God. “ Unity,” we are informed, “ cannot “ by nature receive either addition or subtraction, “ being the image of *the only full God*; for the “ other things are soft in themselves, and, if ever “ they have been even stiffened, they are *kept toge- “ ther* by the divine *Logos*; for *he* is the *glue* and “ *band*, who *hath filled all things out of his essence*; “ but

“ but *he*, who formed the *connexion* and *contexture*  
 “ of every thing, is properly *full of himself*, *not need-*  
 “ *ing any other at all*.”

—VII.—

I MIGHT here take my leave of the subject. The belief of the Jews in the absolute Divinity of their and our Logos, stands forward too plain upon the pages of Philo, and meets the eye in too prominent a form; to leave the slightest doubt upon the mind. Yet I will add a little more. And I will show the Logos of Philo to have been, in the opinion of him and his countrymen, the visible God of their nation, and the acting Jehovah of the Old Testament to them and to all mankind.

“ The holy Logos — speaks to some as a king,—  
 “ to some as a schoolmaster;—to some he is very  
 “ useful, as one counselling with them, introducing  
 “ the best opinions to those, who know not of them-  
 “ selves what is expedient; and to some as a friend,  
 “ mildly and with persuasiveness, he produces many  
 “ even of unspeakable things, of which it is not  
 “ lawful for the imperfect man himself to hear any

<sup>n</sup> P. 506—507. Μονας δε εις προσθηκην εις αφαιρουν δεχουσαι πε-  
 φυκειν, ειπων οσα τε μονα πληρης δεσ. χαυνα γαρ τα τε αλλα εξ αυτων  
 ει δε πα και πυκνωθεν ειη, λογω σφιγγεται δειω· κολλα γαρ εις και  
 δεσμοι εις, τα παντα της υσιας εκπληρωτικως. Ο δ' ειρας και  
 συμφηνας εκασα, πληρης αυτου εαυτε κυριως εστιν, & δεηθεις ετερε  
 τοπαραπικν.

“ thing :

“ thing: and there is a time, when he enquires of  
 “ some, *as of Adam*, this, Where art thou? to *whom*  
 “ one may answer properly, No where; because all  
 “ human affairs remain not in the like state, but  
 “ are moved about, both in soul and body and the  
 “ things without.” The Logos is thus averred  
 incidentally and allusively, to have been the God of  
 the Unfallen Man, to have visited him in person on  
 his fall, and so to have commenced his open in-  
 tercourse with our race, in the life of our first father,  
 and during our residence in Paradise. And he,  
 who was the interposing God of the human family,  
 in that grand crisis of its fate, when man became  
 what he now is, unable to discern clearly what he  
 then was, and only sensible he is now very different  
 and very wretched; yet still lifting up his head, un-  
 der assurances of pardon on his penitence, and still  
 looking forward with faith, to his effected restora-  
 tion by a redemption; must certainly be the God of  
 man, in *all* this period of his restoration, and from  
 the beginning to the end of it<sup>p</sup>.

We

<sup>p</sup> P. 593—594. Ο ἱερῶ λογῶ, τοῖς μὲν ὡς βασιλεὺς—παρὰ ἀγγελλεῖ  
 τοῖς δὲ ὡς γνωριμοῖς διδασκαλῶ— τοῖς δὲ ὡς συμβέλος, γνωμᾶς εἰση-  
 γημεῖν τὰς ἀριετίας, τὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἐξ ἑαυτῶν ἢ ἐιδόλας μῆγα ὠφελεῖ  
 τοῖς δὲ, ὡς φίλῶ, ἐπιεικῶς καὶ μετὰ πειθῆς πολλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἀνα-  
 φρεῖ, ἂν εἶδεν αὐτὸν [αὐτὸν] ἀτελεστον ἐπακῆσαι θεμῖς· ἐστὶ δ' ὁ καὶ  
 πυνθαιεταί τῶν ὡσπερ τῆ Ἀδάμ, τὸ, Πῆ εἰ· πρὸς ὃν ἀποκριναιτο ἂν τις  
 αἰκίως, εὐδαμῶ· τῶ τὰ ἀνθρώπεια πάντα ἐν ὁμοίῳ μὴ μένειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κινεῖσ-  
 θαι καὶ ψυχῆ καὶ σώματι καὶ τοῖς ἐντῶ.

<sup>p</sup> “ In the Jerufalem Targum—on Gen. xxxv. 9. we have these  
 “ following

We accordingly see him incidentally again, acting as the God of our race at that marked æra of this period, when God had just entered upon a new course of interference with his sinning man; and had separated the family of Abraham from the other families of the earth, in order to check the commencing idolatry of it. “According to the third signification, he [Moses] gives the name of the Sun to the divine Logos, that pattern (as I have said before) of Him who is resident in heaven; of whom [the Logos] it is said, The Sun came out upon the earth, and Lot entered into Sigor, and the Lord rained brimstone and fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah. For the Logos of God, when he comes out to our earthly system, assists and helps those who

following words, “O Eternal God, thou hast taught us the marriage-blessing of Adam and his wife, for thus the scripture saith expressly, And the Word of the Lord blessed them, and the Word of the Lord said to them, Be ye fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 205—206). “I quote here only R. Menachem, because he brings the very words of the authors who lived before him; so that his authority is not alone, but upheld by the consent of old authors. Now he and his authors teach constantly, that ’twas the Shekinah [or Logos], which appeared to Adam after his sin, and made him some clothes, fol. 59. col. 4” (Allix, p. 165). “Onkelos and Jonathan have it, that Adam and his wife “heard the voice of the Word of the Lord God walking in the garden” [Gen. iii. 8]. “Likewise in the Jerusalem Targum, ver. 9, it is said, “The Word of the Lord called to Adam,” &c. “and again, ver. 10, where Adam makes this answer to God, “I heard thy voice in the garden;” both Onkelos and Jonathan have it, “I heard the voice of thy Word in the garden” (p. 206).

“ are

“ are related to virtue, and are fond of virtue, to  
 “ afford a perfect refuge and preservation to them;  
 “ but, on the enemies of virtue, sends down ruin  
 “ and destruction incurable.” In this mixed and  
 imperfect kind of allegory, in which the Logos is  
 at once figuratively under the type of the Sun, and  
 personally with the appellation of the Lord; we  
 see him “ coming out to our earthly system,” then  
 “ assisting and helping” the virtuous family of Lot,  
 and “ affording them a perfect refuge and preser-  
 “ vation” in Zoar; but “ sending down ruin and  
 “ destruction incurable,” on “ the enemies of vir-  
 “ tue” in Sodom and Gomorrah. And we thus  
 find the God of the post-diluvian world, in the  
 opinion of the Jews of Philo’s days, to be equally  
 the Logos with that of the ante-diluvian; and the  
 God of Abraham, in the belief of his descendants,  
 to be the same with the Logos of both †.

“ It

† P. 578. Κατα δε τριτον σημαιομενον, ηλιον καλει του θειου λογου, το τε κατ’ υρανον περιπολεντ<sup>ς</sup> (ως προλερον ελεχθη) παραδειγμα· εφ’ ο λεγεται, Ο ηλι<sup>ς</sup> εξηλθεν επι την γην, και Δω<sup>ι</sup> εισηλθεν εις Σιγωρ, και κυρι<sup>ς</sup> εβρεξεν επι Σοδομα και Γομορρα θειον και πυρ. Ο γαρ τε θε<sup>ς</sup> λογ<sup>ς</sup>, οταν επι το γεωδες κμων συστημα αφικηται, τοις μεν αρετης συγγενεσι και προς αρετην αποκλιουσιν αρηγει και βοηθει, ως καταφυγην και σωθριαν αυταις παριζειν παντελη· τοις δε αντιπαλοις ολεθρον και φθοραν ανιατου επιπεμπει.

† “ R. Menachem—and his authors teach constantly, that ’twas  
 “ the Shekinah [or Logos], which—*appeared to Abraham*, fol. 35.  
 “ col. 2” (Allix, p. 165). “ Now, saith the Jerusalem paraphrase  
 “ on Exod. xii. 42, It was the *Word* of the Lord, that appeared to  
 “ Abraham between the pieces; and, according to Onkelos and Jo-  
 “ nathan,



“ It is said, “ The Lord thy God will instruct  
 “ thee, as if a man shall instruct his son.” Why  
 “ then do we yet wonder, that he is assimilated to  
 “ angels; when he is assimilated also to men, for  
 “ the sake of assisting them who want: as when he  
 “ says, “ I am the God who appeared to thee in  
 “ the place of God;” this is to be understood,  
 “ that the Unchangeable held in semblance the  
 “ place of an angel, for the profit of him who was  
 “ not yet able to look upon the true God. For as  
 “ those, who cannot look upon the sun itself, view  
 “ the sun’s reflected light as the sun, and the  
 “ changes about the moon as the very moon; so  
 “ also they consider the image of God, his angel,  
 “ the Logos, as himself. Observest thou not that  
 “ compleat instruction, Hagar; that she says to  
 “ the angel, “ Art thou the God who looked  
 “ upon me?” For she was not fit to look at the  
 “ most ancient cause; she being by descent from  
 “ those of Egypt. But now the mind begins to  
 “ improve, going in its imagination up to the  
 “ Chief of all powers. Wherefore he himself says,  
 “ I am the Lord the God, whose image thou  
 “ [Jacob] hast hitherto contemplated as me, and

“ nathan, Exod. vi. 8, It was by his *Word* that God made this co-  
 “ venant with Abraham:—so the Jerusalem paraphrase has it” on  
 Gen. xviii. 1, “ The *Word* of the Lord appeared to Abraham;”  
 “ Jonathan also—on Deut. xxxiv. 6, hath these words—“ The Lord  
 “ revealed himself by the vision of his *Word* to Abraham” (p. 207  
 —208.)

“ hast

““ haft dedicated a most holy pillar, having en-  
 ““ graven an inscription on it. And the inscription  
 ““ signified, that I have stood alone, and have fixed  
 ““ the nature of all things; having brought disorder  
 ““ and deformity into order and beauty, and having  
 ““ constituted the whole, that it may be established  
 ““ firmly by the Powerful One, and my Deputy  
 ““ Governor, the Logos<sup>9</sup>.” I have cited this long  
 and

<sup>9</sup> P. 600. Λεγέται, Παιδεύσει σε Κύριος ο Θεός, ως ει τις παιδεύσει ανθρωπος τον υν αυτε. τι εν ει θαυμαζομεν ει αγγελους, οποτε και ανθρωποις (ενεκα της των δεομενων επικαριας), απεικαζέται· ως τε οταν φη, Εγω ειμι ο θεος, ο οφθεις σοι εν τοπω θεε. τε τ' εννοησον, οτι τον αγγελον τοπον επεσχε (οσα τω δοκειν) ε μελαβαλων, προς την τε μηπω δυναμεν τον αληθη θεον ιδειν ωφελειαν. Καθαπερ γαρ την ανηλιον αυγην ως ηλιον, οι μη δυναμενοι τον ηλιον αυλον ιδειν, ορωσι, και τας περι σηληνην αλλοιωσεις ως αυτην εκεινην· εως και την τε θεε εικονα, τον αγγελον αυτε, λογον, ως αυλον καλινοσιν. εχ ορας την εγκυκλιον παιδειαν Αγαρ, οτι τω εγγελω φησι, Συ ο θεος ο επιδων με; ε γαρ ηνικαη το πρεσβυταλον ιδειν αυλιον, γενοσ εσα των απ' Αιγυπτου. υνι δε ο υεσ αρχεται θελιεσθαι, τον ηγεμονα πασων των δυναμεων φαλιασιμενοσ· διο και αυλοσ φησιν, Εγω ειμι κυριοσ ο θεοσ, ε την εικονα ως εμε προτερον εθεασω, και σηλην (επιγραμμα εγκολαψασ) ερωταλον ανεθηκασ· το δ' επιγραμμα εμνηυεν, οτι μονοσ εσηκα εγω, και την παντων φυσιν ιδρυσαμεν, την αλαξιαν και ακοσμιαν εις ταξιν και κοσμον αγαγων, και το πανν επερεσασ, να σησιχθη θεβαιωσ τω κραταυ και υπαρχω με λογω. Concerning the Being who appeared to Hagar, “ Jonathan renders “ ver. 13 [Gen. xvi], “ She confessed before the Lord Jehovah, “ whose *Word* had spoken to her;” and the Jerufalem Targum, “ She confessed and prayed to the *Word* of the Lord who had appeared to her.” And “ Gen. xxi.—ver. 20, “ God was with “ the lad,”—is thus rendered both by Onkelos and Jonathan, “ the *Word* of the Lord was his support or assistance” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 210). As to Jacob, “ according to Jonathan’s Targum  
 “ gum

and obscure passage, in order to show more fully than I could do by a shorter extract, the acknowledged agency of the Logos in the peculiar theocracy of the Jews. In that history of our race, which alone carries us to the first springs and sources of nations, and exhibits them to us awfully beginning in a single pair, thence expanding into families, dilating into towns, and at last diffusing themselves into kingdoms; we peculiarly see those two nations of the Saracens and the Jews, which now stand so distinguished on the earth for their common opposition to our God, descending both from the great father of the faithful, Abraham. The present passage refers, to the first lineaments of the history of both. There is an obscurity in parts,

“ gum on Gen. xxvii. 28, Isaac prayed for his son Jacob in these  
 “ words, “ The *Word* of the Lord give thee of the dew of heaven;”  
 “ and in the same Targum on Gen. xxxi. 5, where Jacob saith  
 “ The God of my father hath been with me,” it is rendered  
 “ The *Word* of the God of my father,” or “ The *Word* BEING  
 “ the God of my father.”—In the introduction, ver. 10 [of Gen.  
 “ xlviii], where the text speaks of Jacob’s setting out from Beer-  
 “ sheba to go to Haran; there both Jonathan and the Jerusalem  
 “ Targum tell us, of the sun’s making haste to go down before his  
 “ time, because the *Word* had a desire to speak with Jacob. Again,  
 “ in the conclusion of this history Gen. xxviii. 20—21, where Jacob  
 “ vowed a vow saying, “ If God will be with me—, then shall the  
 “ Lord be my God;” here we read in Jonathan’s Targum, that  
 “ Jacob vowed a vow to the *Word*, saying, If the *Word* of the Lord  
 “ will be my help,—then shall the Lord be my God.”—And it is  
 “ expressly said in the Jerusalem Targum, “ The *Word* of the Lord  
 “ appeared to Jacob the second time, when he was coming from  
 “ Padan-Aram, and blessed him” (p. 211—213).

H

from

from the involution of one allegory within another. But the import of the whole is clear. “The *God* “who appeared” to that second father of the Jews, Jacob, is declared to have “appeared in *the place* “of *God* ;” and, by him, “*the Unchangeable* held “in semblance the place of an angel ;” because Jacob “was not able to look upon the true God.” But then this Angel and this God, was “the image “of God, his Angel, the Logos.” And he was “considered” by the persons to whom he then appeared, “as God himself ;” just “as those, who “cannot look upon the sun itself, view the sun’s “reflected light as the sun.” The Logos therefore was then “considered,” just as we publicly pronounce him at present, to be “God off God,” and “Light off Light.” He is also said to have been the *Angel* and the *God*, which appeared to that mother of the Saracens, Hagar ; because “she was “not fit to look upon the Most Antient Cause,” or God the Father himself. Nor is the *Father* here said to have ever appeared to Jacob, in reference to any historical fact. The intimation is merely one of Philo’s fancy-pieces ; and is only then to be true, *when* “the mind begins to improve, going in its “*imagination* to the Chief of all powers.” Jacob is expressly declared in this very extract, to have “*hitherto* contemplated the image of God,” or the Logos, “as God himself.” And the reason of this contemplation is assigned, in a manner that extends

to Jacob, to Abraham, and to Adam, to all generations of men before and after the flood; that the Father has left all things in this world of his, to “ be established firmly by the Powerful One, and “ his Deputy Governor, the Logos.” The Son of God was the God of the Jews, because he was, and had always acted as, the Lord of the universe before; the Father having deputed him, to take the general government of the world, and the particular government of the Jews, into his hands<sup>t</sup>.

We have thus the vision of Jacob, in some measure realized to us; “ a ladder” is “ set upon “ the earth, and the top of it reaches to heaven;” and “ the Lord” the Logos “ stands above it, and “ says, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy Fa-

<sup>t</sup> “ The Samaritans, who were originally of the same religion with “ the Jews,—have shewn that they had in the apostles times, the “ same notions that are met with in Philo, of a plurality in God. “ We have a proof of it Acts viii. 9; where we read, that Simon “ Magus had bewitched that people, giving out that himself was “ *τις μεγας, some great one.* He did not say what, but gave them “ leave to understand it their own way. And how did they take it? “ This follows ver. 10: they said, *δλος εστιν η δυναμις τε θεου η μεγαλη,* “ *This person is the great power of God.* This they would not have “ said, if they had not believed, that, besides the Great God, there “ was also a person called *η δυναμις θεου.*—For their calling him the “ Power of God, what that means we cannot better learn than from “ Origen; who, speaking of Simon, and *such others as would make “ themselves like our Lord Jesus Christ,* saith they called themselves “ *Sons of God, or the Power of God,* which he makes to be two titles “ *of one and the same signification* (Orig. cont. Celsus, lib. i. p. 44); “ and both these titles are given to the *Λογος,* by Philo” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 133—134).

“ther, and the God of Isaac.” The same Being continued the Guardian God of the Jews, ever afterwards. “In the middle of the flame,” says Philo concerning the burning bush of Moses, “was  
 “a certain very beautiful form, comparable to no-  
 “thing of the visibles; a most god-like image,  
 “lightening out a light more splendid than fire;  
 “which one might conjecture to be the image of  
 “Him Who Is: but let it be called an angel, be-  
 “cause he almost foretold the things that were  
 “about to happen, in a plainer manner than he had  
 “done with his voice before, through the mag-  
 “nificently elaborated sight.—God having shown  
 “to Moses this very wonderfully elaborated pro-  
 “digy,” &c<sup>x</sup>. Philo thus makes the Being who appeared to Moses in the bush, to be that “Angel” who was “the image” of the Father, who was therefore “God” with him, and was denominated his Logos or his Son. This Being appeared as “a  
 “certain very beautiful form, comparable to no-  
 “thing of the visibles, a most god-like image,  
 “lightening out a light more splendid than fire;  
 “which one might conjecture to be the” very

<sup>x</sup> Gen. xxviii. 12—13.

<sup>x</sup> P. 612—613. Καία δὲ μετὴν τὴν φλόγα μορφὴ τις ἢν περικαλλεσάτη, τῶν ὀρέων ἐμφερὴς ἔδει, θεοειδέτατος ἀγαλμα, φῶς αὐτοειδέτερον τῆ πυρὸς ἀπασφραπίεσα, ἢν ἂν τις ὑπέλοιπεν εἰκόνα τῆ οὐλοῦ εἰκαί· καλεῖσθαι δὲ ἀγγελοῦ, ὅτι σχεδὸν τὰ μελλούτα γενήσεσθαι διηγγελλεῖο τρανότερα, φῶνὴς ἀσχημα, διὰ τῆς μεγαλεργηθείσης ἀφῆως.—το τεραστῖον τέλο καὶ τεθαυμα-  
 Ἱεργημειον δειξάξαι ὁ θεὸς τῷ Μωσῆι, κ. ἴ. λ.

“ image” of God the Father himself. “ But let it “ be called an angel,” that showed “ the magnificently elaborated fight.” Yet it was “ God,” who “ showed this very wonderfully elaborated “ prodigy.” This God also declares expressly, in the very history to which Philo is here referring; “ I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob .” And therefore the God of Moses’s father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, in the opinion of Philo and the Jews, was the very Logos himself<sup>z</sup>.

But we need not dwell upon particular evidences. We may appeal to comprehensive testimonies. “ There is a time,” as Philo has said before, “ when the Logos enquires of some as of *Adam*, “ this, Where art thou?—When however he comes “ into the assembly of friends, he begins not to “ speak, before he calls upon every one of them,

<sup>y</sup> Exodus iii. 6; or (as cited in Acts vii. 32), “ the God of thy “ fathers” in the plural. So it is also in an ancient author, quoted by Eusebius in *Prepar. Evang.* p. 190.

<sup>z</sup> When this “ Angel of the Lord,” and this “ God of Abraham, “ God of Isaac, and God of Jacob,” ordered Moses at the burning bush to tell the Israelites, “ I AM THAT I AM,” or in fewer words, “ I AM, hath sent me unto you,” Exod. iii. 14; “ in the “ Jerusalem Targum—we read, that “ the *Word* of the Lord said “ to Moses, He that said to the world, Let it be, and it was, and “ shall say, Let it be, and it shall be.” Here Moses asked *God*, “ and the *Word* answereth his question” (*Allix’s Judgment*, p. 215).

“ and addresseth them by name—. In this manner  
 “ is *Moses* called upon, at the bush. For “ as  
 “ soon as *God* saw,” says the history, “ that  
 “ *Moses* approached to behold, *God* called to him  
 “ out of the bush, saying, *Moses, Moses.*” —  
 “ *Abraham* too, at the holocaust of his beloved and  
 “ only son,—is stopt. For in the beginning says  
 “ the historian, that “ *God* tempted *Abraham.*” —  
 “ And there “ called to him the *angel* of the Lord  
 “ out of heaven, saying, *Abraham, Abraham* <sup>a</sup>.”  
 The great lawgiver of the Jews, the celebrated  
 founder of their nation, and the venerable progeni-  
 tor of them and of all mankind, all consequently  
 owned the Logos, the Angel of the Lord, for their  
 immediate God. “ This Logos did not the fa-  
 “ thers know; not those who were in truth so, but  
 “ those who, gray-headed with age, said, Give us  
 “ a leader, and let us return to the sins of Egypt <sup>b</sup>.”  
 This passage affirms in fact, what it seems to deny  
 in words. The Logos is allowed to have been the

<sup>a</sup> P. 594. Ἐστὶ δ' οἷε καὶ συνθανεῖναι τινῶν ὡσπερ τὸ Ἀδάμ, τὸ, Πᾶσι εἰ-  
 —επειδὴ μὲν οἱ πρὸς τὸ τῶν φίλων εἰθνη συνθεῖον, ἔπειτα ἀρχαῖαι λέγουσι,  
 ἢ ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἀνακαλεσάσθαι, καὶ ὀνομασίαν προσεπιπέμψαι—. τῆσιν τὸν τρόπον.  
 ἐπὶ τῆς ἑσθῆς Μωϋσῆς ἀνακαλεσάσθαι· ὡς γὰρ εἶδε (φησὶν) οἷε προσάγει ἰδεῖν,  
 ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς ἀπο τῆς ἑσθῆς, λέγων, Μωϋσῆ, Μωϋσῆ.—Ἀβραάμ δὲ,  
 ἐπὶ τῆς τῆ ἀγαπῆς καὶ μονῆ παιδὸς ὀλοκαυτώσεως,—ἐκάλυθη. ἀρχόμενος  
 μὲν γὰρ φησὶν, οἷε ὁ θεὸς ἐπειράζει τὸν Ἀβραάμ.—τὸν δὲ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν ἀγ-  
 γελὸς κυρίου ἐκ τῆς οὐρανόθεν, λέγων, Ἀβραάμ, Ἀβραάμ.

<sup>b</sup> P. 93. Τῆσιν τὸν λόγον ἐκ ἠδείσαν οἱ πατέρες, ἔχ' οἱ πρὸς ἀληθείαν,  
 ἀλλ' οἱ χρόνῳ πολλοῖσι, οἱ λεγομένοις, Δωμῶν ἀρχηγόν, καὶ ἀποσφραγίσμεν εἰς τὸ  
 παθεὶς Αἰγυπτῆα.



God of their fathers. Him all the Israelites acknowledged for their God, in that march of a whole nation out of Egypt, which has no parallel in all the movements of the human race, for its own intrinsic grandeur of action, and exclusively of all its accompanying prodigies of power. They all acknowledged him, but some did not *know* or *honour* him. These repented of their migration out of Egypt, notwithstanding all the prodigies which they had seen; wanted to throw off the guiding hand of their Logos; and wished to return out of the barren wildernesses before them, to the well-provided tables of Egypt. They thus, says David, “provoked “the *Most Highest* in the wilderness<sup>c</sup>.” And the Logos is accordingly said by Philo, to be “denominated the Principle, and the Name of God, “and the Logos, and the Man after the image” of God, “AND THE OVERSEER OF ISRAEL<sup>d</sup>.”

<sup>c</sup> Psalm lxxviii. 18. I cite the translation in our liturgy, as most popular. The other version says, “the Most High.”

<sup>d</sup> Philo p. 341. *Αρχη, και Ονομα θεου, και λογος, και ο καθ'εικονα ανθρωπος, και Ορων Ισραηλ, προσταγορευεται.* So our Saviour is called the Charioteer of Israel, *ηνιοχε Ισραηλ*, by Clemens Alexandrinus (Pædagogus, lib. iii. c. 12. p. 311). “They [the Jews] make it “*the Word*, that appeared to the ancients under the name of the “Angel of the Lord” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 184). They maintain—the *Memra* [or Logos] is the *Jehovah*, the Angel of the “Covenant, the Angel of the Redeemer whom Jacob invoked “Gen. xlviii. 5, *this very Ruler of Israel*, to whom they refer all “things related in the Books of Moses. Men. fol. 59. col. 2” (p. 332).

The Logos was plainly then, in the opinion of Philo, the God of the Jews, the God of the patriarchs, and the God of the antecedent ages of man. He is therefore stiled God, says Philo, repeatedly in the Old Testament. Jacob cried out on awaking after his vision at Bethel, “ Surely the Lord is in  
 “ this place, and I knew it not —; how dreadful is  
 “ this place! this is none other but the house of  
 “ God.” “ This sensible world,” Philo remarks upon the passage, “ is nothing else but the house of  
 “ God, who is one of the Powers of the real God,  
 “ by whom he was good<sup>e</sup>.” The “ God” who appeared to Jacob at Bethel, we have seen before to be the Logos; and this God is here declared to be  
 “ one of the Powers of the real God,” even that very Power “ by *whom* he was good.” “ Do not,” adds Philo, “ pass over what is said” to Jacob,  
 “ but accurately examine if there are two Gods.  
 “ For it is said, I am the God who appeared to  
 “ thee, not in my place, but in the place of God,  
 “ as of another God. What then should we say?  
 “ Indeed he that is in truth God, is one; but they  
 “ that are catachrestically made Gods, are several.  
 “ Wherefore also holy writ, in the present passage,  
 “ has pointed out him that is in truth God by the  
 “ article, saying, I am *the* God; but the cata-

<sup>e</sup> P. 593. Ο αισθητός εἶσι κοσμος εδεν αρχη αλλο εστιν, η οικος θεου, μιας των τε οντως θεου δυναμεων, καθ' ην αγαθος ην.

“ chrestick God without the article, saying, Who  
 “ appeared to thee in the place, not of *the* God,  
 “ but only this, of God. And he calls now his  
 “ most antient Logos *the* God, not being religi-  
 “ ously scrupulous about the position of names, but  
 “ having proposed one end to his narration <sup>f</sup>.”  
 Philo thus pronounces the Logos to be *the* God,  
 and “ him that is in truth God;” in opposition *seem-*  
*ingly* to the Father, as a “ catachrestick God,” but in  
 contradistinction really from “ the catachrestically  
 “ made Gods” of Heathenism. It is the Father,  
 “ who calls now *his* most antient Logos *the* God.”  
 And “ he that is in truth God, is *one*; but they  
 “ that are catachrestically made Gods, are *several*.”  
 Either way, however, the passage marks the true,  
 the genuine divinity of the Logos, in the most sub-  
 stantial manner <sup>g</sup>. By the cherubim over the  
 mercy-seat,

<sup>f</sup> P. 599. Μη παρελθης δε το ειρημενον, αλλ' ακριβως εξηλασον ει δυο  
 εισι θεοι· λεγεται γαρ, Εγω ειμι ο θεος ο οφθεις σοι, εκ εν τοπω τω εμω,  
 αλλ' εν τοπω θεου, ως αν ελεγε. τι εν χρη λεγειν; ο μεν αληθεια θεος, εις  
 εστιν· οι δ' εν καταχρησει γεινομενοι, πλειεις. διο και ο ιερος λογος, εν τω  
 παροντι, τον μεν αληθεια δια τε αρθρου μεμνησκεν, ειπων, Εγω ειμι ο θεος·  
 τον δε καταχρησει χωρις αρθρου, φασκων, Ο οφθεις σοι εν τοπω, & τε θεου,  
 αλλ' αυλο μουιν, θεου. Καλει δε τον θεον τον πρεσβυταλον αυτη νυνι λογον, &  
 δεισιδαιμωνων περι την θεσιν των ονοματων, αλλ' εν τελος προστεθειμενον  
 [προστεθειμενος] πραγματολογησει.

<sup>g</sup> See also p. 593, where *the* God, ο θεος, is also called the *Angel*  
 of *the* God, just as in Gen. xxi. 11—13 the Angel of God is deno-  
 minated *the* God. This therefore turns that *petty* argument of the  
 Arians, directly against themselves; which would deny the divinity of  
 the Son of God, because, though he is called *God*, yet he is not called  
*the* God, as the Father is. Surely *that* is as sufficient to establish the  
 divinity

mercy-seat, “ I would say are plainly to be understood, the two most antient and most high Powers of Him Who Is, the Making and the Royal; and indeed his Making Power is denominated *God*, according to which he placed, and made, and disposed this universe; but the Royal is called *Lord*, by which he governs the things that are made, and with justice firmly controuls them<sup>h</sup>.” We have already seen both these Powers, united by Philo in the Logos; as the equal Creator and Governor of the world under the Father, and as therefore the *Lord God* of the Old Testament. “ Seeft

divinity of the *Son*, as *this* may be to ascertain the Godhead of the *Father*. And the argument, if well-founded in itself, would only serve to prove, that the *Son* is *not* the *Father*. But the argument is as false in fact, as it is frivolous in nature. In Philo and the Old Testament here, *the God* is the very *Son* of God himself. And, by Arian logick, these passages would exclude the very *Father* from the Godhead.

I say not this, as resting on such a point of *articular* theology. It is too trifling either way, for a moment’s thought. The passage in 593 shows this very clearly; where *the God* is denominated the Angel of *the God*, ο θεος and ο αγγελος τω θεω. And, as any page either in the Old or New Testament will convince an examiner at a glance, the article is omitted or inserted, and inserted or omitted; from some principles of composition, that are indiscernible, and therefore seem arbitrary, to us. See also a long and decisive note upon the subject, in Pearson on the Creed, p. 120—121; and others again, in p. 124, 130, 132, and 150, of that universal scholar.

<sup>h</sup> P. 668—669. Εγω δ’ αν ειποιμι δηλωσθαι δι’ υπονοιαν τας πρεσβυτητας και ανωτατω δυο τω Ουλοσ δυναμεις, την τε ποιητικην και Βασιλικην. ονομαζειται δε η μεν ποιητικη δυναμις αυτη θεος, καθ’ ην εθηκε και εποισε και διεσκοσμησε τοδε το παν’ η δε Βασιλικη Κυριος, η των γενομενων αρχει, και συν δικη εεβαιως επικρατει.

“ thou

“ thou not,” adds Philo in the same spirit of subtilizing being into power, and dividing the Logos in two; “ that about Him Who Is are the first  
 “ and greatest of Powers, the Beneficent and the  
 “ Corrective? And the Beneficent is called *God*,  
 “ because according to it he placed and disposed the  
 “ universe; but the other is called *Lord*, to which  
 “ belongs the government of the whole<sup>i</sup>.” The  
 Logos consequently, that Creator and Governor of  
 the world, has all the beneficent and corrective  
 Powers of God in his hands. And “ of the Powers,  
 “ which God has extended to the creation of that  
 “ which was constituted in beneficence, it is the  
 “ case of some to be called according to their ob-  
 “ ject; the Royal, the Beneficent. For a king is a  
 “ king of somebody, and a benefactor is a bene-  
 “ factor of somebody; he who is governed by the  
 “ king, and he who is obliged by the benefactor,  
 “ being totally different. Related to these is also  
 “ the Making Power, which is called *God*; for, by  
 “ this Power, the Father who generated and framed,  
 “ placed all things<sup>k</sup>.” Philo has thus multiplied  
 the

<sup>i</sup> P. 854. Η βχ' ορας, οτι περι το Ον αι πρώται και μεγισται των δυνα-  
 μεων εισιν, η τε ευεργέτης και κολασηριος; και προσαγορευεται η μεν ευερ-  
 γέτης θεος, επειδη καλα ταυτην εθηκε και διεσκοσμησε το παν· η δ' ελερα Κυ-  
 ριος, καθ' ην ανηπται των ολων το κρατος.

<sup>k</sup> P. 1048—1049. Των δε δυναμεων, ας ελεινεν εις γενεσιν επ' ευερ-  
 γεσια τε συσθαθελιος, ενιας συμβεβηκε λεγεσθαι ωσανει προς τι· την Βασι-  
 λικην, την ευεργετικην. Βασιλευς γαρ τινος, και ευεργετης τινος· ελερα  
 παλιως

the Logos at last, into *three*; and made him the Creative, the Beneficent, and the Royal, Powers of God. What then remains behind in the Godhead? Nothing certainly. The whole Godhead is exhausted (as it were) by Philo, in order to dress out the Logos of the Jews, in all the moral and physical attributes of God.

But let us observe, how Philo speaks of these Powers in the Godhead, upon another occasion. "I pray then," he introduces a man saying to God, "that I may behold the glory around you; and I think your glory to be the Powers which attend you as guards— And he answers and says, The Powers which you seek to know, are wholly invisible and intellectual, as I am invisible and intellectual— But, though they are incomprehensible in their essence, yet they show a certain stamp and image of their operativeness, like seals among you— Such, it is to be understood, are the Powers which stand about me, investing with qualities the things that want qualities, and the things without form with form, and yet being no ways lessened or diminished in their eternal nature. And some of your countrymen name them not amiss *Ideas*, because they *ἰδιοποιῶσι* [give the proper forms to] every one of

παύτως Βασιλευμενα και ενεργημενα· ταυτων συγγενης εστι και η ποιητικη δυναμις, η καλεσμενη θεος· οια γαρ ταυτης της δυναμειως εθηκε τα παιδια, ο γεννησαι, και τεργημενους παληρ.

“ the

“ the things existing, putting the disordered in  
 “ order, and bounding and terminating and figur-  
 “ ing the unbounded and untermiated and un-  
 “ figured, and on the whole harmonizing the worſe  
 “ into the better’.” This is plainly meant, only as  
 a diffuſive and metaphorical deſcription of the Lo-  
 gos. He, as we have ſeen abundantly before, has  
 “ ſhown a certain ſtamp and image of his operative-  
 “ neſs, like a ſeal among men,” in the works of  
 the creation; though at the ſame time, as “ the  
 “ glory around” the Father, in the language of  
 Philo, or, in the ſimilar language of Chriſtianity,  
 as “ the brightneſs of his Father’s glory,” he is  
 “ incomprehenſible in his eſſence.” He has thus  
 “ inveſted with qualities, the things that wanted  
 “ qualities” in the chaotic ſtate; “ and the things  
 “ without form, with form.” Yet he was “ no-  
 “ ways leſſened or diminished in his eternal nature.”  
 And *ſome of the Jews before Philo*, who had been re-  
 fining like him on the ſubject of the Logos, had

1 P. 817. Ἰδέτω δ' ἐγώ, τὴν γὰρ περὶ σε διζῆαι θεασασθαι· διζῆαι δὲ  
 σὴν εἶναι νομίζω τὰς τε δορυφορούσας διαμαχίας— ὁ δὲ ἀμειδίαι καὶ φησὶ,  
 Ἄς ἐπιζητήσῃς διαμαχίας, εἰσὶν ἀοράτοι καὶ νοητοὶ πάντως, ἐμὲ τε ἀοράτω καὶ  
 νοητῷ— αἱ δ' ἀκατάληπτοι κατὰ τὴν ἕσταν, ὁμῶς περιφραίνουσιν ἐκμαχίον τὴ  
 καὶ ἀπεικονίσμα τῆς αἰῶν ἐνεργείας, οἷαι παρ' ἡμῖν [ὑμῖν] σφραγίδες—  
 τοιαύτης ἐποληπτεῖον καὶ τὰς περὶ ἐμὲ διαμαχίας, περιποιούσας ἀποτοίς ποιότη-  
 τας καὶ μορφὰς ἀμορφοῖς, καὶ μηδὲν τῆς αἰῶν φύσεως μὴ ἐλαττώσας μὴ ἐ-  
 μείψμενας· οἰομαζέσθαι δ' αἰῶν ἐκ ἀπο σκοπέ τινας τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν ἰδέας,  
 ἐπειδὴ ἐκάστον τῶν οὐκ ἰδιοποιεῖσι, τὰ ἀτάκτω τατίσασθαι, καὶ τὰ ἀπείρα  
 καὶ ἀορίστα καὶ ἀσχημάτιστα πειραίσασθαι καὶ περιορίζεσθαι καὶ σχηματίζεσθαι,  
 καὶ συλλογῆς τὸ χεῖρον εἰς τὸ ἀμειδίον καθαυμάζεσθαι.

called

called him an *Idea*; just as Philo himself has called him the Intellectual World, and the World composed of Ideas; because *ideas* in the Greek, in which Philo and they wrote, signify thoughts as the *proper* resemblances of things; and because he “gave  
“ the proper forms, to every one of the things exist-  
“ ing.” In this manner does Philo continue to dwell upon the Logos, as “the Powers” of the Godhead, and as therefore the substance and essence of God the Father.

To these evidences of the sentiments of Philo and his countrymen, concerning the Godhead of the Logos; I shall subjoin only three more, all tending to the same point of important intelligence; and even more distinctly showing the whole power of the Godhead, seemingly concentrated in the Logos. “In the one truly existing God, are two very high  
“ and first Powers, Goodness and Authority; and  
“ by Goodness indeed was all the universe made,  
“ but by Authority is the universe governed; and  
“ a third, as a conjoiner of and middle between  
“ both, is the Logos. For by the Logos is God  
“ a Governor and Good<sup>m</sup>.” How strongly does Philo display the general opinion of his times, con-

<sup>m</sup> P. 112. Κατα τον ενα οληως οληα θεον, δυο τας ανωτατω ειναι και πρωτας δυναμεις, αγαθοτητα και εξουσιαν· και αγαθοτητι μεν το παν γεγενηκεναι· εξουσια δε, τω γεννηθειτος αρχων· τριτον δε συναγωγου αμφοιν, μεσσω ειναι λογος· λογος γαρ και αρχοντα και αγαθον ειναι τον θεον.



cerning the Divinity of his Logos! The Logos is “the Goodness” of the Father, “by whom,” as was said before, “he was Good,” or, as is said now *to the very same meaning*, by whom “was all the universe framed.” The Logos too is “the Power” of the Father, by which “is the universe governed.” And the Logos is also “the third, as a conjoiner of and middle between both;” because “by the Logos is God a Governor and Good.” The Logos therefore is the Authority and the Goodness of the Father, and at once the cement and the cause of both in Him.—In the same manner does Philo speak, of that Being’s appearance to Abraham just before the destruction of Sodom; whom we know to be characterized in the history, as “the judge of all the earth<sup>n</sup>,” and who is stated by Philo himself before, to be the Logos. He comes “as God, attended with his guards of two most high Powers, Dignity and Goodness; one of whom, he in the middle, wrought the appearance of a third upon the discerning soul; every of which Powers is indeed un-measurable, for un-circumscribed also are his Powers, and they have measured the universe<sup>o</sup>.” And the Logos is thus spoken of

<sup>n</sup> Gen. xviii. 25.

<sup>o</sup> P. 139. Ο θεὸς δορυφορημένος ὑπο δυνάμιν [δυνάμιν] τῶν ἀνωτάτων δυνάμεων, ἀρχῆς τε αὐτῆς καὶ ἀγαθοτήτος· εἰς ἣν, ὁ μέσος, τρίτης φαντασίας ἐνεργάζετο τῆ ὁρατικῆ ψυχῆ, ἣν ἐκάστη μεμετρηται μὲν ἕδαμῶς· ἀπεριγραφοὶ γὰρ καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτῆς, μεμετρήθη δὲ τὰ ὅλα.

expressly

expressly as God, and (what is more) exactly as the Father has been before, being equally as he attended by the Goodness and Dignity of the Godhead; being un-measurable in himself, being un-circumscribed in them, and having measured the universe with them at the creation.—“ A man standing  
 “ nearest to the truth might say, The Father indeed of all is the middle, who in the sacred  
 “ scriptures is called by the proper name of He  
 “ Who Is; and on each side are the nearest and  
 “ oldest Powers of Him Who Is; of which one is  
 “ called the Making, and the other the Royal  
 “ Power. And the Making is *God*, for by this  
 “ he placed and disposed the universe; and the  
 “ Royal is the *Lord*, for it is just that he who made  
 “ should govern and command the things made.  
 “ Being attended therefore by these Powers, as  
 “ guards on each side, and being in the midst of  
 “ them; he exhibits to the discerning intellect, the  
 “ appearance sometimes of One, and sometimes of  
 “ Three: of One, when the soul is exactly purged,  
 “ and passes over not merely the multitude of  
 “ numbers, but even that neighbour of Unity the  
 “ Duality, and is led to the Idea unmixed, and un-  
 “ complicated, and of itself wanting nothing at all;  
 “ and of Three, when, not yet initiated in the  
 “ great mysteries, it has been introduced into the  
 “ lesser orgies only, and is not able to comprehend  
 “ Him Who Is, alone by himself, without some  
 “ other

“ other one ; but, through the things done, comprehends either the Maker or the Governor P.”

This passage has been particularly adduced, as indicative of the Trinity<sup>9</sup>. So it seems to be, at the first survey of it. But, by collating it with the passages antecedent, we see it relates merely to the Logos. He is here accompanied again by his two Powers, Dignity and Goodness, as his guards ; which are called here, as they are before, the Royal and the Making Powers. He is thus represented again, just as the Father has been before. And he

P P. 367. Τις της αληθείας εγγυτάτα ισάμει<sup>Θ</sup> εἶποι, Πατήρ μὲν τῶν ὅλων ὁ μεσ<sup>Θ</sup>, ὡς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς κυριῶν ὀνομασίαι καλεῖται Ὁ Ὡν<sup>Θ</sup> αἱ δὲ παρ’ ἑκατέρω πρῶτον κατατάσσονται καὶ ἐγγυτάται τῷ ὄντι<sup>Θ</sup> δυνάμεις· ἡ μὲν Ποιητικὴ, ἡ δὲ Βασιλικὴ προσσαγορεύεται. καὶ ἡ μὲν Ποιητικὴ Θε<sup>Θ</sup>· ταυτὴ γὰρ εἴθε τε καὶ διεσκοπήθη το παν<sup>Θ</sup>· ἡ δὲ Βασιλικὴ Κυρι<sup>Θ</sup>, θεμὴ γὰρ ἀρχεῖν καὶ κρατεῖν το σπεποικ<sup>Θ</sup> τε γειομεν<sup>Θ</sup>. δορυφορεμεν<sup>Θ</sup> ἔν ὁ μεσ<sup>Θ</sup> ὑφ’ ἑκατέρας τῶν δυνάμεων, παρεχεῖ τῆ ὁρατικῆ διανοίῃ, τότε μὲν ἐν<sup>Θ</sup>, τότε δὲ τριῶν, φαντασιαν<sup>Θ</sup> ἐν<sup>Θ</sup> μὲν, ὅταν ἀκρῶς καταρθεῖσα ψυχῆ, καὶ μὴ μόνον τα πλῆθη τῶν ἀριθμῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν γειτονα μοναδ<sup>Θ</sup> δυάδα υπερέβασα, πρὸς τὴν ἀμιγῆ, καὶ ἀσυμπλοκῆν, καὶ καθ’ αὐτὴν ἐδεν<sup>Θ</sup> ἐπίδεα το παραπαν, ἰδεῖν ἐπειγεται· τριῶν δὲ, ὅταν μὴ πω τας μεγάλας τελειοθεῖσα τελεται, ἐτι ἐν ταῖς βραχυτέρας ὀργιαζῆται, καὶ μὴ δύνηται Το Ὡ ἀνευ ἐτέρω τιν<sup>Θ</sup>· ἐξ αὐτῆ μόνε καταλαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ δια τῶν δευόμενων ἡ κλιζὸν κερχον.

<sup>9</sup> By Dr. Randolph in his answer to Essay on Spirit, part 1st. p. 29; an author, who is allowed by Arianism itself, to have been “ the only able and formidable antagonist” of the Essay (Biog. Brit. iii. 623. CLAYTON, 1784); and of whom I am happy to record, that he was a sound scholar, a judicious divine, and, what is most to his praise, a good man. He had particularly that extent of scholarship, and that solidity of judgment, which were sure to keep him from the absurdities of Arianism, and also to make him an “ able and formidable antagonist” to the Arians.

is exprefsly denominated “ the Father of all,” and “ He Who Is;” appellations, which Philo has hitherto appropriated and confined to God the Father. He is alfo faid to have “ placed and difpofed the “ univerfe,” by his power as “ God;” and to “ govern and command the things made,” by his power as “ Lord.” And he is defcribed, as exhibiting the appearance of One, when he is confidered in and by himfelf; and of Three, when he is viewed relatively to his works, and confidered in his creative and in his governing capacities, as well as in his perfonal. So much does the Logos finally *feem*, in the *language* of Philo, to be the fame with the Father himfelf, and even to abforb the whole Trinity in his own perfon! So much does the Logos finally *appear*, in the *sentiments* of Philo, to be the oftendifible, the interpofer, the energetick God of the univerfe! And fo fully and completely is the Logos here shown from all, to have been the perfonal Creator of the world to the Jews, the perfonal Governor of the world to all mankind, and the acting God, the Deputy and the Equal of God the Father, to the Jews and to all mankind through all ages<sup>r</sup>!”

## CHAPTER

<sup>r</sup> To thefe historical proofs of the pofitive Divinity of God the Son, let me fubjoin a note in oppofition to thofe, who fo far unite with the church and with truth, as to allow the Logos to have been the vifible God of the Old Teftament; and yet fo far recoil from both, as to affert him to have been only an angel by nature, and a  
God

## CHAPTER THE THIRD.

## — I. —

WE have now seen the opinions of the Jews at Jerufalem in the days of our Saviour, and concerning the Divinity of the Son of God; all repeatedly

God by investiture. This wild whimsy, which was first suggested in our own country (I believe) by Sir Isaac Newton, in his fiction of a *Quasi Deus*; has been since moulded into form, by Bishop Clayton in his Essay on Spirit, and by Mr. Taylor in his letters from Ben. Mordecai. What I have already said, sufficiently precludes the arguments of both. But let me now reply to them briefly. The former work indeed has been some time resigned up to the shades, from which it came. I will not disturb its repose. “I war not with the dead.” But, as the latter is yet “moving betwixt earth and heaven,” it may be useful to make a few remarks upon it. A few will be sufficient to give it its death’s wound. And, in him, I shall answer the Essayist and all these *Semi-arians*.

“The word **JEHOVAH**,” says Mr. Taylor, “is the **PROPER** name of the **SELF-EXISTENT** God, and is **APPROPRIATED** to Him **ALONE**” (I. 403). “It appears from the scriptures, that the word **Elohim**, God, does not include in it always the idea of *Supremacy* and *Self-existence*, as **THE WORD JEHOVAH DOES**; and may therefore be applied to other beings, who are *not* supreme nor *self-existent*” (I. 405). “The charge of Polytheism against the Christians, arises from not distinguishing the different senses of the word **Θεός**, **Deus**, **God**, as used in the scriptures; sometimes in the sense of the word **Elohim**, in which sense there are many gods; and sometimes in the sense of **JEHOVAH**, in which **THERE IS BUT ONE**. But as long as the Christians observe this distinction, and allow of but **One Supreme God**, but **ONE Self-existent JEHOVAH**;

peatedly echoed back in the sentiments of the Jews at Alexandria, co-temporary with the apostles.

Philo.

“ there is not the least ground for any such charge. And all those  
 “ who argue, from confounding these two senses of the word God,  
 “ that there is but one Elohimi, because there is but ONE JEHOVAH;  
 “ and that CHRIST cannot be God, Elohimi, *except* he be JEHO-  
 “ VAH, the SUPREME SELF-EXISTENT GOD;” do argue falsely  
 (1. 407). And “ those who carefully distinguish the two senses of the  
 “ word God, as they are used in the scriptures; and believe that  
 “ CHRIST was invested with the name of God, “ because he was so  
 “ faithful, because he assumed nothing to himself, that he might  
 “ fulfil the commands of him that sent him;” that he has all his  
 “ titles, viz. Son of God, Lord, Word, &c. from his being “ be-  
 “ gotten of the Father by his will;” and that he is Lord of Hosts,  
 “ *κυριος δυναμεων*, by the will of the Father that giveth him power;  
 “ and that he is constituted Almighty by the Father and Lord of  
 “ the whole creation: cannot attribute the same honour to all Be-  
 “ ings, who have the name of God; but believe in ONE JEHOVAH,  
 “ who is SELF-EXISTENT AND SUPREME over all, to whom all  
 “ other Beings in the universe, though called by the name of God,  
 “ Elohimi, even CHRIST himself, are subject” (1. 409). I have  
 produced these extracts at full length, in order to demonstrate from  
 them the grand point aimed at by Mr. Taylor here. God the Fa-  
 ther is here represented, as THE ONE ONLY JEHOVAH; because he  
 is the *Supreme* and the *Self-existent* God. That is his “ proper”  
 name. And “ to Him *alone* it is appropriated.” Nor is this said  
 only here. It is the substantial principle, the vital spark, of all Mr.  
 Taylor’s Arianism. And it is that by which he distinguishes  
 throughout the remainder, the nominal Divinity of his created Logos  
 from the genuine Divinity of his Creator God.

Yet is this very principle in absolute contradiction, to all the pre-  
 ceding parts of his work. The main design of all before is to show,  
 that the Logos was *the visible Jehovah of the Old Testament*. Thus  
 in 1. 227 we read of “ the frequent appearance of JEHOVAH, and  
 “ the many conversations which we are told of between God and  
 “ man: that JEHOVAH walked in the Garden of Eden in the cool

“ of

Philo has historically proved, a very useful commentator upon the Evangelists. But from these works

“ of the day, and passed judgment on Adam and Eve [Gen. iii. 8, &c.]; and came down to see the tower which the children of men builded in the days of Peleg [xi. 5]; and appeared to Abraham as a man accompanied with two angels, in the plains of Mamre (xviii. 1, 2); and spake to Moses out of the bush [Ex. iii. 2, 4]; and went before the Israelites in a pillar of a cloud by day, and in a pillar of fire by night (xiii. 21); and was afflicted in all their afflictions (If. lxiii. 9); and appeared to Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and the seventy elders of Israel (Ex. xxiv. 10); and descended on Mount Sinai, to give the law (xix); and was heard by the children of Israel to speak with a great voice (Deut. v. 22); and resided in the tabernacle (Ex. xxv. 22); and promised that he would return again, and reside among men in the latter day (Jer. xxxi. 31); and renewed that promise (Zech. ii. 10, 11) in the days of Darius Hystaspis, about 500 years before the Christian æra.” “ It becomes both Jews and Christians,” he argues from all, “ to consider how such actions can possibly be performed by JEHOVAH; for they are both agreed, that the history is true, and yet that THE SUPREME SELF-EXISTENT GOD of the universe hath never been *seen or heard* at any time” (1. 229—230). If then “ JEHOVAH so often appeared to our fathers, and conversed with them; and yet—the Supreme God and Father of the universe was never seen by any one, nor his voice heard; there must be without doubt SOME OTHER PERSON, besides the Supreme God and Father of the universe, WHO IS CALLED BY THAT NAME” (1. 232). And in 1. 246 we have “ the JEHOVAH ANGEL speaking in the first person in the name of God; and so HE speaks to Nicodemus Jo. iii.”

Here then we have a gross and massy contradiction. That name which is “ proper” to God the Father, and “ is appropriated to him alone;” and which indeed *must* be so proper, and so appropriated, *because* it includes in it “ the idea of supremacy and self-existence,” those exclusive characters of God the Father; is yet, we now find, *not* “ proper,” and *not* “ appropriated” to

works of his, we now pass to others; to show how much later than these, the Jews continued in the same

God the Father, but *given repeatedly to God the Son*. HE, we now find, was the JEHOVAH, whom we see so frequently appearing "in the books of Moses." HE was the JEHOVAH, who by the prophet Jeremiah "promised, that he would return again, and reside among men in the latter day." HE too was the JEHOVAH, who by the prophet Zechariah "renewed that promise in the days of Darius Hytaspis, about 500 years before the Christian æra." HE was even "called" expressly "by that name" of JEHOVAH, and was "the Jehovah Angel" in reality. And HE was therefore, by fair inference from all, *that very Supreme and Self-existent God*, which the word JEHOVAH (according to Mr. Taylor) implies the bearer to be, which Mr. Taylor *at times* so unjustly charges the orthodox with thinking him, and which yet he himself most astonishingly makes him. Mr. Taylor thus sets up the two parts of his work, like a couple of nine-pins; to impinge upon each other directly, and to beat down each other effectually.

Nor is this contradiction, however palpable and big, such an incidental stroke of inadvertency, as an intellect not very distinguishing may occasionally commit. No! It is such, as only a very confused one could possibly exhibit at all. It affects Mr. Taylor's *main principle*. It results from his *original ideas*. And it is the necessary consequence, of his *whole system of Arianism*. When our Saviour is allowed, as *even Arianism itself cannot any longer deny him*, to be the visible and acting Jehovah of the Old Testament; all attempts to give him less than a positive and substantial Divinity, must inevitably recoil in a full charge of contradictoriness, upon the body of the attempter.

Having said this, I need not press a single point more. I have said enough to show the incompetency of Mr. Taylor's abilities, if any abilities could be competent, for defending such a cause as his. But I wish to notice the Apollinarian absurdity, of our Saviour having no *soul*; the Logos, *a distinct person*, supplying (it seems) the place of a soul to him (1. 99): when our Saviour himself *confessedly* says, "my *soul* is exceedingly sorrowful even unto  
"death,"



same sentiments, and adhered to the same opinions. And let us first add to the various extracts from the

“ death,” and cries out equally with *St. Stephen*, “ Father, into thy hands I commend my *spirit* ;” when one of the evangelists says of Him equally as of the *Baptist*, “ He waxed strong in *spirit* ;” and when all say at his death, “ He gave up the *ghost*.” I wish also to notice that strange assumption, derived expressly from Sir Isaac Newton, calculated only to bolster up a sinking cause, and proving how weakly a wise man can think when he is an Arian ; which says “ the Being who governs all things as Lord of the universe, is stiled “ Lord God upon account of his *dominion*, for the word God is a “ *relative* term” (1. 397—398) : a principle, which is big with infinite monstrosity ; which lays the *existence* of God himself, dependent upon that of his creatures ; which gives him no existence, *till* he has *exerted his existence* in forming creatures ; which either makes God begin to exist *in time* together with his creatures, or makes his creatures to be *co-eternal* in existence with him ; and so either deifies *them*, or undeifies *him*. I wish too to mark Mr. Taylor’s defence of *praying* to the Logos, though *wholly a creature*, in 1. 410, &c. ; when in 1. 90—92, he contrarily *abuses* the orthodox, for praying to him as *partially* so ; because, “ if they worship Christ as *God* and *man*, “ they worship the creature *as well as* the Creator.” And I wish at the close to exhibit his whole doctrine of Arianism, as inextricably involved in contradictions and absurdities. We accordingly see him, affirming there is only *one* Jehovah, and yet holding out *two* to us. We hear him saying, “ Christ—is LORD OF HOSTS, *κυριος* “ *δυναμεων*, by the will of the Father that giveth him power” (1. 409), and so distinguishing him directly from the Father “ the one “ Jehovah” (ibid. ibid.) ; when this very title of Lord of Hosts is JEHOVAH OF HOSTS in the original, and when it is expressly declared to be so by Mr. Taylor himself ; the word *Lord*, or *κυριος*, being actually shown by him, to be a translation for *Jehovah* in general (1. 278—280), and that particular passage in Hosea, xii. 5, “ the “ Lord God of Hosts,” being actually rendered by him “ *Jehovah* “ God of Hosts” (1. 265). We find him exhibiting to us a *Jehovah*, who was an *angel* ; a *Supreme*, who was a *creature* ; a *Self-existent*,

the early and known works of Philo, a few from a single and later work of his, that does not profess to

existent, who was *made*; an *Almighty*, who was *constituted*; and an *Eternal*, who was formed *in time* (1. 160). In his work we behold a Being, who, as a *creature*, exists by an extraneous operation of God, *made every moment*, and therefore *intermittible at pleasure*; and who is also "Lord" or *Jehovah* "of Hosts," *by the same power so made and so intermittible*, because he "is Lord of Hosts by the will "of the Father that *giveth* him power" (1. 409). Even in God the *Father* himself, we here contemplate a *relative*, a *contingent* God; who began to exist, only *when* he had created subjects to himself; who must therefore have acted *before* he existed; and is sure, if his creatures were annihilated to-morrow, to be to-morrow annihilated himself. We have the Son of God "invested with the *name* of God, "because he was so faithful, because he assumed nothing to himself, "that he might fulfil the commands of him that *sent* him" (1. 409); and, consequently, *after* he had been faithful, *after* he had assumed nothing, and *after* he had been sent; "the reward of his love to "man and obedience to God being *deferred*, till he should be made "perfect—by—greater sufferings,—*when*—God—*sent* him into the "world" (1. 260—261). Yet the same Son of God, we find, was *many ages before* the visible *Jehovah* of the Old Testament; had "power—in a peculiar manner over the Jews, as their *God* and King" (1. 261); and even then announced himself, to be the great "I Am" (1. 245). Thus, he, who had not the very *name* of God till he was incarnated, yet was the actual *God* of the Jews near 1500 years preceding, even bore the high and appropriate *name* of *Jehovah* then, and even assumed that still higher and more appropriate *name* of *Deity*, "I Am." We have also a Being, who was the *Creature God* of the Jews, and the *Creature God* of the patriarchs; the *created* Lord of the creation, at present; and the *created* Creator of it, at first. And we have finally a Being, who particularly delivered the law on Mount Sinai (1. 127); who therefore uttered this command to the Jews at the time, "I AM THE LORD "THY GOD,—THOU SHALT HAVE NONE OTHER GODS BUT "ME;" and who thus presumed, though an *angel* only, to shut out  
God

to be, and yet is assuredly, so. That apocryphal book, THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON, was professedly written in the name of Solomon; but is attributed to Philo by some of the first-rate authors in Christian antiquity, Basil, Jerome, and Austin<sup>s</sup>. The tradition of his writing the work, was accordingly continued through the middle ages<sup>t</sup>. And so impressed was this upon the general mind, that the work was cited at times by the very appellation of Philo<sup>u</sup>.

Yet a learned and thinking divine has ventured, to call this tradition a mere “dream;” and appeals to “most certain evidences,” without any specifick reference, for the much higher antiquity of the work<sup>x</sup>. If the Book of Wisdom *be* much older than Philo, any passages in it serve strongly to corroborate my general argument, by carrying to a

God from his Jewish part of the creation, to intercept the whole worship of the Jews from him, and to confine it all to himself; sinking *them* into absolute idolaters, and exalting *himself* into a very Lucifer over them. Never surely does the human mind expose its own futility and folly so much, as when it deserts the publick road of theology, and ventures to strike out a bye-path for its movements; entangling itself with briars and thorns, falling at every step over stumps of trees, and losing itself at last in an impracticable wilderness.

<sup>s</sup> See ix. 7—8 for the assumed character of Solomon, besides the title; and see Cofin's History of the Canon of Scripture (edit. 1683), p. 24 and 196, for these authors.

<sup>t</sup> Cofin, p. 170 and 197.

<sup>u</sup> Cofin, p. 163.

<sup>x</sup> Bull, p. 14. His reason probably for speaking so, was one which is answered in a note of next section.

still

still higher period the Jewish notions of Divinity in the Messiah. Thus, in that other piece of Apocryphal Scripture, which was written no less than two hundred and sixty years before our Saviour, the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach; the author represents himself, as addressing a prayer to God in this form. "I called," he says, "upon the Lord " THE FATHER OF MY LORD, that he would not " leave me in the days of my trouble<sup>y</sup>." The Jew, we see, even then prayed in the *Christian* manner; owning a *second* person in the Godhead, and praying to the first as the *father* of the second; acknowledging the first, under his equally Jewish and Christian appellation, of Lord or *the* Lord; and acknowledging the second, under his appropriating and Christian denomination at present, of *our* Lord<sup>z</sup>. In the very same terms, according to our Saviour's own interpretation of them, and agreeably to the received construction of them at the time, does David speak of the very same persons in the Godhead, eight hundred years before the son of Sirach; when he tells us concerning the Messiah, that "*the* Lord said to *my* Lord, Sit thou on my

<sup>y</sup> Chap. li. 10. And in the "prologue" says the author: "in the eight and thirtieth year coming into Egypt, when Euergetes was king, and continuing there some time, I found a book, &c."

<sup>z</sup> "R. Azariah de Rubeis in his book Meor Enaim, ch. 22. witnesseth, that Ecclesiasticus is not rejected *now* by the Jews, but is received among them *with an unanimous consent*" (Allix's Judgment, p. 68).

“right-hand, till I make thine enemies thy foot-  
 “fool<sup>a</sup>.” And the mother of the Baptist suitably  
 calls the Virgin Mary, “the mother of *my* Lord<sup>b</sup>.”  
 Yet, what is more wonderful, the very Heathens of  
 Assyria, near six hundred years before our Saviour,  
 familiarly knew this second person in the Godhead,  
 knew him by his very “form” of Divinity, and  
 knew him too by his very title of “Son of God.”  
 “Lo,” cries Nebuchadnezzar “astonied, and  
 “rising up in haste,” after he had thrown the three  
 Jews into the furnace of fire; “I see *four* men  
 “loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they  
 “have no hurt; and the FORM OF THE FOURTH IS  
 “LIKE THE SON OF GOD<sup>c</sup>.” The antient Hea-  
 thens appear to have framed to themselves, a settled  
 and precise idea of resemblance for the Son of God.  
 Accordingly the king, starting up in an agitation  
 of spirits, and speaking hastily the sentiments and  
 language of all around him, avers the personal ap-  
 pearance which he here saw, to be “*like* the Son of  
 “God” in “form.” But the idea was common to  
 them and to the Jews. Hence that very Daniel,  
 who has recorded this averment of the king’s, does  
 himself describe the same personage, as “one *like*  
 “the Son of Man;” the titles of Son of Man and  
 Son of God (as I have shown before, and shall again

<sup>a</sup> Mat. xxii. 43—44.

<sup>b</sup> Luke i. 43.

<sup>c</sup> Daniel iii. 25.

show hereafter) being equally applied to the Messiah; and as having “an *everlasting* dominion, which “*shall not pass away.*” Nor was the idea unknown to the first Christians. St. John therefore, in his Revelations, sees “one *like* unto the Son of Man;” who says of himself, “I am he that liveth and was “dead;” and whose “countenance was, as the sun “shineth in his strength.” Christians, Jews, and Heathens, derived this common idea probably, from the form of his repeated appearances to the Jews, the Patriarchs, and the Ante-diluvians. He always appeared probably with a “countenance,” that “was as the sun shineth in his strength.” From the firm and fixed impression, which the sensible “form” of the Son of God appears to have made, upon the universal mind of man; he certainly exhibited himself always to the eye of man, with *some* permanent and illustrious signature of identity. What then was it? Such a countenance as this, it is most likely to have been. Such a countenance we see actually appropriated to the Messiah, at his appearance in the visions of St. John. And we even see it appropriated to him again, when he resided upon earth, but while he was “transfigured” before the same John. Then “the fashion of his *countenance* was altered.” Then “his *face* did” once more “shine as *the sun.*” And “all the people, “when they beheld him” on his return from the mount of transfiguration, “were *greatly amazed*”

at the remaining "glory" of his countenance; as Nebuchadnezzar was "astounded" at the form of the Son of God, and at the sight of the three men walking with him: "and running to him—saluted him," just as Nebuchadnezzar "came near—and spake<sup>d</sup>."

But attached to the Book of Proverbs are some of Solomon's, which "the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out," and which run from chapter xxvth to chapter xxixth inclusively. Then come the words of Agur and of Lemuel's mother, in two chapters attached to all. Of what date the latter additions are, it is difficult to say. But that they are not later than Ezra, is evident from their appearance as a part of the Jewish canon. In these Agur, a name familiar among us from his magnanimous selection of the middle state of life, but a person totally unknown in his origin and connections; is introduced speaking in this magnificent language of interrogation, concerning the majesty of God and the pettiness of man. "Who," he asks, "hath ascended up into heaven," to gain a proper knowledge of God; "or descended," to give a proper knowledge of him to man? "Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? Who hath bound the waters in a garment? Who hath established all the ends of the earth<sup>e</sup>? This is so similar to

<sup>d</sup> Dan. vii. 13—14, and Rev. i. 13, 16; Luke ix. 29, Mat. xvii. 2, Mark ix. 15, and Luke ix. 32; and Dan. iii. 25.

<sup>e</sup> Proverbs xxx. 4.

other passages of Scripture, which mark the superiority of God over man, by the same dignified appeal to the works of creation; that a critick must be cold-blooded indeed, and have lost all critical sensibility of taste, who can doubt the purport of the whole for a moment<sup>f</sup>. “No man hath ascended up to heaven,” says our Saviour with a remarkable conformity to the first question, “but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man<sup>g</sup>.” “Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand,” asks God himself in Isaiah; “and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure; and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance<sup>h</sup>?” The Psalmist also speaks of “the earth, which God hath established for ever;” says he “laid the foundations of the earth, that it never should move at any time;” and adds to God himself, “Thou coveredst it with the deep as with a garment<sup>i</sup>.” And God, speaking to Job out of the whirlwind, asks: “Where wast thou, when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding.—Or who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth as if it had issued out of the womb” of nature?

<sup>f</sup> As Patrick has doubted.

<sup>g</sup> John iii. 13.

<sup>h</sup> Isaiah xl. 12.    <sup>i</sup> Psalm lxxviii. 69 and civ. 5—6. The Liturgical version of lxxviii. 69, “the ground which he hath made continually,” is too equivocal in meaning to be cited.

“When



“ When I made the cloud the garment thereof, and  
 “ thick darknes a swaddling-band for it?—De-  
 “ clare, if thou knowest it all<sup>k</sup>.” In these passages  
 there is a vein of majestick sublimity concerning  
 God, which exceeds the highest sublimity of Hea-  
 then writings, as much as the upward flight of an  
 eagle is above the ascent of a mere sparrow. The  
 mind of man seems to expand and swell, beyond all  
 its dimensions before; with the grandeur of the ideas  
 infused into it. And these passages unite in refer-  
 ring the correspondent questions of the Proverbs,  
 to their only object, the Lord of the universe, and  
 the Center of all greatness. But the questions go  
 on farther thus, concerning this awful Being:  
 “ What is HIS name, and what is HIS SON’S name,  
 “ if thou canst tell?” So, another Scripture assures  
 us, “ Jacob asked him and said, Tell me I pray  
 “ thee thy *name*; and he said, Wherefore is it that  
 “ thou dost ask after my *name*? And he blessed him  
 “ there; and Jacob called the name of the place  
 “ *Peniel*, for I have seen God face to face, and my  
 “ life is preserved<sup>l</sup>.” The more antient rabbies of  
 the Jews, and one even more antient than they,  
 Philo, show their countrymen to have originally  
 interpreted this very Being, whose name Jacob  
 asked, to be the *Logos* himself; the very same,  
 whose name is here asked with the name of God the

<sup>k</sup> Job xxxviii. 4, 8, 18.

<sup>l</sup> Gen. xxxii. 29—30.

Father by Agur, as being GOD himself *because* he is the Son of God<sup>m</sup>. And Agur concurs with David, with the Son of Sirach, and with Zecharias, to show the belief of the Jews before the birth of our Saviour, in a SON OF GOD; whose name was equally unfearable with that of God the Father himself, who was equally with him a LORD to man, and who was peculiarly THE LORD OF MAN.

Nor were even the Heathens of our western Europe, ignorant of him. To prove this, I shall produce Epicharmus, who lived among the Greeks of Sicily about four centuries and a half before our Saviour; and who speaks of the Logos expressly, as the author of reason to man, and the additional intimator of all the useful arts of life to him.

If men have powers of reason, they have too  
 THE HEAVENLY LOGOS: for life's changeful scenes  
 Was reason planted in the frame of men;  
 THE HEAVENLY LOGOS waits on all their arts,  
 Himself suggesting what they ought to do:  
 For man invented not a single art,  
 But 'tis THE GOD who first produces it;  
 And man's own reason planted was in man,  
 By the great LOGOS and his HAND DIVINE<sup>n</sup>.

Epicharmus

<sup>m</sup> Ainsworth, p. 121, and Sect. vii<sup>th</sup>. of the chapter immediately preceding.

<sup>n</sup> Εἰ ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ λογισμὸς, ἐστὶ καὶ θεῖος λόγος·  
 Ὁ λόγος ἀνθρώπῳ πεφυκεν περὶ εἰς κατὰστροφάς·  
 Ὁ δὲ γὰρ τὰς τέχνης ἀπασί συνεπέλαι θεῖος λόγος,  
 Ἐκδιδασκῶν αἰεὶ αὐτὸς αὐτῷ ὅ τι ποιεῖν δεῖ συμφερόν.

Epicharmus thus makes his God Logos, to be at once the *Apollo* and the *Pallas* of Heathen antiquity. And “ I have filled Bezaleel,” in an exact correspondency says the same Logos to Moses, “ with  
 “ the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understand-  
 “ ing, and in knowledge, and in all manner of  
 “ workmanship; to devise cunning works; to work  
 “ in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cut-  
 “ ting of stones to set them, and in carving of tim-  
 “ ber; to work in all manner of workmanship.”  
 And the particular enumeration in the sacred writer, wonderfully accords with the general assertion of the profane; in this new addition of character to the Logos, by making him the Inspirer and Patron of all the arts of man. To Epicharmus I shall add that famous prophetess of Heathenism, the Sibyll; not indeed as her verses are recorded by Lactantius, who, in the indolence of an establishment now gained for Christianity, has certainly mistaken for Sibylline what is merely the Scripture History in verse; and not even as they are transmitted to us, by Theophilus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and

Ου γαρ ανθρωπος τεχνην ευρ' ο δε θεος ταυταν φερει.

Ο δε γε ανθρωπος λογος πεφυκ' υπο τε θεω λογω.

Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 719—720. There is a various reading in the end of the second line. I have taken that, which makes the best sense. The passage is also in Eusebius, p. 399. *Evang. Prepar.* And see p. 353 of Clemens, for Epicharmus being cotemporary with Hiero king of Syracuse.

• Exodus xxxi. 3—5.

K

Justin,

Justin, who, writing under the tyranny of Heathenism, and boldly appealing to this evidence against it, would not suffer themselves to be deceived, and would not have been suffered (if they had) to deceive others<sup>p</sup>; but as they actually appear in a Heathen writing, about forty years prior to our Saviour. Virgil, in that very extraordinary pastoral, by which he has at once recorded his own abject obsequiousness of spirit, and preserved some amazing prophecies of an Italian concerning our Saviour's coming; has particularly and pointedly marked his Godhead. "A NEW SORT OF MAN," he cries, alluding to that mysterious complication of natures which forms a God-man, "is now descending from *high heaven*—; he shall *share* in the "happiness of the GODS, shall see the *heroes* of the "world advanced among the GODS, and SHALL BE "ADVANCED AMONG THEM HIMSELF; and he shall "GOVERN THE GLOBE in peace with THE VIRTUES "OF HIS FATHER:—the time is coming; oh! rise "and assert the mighty honours due unto thee, "THOU BELOVED OFFSPRING OF THE GODS, thou "MIGHTY SON OF JOVE<sup>q</sup>." Here those unequivocal

<sup>p</sup> See Bull, p. 378—381.

<sup>q</sup> Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto;

. . . . .  
Ille Deum vitam accipiet, Divisque videbit  
Permixtos heros, et ipse videbitur illis;

vocal signatures of Divinity, the filial relation of this Being to the Godhead, and the sovereignty ceded to him over the whole world, mark him indubitably for a God; for a sharer in the nature, and a partaker in the supremacy, of the Jehovah or Jove of heaven. Nor could a Heathen have foretold the coming appearance of this God, in the vesture of humanity; the heroic conduct which he was to exhibit, before his brothers of the body; and the high honours which he was to receive for it, by the exaltation of his assumed nature, to a seat with his original on the throne of the Godhead; in language more apposite to the history than this, and therefore more expressive of the Man-God. And this evidence unites with the speech of Nebuchadnezzar, and with the verses of Epicharmus, before; to show the Heathens equally informed with the Jews, in the main elements of the system of Redemption; and as a constituent, an essential, and a capital point of all, in the con-substantial Divinity of the Great Redeemer.

Such would be the evidence for that Divinity, to accompany the Book of Wisdom; if we considered it to be as old as Solomon, or only as the Son of Sirach. But I consider it to be much later than

*Pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem.*

. . . . .  
*Aggredere ô magnos, aderit jam tempus, honores,  
 Cara Deûm soboles, magnum Jovis incrementum.*

*Eclog. iv<sup>h</sup>.*

either, and actually a work of Philo's. Tradition, that useful echo of history, has pronounced it his. Where the original voice cannot be heard, we must take the reverberation of it. This becomes decisive, when the work says nothing to the contrary. But the Wisdom of Solomon says much, in favour of the tradition. The language is very similar to Philo's; flowing, lively, and happy. And the sentiments are equally similar; refined, religious, and dignified. There is also the same fondness for music, the same sort of observations concerning the plagues of Egypt, the same kind of explanation concerning the high-priest's dress, and many other samenesses of thought and fancy<sup>r</sup>. The work too alludes in one place to the days of the Gospel, as evidently as the personated character of Solomon would allow it to do. The righteous man is shadowed out by the author, with a plain reference to our Saviour himself. "Let us lie in wait for the righteous," say the wicked; "—he *upbraided* us with our offending the law, and *objecteth to our infancy* the transgressions of our education." The righteous man of this work, therefore, is not a man merely righteous in himself. He is intimated, to be equally a *preacher* of righteousness to

<sup>r</sup> Philo, p. 620, 671, 675, and 823, compared with Wisdom xviii. 24, &c. And see also Arnold's useful Comment on the Book of Wisdom, p. ix, xxvii—xxix, 17, 24, 31, 32, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 54, &c. edit. 1744.

others. “ He *professeth* to have the *knowledge* of “ God.” This carries on the same intimation, of his being *officially* like our Saviour. “ He calleth “ himself *the* child of God.” This marks the preacher, to be *essentially* similar to our Saviour. “ He *pronounceth* the end of the just to be blessed,” the official character being still supported in him; “ and maketh his boast, that God is *his* Father,” the essential similarity being more strongly suggested still. “ Let us see if his words be true, and let “ us prove what shall happen in the end of him; “ for, if the just man be THE SON OF GOD, he “ will help him, and deliver him out of the hand “ of his enemies.” We have thus the very appellation of our Saviour, his distinguishing title among the Jews, attributed in a seemingly easy and incidental manner to this just man. This is so pointed an indication, as marks the design at once. But we may additionally observe, that the very words, here used to the just man, were actually used *to our Saviour*. “ He trusted in God,” cried the Jewish wretches at his crucifixion; “ let him deliver him “ if he will have him; for he said, I am the Son “ of God’s.” Nor is the work content, with merely doing this. It touches upon other circumstances of our Saviour’s sufferings; and *then* proceeds to those of his followers. “ Let us *examine*

° Mat. xxvii. 43.

“ him,” they still cry, “ with *despitefulness* and *tor-*  
 “ *ture*,” alluding to the insults and the scourging  
 used to our Saviour<sup>t</sup>; “ that we may *know* his  
 “ *meekness* and *prove* his *patience*.” And, as they  
 finally say, “ let us *condemn* him with a shameful  
 “ *death* ;” in allusion to his crucifixion. The  
 work thus draws the profile of our Saviour, in its  
 portrait of a righteous man. But it goes on im-  
 mediately, to shade out in the same manner the  
 face of the first Christians. The stile therefore is  
*instantly changed*. The *one* of the preceding passages,  
 is multiplied into *many*. “ The souls of the righte-  
 “ *ous*,” says the author, “ are in the hand of God,  
 “ and there shall no *torment* touch them; in the  
 “ *fight* of the unwise they seemed to die, and their  
 “ *departure* is taken for misery, and their going  
 “ *from us* to be utter destruction; but they are in  
 “ *peace*: for though they be punished in the *fight*  
 “ *of men*, yet is their hope full of immortality:  
 “ and having been a little chastised, they shall be  
 “ *greatly rewarded*; for God proved them, and  
 “ *found them worthy* for himself; as gold in the  
 “ *furnace* hath he tried them, and received them  
 “ *as a burnt-offering*; and *in the time of their vi-*  
 “ *sitation they shall shine*, and run to and fro like  
 “ *sparks among the stubble*; they shall judge the na-  
 “ *tions*, and have dominion over the people; and their

<sup>t</sup> Ὑψεῖ και βασινω εἰσαγωμεν αυτον, explained by Acts xxii. 29. ος  
 μελλοντες αυτον ανελαζειν, and 24. μαστιζην ανελαζεσθαι.



“ Lord shall reign for ever<sup>u</sup>.” I have cited the passage at full length, that my reader may mark the regular harmony of the whole, and the full diapason at the close. The animating promise of our Saviour to his disciples, that, at the end of the world, “ shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father<sup>x</sup> ;” is obviously though faintly reflected, in this prophecy allusive to the clearing of stubble-land by burning, of their “ shining, and running to and fro, like sparks among the stubble.” But that they shall “ judge the nations, and have dominion over the people,” is evidently nothing more than a repetition, of that awful and amazing prediction of our Saviour’s; “ Ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel ;” enlarged as it is by St. Paul’s question, “ Do ye not know that the faints shall judge the *world* ?” And the secret allusion to this mysterious revelation from the lips of our Saviour, and the silent reference to this extraordinary belief in the minds of the first Christians, unite to give us an incontestable evidence; that the Wisdom of Solomon was written later than the days of our Saviour, and might be written, as historical report says it actually was, by Philo. The internal

<sup>u</sup> Chap. ii. 12, 13, 16—19, iii. 1—8.

<sup>x</sup> Mat. xiii. 43.

<sup>y</sup> Mat. xix. 28 and 1 Cor. vi. 2.

evidence agrees with the external, to fix it firmly upon him<sup>z</sup>.

We thus give him the honour of a composition, which raises him higher in the estimation of the world, as a man of elegance and genius; than all his other works together. But when is this masterpiece of his first cited, and when was it first inserted in the Apocrypha? It appears to be tacitly cited in a passage of Barnabas's epistle, in which the appeal is expressly to a prophet, and actually to Isaiah; but the quotation is lengthened out, from a coincidence in the sentiments and a failure in the memory, with the very words of Philo. This marks his book as then inserted in the code of Scripture, though not in the canonical part of it. The words of it thus chimed imperceptibly upon the ears of Barnabas, and were thus mixed insensibly in the remembrances of Barnabas, with the real words of

<sup>z</sup> In xv. 14 the author notices to God, "all the enemies of thy people, that hold them in subjection." The word in the original is *καταδυναστευσαντες*, who have *novu* for some time held them in subjection. And as this marks a period of *passive* submission to the Heathens, which now existed, and had existed for some time; it points at the power of the Romans over the Jews, and forms an historical testimony exactly concurrent with all. For the compatibility of Philo's age with all this, see a note in the next section. The book is accordingly inserted in the Vulgate, with this title to it; "Sapientia juxta Græcos Salomonis, juxta alios Philonis." See Table of Contents. The "prologus" also says from St. Jerome, "Hunc Judæi Philonis esse affirmant." See p. 427. edit. 1541. And the "prologus" equally adds from St. Jerome, that "in eâ Christi adventus—et passio diligenter exprimitur."

inspiration.

inspiration. And, as Clemens Romanus refers expressly to the two companions of this book in the Apocrypha, the books of Judith and Esther; so has he some coincidences of thought and language, that seem to have been suggested in the same unnoticed manner to his mind. The Book of Wisdom is accordingly cited afterwards in form, by Cyprian, Eusebius, Athanasius, and others; as a scriptural, but not a canonical, composition; as one that lay ready to their eye and hand in the volume of inspiration, but as not claiming the rank and prerogative of an inspired book there <sup>a</sup>.

In this lively and dignified exhortation to religion, Philo, with his usual vein of allegorical refinement; and with the same confusion at times, in which he has occasionally spoken of the Logos before, now speaking of the Person in the Godhead, then of the Attribute in it, and sometimes of the Quality in his

<sup>a</sup> Ruffel's Patres Apostol. i. Barnabas. p. 18. Λεγει γαρ ο Προφητης επι του Ισραηλ, και τη ψυχη αυτων, οτι βεβηλευται Βηλην ποιησαν καθ' αυτων, επιουτες, Δησωμεν τον δικαιον, οτι δυσχερης ος ημιν εστι. The two first clauses of this citation, are literally in the Septuagint version of Isaiah iii. 9; and the two last are thus, in that of the Book of Wisdom ii. 12, Ενεδρευσωμεν δε τον δικαιον, οτι δυσχερης ος ημιν εστι. In Ep. i. p. 205. Clement says, Ισδιθ η μακαρια, κ. λ. λ, and εχ ητιον αυ και η τελεια καια πωσιν Εσθηρ, κ. λ. λ. His seeming citations from the Book of Wisdom, are in p. 17 and 113. And see Cofin, p. 39, 40, 47, 49, 52, 57, 64, 68, 72, and 32. The method above, of accounting for the intermixture of canonical and uncanonical passages in Barnabas, seems to be the only natural one; and it solves all difficulties arising from the certain fact, in an easy and effectual manner.

creatures;

creatures; expatiates repeatedly on a Being, whom he denotes at first by the name of WISDOM, afterwards by the appellation of LOGOS or WORD, just as Philo has done already, and at last, like him too, by the denomination of GOD or LORD. In the first ten chapters, this venerable personage wears the title of Wisdom; and is only once glanced at through the whole, under that of the Word. Then *that* appellation is discontinued, and *this* is adopted. And both are sunk entirely through all the rest of the work, in the denomination of Lord or God. The Wisdom of the first half, however, is plainly characterized with the Logos or Word as a Divine Being, ministerial to God, and yet God himself. A variety of actions is attributed to the Logos and to him, that mark the Divinity of both precisely. Yet the one is the Wisdom of God, and the other is the Word of the Lord. Both are as apparently the same person in this author, as they are in Philo and the Evangelists. And both are equally absorbed at the close, in the engulfing vortex of the Godhead.

I begin first with the Logos or WORD, as most familiar to us at present. This person we have already seen invested, with all the attributes of the Deity. We equally see him invested here. We have particularly beheld him the visible and acting Jehovah of the Jews, in all ages of their history. The present writer has accordingly singled out one  
point

point of this history, and referred it directly to the WORD. When the Jews in the wilderness murmured against their God, "they murmured," says the Chaldee paraphrast, "against the WORD of the Lord;" and it was "the WORD of the Lord," he adds, who "sent fiery serpents among the people" to punish them. But we are taught the same principle of historical faith, by an authority still higher than he. "Neither tempt ye CHRIST," advises St. Paul, "as *some of them* also tempted, and *were destroyed of serpents.*" But, as the Psalmist lengthens on the train of information, concerning those who were bitten and not yet dead; "God sent his WORD, and healed them; and they were saved from their destruction." They were saved by that ascertained symbol of our Saviour, a serpent of brass, erected upon a pillar of wood, and exhibited to the eyes of the wounded. This was a visible and bodily memorial, of the immediate presence of the Logos with them; and an assimilated medium, by which his healing powers were conveyed to them. "Whosoever shall be bitten by a serpent," as the Chaldee Paraphrast explains the instituting command of God, "and shall look upon this; he shall then live, if his heart shall be directed to the name of the WORD of the Lord." "It happened," as he goes on to explain the actual efficacy of this temporary kind of sacrament, "that when a serpent bit a man, and he fixed his  
" eyes

“ eyes on that brazen serpent, and his heart was  
 “ intent upon the name of the WORD of the Lord;  
 “ he lived.” And, in the same language and with  
 the same ideas, does the Wisdom of Solomon speak  
 of this mysterious fact. “ When—they perished  
 “ with the stings of crooked serpents,” it tells us in  
 an address to God, “ *thy* wrath endured not for  
 “ ever; but they were troubled for a small season,  
 “ that they might be admonished, having *a sign of*  
 “ *salvation*, to put them in remembrance of the  
 “ commandment of *thy* law: for he, that turned  
 “ himself toward it, was not saved by the thing that  
 “ he saw, but by *thee*, who art THE SAVIOUR OF  
 “ ALL:—it was neither herb nor mollifying plaister,  
 “ that restored them to health; but thy WORD, O  
 “ Lord, WHICH HEALETH ALL THINGS<sup>b</sup>.” We  
 thus see the God of the Jews, characterized for  
 “ the Saviour of all;” as we have seen him cha-  
 racterized before, for “ the Judge of all the  
 “ earth:” and so marked by a double title, to be  
 the God of the Christians. We also see God and  
 his WORD, so closely interwoven (as it were) by  
 identity of essence together; that the efficacy of this  
 prototype of the cross, is attributed in one place to  
 GOD, and in another to the WORD of God; and  
 that, as the former is denominated “ the Saviour  
 “ of all,” the latter is equally denominated He

<sup>b</sup> Chap. xvi. 5—7 and 12. And see Arnold, p. 110 and 111  
 †112.

“ which

“ which healeth all things.” So blended are their titles, so mixed their powers, that the Logos is God, and God is the Logos ; both sharers in the Godhead, yet both distinct, distinct by difference of personality, and distinct by incidents of origin and office <sup>c</sup>!

In another part of his work, this writer paints the inflictions of God upon rebelling Egypt, in the most vivid colours that ever fancy lent to history. At the close of these inflictions, with the full consent of canonical Scripture, and in concurrence with the opinions of his countrymen, he states the Logos or WORD to have been the very person, that in one memorable night slew the first-born of Egypt with his hand. He therefore introduces him, with a pomp and dignity much superior to any of Homer's Gods, to the execution of this awful vengeance. “ While all things were in quiet silence,” he says to God, “ and that Night was in the midst of her “ swift course; thine Almighty WORD leaped down “ from heaven out of thy royal throne, as a fierce “ man of war, into the midst of a land of destruc- “ tion; and brought thine unfeigned command- “ ment, as a sharp sword; and, standing up, filled “ all things with death: and it [he] touched the

<sup>c</sup> “ The ancient Jews lookt upon the brazen serpent, as a type of the Messias. So we find by their Targum on Numb. xxi. 8 ; “ which expounds this serpent which Moses lifted up, by *the Word of the Lord*” (Allix's Judgment, p. 60).

“ heaven

“ heaven, but it [he] stood upon the earth.” Here the imagery is uncommonly bold and magnificent. It mounts beyond the cold atmosphere of a northern taste. It has therefore been considered by many of our modern criticks, as the mere ebullition of oriental figurativeness. But it is plainly meant as a highly poetical delineation, of the God Logos coming forward to crush the continued resistance of the Egyptians. The Chaldee Paraphrast accordingly interprets the *history* of the transaction, in the same *general* way as our author. “ In the middle of “ the night,” he tells us, “ the WORD of the Lord “ appeared against the Egyptians; his right hand “ slew the first-born of the Egyptians, and his right “ hand freed the first-born of the Israelites.” This is historically the same, but not poetically so. In the Book of Wisdom we see, we feel, we wonder at, a description so illustriously adapted to the act. We behold the Logos “ leaping down from heaven” to earth, with eagerness to quell at once this still-rising leviathan of Egypt. We behold him also “ leaping out of the royal throne” of God, into “ the “ midst of that devoted land;” or rather (as the original suggests to us in its *plural* words) “ the royal “ thrones” of God, one of the three which Scripture, Judaism, and Christianity agree to place in heaven, for each of the three persons in the Trinity; and all which united they equally agree to consider, as the one and common throne of the God-head.



head<sup>d</sup>. There his feet “stand upon the earth,” and his head “touches the heaven.” Thus standing in the center of Egypt, and armed with “the sharp sword of God,” he “fills all things with death;” slaying the children on every side of him, and spreading the dreadful carnage through the whole circuit of Egypt. And in this account we have a specimen of Jewish sublimity, perhaps as much superiour to any sublimity of Heathenism, as the God Logos is to its Gods; and *almost* worthy of Him, who is here expressly placed “on the throne” of the Godhead in

<sup>d</sup> So Daniel vii. 9, “the thrones were cast [set] down, and the “Ancient of Days did sit” upon one of the thrones; “—his throne “was like” &c. “One like the Son of Man—came to the Ancient “of Days, and they brought him near before him; and there was “given him” &c. v. 13—14. Wisdom, *ἐκ θρονῶν Βασιλείων*, Daniel, *οἱ θρόνοι ἐβήσαν*. The Jews “were divided about the “*thrones set* Dan. vii. 9. For to what purpose *many* thrones, if “there were but one person? R. Akiba maintained, that there was “one for God, and another for David. He seems by David to have “understood the Messias. But R. Jose looked upon this as im- “pious; and affirmed that one of these thrones was set for God’s “Justice, the other for his Mercy,” and the third assuredly for himself. “R. Akiba was at last convinced, and received this ex- “plication; which R. Eliezer son of Azariah hearing, was so far “from approving of, that he sent away Akiba with indignation.— “As for R. Eliezer himself, he said that these *two* thrones signified “only, that there was one for God, and a footstool to it” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 325). “The thrones here mentioned import, first “of all, the thrones of God and Christ,—and then those of his “saints,” that of the Holy Ghost undoubtedly (Patrick on the place).

heaven,

heaven, is expressly declared to be ALMIGHTY too; and was the governing God of the universe<sup>e</sup>.

But let us now turn from this philosophical yet familiar appellation of Logos, for the Son of God; to one, which is at least equally philosophical, and more retired from use, that of WISDOM. We have seen our Saviour, giving himself this appellation

<sup>e</sup> The original runs thus in the main parts: ο παντοδυναμος σε λογος απ' υρανων εκ θρονων βασιλειων, απολομος πολεμιστης, ες μεσον της αλεθριας κλαλο γης, ξιφος οξυ την ανυποκριτον επιλαγην σε φερων, και τας επληρωσε τα παντα θανατη· και υρανε μεν ηπλιετο, Βεβηκει δ' επι γης (chap. xviii. 14—16). That he, who destroyed the first-born, is represented in Scripture to be God, and not an angel; is plain, whatever some commentators have said to the contrary, from the very history itself. “*The Lord* said unto Moses,” we are told in Exodus xi. 1 and 4: “Yet I will bring one plague more upon Pharaoh;” and “thus saith *the Lord*, About midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt, and all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die.” In xii. 11—13 “it is *the Lord’s* passover,” says God, “for I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the first-born, both man and beast; and against the Gods of Egypt I will execute judgment, *I am the Lord*:—and when I see the blood, I will pass over you,—when I smite the land of Egypt.” In xii. “*the Lord*,” we are told, “will pass through to smite the Egyptians, and—*the Lord* will pass over the door” (12); “it is the sacrifice of *the Lord’s* passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians” (27); and “*the Lord* smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt” (29). So truly scriptural is the Book of Wisdom here; so much more so, than some Christian commentators! See Bull, p. 14, and Patrick on Exodus xi. 4. And the Chaldee Paraphrase on Exodus xii. 42, is thus in Latin: “Apparuit Sermo Domini in mediâ nocte contra Ægyptios; dextra ejus interficiebat primogenitos Egyptiorum, et dextra ejus liberabat primogenitos Israelitarum” (Arnold, p. 130).

before.

before. We have seen Philo before continuing it, in his acknowledged works. And he continues it here, in one place. "O God of my fathers," he introduces Solomon saying in prayer, "and Lord  
 "of mercy, who hast made all things with thy  
 "WORD, and ordained man through thy WIS-  
 "DOM<sup>f</sup>." Philo thus shows us the national and his own belief, in the personal identity of this double-named Being. When God the Father created "all things" by his WORD, he necessarily "ordained man" too by his WORD. And the WISDOM which made man, was the very same with the WORD that formed the universe. Accordingly Philo places him on the throne of the Godhead in heaven, just as he has placed the Logos immediately before. "Give me," adds the praying Solomon, "WISDOM, that SITTETH BY THY THRONE," that is, as I have just shown before concerning the WORD, who sitteth on her own throne ranging by the side of thine, and even forming a very part of thine; "O send her out of thy holy heavens, and from  
 "THE THRONE OF THY GLORY." And we thus find WISDOM, as we have found the WORD, an assessor with God the Father on the throne of the heavens, and an assistant with God the Father in the creation of the universe. This assistance is again noticed in the prayer of Solomon, and an intima-

<sup>f</sup> Chap. ix. 1-2.

tion given of what forms the foundation of it. "FROM THE BEGINNING," says the supplicating king, and refers evidently to the commencement of eternity, because he speaks of a period antecedent to time; "WISDOM WAS WITH THEE." He "was PRESENT WHEN THOU MADEST THE WORLD." He was *actively* and *efficiently* present. Thou didst "make all things with thy WORD," and thou didst "ordain man through thy WISDOM." The Son was both the WISDOM and the WORD, to the Father. He "knew," as Solomon proceeds concerning WISDOM, "what was acceptable in thy sight, and right in thy commandments;" he "knoweth thy works;" he "knoweth and understandeth ALL things<sup>g</sup>."

But

g Chap. ix. 4, 10, 9, and 11. The Romish church is authoritatively taught, to consider the *Wisdom* of this book as *Christ*; by these words prefixed to it in the Vulgate, from St. Jerome: "in eâ Christi adventus, qui est Sapiencia Patris, et passio, diligenter exprimitur." "It may not be amiss to observe upon the Greek reading of this passage, viz. *μυμημα σκενης αγιας, ην προηλοιμασας απ' αρχης*; that—*απ' αρχης* seems unnecessary after *προηλοιμασας*. I would therefore carry these words forwards to the beginning of the next verse, and read *απ' αρχης και μετ' η σοφια*" (Arnold, p. 48). And then the whole will run thus, "From the beginning Wisdom was even with thee;" and is surprizingly parallel to St. John's words, *Εν αρχη ην ο λογος, και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον*. Even that passage concerning *Wisdom* in Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 3, "I came out of the mouth of the Most High," is thus paraphrased by the ancient translator of it into Latin: "Ego ex ore altissimi prodivi, *primogenita ante omnem creaturam; Ego feci in caelis ut oriretur*  
" *lumen*

But this extrinſick WISDOM of God the Father, is alſo deſcribed by Philo, juſt as he has deſcribed the Logos; as not merely the Creator of the univerſe, but as the actual Pervader of it, the careful Inſpector of its inhabitants, and the exertor of an Omnipotence of power in an Omnipreſence of nature. “WISDOM,” he cries, “—IS THE WORKER  
 “OF ALL THINGS,—HAVING ALL POWER, OVER-  
 “SEEING ALL THINGS, AND GOING THROUGH ALL  
 “UNDERSTANDING, PURE, AND MOST SUBTIL, SPIRITS;  
 “FOR WISDOM IS MORE MOVING THAN ANY MO-  
 “TION, ſHE PASSETH AND GOETH THROUGH ALL  
 “THINGS by reaſon of her pureneſs—; and ſHE  
 “CAN DO ALL THINGS<sup>h</sup>.” “WISDOM,” we are alſo told, “REACHETH FROM ONE END TO AN-  
 “OTHER mightily, and ſweetly doth ſHE ORDER ALL  
 “THINGS<sup>i</sup>.” This Being therefore is at once the  
 Providence,

“*lumen indeficiens.*” “Ex hâc autem paraphraſi auctoris,” ſays Bull, p. 203, “cujus verſionem et nos *perantiquam* agnoſcimus, et Romanæ Eccleſiæ Doctores pro authenticâ habent, liquet Interpretem ſenſiſſe, per Sapientiam ibi *intelligi τον λογον ſive Filium Dei*; et *τον λογον ideo primogenitum ante omnem creaturam dici, quôd in principio, veluti ex ore Dei Patris, prodierit ad conſtitutionem uni-verſi cum voce illa omnipotenti, fiat*; quâ et Deus, *in luce primigeniâ procreandâ, uſus legitur.*”

<sup>h</sup> Chap. vii. 22—24 and 27. V. 23 in the original has theſe words, *πανθοδυναμον*, the very word applied to the Logos before, *πανεπιſκοπον, και δια παντων χωρων πνευμαλων, κ. λ. λ.*

<sup>i</sup> Chap. viii. 1. *Διαλεινει δε απο περαλος εις περας ευρωπας, και διοικει τα παλαια χριſτως.* The Arabic verſion ſays, “Porrigit autem ſeſe ab extremo terrarum orbe ad extremum uſque integrum.” And

Providence, the Presence, and the Power of God the Father.

“ Love righteousness,” says the author at the beginning, “ —think of the LORD—; for he—  
 “ sheweth himself unto such as do not distrust him,  
 “ for froward thoughts separate from GOD—; for  
 “ into a malicious soul WISDOM shall not enter—;  
 “ for WISDOM is a loving *spirit*, and will not ac-  
 “ quit a blasphemer of his *words*; for GOD is wit-  
 “ nesses of his reins, and a true beholder of his heart,  
 “ and a *bearer* of his *tongue*; for the *Spirit* of the  
 “ LORD FILLETH THE WORLD, and THAT WHICH  
 “ CONTAINETH,” or (as the margin more properly  
 reads) that which UPHOLDETH “ ALL THINGS, hath  
 “ *knowledge* of the *voice*: therefore he that *speaketh*  
 “ unrighteous things cannot be hid,—and the *sound*  
 “ of his *words* shall come unto the LORD.” This  
 carries on the same train of ideas, as the two ex-  
 tracts immediately preceding. But it enforces them,  
 by a variation of the language and a repetition  
 of the meaning. It gives up to the WISDOM of  
 God, that essential and incommunicable prerogative  
 of God, with which the very Heathens were so  
 fully acquainted; of being as Seneca calls him,  
 the “ permeator universitatis.” This appears from

St. Bernard paraphrases it thus: “ a summo cœlo usque ad inferiores  
 “ partes terre, a maximo angelo usque ad minimum vermiculum,  
 “ substantiali quâdam et ubique præfenti fortitudine; quæ utique  
 “ universa potentissimè movet, ordinat, et administrat suaviter, i. e.  
 “ sine necessitate aut difficultate” (Arnold, p. 41).

the

the remarkable interchange of names, here. We pass from the Lord God to WISDOM, from WISDOM to the Spirit of WISDOM and the Spirit of the Lord, and from the Spirit of the Lord to the Lord himself. All these appellations unite and center in one Being. They are only the diversified denominations of the Godhead. And we evidently see in this explaining outset of the author's work, that his WISDOM is the Word, and the Spirit of his WISDOM is the Spirit of God; that therefore WISDOM "will not acquit a blasphemer of his *words*," because "God—is a *bearer* of his *tongue*," because "the Spirit of the Lord—hath *knowledge* of the *voice*," and because "the *sound* of his *words* shall come unto the Lord;" and that, consequently, "the Spirit of the Lord which filleth the world, and that which upholdeth all things," is this very WISDOM, and that very Son of God, who, in the similar language of St. Paul, is even now "upholding all things by the word of his power<sup>k</sup>."

But

<sup>k</sup> Chap. i. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9. See also Arnold, p. 38. In the original, πνευμα Κυριε πεπληρωκε την οικημενην, και το συνεχον τα παντα γνωσιν εχει Φωνης. "Some manuscripts read ο συνεχων, which probably is the true reading—. Thus the Syriac and Arabic versions expound it; the former rendering, Ille qui tenet omnia, scienter habet vocem ipsius; and the latter, Et qui creaturas omnes amplectitur, possidet notitiam vocis" (Arnold, p. 4). See also Heb. i. 3. Φεφων. There is a very fine eulogium upon Wisdom, and very similar to this, in Proverbs viii. 22—30. "The Lord possessed me," says Wisdom herself, "in the beginning of

But we may observe the personal identity of the WISDOM and the WORD with each other, and the

“ *his way*, before his *works of old*. I was set up from EVERLAST-  
 “ ING, from the *beginning*, or ever the earth was. When there  
 “ were no depths, I was *brought forth*; when there were no foun-  
 “ tains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled,  
 “ before the hills, was I *brought forth*: while as yet he had not  
 “ made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of  
 “ the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there; when  
 “ he set a compass upon the face of the depth; when he established  
 “ the clouds above; when he strengthened the fountains of the  
 “ deep; when he gave to the sea his decree, that the water should  
 “ not pass his commandment; when he appointed the foundations  
 “ of the earth. Then I was by him, as one *brought up with him*;  
 “ and I was *daily* his delight, rejoicing *always* before him.” Here,  
 says Dr. Bull in a work additional to his Defence of the Nicene  
 Faith, but lost in the splendour of that refulgent sun, and yet a star  
 of some brightness itself; “ the Wisdom of God, which is said to be  
 “ with God from everlasting, from the beginning, before the earth  
 “ was,” and to be “ his continual delight;” *all the fathers una-*  
 “ *nimously understood* to be (as indeed the words themselves literally  
 “ and plainly import) σοφία ὑπερῶσα, a subsisting, personal Wisdom,  
 “ i. e. the Son of God, who is accordingly by St. Paul expressly  
 “ styled, “ the Wisdom of God,” 1 Cor. i. ver. 24” (Bull’s Catho-  
 lic Doctrine concerning the B. Trinity, among his Sermons and  
 Discourses iii. p. 842—843). See also Allix’s Judgment, p. 161.  
 for the Jerusalem Targum. This passage indeed was allowed by  
 both the Arians and the orthodox, in the grand contest between them  
 during the fourth and fifth centuries; to refer to the Logos or Son of  
 God. The Arians allowed it, and even urged it; relying only on  
 their own construction of that word in the Septuagint, which is  
 answered in our version by *possessed*, as it means in the original  
 (Randolph, part i. p. 45), and which was rendered by them *created*.  
 And, with a truly Arian pettiness of soul, they dwelt upon this poor  
 and (at best) ambiguous point; and adverted not to the existence of  
 this personal Wisdom, so expressly asserted to be “ from everlasting.”  
 They skulked from conviction behind a reed, while an oak was fall-  
 ing down upon them.

substantial



substantial identity of Both with God, in other parts of this work. WISDOM is represented to have been the Divine Being conversant with man, in all the periods of his calamitous history, from Adam to Moses<sup>l</sup>; when we have seen this very Being before, to have been the WORD himself. WISDOM is particularly conversant with Adam, with Abraham, with Lot, and with Jacob<sup>m</sup>; all of them persons, with whom Philo has previously introduced the WORD conversing. WISDOM is also described expressly, as he who “delivered the righteous people and blameless seed” of the Israelites, “from the nation” of Egyptians “that oppressed them<sup>n</sup>;” when the grand act of this deliverance, the decisive stroke of vengeance that consummated their deliverance, has been already ascribed in this very work, to the WORD himself; and when, in other parts, both it and all are equally ascribed to GOD himself. As “they” the Egyptians, says the author to God, in a just admiration of his assimilating punishments to transgressions, “had determined to slay the babes of the fairs; one child [Moses] being cast forth, and saved to reprove them, THOU tookest away the multitude of *their* children.” And it was “THY ALMIGHTY HAND,” he says again, “that made the world of matter without form;— for the whole world before thee is as a little

<sup>l</sup> Chap. ix.<sup>m</sup> Chap. x. 1—2, 5—6, and 10.<sup>n</sup> Chap. x. 15.

“ grain of the balance, yea, as a drop of the morning dew that falleth down upon the earth;” and “ the ungodly, that denied to know thee, were scourged by the strength of thine arm: with strange rains, hails, and showers were they persecuted, that—themselves might see and perceive, that they were persecuted with the judgment of GOD.” WISDOM is equally exhibited to us, as one who “ guided them [the Israelites] in a marvellous way, and was unto them for a cover by day, and a light of stars in the night-season; brought them through the Red Sea, and led them through much water; but—drowned their enemies.” Yet the passages in the Psalms, of which this is in part a copy, assign the whole of this most extraordinary and double prodigy, to the LORD GOD of the Israelites. “ Marvellous things did HE,” the Psalmist cries out, “ in the sight of our fore-fathers, in the land of Egypt, even in the field of Zoan: HE divided the sea, and let them go through; HE made the waters to stand on an heap: in the day-time also HE led them with a cloud, and all the night through with a light of fire:” and “ HE spread out a cloud to be a covering, and fire to give light in the night-season.” And “ thou,” says that very author to GOD, “ gavest them [the Israelites] a

° Chap. xviii. 5, xi. 17, 22, and xvi. 16, 18.

p Chap. x. 17—19.

q Psalm lxxviii. 13—15, and cv. 38.

“ burning

“ burning pillar of fire, both to be a guide of the  
 “ unknown journey, and an harmless fun to enter-  
 “ tain them honourably;—THOU destroyedst them  
 “ [the Egyptians] altogether in a mighty water<sup>r</sup>.”  
 So completely is the WISDOM of Philo here, the  
 Un-created WISDOM of God, the Personal WISDOM  
 OF WORD of the Father, the Son of God, God the Son,  
 and the superintending God of man; denominated the  
 WISDOM of the Father, because in him “ are hid all the  
 “ treasures of wisdom and knowledge<sup>s</sup>;” and deno-  
 minated also the WORD of the Father, because he  
 was to speak the dictates of that wisdom and know-  
 ledge, to all the creatures of God; the Filial Deity  
 being the Oracle of Paternal Wisdom, to them<sup>t</sup>.

Nor

<sup>r</sup> Chap. xviii. 3 and 5. See also Chap. xix. 6—8, and 22.

<sup>s</sup> Coloff. ii. 3.

<sup>t</sup> So in Proverbs viii. 31, Wisdom represents herself, in an allu-  
 sion to this presence of the Logos with the Israelites, with the patri-  
 archs, and with all the religious of mankind up to Adam; as “ re-  
 “ joicing in the habitable [inhabited] part of his [the Father’s]  
 “ earth, and my delights were with the sons of men.” Dr. Young  
 accordingly says thus, in that poem of his which is often so brilliant,  
 so strong, and so particularly affecting to the younger votaries of re-  
 ligion; the Night-thoughts:

Un-injur’d from our praise can HE escape,  
 Who, dis-embosom’d from the FATHER, bows  
 The Heav’n of Heav’ns, to kiss the distant earth!  
 Breathes out in agonies a sinless soul!

. . . . .  
 Throws wide the gates celestial to his foes!  
 Their *gratitude* for such a boundless debt,  
 Deputes their *suff’ring brothers* to receive!

And,

Nor shall I add any more to what I have said, except only to present my reader with the account here given, of the high dignity of this WISDOM, and of what is the primary cause of it all, his origination in essence from the Father. We have seen before from the pencil of Philo, a luxuriant delineation of the beauty and brightness of the WORD. We have also compared it with St. Paul's exhibition of the same personage, under the title of SON OF GOD; who is said to be "the brightness of his glory, and "the express image of his person." And Philo has here obliged us with another sketch of this Secondary God, that is even more luxuriant in brilliancy of colouring, than the former; yet is more sober, in propriety of ideas; and seems, in the *main* points, to be only an expansion of St. Paul's sentiments. His WISDOM, he says, "is the worker of all things,— "having all power, overseeing all things, and going "through all—spirits;—she passeth and goeth "through all things, by reason of her pureness; "for She is THE BREATH of the POWER of God,

And, if deep human guilt in payment fails,  
 As deeper guilt, prohibits our *despair!*  
 Enjoins it as our duty, to *rejoice!*  
 And (to close all) omnipotently kind,  
*Takes his delights among the sons of men!*  
 What words are these?—And did they come from Heav'n?  
 And were they spoke to man? to guilty man?  
 What are all mysteries, to love like this?     *Consolation.*

<sup>u</sup> Heb. i. 3.

“ and A PURE INFLUENCE [*rather emanation*] flowing from the GLORY of the Almighty;—She is “ THE BRIGHTNESS of the EVERLASTING LIGHT, “ the UNSPOTTED MIRROR of the POWER [energy] of God, and THE IMAGE of his GOODNESS <sup>x</sup>.” We thus concenter all the principal rays of our argument, in one point; and leave them united in one effulgence of truth, to blazon forth the derivation of the WORD or WISDOM from God, as of a Son from a Father; the co-existence of the Son with the Father, as a necessary and eternal Radiation from the Self-existent and Eternal Light; the consequent co-essentiality of the Son and the Father together; and the final co-ordination of Both, not in origin, not in office, but in nature, in goodness, in power, and in glory.

— II. —

BUT let us now turn from Philo to three works, one of which will give us occasion, to notice some new circumstances concerning him; to mark the posterior date of his Wisdom of Solomon, to all his acknowledged works; and so to continue his line of evidence, to the close of the apostolick period.

<sup>x</sup> Chap. vii. 22—26. Ατμις γαρ εστι της τῆς θεῶν δυναμεως, και απορροια της τῆς παντοκρατορος δοξης ειλικρινης.—Απαυγασμα γαρ εστι φωτῶς αιδιου, και εσοπτρον ακηλιδωτου της τῆς θεῶν ενεργειας, και εικων της αγαθοτητῶς αυτης. The original words of St. Paul, are these: Ος ὡν απαυγασμα [the very same word with our author's here, and signifying a radiation from a mass of light] της δοξης, και χαρακτηρισμῶς [the very print or impression] της υποφασεως αυτης.

These

These three immediately succeed to it and to him. And they lengthen out the chain of electric fire, from those grand luminaries of Christianity, the apostles, to the middle of the second century.

I.—The first of these is equally with the Book of Wisdom, a work of a Jewish author, a little later in time, and just posterior to the days of the apostles. This is what is now denominated, the SECOND Book of ESDRAS; because it is composed in the name of Ezra or Esdras, and has been placed with the *first* in the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. The *first* was in the Apocrypha, *not* before the Septuagint translation was *made*, for it was not in the original translation; yet before the translation was *completed* for the use of the Hellenist Jews, and is therefore found in that translation at present<sup>y</sup>. But the *second* was inserted in it, like the Book of Wisdom, by the Christians; and by the Christians of the West only. The earliest Christians formed an Apocrypha to the New Testament, as the later Jews had done to the Old. The Christians of the *East* placed Hermes, Barnabas, and those other writers of the apostolick age, which the Romanists still place, in the Apocrypha of the New. They even threw the Book of Wisdom in its original *Greek*, into the Apocrypha of the Old. And the Christians of the *West* retained all these; even added the writings of Ambrose, Austin, and others of the

<sup>y</sup> Cofin, p. 54, 99, 114, and 142.

Western Fathers, to the Apocrypha of the New; and threw the second Book of Esdras in its original *Latin*, into the Apocrypha of the Old <sup>z</sup>.

That this work was written *after* the publication of the Gospels, is apparent from several passages in *them*, passages incidental and peculiar, being incorporated into *it* <sup>a</sup>. That it was written also, *after* the Revelations of St. John were published; is equally apparent from many images and expressions, that are borrowed from them <sup>b</sup>. Yet it is quoted by Tertullian at the beginning of the third century,

<sup>z</sup> Cofin, p. 115—118, and 159. It now remains in the Vulgate accordingly, with this sentence prefixed in the Table of Contents, “*Libri sequentes non sunt in canone Hebræo, ab ecclesiâ tamen recepti Christianâ, Tertius et Quartus Esdræ;*” the Romanists reckoning Ezra and Zechariah, as the First and Second of Esdras. And, in the preface to it from St. Jerome, we read this warning to the reader; “*Nec APOCRYPHORUM tertii et quarti libri SOMNIIS delectetur, quia et apud Hebræos Esdræ Neemiæque sermones in unum volumen coartantur; et quæ non habentur apud illos, nec de viginti quatuor senibus [See Cofin, p. 117], SUNT PROCUL ABJICIENDA*” (p. 290). With such a bold brand of falsification on her front, does the Church of Rome proceed continually in *canonizing* these apocryphal books! Her very Bibles, with her own comments inserted in them, condemn her. And this very preface, which she has not dared to throw out from them, though she has dared to *canonize* the books mentioned as apocryphal in it; shows at once what she formerly thought of the books, leads her people to think so still in direct contradiction to her mandates, and marks her modesty in the midst of her effrontery.

<sup>a</sup> See the margins of the Oxford Bible, for i. 30, 32, 33, &c.

<sup>b</sup> See the margins for ii. 12, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 47; and vi. 17, compared with Rev. i. 15.

and

and by Clemens Alexandrinus before the end of the second<sup>c</sup>. And it consequently appears to have been written, about the commencement of the second. It was then composed by a Jewish Christian of the West. His frequent references to the New Testament, prove him to have been a Christian. But his Christianity is frequently overlaid by his Judaism. The Judaism of Philo is very apparent, even in his Book of Wisdom; from his dwelling again and again upon the sufferings of the Egyptians, and his magnifying them beyond the canonical standard of truth; from his mention of the angel that slew the Israelites in the wilderness, as “afraid” of the priestly robes of Aaron; and from his notice of the land of Canaan, as “the land which God esteemed above all other,” and as therefore selected by God to “receive a worthy colony of God’s children<sup>d</sup>.” In the same, and even a more marked, style of Judaism; does this Esdras recite for true history, with a glancing obscurity however, that shows the struggles of shame in him; some rabbinical dreams about Behemoth and Leviathan, as the appointed materials of a feast for the elect, at the Day of Judgment. “Then didst thou ordain,” he says to God concerning the creation, “two living creatures; the one thou calledst Enoch [*mar-*

<sup>c</sup> Cofin, p. 37 and 39, and Eusebius’ Hist. v. 11, p. 223.

<sup>d</sup> Wisdom, xv. 9, 18, &c.; xvii. 3, 4, &c.; xviii. 25; and xii. 7.



“ *gin*, Behemoth], and the other Leviathan;—unto  
 “ Enoch thou gavest one part—which was dried  
 “ up,—that he should dwell in the same part,  
 “ wherein are a thousand hills; but unto Leviathan  
 “ thou gavest—the moist, and hath kept him to be  
 “ devoured of whom thou wilt, and when <sup>e</sup>.” He  
 also assures us of something that is Judaically false,  
 concerning those *ten* tribes of the Jews, which have  
 been so vainly explored by what are supposed to be  
 the other *two*, in every corner of the globe: and  
 which appear plainly from *our* scriptures, from the  
 belief of the Jews cotemporary with them, and from a  
 concurrent intimation in *their own* scriptures; to have  
 been associated with the two others, at the restora-  
 tion of all from the Assyrian captivity; to have been  
 dispersed with all afterwards, at the Roman destruc-  
 tion of Jerusalem; and to be apparent, in the apparent  
 mass of the Jews at present <sup>f</sup>. Yet these, says this very  
 Judaizing

<sup>e</sup> II. Esdras, vi. 49—52 and Mod. Un. Hist. xiii. 174, 475, and 520.

<sup>f</sup> St. Paul speaks of the *twelve* tribes, as *all* equally apparent and known then, and so speaks *to* the king, and *before* a number of the Jews; “ unto which promise our *twelve* tribes, instantly serving  
 “ God day and night, hope to come” (Acts xxvi. 7). St. James also addresses his Epistle expressly, “ to the *twelve* tribes which are  
 “ scattered abroad” (i. 1). St. John too, speaking of the Jews that were baptized into Christianity, says they were sealed out of “ *all*  
 “ the tribes of the children of Israel” (Rev. vii. 4). And Ezra at the very time, *never* confining the refugees to the *two* tribes, once intimates them very plainly to have been out of *all the twelve*.  
 “ The children of Israel,” he says, “ the priests and the Levites,  
 “ and

Judaizing Christian, retired from the Assyrian yoke “ into a further country, where never mankind “ dwelt;” having “ entered into Euphrates, by the “ narrow passages of the river;” God having “ held “ still the flood, till they were passed over;” and they having been “ a year and a half” on their long march<sup>g</sup>. And in a third place he boldly avers, that God created the world for the sake of—the Jews; and actually introduces God saying, “ For “ *their* sakes I made the world<sup>h</sup>.”

Such an author therefore is peculiarly competent, to witness the still-remaining faith of the Jews, in the Divinity of their Messiah. We have already had Philo as a powerful witness, for a period preceding. Yet Eusebius affirms him, from historical tradition,

“ and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication “ of this house of God, with joy; and offered at the dedication of “ this house of God, an hundred bullocks, two hundred rams, four “ hundred lambs, and, for a sin-offering for *all* Israel, *twelve* he- “ goats, according to the number of the *tribes* of Israel” (vi. 16—17). Philo accordingly says p. 822, that there *are* twelve tribes of the Jews, φυλαι μὲν ἐν εἰσὶ τὸ εὐρασιατικῷ ἔθνεσσι δωδεκα. And Justin Martyr, speaking to Trypho a Jew, involves all the *twelve* tribes in the murder of our Saviour; and says they shall all mourn, ὑμῶν αἱ δωδεκα φυλαι, at his re-appearance to judgment (p. 355. edit. Coloniae 1686).

<sup>g</sup> Chap. xiii. 40. The ten tribes have been therefore supposed by some Christians, to be found—in the *Tartars* (Whiston's *Memoirs*, 575—598), and still more strangely perhaps, in the southern or northern natives of *America* (*Mod. Un. Hist.* xiii. 437, 447—448, and 498).

<sup>h</sup> Chap. vi. 55—56, vii. 11.

to have conversed with St. Peter at Rome; St. Jerome asserts him, equally from the same tradition, to have cultivated the friendship of St. Peter there; and Photius, that useful gleaner of hints from works that have been since lost, and therefore referring, like the others, to the tradition of history for what he says; very correspondently declares him, to have professed Christianity for some time, and at length through grief and repentment to have recoiled from it<sup>i</sup>. He was one of those spirits of earth probably, who can seriously court Truth under the shade of academick groves<sup>k</sup>, but dare not venture to wed her forsooth! without the consent of the world. He felt the beauty of the Christian religion; but then the multitude frowned upon her. He therefore tore himself, “through grief and repentment,” away

<sup>i</sup> Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. ii. 17. p. 65. Ουκαι λογ<sup>θη</sup> εχει, κατα Κλαυδιου επι της Ρωμης εις ομιλιαν ελθειν Πητρω, τοις εκεισε τοτε κηρυτλοντι. Jerome in Cat. Scrip. Eccles. “Aunt hunc—, cum secundâ vice venisset ad Claudium, in eâdem urbe locutum esse cum apostolo Petro, “ejusque habuisse amicitias.” Photius in Bib. Cod. Λεγεται δε, αυτου και τα χριστιανων μυηθεντα, υπερον τελων δια τινα λυπην και οργην επιπεσειν, αλλα προτερον γε, φασιν, επι Κλαυδιω Ρωμην καταλαβοντα, Πητρω τω κορυφαιω των αποστολων εντυχειν, και φιλιω; διατεθηναι. Testimonies prefixed to Philo’s works. These three authors all refer, not (as they are commonly understood) to mere tradition for their accounts, but (as the varying nature of them shows, the last extending much beyond the first, and yet all concurring in the main point) to what I have called the tradition of history, the general testimony of preceding writers. See also next note but one, for a mistake in all concerning the precise reign in which this happened.

<sup>k</sup> Inter sylvas academi quærere verum.

from her arms; “through repentment,” that he could not keep without openly acknowledging her, and “through grief,” that he durst not make her such an acknowledgment: and so was compelled by both, struggling as they were within him, to desert what he loved, and to yield up his affections to his meanness. He thus left her to the enjoyment of those, who could presume to act for themselves; who had sense enough to prefer God, before the rabble of mankind; and who had soul enough to know, a thousand worlds were well laid out in purchase of his Heaven. His own Book of Wisdom too shows him, conformably with all, by his allusions in it to our Saviour, and by his references to the apostles, to have certainly imbibed Christianity once. And, by his choosing to personate Solomon there; thence taking occasion to rob the Gospel, in order to dress out the Law; and so abstaining studiously in his praises of Jewish and other worthies, from any mention of that very Saviour, at whom he glances so strongly under the appellation of *the Son of God*, and of those very apostles, of whom he insinuates so much praise; he appears to have suppressed his acknowledgment of Christianity, even while he revered it, and so to have returned in appearance only, to his original Judaism<sup>1</sup>.

In

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Allix urges, that Philo had *no* connexion with St. Peter at Rome; but urges it from two considerations, which are both erroneous.

In that similarly circumstanced work, the Second Book of Esdras; this reputed Ezra brings in God, as

ous. First he alledges, that Philo in p. 883 speaks of an historical event, which happened about the year 40 before our Saviour, as having happened "not long before" he wrote (Judgment, p. 78). Yet this expression surely is too indefinite and unchronological, to mark any precise period of duration. All such notes of time, indeed, are merely relative. And Philo, having recited several instances from *ancient* history, comes at last to a *recent* one. This happened, he says, *ε πορο πολλοις*, "not long ago;" as opposed to the ancient stories of Euripides's Polyxena, the Dardanian women, and the Lacedæmonian boy. Those therefore were ancient, when compared in age with this; and this was recent, when compared in age with those. And the Doctor's first argument is plainly of no avail. Nor is his second of more. "Philo," he alledges, "in the history of his legation to Caligula says of himself, that he was *at that time* all grey with age, "that is, 70 years old according to the Jewish notion of a man with "grey hair:—it follows that he was born in the year of Rome 723," sixty years "before Christ *preached* in Judæa" (p. 80). But this is all a gross mis-construction of the words of Philo. In the beginning of his History of the Legation, he speaks thus: "How long "shall we, who are old men," *ημεις οι γεροντες*, "yet be boys; in "our bodies indeed grey with length of time," *χρονος μηκει πολλοιοις*, "but in our souls truly infants from our folly" (p. 992)? Philo therefore insinuates himself to be a grey-headed old man, *not* when he *went* on the legation to Caligula, *but* when he *wrote the account* of it. And Dr. Allix's other argument has equally failed him.

That account was not written, in the reign of Caligula. This the whole complexion of it, severely as it exposes the conduct of Caligula, shows us sufficiently. The express mention of the emperor Claudius, *Κλαυδιος Γερμανικος Καισαρ* (p. 1022), hardly shows it more. Nor was it written at the same time with that dissertation on the impiety of Caligula, which he denominated an eulogium on his virtues, and recited before all the senate of Rome in the reign of Claudius (Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. ii. 18, p. 72). It was much later, and co-æval probably with that History of Flaccus's Administration

as prophesying thus concerning our Saviour, "After these years shall MY SON CHRIST die;" and even speaking

in Egypt, which breathes exactly the same spirit, relates to the same sort of incidents in a period of time just prior, and yet was certainly written very late. When Philo wrote the history of his legation, he was now become *old* and *grey-bearded*. When Philo wrote the account of Flaccus, he said he did it not "to revive the memory of *ancient* injuries," εχ' υπερ τε ΠΑΛΑΙΩΝ απομνημονευειν αδικηματα, "but to show with admiration the justice that conducts human affairs" (p. 986). And a period of time had intervened between the commission and the description of the injuries, sufficient to render them *ancient*, even in the memory and language of Philo.

Philo in fact spent all the early part of his life, in the philosophical studies of religion. This part he calls η πρωτη ηλικια, or his first age (p. 776). But he was forced from these studies by violence, he tells us, "and thrown into that great sea of *political concerns*, on which he was then tossed;" καταβυθισθαι εις μεγα πελαγος των εν πολιτεια φροντιδων, εν η φεραμενθ (ibid.). These concerns were, what the behaviour of Caligula particularly imposed upon him. "It is worth while," he says in his Account of the Legation to Caius, "to record both what we saw and what we heard, when we were sent to fight this fight of a *political nature*," μεταπεμφθεντες αγωνισασθαι τον περι της πολιτειας αγωνα (p. 1040). He was therefore no longer in his *πρωτη ηλικια* or first age. He was now in the second or middle age of his life. Accordingly he tells us in his advancing account of the legation, that "seeming to see something farther, both from his *age*," not *πρωτην ηλικιαν* as before, but simply and only *ηλικιαν*, "and his education besides, he was suspicious of what the others rejoiced at" (p. 1018). And Josephus correspondently informs us, that Philo was *at the head* of this legation, *προσβουλος των Ιουδαιων της προσελευσεως* (Ant. xviii. 9, p. 821). Philo was therefore about 30, when this happened; which was about the year 40 of Christ.

In these publick concerns he was engaged many years. Yet, in all intervals of leisure from them, he continued to study the law of God, and even to publish treatises explanatory of it, as he had done before

speaking of him by his personal appellation thus, "MY SON JESUS shall be revealed<sup>m</sup>." He thus acknowledges the Messiah, by that exclusive and appropriated title of SON OF GOD; which we have seen before, and shall immediately see hereafter, to

before (p. 776—777). He also composed and recited his ironical eulogium upon Caligula, mentioned above. He wrote other works again, as his Account of Flaccus, and his History of the Legation, at a much later period; when the injuries received at Alexandria before, were now grown *ancient*; and when the author himself was now become *old* and *grey-bearded*. And, as he wrote these certainly at a distance from Alexandria, because of the just but severe censures, which he has occasionally given to the Alexandrians in them (p. 971, 1009, 1015, &c.); so did he probably write them at *Rome*, where his curation against Caligula was received with admiration, and where all his publications were honoured with a place in their libraries (Eusebius, ii. 18, p. 72). There he was young enough, we see, to converse with St. Peter; even though St. Peter did not come thither, as some have thought, till the 1st of Nero, or A. D. 55. Philo was then about 45 only. But in fact, I believe, St. Peter did not reach Rome till 63, and was martyred in three or four years afterwards. And Philo, we know, lived to be more than sixty years of age; even 70, according to the Jewish notion above; and still continued to write and publish. In this period of his residence at Rome, it must have been that he met with St. Peter there, as Photius, Jerome, and Eusebius unite to assure us he did; conversed with him; and became a Christian. But, on the martyrdom of St. Peter probably, and the threatened extermination of the Christians by Nero, Philo renounced his Christianity so much, as was sufficient to save him from persecution for it. Yet he retained all his inward reverence for the Gospel; and endeavoured covertly to serve it, by writing his Book of Wisdom. And chronology now unites with history and with this, to give a full certainty to the final Christianity of Philo.

<sup>m</sup> Chap. vii. 29, 28.

involve in it such an amplitude of power, such prerogatives of glory, and even such a communion of Divinity. He accordingly installs him, as it were, in that power, that glory, and that Divinity. “ I, “ Efdras,” he says, “ saw upon the Mount Sion a “ great people, whom I could not number; and “ they all praised THE LORD with songs: so I asked “ the angel, and said, Sir, what are these? He an- “ swered and said unto me: These be they that “ have put off the mortal clothing, and put on the “ immortal, and have *confessed* the name of GOD; “ now are they crowned, and receive palms. Then “ said I unto the angel: What young person is it, “ that crowneth them, and giveth them palms in “ their hands? So he answered and said unto me; “ It is THE SON OF GOD, whom they have *confessed* “ in the world. Then began I greatly to commend “ them, that stood *so* stiffly for the name of THE “ LORD. Then the angel said unto me; Go thy “ way, and tell my people what manner of things, “ and how great wonders of THE LORD thy GOD, “ thou hast seen<sup>n</sup>.” Here those who confessed *the Son of God*, are said by the author to have stood stiffly for the name of *the Lord*, to have confessed the name of *God*, and for it to have been honoured with crowns and palms, by *the Lord his God*. And the *manner*, in which the Divinity of the Messiah is thus indicated, not by positive assertion but by obvious

<sup>n</sup> Chap. ii. 42—47.



inference, not avowedly but incidentally; is the natural result of a conviction, resting familiarly upon the mind of the writer, neither encountering nor expecting to encounter any opposition, and breaking out in the fulness of his own and the general persuasion concerning it.

The name of *THE SON OF GOD*, as I have formerly observed<sup>o</sup>, appears with its seemingly opposed title of *the Son of Man*, to have been the ordinary appellative among the Jews, for the Messiah or Saviour of their scriptures. *This* marked the humanity, and *that* denoted the Divinity; while either comprehended the other, as a well-known accompaniment to itself. The title indeed of *the Son of God*, does not convey to *our* ears generally any intimation of Divinity. But it did to the Jews. And all titles must be taken, in their peculiar and idiomatic meaning. From our early acquaintance with classical Heathenism, we consider the appellative too much in the light of a Heathen one; and too much annex the ideas of the school, to the term. But we should divest ourselves of these accidental impressions, endeavour to catch the true tone of the scripture-language, and dwell on the Judaical combinations of ideas in it. Then we see the title of *the Son of God*, as an intended designation of Divinity. We hear our Saviour called *the Son of God* by others, and hear him addressed as *GOD*. We see him entitled *the Son*

• Chap. 1, sect. iii.

*of God* by himself, and see him assuming all the prerogatives of GOD. We behold the Jews at large, we behold the apostles, and we behold our Saviour, habitually comprehending Godhead in the term. There is an association of ideas in them all, which regularly and insensibly comprizes the one in the other. And we find the fact particularly displayed in one pregnant part of the scripture-history, which exhibits to us Jews and Heathens interchangeably using the title, and using it in such a manner as lends it the full force of Divinity.

As our Saviour hung upon the cross, says St. Matthew, “ they that passed by, reviled him, wag-  
 “ ging their heads and saying, Thou that destroyest  
 “ the temple and buildest it in three days, save thy-  
 “ self; if thou be the SON OF GOD, come down  
 “ from the cross. Likewise also the Chief Priests  
 “ mocking him, with the Scribes and Elders, said,  
 “ He saved others, himself he cannot save; if he be  
 “ THE KING OF ISRAEL, let him now come down  
 “ from the cross, and we will believe him. He  
 “ trusted in God; let *Him* deliver him now if he  
 “ will have him: for he said, I am THE SON OF  
 “ GOD. The thieves also, which were crucified with  
 “ him, cast *the same* in his teeth, [one of them say-  
 “ ing, If thou be CHRIST, save thyself and us; but  
 “ the other—said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me,  
 “ when thou comest *into thy kingdom*]. [And the  
 “ soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, and of-  
 “ fering

“fering him vinegar, and saying, If thou be THE KING OF THE JEWS, save thyself.]—Now when the centurion, and they that were with him watching Jesus, saw the earthquake and those things that were done; they feared greatly, saying, [Certainly this was a *righteous man*], Truly this was THE SON OF GOD P.” Here we see the Jews, and the Gentile residents among them, uniting to speak in a language, that stamps Divinity upon the title used by them both. The Jewish passengers upon the road over the top of Calvary, stood still near the cross of our Saviour, insultingly to nod at him; to reproach him, with his assumed appellative of the Son of God; and to challenge him to an exertion of that Divinity which both he and they affixed to it, by coming down from the cross, and saving himself from death. The Elders, the Scribes, and the Chief Priests, equally insulted him with the same assumption, and equally challenged him to the same exertion; calling upon him now to show he was truly THE KING OF ISRAEL, or the Lord and Sovereign of their nation in all ages, by putting forth the power of his Divine Royalty, and coming down from the cross. The strong import of the appellation KING OF ISRAEL, and the plenitude of Godhead which it intimates, may be shown by a variety of passages in scripture; but is sufficiently evident from this, and

P Mat. xxvii. 39—44, Luke xxiii. 39—40, and 42, Mat. xxvii. 54, and Luke xxiii. 36—37, and 47.

two very similar passages, collated together. When Nathaniel and Thomas expressed their full conviction, of our Saviour's being all that he said he was; Thomas cried out, "My Lord and my God," and Nathaniel, "Rabbi, thou art *the Son of God*, thou art **THE KING OF ISRAEL**."<sup>1</sup> One of the thieves also did the same, by combining the characters of Son of God and of King of Israel together, in that of Christ; and the other desired our Saviour to remember him, when in the state to which our Saviour was hastening beyond the grave, he whose "kingdom was not of this world," should take an open possession again of that his *kingdom over Israel*. But let us now come to the Heathen part, of the attendants upon this occasion. The centurion had

<sup>1</sup> John xx. 28 and i. 49. "The Holy One of Israel is our *King*," says the the Psalmist (lxxxix. 19). "Mine eyes have seen the *King*, the Lord of Hosts," adds Isaiah (vi. 5), and "I am the Creator of Israel, your *King*" (xliii. 15). And "the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice," St. Luke tells us concerning our Saviour himself, "and praise God with a loud voice, "for all the mighty works that they had seen, saying, Blessed be the *King* that cometh in the name of the Lord, peace in heaven, and glory in the highest" (xix. 37—38). So Pilate asked our Saviour, "Art thou *the King of the Jews*?" And he answering said "unto him, Thou sayest it.—Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you *the King of the Jews*?—Pilate answered, "and said again unto them, What will ye then that I shall do unto him, whom ye call *the King of the Jews*?—They began to salute him, "Hail, *King of the Jews*.—And the superscription of his *accusation* "was written over, *The King of the Jews*" (Mark xv. 2, 9, 12, 18, and 26).

<sup>1</sup> John xviii. 36.

only a quaternion of foldiers, under him<sup>s</sup>. He and they equally infulted our Saviour, with the fame reference to his claim of Divinity, and with the fame challenge to his immediate exercife of it. If thou be, they cried, what we have heard with aftonifhment, thy friends and thy foes declare thou profefteft thyfelf to be, “ the King and God of the Jews;” now ftretch forth thy fceptre of Godhead, now fave thyfelf, and prove to thefe murderers, thou art their God and King. In all thefe challenges, our Saviour is called upon equally with God; God to deliver our Saviour, our Saviour to deliver himfelf; and our Saviour is called upon feveral times, while God is called upon once only. And when the dignified mode of our Saviour’s death<sup>t</sup>, and all the prodigies of nature that accompanied it, had wrought an infant conviction on the minds of the centurion and his little party; they cried out exactly with the fame current of ideas, but with the current now turned back in its courfe; that our Saviour had fhown himfelf a man of probity in all which he had faid, and that he now appeared plainly to be what he had faid he was, the

<sup>s</sup> John xix. 23, “ Then the foldiers, when they had crucified “ Jefus, took his garments; and made *four* parts, to *every* foldier a “ part,” &c.

<sup>t</sup> Mark xv. 39, “ When the centurion, which flood over againft “ him, faw that he fo cried out and gave up the ghoft, he faid,” &c.

Chrift,

Christ, the Son of God, the King of Israel, the King of the Jews, or the Patron God of their nation <sup>u</sup>.

There was thus in the faith of the Jews, a common principle of Divine existence, a band of Deity, and a link of Divinity; which connected the Father and the Son together, in a community of powers; and formed them vitally and inseparably into one Godhead. The Son has received an essence from the Father, by his filial derivation from him; which is substantially divine of course, *because* it is the essence of the Father. Every Son stands in the same

<sup>u</sup> In a spurious Gospel which is falsely attributed to St. Barnabas, and which has been furnished by Mr. White in his Bampton Lectures, p. 358, edit. 2d; and by Mr. Sale in his notes upon the Koran, chap. iii. p. 42, to be the forgery of some heretical Christian; this title of *Son of God* is fully acknowledged to be the same as *God*, in the opinion of the Christians at the time of the forgery. “When God shall take me out of the world,” says our Saviour in it, “Satan will again promote this cursed sedition, making the wicked believe that I am the SON OF GOD.—The president, high-priest, and Herod said, Disturb not thyself, Jesus the saint of God, for in our time there will be no more sedition; for we will write to the holy senate of Rome, that by an imperial decree none may call thee GOD” (White, notes, p. xlii—xliii). “Though I was innocent,” adds our Saviour, “yet as they called me GOD and HIS SON,—he has chosen that I should be mocked in this world” (White, *ibid.* p. lxxv—lxxvi). The Arian Gospel thus proves the faith of the *Christians* originally, to have been what it was among the *Jews* at first; that He who was at once their Prophet, their Pattern, and their Propitiation, was also the Son of God, and, *as such*, was God. This it proves in the strongest manner, by its very proscription of the faith,

relation

relation to his Father, being a sharer in his nature, and a reflector of his person. For this reason has God selected these very appellations of Father and Son, to shadow out to us the relation between the First and Second Beings in his Godhead. They mark the subordination, and they ascertain the equality, at a glance. *He* cannot but be equal, who enjoys the same nature. *He* cannot but be subordinate, who receives it by communication.

Nor could that petty mode of argumentation, which so often embarrasses and perplexes some of what we may call, *us* Jews of Heathenism, *us* Christian profelytes of the gate; and which is founded on the supposed necessity, of the derived Being being posterior in date, to that from which it is derived; either perplex the minds, or embarrass the faith, of the ancient Jews. They studied their scriptures more closely, than we do either theirs or our own. They imbibed the leading principles in them, more thoroughly than we do. The scriptural writers were their orators, their historians, and their philosophers. They were even more. They were all these, directed by a ray of light, and inspirited with a beam of fire, from the God of Heaven. The sentiments in them, therefore, went with peculiar force to the minds, and hung with peculiar weight upon the spirits, of the Jews. They saw in human generation, that the father was prior in time to the son; but were too well tutored in the principles of theology, for the  
absurdity

absurdity of concluding this must therefore be the case with divine. They saw themselves assured by the scripture, that it was not; and, in a manliness of good sense, bowed down to the paramount authority of revealed truth. They saw the Son equally deified with the father, in their code of revelation. They saw him acting as the general Jehovah of the world, and the peculiar Jehovah of their nation; proclaiming himself to be the visible God of the universe, proving himself to have all the elements in his hands, and wielding the very thunder and lightning of the Godhead. Their senses and their history showed him to be God; their senses to the present generation, and their history to the generations succeeding. Yet they knew, he was not the First Being in their Godhead. They acknowledged him only for the Second. But they still adored him as God; as the *Son* of God, and *therefore* as God. They necessarily owned him to be Eternal, as God; though they reckoned him only Secondary, as Son. And they rested firmly in this faith, unhurt by that impertinence of philosophy, which is only a solumner sort of folly; which either reduces God into a man, or exalts man into God, and then reasons from its own absurdity; a madman arguing from assumptions wild and ridiculous, imagining a candle to be the orb of day, or supposing the orb of day to be a candle. Even in scenes of earth, they might see sufficient to illustrate the mode of divine generation,



generation, when theology had ascertained the fact. In all effects that are *voluntary*, the cause must be prior to the effect; as the father is to the son, in human generation. But, in all that are *necessary*, the effect must be co-eval with the cause; as the stream is with the fountain, and light with the sun. Had the sun been eternal in its duration, light would have been co-eternal with it. Was the fountain from everlasting, the stream would be equally from everlasting too. And the Son of God, in the faith and confession of the Jews, was the Second Jehovah, or the Mediate God of the universe; an Eternal De-ri-ation from the Eternal Fountain of Deity, an Everlasting De-radiation from the Everlasting Sun of Divinity, in God the Father.

II.—But let me leave these reflections, which the Second Book of Esdras has suggested to me; and produce some passages from another work, that will need little enforcement. The former shows the lustre of the Jewish faith, to have still continued bright and unfulled in general, from the days of our Saviour to the days of this Esdras. We may now appeal for the fact, to a second evidence; which is nearly of the same nature as the first, actually co-temporary with it, and much stronger and richer in itself. This is in a work, which is entitled THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS, and which was first brought into Europe in the thirteenth century. Robert Grossthead, bishop of Lincoln,

Lincoln, received information from one of his archdeacons; that, while he (the archdeacon) was *prosecuting his studies at Athens*, he had heard of some works, from the learned professors among the Greeks there; which were unknown to the Latins of the west. The archdeacon particularly mentioned this. The bishop therefore sent a commission into Greece, to procure it. It came. And the bishop, with the assistance of one Nicholas, a *Grecian*, then clerk to the abbot of St. Alban's, and rector of Datchet, translated it out of Greek into Latin in 1242. The translation was afterwards printed at *Paris*, in 1549. But the original was not printed till 1698. And the work is even yet so little known in general, that this short history of it, I believe, is quite requisite to my present intention of using it<sup>x</sup>.

The author wrote *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jews; because he once alludes to that double event<sup>y</sup>. But he cannot be later than the *second* century, because he is cited by Origen about the middle of the third<sup>z</sup>. And the genius of his sentiments, so coincident with those of the spurious Esdras, fixes him at the beginning of that century. He is clearly, like Esdras, a Jew converted to Christianity, still retaining all his Jewish notions under it, and even holding such as are

<sup>x</sup> Grabe's *Spicilegium Patrum*, i. 144 and 336.

<sup>y</sup> P. 140.

<sup>z</sup> P. 131—132.

ir-reconcilable to it'. He is very conversant with some apocryphal books of the Jews, that have been long since lost to the general eye of curiosity. From these he produces incidents in the lives of the patriarchs, of which we have no notice in the Old Testament. He peculiarly makes repeated reference to the book of Enoch, for a prophecy concerning the Jewish nation'. And an author, so very Judaical, may usefully stand as a mirror with Esdras; to reflect again the continuing opinions of the Jews, at the commencement of the second century, concerning the Godhead of their Messiah.

In the Testament of Simeon he makes this patriarch to say, when literally translated: "the Lord shall raise up out of Levi one for a High-priest, and out of Juda one for a King, who shall be GOD AND MAN<sup>c</sup>." In another says the dying Zebulon: "After these things THE LORD HIMSELF shall rise upon you, a light of righteousness; and healing and mercy shall be on his wings: HE shall

<sup>a</sup> P. 133—134.

<sup>b</sup> P. 344, &c. Grabe has here collected together several passages of the Book of Enoch, which lay scattered in various writers. Those books, he says, speaking in the plural number, "integros penes Scaligerum extitisse, in Electis Scaligerianis, p. 283, in voce "Nazaretanus, lego quidem, sed non credo" (p. 345). The church of Ethiopia has been long said, to be in possession of the whole; and Mr. Bruce confirms the report.

<sup>c</sup> P. 157. Αναστήσει γὰρ κυρίως ἐκ τῆς Λεῦϊ ὡς ἀρχιερεὺς, καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδα ὡς βασιλεὺς, Δεῖον καὶ ἀνθρώπων.

“redeem all the captives of the sons of men from  
 “Beliar [Belial], and every spirit of error shall  
 “be trampled down; and HE shall turn all the na-  
 “tions to an emulation of HIMSELF, and YE SHALL  
 “SEE GOD IN THE FIGURE OF MAN<sup>d</sup>.” In a third  
 Testament Nephthali declares, that “through Ju-  
 “dah shall arise salvation to Israel, and in him shall  
 “Jacob be blessed; for, through his sceptre, shall  
 “appear GOD DWELLING AMONG MEN UPON  
 “EARTH, to save the race of Israel.” Ashur  
 prophecies in another, that “THE MOST HIGH  
 “SHALL VISIT THE EARTH, EVEN HE HIMSELF COM-  
 “ING AS A MAN, eating and drinking with men,  
 “and calmly bruising the head of the serpent by  
 “water; HE shall save Israel, and all the nations,  
 “A GOD IN THE MASK OF A MAN<sup>f</sup>.” And Ben-  
 jamin, in his Testament, uses these terms concern-  
 ing the resurrection: “then shall we also rise,—

<sup>d</sup> P. 203. Μετα ταυτα ανατελει υμιν αυτος κυριος, φως δικαιοσυνης και ιασις και ευσπλαγχνια επι ταις πλερευξιν αυτη. αυτος λυτρωσεται πασαν αιχμαλωσιαν υιων ανθρωπου εκ τη Βελιαρ, και παν πνευμα πλανησ παληθησεται· και επισρεψει παντα ταε θνη εις παραζηλωσιν αυτη, και οψεσθε θεον εν σχηματι ανθρωπου.

<sup>e</sup> P. 216. Δια γαρ τη Ιουδα ανατελει σωτηρια τω Ισραηλ, και εν αυτη ευλογηθησεται Ιακωβ. δια γαρ τη σκηπτρι αυτη, οφθησεται θεος κατοικων εν ανθρωποις επι της γης, σωσαι το γενος Ισραηλ.

<sup>f</sup> P. 228—229. Ο υψιστος επισκεψεται την γην, και αυτος ελθων ως ανθρωπος, εσθιων και πινων μετα των ανθρωπων, και εν ησυχια συντριβων την κεφαλην τη δρακοντος δι' υδατος. ετος σωσει τον Ισραηλ και παντα τα εθνη, θεος εις ανδρα υποκρινομενος.

“worshipping

“ worshipping THE KING OF HEAVEN, who AP-  
 “ PEARED UPON EARTH IN THE FORM OF HUMBLD  
 “ MAN; and as many as believed on HIM upon  
 “ EARTH, shall rejoice with HIM;—and THE LORD  
 “ shall judge Israel first, even for their iniquity to  
 “ HIM, because they believed not in GOD, when HE  
 “ CAME TO THEM IN THE FLESH as a Deliverer;  
 “ and then shall HE judge all the nations, as many  
 “ as believed not in HIM, when HE APPEARED UPON  
 “ EARTH <sup>5</sup>.” These are passages sufficiently speci-  
 fick in their language, and explicit in their ideas;  
 to shew us the abiding sense of the Jews in general,  
 as late as the beginning of the second century, con-  
 cerning the Divinity of their Messiah <sup>h</sup>.

III.—With these two witnesses from the bosom  
 of Judaism, I shall briefly couple a third, in the  
 Book of BARUCH. This short piece, which forms

Ε Ρ. 251. Τότε και ημεις αναστησομεθα—, προσκυνητες τον βασιλεα των θρανων, τον επι γης φανεντα εν μορφη ανθρωπε ταπεινωσεως. και οσοι επισευσαν αυτω επι γης, συγχαρησονται αυτω.—Και κρινει κυρις <sup>Θ</sup> εν πρωτοις του Ισραηλ, και περι της εις αυτον αδικιας, οτι παρχυνομενον θεον εν σαρκι ελευθερωτην εκ επισευσαν. και τότε κρινει παντα τα εθνη, οσα εκ επισευσαν αυτω επι της γης φανεντι.

<sup>h</sup> “ Levit. xxvi. 11—12. *I will walk among you, and be your  
 “ God.*—I am sure the later Jews, as Ramban upon that place after  
 “ the author of *Torath Cohanim*, do build here the opinion of a *real*  
 “ *habitation of the Divinity* amongst them, in the times of the Mes-  
 “ *ias*; and *that* they derive from one of their *most ancient* traditions,  
 “ that the *salvation* of Israel shall be *made by God himself*; which  
 “ they prove by Zech. ix. 9” (Allix’s Judgment, 275).

one upon the too long list of apocryphal works in our Bibles, and was with much opposition exalted into the sphere of canonical scripture, by the arrogant council of Trent<sup>i</sup>; is not acknowledged by the Jews, and is not found in the Hebrew language<sup>k</sup>: though it pretends to recite the transactions of the Jews at Babylon, only *five* years after their captivity there. It is found only in *Greek*<sup>l</sup>; and was written long after the æra of the captivity. It has therefore those *escapes* in chronology, which are always incident to a narrative of facts pretendedly prior; and are peculiarly incident to one, where the simulated narrator is considerably posterior in time, to his supposititious events. Fiction never impresses a conviction upon the mind, as strongly as a reality does; and consequently guards not the spirit of an author, so securely from anachronisms. But in a fabrication like the present, where no actual forgery was intended, and only an honest deception was pursued; the name of Baruch being taken merely, under it to awake the spirit of repentance, and to guard against the dangers of idolatry; there the mind of the author would keep a less rigorous watch, upon its own movements, and wilfully perhaps sacrifice consistency at times, to its general

<sup>i</sup> Cofin's Canon of Scripture, Table of Matters remarkable, *Baruch*.

<sup>k</sup> Cofin, p. 59.

<sup>l</sup> P. 59.

views of good. From this principle or from that, the author speaks at his outset, of the Chaldeans having five years before “ taken Jerufalem, and “ burnt it with fire;” and yet fays the Jews of the captivity fent money from Babylon, to their brethren at Jerufalem, “ to buy them burnt-offerings, “ and fin-offerings, and incenfe,” when there was no temple exifting at Jerufalem, and no offerings were or could be made there<sup>m</sup>. He fpeaks alfo of the “ filver veffels,” that were made by Zedekiah and “ carried out of the temple,” being “ received” back at Babylon in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, “ to return them into the land of Juda;” when there was no temple at Jerufalem for their reception, and when the filver veffels were, equally with the golden, in the royal treafury at Babylon, under the fucceeding reign of Belshazzar<sup>n</sup>.

But this lively and pleafing work plainly fhows itfelf, like the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Second Book of Efdras, and the Book of Wifdom, to be of the age of Chriftianity. Written evidently by a Jew, in order to fuggelt repentance to the Jews, and to guard the Jews from idolatry, on their *recent* captivity under the Romans, and on

<sup>m</sup> Chap. i. 2, 6, and 7.

<sup>n</sup> Chap. i. 8, and Daniel, v. 2, “ Belshazzar—commanded to “ bring the golden and *filver* veffels, which his father Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerufalem.”

their *recent* dispersion among the nations of the Roman empire; it has some strokes in it, that glance obscurely at Christianity, and one, that refers to it pointedly.

“ Be of good cheer, O my children,” Jerusalem is introduced saying to her subjects, “ cry unto the Lord, and he shall deliver you from the power and hand of the enemies. For my hope is in the Everlasting, that he will save you; and joy is come unto me from the Holy One, because of the mercy which *shall soon come unto you, from the Everlasting our Saviour*. For I sent you out with mourning and weeping; but God will give you to me again, with joy and gladness for ever. Like as now the neighbours of Sion have seen your captivity; so *shall they see shortly your salvation from our God, which shall come upon you with great glory, and brightness of the Everlasting*.—He that hath brought these plagues upon you, *shall bring you everlasting joy again with your salvation*.” “ Put off, O Jerusalem, the garment of thy mourning and affliction,” the author introduces himself saying in reply; “ and put on the comeliness of the glory, that cometh from God for ever. Cast about thee a double garment of *the righteousness, which cometh from God; and set*

◦ Chap. iv. 21—24, and 29.



“ a diadem on thine head, of the glory of the  
 “ Everlasting. For God will shew thy brightness,  
 “ *unto every country under heaven.* For thy name  
 “ shall be called of God for ever, *The peace of righ-*  
 “ *teousness, The glory of God’s worship.* Arise, O  
 “ Jerusalem, and stand on high, and look about  
 “ toward the east; and behold thy children gather-  
 “ ed from the *west* unto the east, by the word of  
 “ the Holy One, rejoicing in the remembrance of  
 “ God. For they departed from thee on foot, and  
 “ were led away of their enemies; but God bring-  
 “ eth them unto thee exalted with glory, as *children*  
 “ *of the kingdom.* For God hath appointed that  
 “ *every high hill, and banks of long continuance,*  
 “ *should be cast down, and vallies filled up; to make*  
 “ *even the ground, that Israel may go safely in the*  
 “ *glory of God.* Moreover even the woods, and  
 “ every sweet-smelling tree, shall overshadow Is-  
 “ rael by the commandment of God. For God  
 “ shall lead Israel with joy, in the light of his glo-  
 “ ry, with the mercy and *righteousness* that cometh  
 “ from him.” All this clearly alludes to some-  
 thing, much beyond a restoration from the Baby-  
 lonish captivity; to a captivity, that had carried  
 them to the *west*, as well as the east, of Jerusalem;  
 and to a restoration, which should make them

*righteous*, and *children of the kingdom*<sup>o</sup>, which should be preceded by *the coming of the Messiah*, and should be followed with *the peace of righteousness*, and *the glory of God's worship*, in Jerusalem for ever. In language frequently evangelical, and with ideas equally Jewish and Christian, the unknown author covertly calls the Jews, to rise from the deep abyss of their national miseries, to embrace the Gospel, and to become more glorious than ever they had been, even the head of the nations of the world.

But what gives a full force to all these general and allusive passages, determines their direction, and draws them to a point, at once; he speaks in a particular passage expressly, of the visit of the Messiah to earth as *already past*; and speaks of him in it after such a manner, as shows him, and as shows his countrymen, to have given a positive *Divinity* to him. “Who hath gone up into heaven,” he cries concerning Wisdom, “and taken her, and brought her down from the clouds? Who hath gone over the sea, and found her, and will bring her for pure gold? No *man* knoweth her way, nor thinketh of her path. But HE THAT KNOWETH ALL THINGS knoweth her, and hath found her out with his understanding:—HE that sendeth forth light and it goeth, calleth it again and it

<sup>o</sup> Mat. viii. 12, and xiii. 38.

<sup>r</sup> Luke iii. 5.

“obeyeth

“ obeyeth him with fear. The stars shined in their  
 “ watches, and rejoiced: when HE calleth them  
 “ they say, Here we be; and so with cheerfulness  
 “ they shewed light, unto HIM THAT MADE THEM.  
 “ This is OUR GOD, and there shall none other be  
 “ accounted of in comparison of him. HE hath  
 “ found out ALL THE WAY OF KNOWLEDGE; and  
 “ hath given it unto Jacob his servant, and to If-  
 “ rael his beloved. AFTERWARD did he SHEW HIM-  
 “ SELF UPON EARTH, and CONVERSED WITH MEN.”

This speaks to the subject decisively. This shows the Book of Baruch, to be written by a Jew posteriorly to the period of commencing Christianity. This proves the faith of the author and of his expected readers, to be in the absolute Godhead of their Messiah. He who had already “ shewn him-  
 “ self upon earth, and conversed with men,” had previously “ Jacob” for “ his servant,” and “ If-  
 “ rael” for “ his beloved;” had “ found out all  
 “ the way of knowledge;” was the “ God” of the Jews, the Maker and Ruler of the stars, the Former and Director of light, and “ He that knoweth  
 “ all things .”

### —III.— To

<sup>s</sup> Chap. iii. 29—37.

<sup>t</sup> This work was inserted in the Apocrypha very early. “ De libro Baruch,” says Bellarmine however, “ controversia fuit et est; tum quia non invenitur in Hebræis codicibus, tum etiam quia nec concilia antiqua, neque pontifices, neque *patres*, quos  
 “ supra

## — III. —

To these evidences for the Jewish theology being founded, like the Christian, upon this grand principle the Godhead of the Saviour; I shall subjoin

“supra citavimus,” as low as Athanasius and Cyril and the council of Laodicea inclusively, “qui catalogum librorum sacrorum “texunt; hujus prophetæ disertis verbis meminerunt” (Cofin, p. 59). Yet the work has been received, as a part of scripture, but an apocryphal part, by the Greek church from a very early period (Cofin’s Table, *Baruch*), and assuredly from the beginning. It is accordingly cited by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, himself (Cofin, p. 92). The Latin church had it from the Greek; and in *Cyprian* actually cites a passage out of it, as well as out of four other apocryphal works, the Book of Wisdom, the Book of Tobit, the History of Susanna, and the Maccabees; *Cyprian* saying, “Apud *Hieremiam* “hic Deus noster,” &c. and producing the three last verses of the 3d. chap. of *Baruch* (Adv. Jud. ii. 6, p. 35, Fell, and Cofin, p. 39 and 92). And at Trent it presumed to *canonize*, what its transmitters the Greeks had given them merely as apocryphal; and to *canonize* as an ancient part of the *Jewish* code, what the *Jews* had never admitted even into their apocrypha. Such a triumph did Popery then exhibit, of folly over facts! The vulgate Bible accordingly says, “Liber iste qui Baruch nomine prænotatur, in Hebræo canone non habetur,” and yet lodges it *in the canon* (see p. 539). “Librum “autem *Baruch*,” says St. Jerome in the *prolegus* prefixed by the Vulgate to *Jeremiah*, “qui apud Hebræos nec legitur nec habetur, “*prætermisimus*” (p. 490). And yet this very vulgate does not only *not omit*, but even *canonizes*, the book. Such a triumph is the church of Rome perpetually exhibiting, of her own scriptures over herself! “Propter notitiam autem legentium,” adds the vulgate very properly, p. 539, “hic scripta sunt; quia *multa de Christo* “*novissimisque temporibus indicant;*” not indeed by way of *prophets*, but as referring in *terms* to the *past*.

some

some additional testimonies from EUSEBIUS. These are in that very rich, but little explored, magazine of theological notices, his *EVANGELICAL PREPARATION*; a work introductory to his *Evangelical Demonstration*, leading through the sentiments of Heathenism up to Judaism, and so opening the door to a higher ascent into Christianity. To produce these, is not necessary, but may be useful. A sufficient conviction (I trust) has been already impressed, upon the justly yielding faith of the reader. But I wish to guard and secure this. And the evidence from Eusebius will usefully serve, I apprehend, to cement the Christian testimonies before, into one mass; to fasten what, at best, has been fluctuating so long in the faith of the public; to tie down, what has been thrown off so repeatedly by the judgment of scholars; and to bind it with a pin of adamant, as it were, upon the mind of my reader.

Eusebius, having recited the opinions of the Heathens, concerning the formation of the world, the nature of man, and the constitution of God; comes at last to contrast all these strange aberrations of lunatick reason, with the sober and solid dictates of Divine Wisdom, in the system of Jewish belief. These dictates are not, as with evident contradictoriness they have been supposed, by that superficial and simple patron of Arianism, the writer of the once famous *Essay on Spirit*; which became famous,

famous, merely from the mischief that it *meant* to do; to be only what Eusebius had an opportunity of collecting from the Jews in Judæa, while he was Bishop of Cæsarea there". They are the sentiments, not of Jews that inhabited the land of Judæa then; as there were then *no Jews in the land*, because all of them were interdicted by Adrian, and continued interdicted beyond the days of Eusebius<sup>x</sup>; but of such, as were antecedent to Eusebius by some centuries. Nor are they what they have been more wisely and more popularly deemed, merely the comments of a Christian bishop upon the Jewish Scriptures. They are adduced partly from their Scriptures, explained in their obvious and acknowledged meaning; and partly from the works of men, who delivered their own principles as Jews, or repeat the principles of Jews from them. Even

" P. 39—40. " As for the opinion of the *more modern* Jews, it " is no easy matter to collect or fix their sentiments; *because that,* " *since the coming of our Saviour,* the Jews—made a collection of " their oral traditions." The author thus fixes the barrier decisively betwixt the modern and the antient Jews, at *the coming of our Saviour*. " And therefore—I shall chuse to lay before him, the " opinion of the most sensible and learned among the *antient* Jews," those evidently that were *before* our Saviour; " as I find it collected " very judiciously by Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine," who lived three hundred years *after* our Saviour; " who must be " allowed to be a tolerable judge, because he lived among them in " the land of Judæa;" a tolerable judge of the opinions of the *antient* Jews, because he lived among the *modern*! What a controversialist was he, who could thus write?

<sup>x</sup> Eccl. Hist. iv. 6. p. 145—146 and note.

at times, when he professedly cites their Scriptures for the purpose; he cites them, as containing “the opinions of the Hebrews.” But he frequently appeals at once, to the very sentiments and principles of the Jews<sup>2</sup>. He even produces some passages from Philo, some from Aristobulus, and some from Demetrius; all uniting to attest the primary articles of the Jewish creed. And all is done expressly, in order to “delineate the mode—among the Hebrews, of that philosophy and religion—, which we [Gentile Christians] have preferred to all those of our own countries.”

Eusebius, then, delineates to us the established creed of the Jewish church, in all ages from the Patriarchs to the Messiah inclusively. But this creed presents us with such a train of Christian articles, as shows us to be Jews while we are Christians; and to have gone, when we entered the society of the church, over from the Gentilism of our fathers to the Judaism of the Gospel. And this is particularly evident, in that which was sure to be

<sup>1</sup> P. 186. Εβραίων δοξαι, p. 188. Εβραίοις περιηλοσοφημενα.

<sup>2</sup> P. 177, 187, 191, 193, and 226.

<sup>3</sup> P. 175. Εβραίων περιλοιπον, και της και αυτης φιλοσοφιας τε και ευσεβειας, ην των πατριων απαντων προσημιηκαμεν. Eusebius uses the name *Hebreus*, in preference to that of *Jews*; because he includes the patriarchs from Abraham to Moses, in his account (p. 179).

the most fixed and stable part in the whole body of religion, the nature of God<sup>b</sup>.

I.—“Examine

<sup>b</sup> Having just now spoken a second time against the Essay on Spirit, and having attributed it to Bishop Clayton; I think it an act of justice to state here, what has been lately said concerning the *real* author of it. “It is a remarkable fact, and hitherto not known in “the world,” says Dr. Kippis in the *Biographia Britannica*, iii. 623—624. edit. 1784, “that the Essay on Spirit was not actually written “by [Dr. Clayton] the Bishop of Clogher. The real author of it “was a young clergyman in our prelate’s diocese, who shewed the manuscript to his Lordship, and, for reasons which may easily be “conceived, expressed his fear of venturing to print it in his own “name. The Bishop, with that romantic generosity which marked “his character, *readily took the matter upon himself*, and *determined “to sustain all the obloquy that might arise from the publication*. He “did not indeed absolutely avow the work, nor could he do it with “truth: but by *letting it pass from his hands to the press*, and *covering it with the dedication*, which was of his own writing, he managed the affair in such a manner, that the treatise was universally “ascribed to him; and it was openly considered as his, in all the “attacks to which it was exposed. Few persons, excepting Dr. “Barnard, the present Dean of Derry, knew the fact to be otherwise; and *he hath authorized Dr. Thomas Campbell to assure the public*, that *the Bishop of Clogher was only the adopted father of the Essay “on Spirit*.” He took up (it seems) this deformed child from the ground. He thought it handsome, in spite of all its deformities. And he adopted it with all its deformities, for his own. Indeed it was too like himself, not to excite in him a kind of parental yearning towards it. In this Essay, says Dr. Kippis himself, “the author hath “given free scope to his *speculations*;—we think, at the same time, “that he hath indulged too freely to *imagination and conjecture*” (p. 623). In a *confessed* work of the Bishop’s afterwards, says the Doctor again, “he pursued his speculations with as much freedom “and ardour as ever (p. 627). And, as the Doctor adds at the close of all, “from the liveliness of his fancy, he was sometimes  
“carried,



1.—“Examine also concerning the Second Cause,  
 “whom the oracles of the Hebrews teach to be the  
 “Logos

“carried, perhaps too boldly, into the regions of conjecture” (p. 628). These characters in appearance *refute* the testimony. To reconcile them, and so do what Dr. Kippis ought to have done, we must suppose the young divine to have derived his *speculations* from the *tongue* of the Bishop, to have formed them into this Essay afterwards, and then to have presented them in their new shape, “alter et idem,” to his eye. Thus formed, he naturally adopted the Essay, and without any exertion of “romantic generosity” at all. As the real parent, he felt a real yearning for it. And the brat became, by a double claim, “the child of his mind.” Nor can I express *my* ideas of a *bishop’s* conduct in this point; a *bishop’s* proceeding to *avow* the same sentiments, in a subsequent work; a *bishop’s* even presuming to *move* in the House of Lords, for taking the Nicene and Athanasian creeds out of the Liturgy; and a *bishop’s* at last drawing down upon himself a prosecution from George the Second, and the prelates of Ireland, which was proper if there is any *truth*, and doubly proper if there is any *probity*, in the world, but which went to his weak heart at once, and killed the timid preacher of Arianism with fear; more appositely and more justly, than by applying these lines of Milton to the Bishop and his Essay, and by making the latter thus address the former in them.

—————Thy head—————  
 ————On the *left* side opening wide,  
 LIKEST TO THEE IN SHAPE AND COUNT’NANCE BRIGHT,  
 Then *shining heav’nly fair*, a *goddess arm’d*  
 Out of thy *head* I sprung: *amazement seiz’d*  
 All th’ *host of heav’n*; back they *recoil’d afraid*,  
 ————And call’d me SIN, and for a sign  
*Portentous* held me; but—————  
 I pleas’d, and with attractive graces won,  
 ————Thee—————, who full oft  
 THYSELF IN ME THY PERFECT IMAGE VIEWING,  
 Becam’st *enamour’d*, and such *joy* thou took’st  
 With *me* in secret, that *my womb conceiv’d*

*A growing*

“ Logos of God, and to be God off God ; as we  
 “ ourselves too have been instructed in theology.  
 “ Moses then does expressly give us the theology of  
 “ two Lords ; when he says, “ And the Lord  
 “ rained from the Lord, fire and brimstone” upon  
 “ the city of the ungodly. There he hath famili-  
 “ arly made an equal application to both the two,  
 “ of the *characters* among the Hebrews [the *letters*  
 “ in *Jehovah*]. And this is that theology, which  
 “ is unspoken by them in the four elements [the  
 “ tetragrammaton]. In concert with him does  
 “ David, another prophet likewise and king of the  
 “ Hebrews, speak, “ The Lord said to my Lord,  
 “ Sit thou on my right hand ;” indicating the  
 “ Most High God by the first Lord, and the second  
 “ to him by the second appellation. For to whom  
 “ else is it lawful to suppose, the right hand to be  
 “ conceded by the Ungenerated Deity ; except to  
 “ him alone, of whom we are speaking ? Whom  
 “ the same prophet, in another place, more plainly  
 “ manifests to be the Logos of the Father, holding  
 “ him forth in his theology to be the Fabricator of  
 “ the universe ; when he says, “ By the word  
 “ [Logos] of the Lord were the heavens esta-  
 “ blished .”

Here

*A growing burden ;*—————  
 —————My womb,  
 Pregnant by thee, and now excessive grown,  
*Prodigious motion felt, and rueful throes.*

c P. 312—313. Επισκεψαι δε και τα περι τω δευτερω [αϊλιω], ου δη  
 θεω

Here we see “ the oracles of the Hebrews,” teaching us there was “ a Second Cause” in the formation of nature; and informing us it was he, who is “ the Logos of God,” and who, as such, is “ GOD off GOD.” So closely assimilated in this point, are Judaism and Christianity; that the Christian Eusebius catches at once the resemblance, and recognizes his own religion in his exhibited mirror of Judaism! He then produces two passages out of the Old Testament, that have been repeatedly produced since, to prove a personal diversity in the Godhead. This “ theology of two Lords,” or two Jehovahs, appears now to have been as well known to the antient Jews, and as familiar to the earlier Christians; as it is to our own times<sup>d</sup>. And the application of the second passage to the Messiah, by the Jews in our Saviour’s time; and the application

θεσ λογον, και θεον εκ θεσ ειναι, τα Εβραιων παιδευει λογια· καθαπερ και ημεις αυλοι θεολογον δεδιδαγμαθα. ο μεν εν Μωσθ διαρρηδη δυ θεολογε κυριε, εν οισ φησι, Και εβρεξε κυριε παρα κυριε πυρ και θειον, επι την των ασεων πολιν. ενθα συνηθωσ επι των δυ την ομοιαν των παρ’ Εβραιουσ χαρακτηρων εποιησατο παραθεσιν· αυτη δε εστι, η δια των τεσσαρων σιχειων ανεκφωνησ παρ’ αυλοισ θεολογια. Τελω δε και Δαειδ, αλλοσ προφητησ ομω και βασιλευσ Εβραιων, συναδων φησιν, Ειπεν ο κυριε τω κυριω μη, Καθη εκ δεξιων μη· τον μεν αναλατω θεον δια τε πρωτε κυριε, τον δε τετε δευτερον δια της δευτερας αποφνηασ προσηγοριασ. Τινι γαρ αλλω θεμισ υπονοσιν, τα δεξια δια της αγεννητεσ θεοτητεσ παραχαρασθαι, η μονω τω περι ε λογοσ; ον ο αυλοσ προφητησ εν εστροισ λευκωτερον διασαφει λογον τε Παλροσ, δημιουργου των ολων υφισταμειοσ ειναι τον θεολογωμειον, εν οισ φησι, Τω λογω κυριε οι εβραιοι εσερωθησαν.

<sup>d</sup> The texts are both applied also by Justin Martyr, a century and a half before Eusebius, p. 357.

of it as a proof of the Messiah's Divinity, by *him* in whom were "hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," *because* "in him dwelled all the fulness of the Godhead bodily<sup>e</sup>;" unite to evince the fixed persuasion of the Jews through all ages, of the second Lord in both being the Logos or Son of God; and to demonstrate the rectitude of reasoning in the Christians, when they apply both to ascertain the Divinity of the Son or Logos. That "Jehovah" or the Lord "rained from Jehovah" or the Lord, "fire and brimstone" upon Sodom; is equivalent in the mode of expression, and in the reach of intelligence, to "the Lord" or Jehovah "saying unto my Lord" or my Jehovah, "Sit thou on my right hand." Both "indicate the Most High God by the first Lord, and the second to him by the second appellation." Nor indeed, exclusive of all authority, could the Jews, or can the Christians, in any regard to the commonsense of criticism, apply the words to any but a superiour and an inferiour Jehovah. "For to whom else is it lawful to suppose, the right hand to be conceded by the Ungenerated Deity; except to him alone," who "is the Logos of the Father," and "the Fabricator of the universe," and "God off God<sup>f</sup>."

2.—"The

<sup>e</sup> Coloss. ii. 3 and 9.

<sup>f</sup> That "their [the Jews] forefathers did hold, that these words [*the Lord said unto my Lord, &c.*] were spoken to the *Messias*; it appears

2.—“ The oracles among the Hebrews, after  
 “ the un-caused and un-generated person of the  
 “ God of all, which is unmixt and beyond all com-  
 “ prehension; introduce a second person and divine  
 “ power, the Principle of all created things, sub-  
 “ sisting the first, and generated out of the First  
 “ Cause; calling it the Logos, and the Wisdom,  
 “ and the Power, of God.” He then cites a pas-  
 sage out of the Book of Job, concerning Wisdom;  
 and that above out of the Psalms, concerning the  
 Word [Logos] of God establishing the heavens.  
 “ In this manner,” he adds, “ does David cele-  
 “ brate the Logos of God, Him who fabricated  
 “ the universe.—And this Divine Logos the Holy  
 “ Scripture introduces at different times, as sent by  
 “ the Father for the safety of men: and therefore  
 “ reports him to have shown himself to Abraham,  
 “ to Moses, and the other prophets who were dear  
 “ to God, and to have taught many things by  
 “ oracles, and to have foretold things to come;  
 “ when it mentions God and the Lord, to have ap-  
 “ peared to and conversed with the prophets.—

“ appears by their Midrash on the Psalms, and Saadia Gaon on Dan.  
 “ vii. 13. Indeed their Targum justifies all that our Saviour said  
 “ in this place [Mat. xxii. 43], not only in acknowledging that this  
 “ Psalm was composed by David, but also that it was written *for* the  
 “ *Messias*” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 55). And as to the other text,  
*the Lord rained from the Lord*, the Jews “ acknowledge distinctly,—  
 “ that those two Jehovahs are *two persons*—: R. Mena h. fol. 11.  
 “ col. 1. and fol. 63. col. 4” (p. 164).

“ Well then does the very wise Moses say,—be-  
 “ ginning the cosmogony with *him*, In the—*begin-*  
 “ *ning* God created the heaven and the earth &.   
 “ With *him*, he introduces God in the creation of  
 “ man, as communing with his domestick and  
 “ first-begotten Logos; when he writes, “ and  
 “ God said, Let us make man after our image and  
 “ our likenefs.” To this also the Psalmist al-  
 “ luded, when, in discoursing of the First Cause,  
 “ he says, “ He spake and they were made, He  
 “ commanded and they were created;” placing  
 “ the order and command of the First Cause op-  
 “ posed to the Second, as of the Father to the Son.  
 “ Truly it is self-evident, that he who speaks any  
 “ thing speaks it to another, and he who com-  
 “ mands any thing commands it to another beyond  
 “ himself. And Moses expressly mentioning both  
 “ the two Lords, namely the Father and Son, thus  
 “ reports concerning the punishment against the  
 “ ungodly, “ And the Lord rained from the Lord,  
 “ brimstone and fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah.”  
 “ In harmony with which, David says in his  
 “ Psalms, “ The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou  
 “ on my right hand<sup>b</sup>.”

In

<sup>ε</sup> This plainly refers the word *Αρχη* or Beginning to the Logos; just as several of the Fathers, and of the *Rabbins*, unite to refer it (Bull, p. 185—186 and Allix's Judgment, p. 161 and 164).

<sup>h</sup> P. 183—190. Ἐὰν παρ' Ἑβραίων λόγια, μετὰ τὴν ἀναρχὸν καὶ ἀγεν-  
 ῆλον τε θεὸν ὅλον εἶπαι, ἀμικτόν εἶπαι, καὶ ἐπεκείνα πάσης κἀληλεψέως,  
 δούλερον

In this passage we see the Deity of the Son of God, still farther displayed to us from the archives of the Jewish faith. “The oracles among the “Hebrews,” we are told, “after the un-caused “and un-generated person of the God of all,—

δεύτεραν ὕσταν και θεϊαν δύναμιν, Αρχην των γενήτων απάντων, πρώτην τε υποσασαν, και τε πρώτη αιθιε γεγενημενην, εισαγασι, Λογον, και Σοφίαν, και Θεσ Δυναμιν αὐτην προσαγορευούτες.—Τον τω απάντων δημιουργικον λογον θεσ, τῆλον ευεφημησας τον τροπον.—Τον δε τον ενθεον λογον, διαφωρως η θεια γραφη προς τε Παῖρος επι τη των ανθρωπων σωτηρια πεπεμημενον, εισαγει· αὐτον δ' εν και τῷ Αβρααμ, Μωσῃ τε, και τοις αλλοις θεοφιλεσι προφηταις, Φησι εαυτον, και χρησιμοις τα πολλα παιδευσαι τε, και θεσ· πισαι τα μελλούτα, ιστορει, σπητικα θεον και κυριον ωφθαι τε, και εις λογος των προφητων ελθειν, μνημονουσι.—Σικιδως δῆλα—και Μωσῃς ο πανσοφος, αρχόμενος της κατ' αὐτον κοσμογονιας, εν τη—αρχη πεποινηκεναι τον θεον τον υρανου και την γην φησιν· αὐτῷ τε εισαγει, ως αν οικειῷ και πρωτογονῷ αὐτῷ λογῷ κοινολογημενον, επι της τε ανθρωπων δημιουργιας του θεου, εν οις γραφει, Και ειπεν ο θεος, Ποιησωμ ανθρωπον κατ' εικονα ημετεραν και κατ' ομοιωσιν. Τῆλο δε και ο ψαλμωδὸς ηητιλει, σπητικα περι τε πρώτῃ αιθιε διεξιων, αὐτος φησιν, Ειπε και εγεννηθησαν, αὐτος ενειδαλο και εκλίσθησαν· αὐτικρυς την τε πρώτῃ προς το δεύτερον αἰθιον, ως εν Παῖρος προς Υιον, διαλαξιν τε και παρακελευσιν υφισταμενος· παῖνη γαρ δηπηθεν ὄθλον, ως πας ο λεγων τι, εἰρω λεγει, και ο ενειδαλομενος, εἰρω παρ' εαυτον ενειλλεῖται. Διαρρηδη δ' αυ ο Μωσῃς ἀμφω δυοιν μνημονουσαν Κυριων, Παῖρος δηλαδῃ και Υιου, ὡδε πη επι της κατὰ των ασέδων τιμαριας ιστορει, λεγων, Και εβρεξε Κυριος παρα Κυριε επι Σοδομα και Γομορρα θειον και παρ' εις συμφωνιας και ο Δαυιδ ψαλλων εφησιν, Ειπεν ο Κυριος τῷ Κυριῷ μου, Καθε εκ δεξιῶν μου. Here I have translated the word *ὑσταν person*, because the whole context demands the translation. So in Sect. VIIth. hereafter I equally, for the same reason, render both *ὑσταν* and *φυσις*. The former, which *ἡσταν* signifies only essence, was then used at times as it is here, for person. The latter also has had the same fate. But *υποσασις* has had just the reverse, formerly signifying essence or substance, and now signifying only subsistence or person (Bull, p. 103—107 and 143 and 205). And this passage, and that in Sect. VIth, need only to be read, in order to convince every one decisively on the point.

“introduce a second person and divine power.” This was “the Principle of all created things, subsisting the first,” or before them all; *because* he was “the Principle” or Creative Cause to them all, and *because* he was “generated out of the First Cause” himself. And he was denominated by the Jews, as he equally is by the Christians, “the Logos, and the Wisdom, and the Power, of God” the Father. This “Logos of God” therefore was the Being, who in his own person “fabricated the universe.” He is also the Being, whom “the Holy Scripture” of the Old Testament “introduces at different times, as sent by the Father for the safety of men;” and whom it “therefore reports to have shown himself to Abraham, to Moses, and the other prophets, who were dear to God.” I have proved at full length from Philo before, that the God, who appeared to Moses and Abraham, in the opinion of the Jews was the Logos or Son of God. But he was also the God, who “taught many things” to the Jews, “by oracles” of visions, of Urim and Thummim, and of common inspiration; and who “foretold” them “things to come,” by all these mediums of miraculous intelligence. He indeed was the “God and the Lord,” who “appeared to and conversed with” all “the prophets,” from the beginning of the Mosaic history, and the commencement of man and the world. And he is even  
introduced



introduced by the history, as acting “in the” very “creation of man;” when God said, “Let us make man after our image and our likeness;” and so said, “as communing with his domestick and first-begotten Logos.” So long has this passage of Scripture been applied, to a divided personality in the Godhead <sup>1</sup>! With such a steady uniformity of pace, has the church of God gone on in all ages of its existence, Jewish and Christian; to pitch upon some passages of Scripture, as directly expressive of it! Nor let us, in the strong beams of light around us at present, despise these fainter gleams of day. They irradiated the Jews, they irradiate us. And they show us, that the same luminary of truth, which now shines “in all the firmament of its power” upon Christendom, once shone very brightly upon Judæa too.

To this “also the Psalmist alluded,” we are told, “when in discoursing of the First Cause he says; “He spake and they were made, He commanded and they were created.”” This interpretation of the Psalm is singular in itself, and yet just in appearance. In the ordinary and popular acceptance of the words, we refer the command to the Godhead, and ascribe the execution to matter; as we must do, when the Son is represented in the act of speaking creatively. But the

<sup>1</sup> It is also applied by Justin Martyr, p. 358—359 and 285.

other interpretation keeps the whole in a new and more natural allusion, to the primogenial speech of God at the creation; considers the Father as again saying in effect to the Son, "Let *us* make an universe;" and represents the Son, as instantly creating the universe. "He," the Father, "spake, and they were made" by the Son; "He," the Father, "commanded, and they were created" by the Son. The Psalmist thus "places the order and command of the First Cause, opposed to the Second; as of the Father to the Son." For truly it is self-evident, that he who speaks any thing speaks it to another, and he who commands any thing commands it to another, beyond himself." And, as may be forcibly added in vindication of this Jewish comment, the God who *here* "commanded," and who *here* "spake," spake not to matter but to spirit; and commanded not spirit that had been created itself, and therefore could not possibly be a Creator; but spake to him, by whom "they were" to be "made," and commanded him, by whom "they were" actually "created<sup>k</sup>."

Indeed,

<sup>k</sup> "It is natural for Christians to conceive, that where it is said so often Gen. i, *and God said*, there God spoke *to* his Word, by which St. John writes that all things were made.—For this we have the judgment of the ancient synagogue, which looked on the Word or Λόγος as a true cause and agent, *to* whom God spoke, and who by an infinite power wrought the several works of the six days"

Indeed, when we see such a striking address as this of God's to some other Being, directing him to act immediately in the formation of man, and appearing in the fore-front of the Scriptural pages; when we see the same idea of Duality recurring at times in the other pages, and a double Jehovah exhibited again and again to our faith; and when we find the double Jehovah in one of these pages, actually recognized by the Jews of our Saviour's days, and actually acknowledged by our Saviour himself: we must expect there will be many intimations of this truth, incidentally thrown out in other places of Scripture; and we may be very sure, that they were generally noticed there by those, who were so much more assiduous than we are in reading the Scriptures, and so much more studious of Scriptural knowledge, the religious and thinking Jews of former times<sup>1</sup>.

### 3.—“ After

(Allix's Judgment, p. 125—126). And so Irenæus actually explains this very Psalm (Adv. Hær. iii. 8); as do others in Bull, p. 75 and 98.

<sup>1</sup> Some of these intimations I will recite: Gen. i. 1, “ in the beginning God [*original*, the Gods] created the heaven and the earth;” Gen. iii. 5, “ you shall be as Gods;” Gen. xx. 13, “ when God [*original*, the Gods] caused me to wander from my father's house;” Gen. xxxv. 7, “ Jacob built an altar, and called the place El-Beth-el, because there God [*original*, the Gods] appeared unto him;” Deut. iv. 7, “ who hath God [*original*, the Gods] so nigh unto them;” Joshua xxiv. 19, “ ye cannot serve *the Lord*, for he is an holy God [*original*, the holy Gods];” 2 Sam. vii. 23, “ whom God [*original*, the Gods] went to redeem for a people  
“ ple

3.—“ After this manner does Moses philosophize, in his prefaces to the Sacred Laws:—that  
“ there

“ ple to *himself* ;” Proverbs xxx. 3, “ I neither learned wisdom, nor  
“ have knowledge of the Holy [*original*, of the Holies];” Eccl. xii. 1,  
“ remember now thy Creator [*original*, thy Creator] in the days of  
“ thy youth ;” and Isaiah liv. 5, “ thy Maker is thy husband [*ori-*  
“ *ginal*, thy Makers are thy husbands], *the Lord of Hosts is his*  
“ name.” We have three other marks of this plurality in the God-  
head : Gen. iii. 22, “ the Lord God said, Behold, the man is be-  
“ come as one of *us* to know good and evil,” explained by i. 26,  
“ let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness,” and by iii. 5,  
“ ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil ;” Gen. xi. 7—9,  
“ *the Lord* said, Go to, let *us* go down and there confound their  
“ language,—so *the Lord*—did there confound their language ;” and  
Isaiah vi. 8, “ I heard the voice of *the Lord* saying, Whom shall I  
“ send, and who will go for *us* ?” We have also these : Psalm xlv.  
6—7, “ thy throne, O *God*, is for ever and ever,—therefore God,  
“ even *thy* God, hath anointed thee ;” Isaiah xlvi. 16—17, “ come  
“ ye near unto *me*, hear ye this, I have not spoken in secret from the  
“ beginning, from the time that it was there am I, and now *the Lord*  
“ *God* and *his Spirit* hath sent *me*, Thus saith the Lord thy Re-  
“ deemer, the Holy One of Israel, I am *the Lord thy God* ;” Jeremiah  
xxiii. 5—6, “ behold the days come, saith *the Lord*, that I will raise  
“ unto David a righteous branch,—and this is *his* name whereby *he*  
“ shall be called, *The Lord our Righteousness* ;” Hosea i. 6—7,  
“ *God* said,—I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will  
“ save them by *the Lord their God* ;” and Zechariah ii. 8—11,  
“ thus saith *the Lord of Hosts*, after the glory hath *he* sent *me* unto the  
“ nations which spoiled you,—and ye shall know that *the Lord of*  
“ *Hosts* hath sent *me*, sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion, for lo I  
“ come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know  
“ that *the Lord of Hosts* hath sent *me* unto thee.” See Allix’s Judg-  
ment, p. 118—119, &c. &c. “ The Talmudists themselves were so  
“ persuaded of a plurality expressed in the word *Elohim* [the plural  
“ of the word *Eloah*], as to teach in Title Megilla c. i. fol. 11, that  
“ the

“ there is an archetype and true image of the God  
 “ of all, his Logos ; being very Wisdom and very  
 “ Life, and Light, and Truth, and whatever Fair  
 “ and Good can be imagined : and that there is an  
 “ image of this image, the Human Mind ; by  
 “ which circumstance, man is confessed to have been  
 “ made after the image of God <sup>m</sup>.”

The Logos is here described, as from “ Moses  
 “ philosophizing” in the preliminary part of the

“ the LXX interpreters did purposely change the notion of plura-  
 “ lity, couched in the Hebrew plural, into a Greek singular [θεος for  
 “ θεοι], as they did also on Gen. i. 26 and xi. 7 ; lest Ptolomy Phi-  
 “ ladelphus should conclude, that the Jews, as well as himself, had  
 “ a belief of polytheism. That was taken notice of by St. Jerome,  
 “ in his preface to the Book De Quæst. Hebr.” (Allix, p. 124).  
 Indeed the doctrine of a plurality in the Godhead, was so habitually  
 impressed upon the minds of the Jews in general ; that in Tobit viii.  
 6, Tobias citing by memory these words in Gen. ii. 18, “ I will  
 “ make him an help meet for him,” actually repeats them thus, “ O  
 “ God of our fathers,—thou hast said,—Let *us* make unto him an  
 “ aid like unto himself” (Allix, p. 101—102). And “ it is clear  
 “ how sensible the Jews have been, that there is a notion of plurality  
 “ plainly imported in the Hebrew text ; since they have forbidden  
 “ *their common people the reading of the history of the creation, lest, un-*  
 “ *derstanding it literally, it should lead them into heresie*” [that is, into  
 the belief of the Gospel and the Trinity]. “ Maimon. Mor. Neboch.  
 “ p. 11. c. 29” (Allix, p. 132). “ R. Eliezer, who lived under  
 “ Trajan,—observed that the reading of *the Old Testament* made the  
 “ Jews turn hereticks, i. e. Christians” (p. 326).

<sup>m</sup> P. 186. Ταῦτα τοι ο Μωσῆς ἐν προοιμίαις τῶν ἱερῶν νομῶν φιλοσοφῆι,  
 —εἶναι—ἀρχέτυπον καὶ ἀληθὲς τὴ θεὸς τῶν ὄλων εἰκόνα, τὸν αὐτὸς λόγον, Αὐ-  
 τοσοφίαν τυγχανούσα καὶ Αὐτοζῶνη, καὶ Φῶς καὶ Ἀληθειαν, καὶ εἶτι Καλὸν  
 καὶ Ἀγαθὸν τίς ἐπινοήσῃεν· εἰκόνα δὲ εἰκότος, τὸν ἀνθρώπων νῦν, παρ' ο καὶ  
 καὶ εἰκόνα θεὸς γεγενῆσθαι ἀνωμολογήται.

Jewish

Jewish law; to be “ an archetype and true image “ of the God of all.” He is also described from the same philosophy, to be “ very Wisdom and “ very Life;” to be the great fountain of wisdom to all the intelligent parts of the creation, and the great wellspring of life to all the animated. He thus becomes “ Light and Truth” to the creation, Light to all the Spirits, and Truth to all the Minds, in it; and is also “ whatever Fair and Good can “ be imagined,” the author of all mental advances, and the cause of all spiritual improvements, that either actually exist at present, or can be imagined possible to exist hereafter, in the soul of man. And all results from this one principle, that the soul of man “ is an image of this image,” the very stamp of the Logos, and the very part “ by which— “ man is confessed to have been made, after the “ image of God.”

So clearly is the Divine sufficiency of the Son of God, asserted in this short passage! Nor can we hesitate a moment, concerning the Jewish belief in all this. We have already seen Philo, speaking so nearly in the very same language; that we are apt to think the passage at first, to be only a transcript from his writings. It is a transcript certainly of his ideas. But then this arises, from Eusebius and Philo copying the same original. Both took the principles of the Jews, as they were professed in their belief, and as they were deduced from their Scrip-  
tures.

tures. And the signal coincidence between them in this one extract, confirms the credit of Eusebius in it and in all.

4.—“ The opinions of the Hebrews concerning God, the First Cause of the universe.”

“ Thus has Moses begun his theology: “ In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” Then he says, “ God said, Let there be light, and there was light.” And again, “ God said, Let there be a firmament, and it was so.” And again, “ God said, Let the earth bring forth grass—, and it was so.” And again, “ God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven—, and it was so.”—Such indeed is the theology received among the Hebrews, which teaches all things to have been framed by the fabricating Logos of God. And it afterwards informs us, that the whole world was not left thus desolate by him who framed it, as an orphan left by a father; but is for ever governed by the Providence of God: so that God is not only the Fabricator and Maker of the whole, but also the Preserver, and Governour, and King, and Ruler; presiding continually over the sun itself, and the moon, and the stars, and the whole heaven and the world; with his great Eye and Divine Power inspecting all things, and being present to all things heavenly and earthly, and directing and governing all things in the world.—Concerning  
“ the

“ the framing of the world; concerning the turns  
 “ and changes of the whole, the substance of the  
 “ soul, and the fabrication of the seen and unseen  
 “ nature of all rational beings; and concerning the  
 “ Providence over all; and concerning what are  
 “ yet above these, the First Cause of all, and the  
 “ theology of the Second; and concerning other  
 “ things, that are comprehensible by the understand-  
 “ ing alone; the Hebrews have wound their dif-  
 “ courses and their theories, well and accurately  
 “ round:—that we may know, the universe is not  
 “ spontaneously directed, or hath been always ex-  
 “ isting at random and by chance, from an irrational  
 “ guidance; but is conducted by that charioteer of  
 “ God the Logos, and is governed by the power  
 “ of unspeakable wisdom.”

The

<sup>a</sup> P. 186—187. Ἐβραίων δοξαί περι θεου, τε πρώτων των όλων αιώνων.

Ὡς πῶς ὁ Μωσῆς ἀπηξάλο της θεολογίας, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός του  
 ἕρανον και την γην· εἶλα φησιν, Εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, Γενεθήτω φως, και ἐγενέτο φως.  
 Και παλιν, Εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, Γενεθήτω σφραγμα, και ἐγενέτο. Και παλιν,  
 Εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, Βλασησατω ἡ γη βότανν χαρῖν, —και ἐγενέτο. Και αυτις,  
 Εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, Γενηθήωσαν φωσηρες εν τῷ σφραγμαί τε ἕρανε—, και ἐγενέτο.  
 —Τοιαυτή μεν ἡ καθ' Ἐβραίων θεολογία, λογω θεου δημιουργικῶ τα πάντα συ-  
 μεζαναί παιδεύουσα. Ἐπειτα δε, ἔχ ὡς ἐρημον, ὡς ὀφθαλμὸν ὑπο πατρὸς,  
 κἀλαλειφθεῖνα του συμπαντα κοσμον ὑπο τε συσσησαμεν διδασκει, ἀλλ'  
 εἰς το αἰν ὑπο της τε θεου προνοίας αὐτον διοικεσθαι· ὡς μὴ μονον δημιουργον  
 εἶναι των όλων και ποιητην του θεου, ἀλλα και σωτήρα, και διοικητην, και  
 βασιλέα, και ηγεμονα, ἡλιῶ αὐτῶ, και σελήνη, και ἀγροισ, και τῷ συμ-  
 παντι ἕρανε τε και κοσμῶ δι' αἰωνος ἐπιταβείνα, μεγαλω τε ὀφθαλμῶ και ενθεῶ  
 δυναμει παιλ' ἐφορώντα, και τοις πασιν ἕρανοις τε και ἐπιγειοις ἐπιπαροῦτα,  
 και τα πάντα εν κοσμῶ διαλατῖβείνα τε και διοικῖβείνα. P. 307. Περὶ συσ-  
 λασεως κοσμου, τα τε περι της τε παντος τροπης τε και αλλοιωσεως, ψυχης  
 τε περιουσιας, και λογικων ἀπαίτων φυσεως, ὀφραμενης τε και ἀφανης, δημι-  
 ουργίας,



The creative and the providential powers of the Logos, are here laid fully before us from the sanctuary of the Jews. The Logos is declared to be the God, who comes forth with so much dignity in the Book of Genesis; and prosecutes the work of forming a world, with such a majestic brevity of speech. He speaks, chaos hears, and an universe is framed. "Let there be light," cried the Logos; and light instantly started into existence. "Let there be a firmament," the Logos said; and a firmament, at the word, expanded itself over the earth. "Let the earth bring forth grass," did the Logos pronounce; and a gay covering of verdure directly spread over the unfighly face of the globe. And "let there be light in the firmament of the heaven," the Logos spoke; and immediately the sun, the moon, and the stars, showed themselves in the front of heaven. Thus does "the theology received among the Hebrews,—teach all things to have been framed by *the fabricating Logos of God.*" Nor does it teach this alone. "It informs us" also, "that the whole world was not left thus desolate by *him who framed it*, as an orphan left by a father." No! It tells us, that "it is for ever

εργίας, της τε τε καθολη προνοιας, και τειων ει προλερον, τα περι τε πραλη των ολων αιλιε, της τε τε δευτερε θεολογιας, και των αλλων των διανοια μονη ληπλων, της λογωε και της θεωριαε ευ και ακριβωε περιειληφασιν.— Ειδεναι, οτι τε μη απηλιτομαλιεαι το παν, μηδ' εικη και ωε ειυχεν εξ αλογε φοραε υφεστηκεν' αγελαι δ' υφ ημοχω θεε λογω, και δυναμει σοφιαε αρηληε διακυβερταλαι.

“governed”

“ governed” by the Logos who framed it, as “ by  
 “ the Providence of God.” The “ God” Logos  
 is “ not only the Fabricator and Maker of the  
 “ whole, but also the Preserver, and Governour,  
 “ and King, and Ruler” of it. Thus is the Son  
 of God “ presiding continually over the sun itself,  
 “ and the moon, and the stars, and the whole  
 “ heaven and the world; with his great Eye and  
 “ Divine Power inspecting all things, and being  
 “ present to all things heavenly and earthly, and  
 “ directing and governing all things in the world.”  
 And the whole system of “ the universe,—is con-  
 “ ducted by that charioteer of God the Logos; and  
 “ is governed by the power of unspeakable Wis-  
 “ dom,” under the guidance of his reining hand.

That these were the sentiments of the Jews concerning him, however grand they appear in themselves, and however declaratory they are of Divinity in him; we have seen sufficiently before, in considering the correspondent extracts from Philo. Philo and Eusebius unite to prove the Jews firmly persuaded, that the God who called all nature out of the vacuity of chaos at first, and the God who preserves all nature from relapsing into its natural state of vacuity again, was the Logos of God the Father. Many Jews had written upon the subject of his Divinity, in the days of Philo. Many here appear, to have written upon this article of it. And “ the Hebrews,” we are expressly told, “ have  
 “ wound

“wound their discourses and their theories, well  
“and accurately round” upon the point.

5.—We have already seen the attestation of Eusebius, that the Jews believed the Logos, who made and who governs the world, to have been the God who interposed so remarkably in their national affairs, by appearing to Abraham, to Moses, and to their other worthies of almost every age. We have also seen Philo, coinciding exactly with Eusebius on the subject. But I shall now proceed to prove it, by the attestation of a Heathen; and so produce a third evidence, additional to the other two.

In that curious compilation of historical commentaries, which was once made by a man now almost unknown by name, one Alexander, concerning the events of the Jewish annals; and which, from their multiplicity, gave him the appellation of Polyhistor in antiquity; this author had collected some pieces, that were purely and simply historical in themselves, and others that were of too poetical a nature to be considered as such. His works indeed have since perished, and the labour of a life perhaps has been buried in the dust. With him have perished too all the commentaries, that he had accumulated together; and nothing remains of the whole, but a few fragments in some extracts made by Eusebius. On such a precarious tenure do authors hold their existence, in this world of dissolution;

lution; unless there be a state of renovation for authors as for men, and the useful and virtuous are to be rescued from the violence of time, and their writings to come forth again in a form, as immortal as their readers! Yet Alexander Polyhistor, says Eusebius, was “ a man of great understanding and great learning, very celebrated among those Græcians, who have not made an idle use of their observation; and he, in his compilation concerning the Jews, gives these historical accounts of “ Abraham.” And as the earliest quoter of him, is an author of the first century; so is he himself reported to have lived, about two hundred years before our Saviour. Polyhistor first produces Eupolemus; a Græcian, who “ in his account of the “ Jews says concerning Assyria, that the city of “ Babylon was originally inhabited by *those who* “ *were saved out of the flood; that they were giants,* “ *and built the tower so much spoken of in history;* “ *and that, the tower falling under the operation* “ *of God, the giants were dispersed over all the* “ *earth:*” a piece of historical information, which explains at once the wild tale of Heathenism concerning the giants scaling heaven, and refers it to

° P. 244—245. Ο Πολυιστωρ Αλεξανδρος, πολυνης ων και πολυμαθης ανης, τοι τε μη παρρηγον τον απο παιδειας καρπον πεποιημενοις Ελλησι γνωριματιος, ος εν τη περι Ισδαιων συλαξει τα καλα του Αβρααμ τελον ιστορει καλα λεξιν τον τροπον. He is quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 396, a whole century before Eusebius; and by Josephus a whole century before that, Eusebius, p. 246.

its true place in history<sup>p</sup>. Polyhistor next produces Artapanus, who, “in his book concerning the “Jews,” speaks similarly of Abraham “going “against the *giants* ;” and says that “these, inhabiting Babylon, were destroyed by the Gods “for their impiety ;” a false circumstance, that brings the true history into a nearer assimilation with the fable<sup>q</sup>. And Artapanus and Eupolemus relate many incidents of the Abrahamick history, in the same manner ; by interlacing truth with false-

P P. 245. Ευπολεμος δε εν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων τῆς Ἀσσυρίας φησὶ, πόλις Βαβυλώνα πρῶτον μὲν κτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν διασωθέντων ἐκ τῆς κατακλύσεως, εἶναι δὲ αὐτῆς Γίγαντας, οἰκοδομῆν δὲ τὸν ἰσορρομητὸν πυργόν. πεσοῦτος δὲ τῆς ὑπὸ τῆς τῆς θεῶν ἐνεργείας, τῆς Γίγαντας διασπαρῆναι καθ’ ὅλην τὴν γῆν.

q P. 245—246. Ἀρτάπανος δὲ φησὶν ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, — τὸν Ἀβραάμ ἀναφεροῦσα εἰς τῆς Γίγαντας, τῆς δὲ οἰκίας ἐν τῇ Βαβυλώνῃ, διὰ τὴν ἀσεβείαν ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀναιρεθῆναι. The same allusion to the giants, was equally kept up among the Jews ; but it referred to an earlier period, even an ante-diluvian one. God “was not pacified,” says the Son of Sirach, “toward *the old giants*, who fell away in the “strength of their foolishness ; neither spared he the place where “Lot sojourned,” &c. (Ecclus. xvi. 7—8). “In the old time “also,” adds Philo, “when *the proud giants* perished, the hope of “the world, governed by thy hand, *escaped in a weak vessel*, and “left to all ages a seed of generation” (Wisdom xiv. 6). “There “were,” as the nominal Baruch subjoins, “*the giants famous from “the beginning, that were of so great stature, and so expert in war*” (iii. 26). And these passages refer only to that piece of ante-diluvian history, which says “there were *giants* in the earth in those “days—; the same became mighty men, which were of old men of “renown” (Gen. vi. 4). So different are the giants of Sacred History, from those of Profane !

hood. Polyhiflor next brings forward Philo, a writer very different from the Jew before, much older than he, and actually a Heathen; who wrote a poem upon Jerufalem, and in it fpeaks obfcurely of Abraham offering up his fon<sup>r</sup>. And Polyhiflor, for a fourth voucher, fets Demetrius before his reader. This Græcian gives an account of Jacob's departure from Ifaac to Laban, of his ftay with Laban, of his marriage with the two daughters of Laban, of his children by them, of his return to Ifaac, and of his going down into Egypt; ending with his death there, and the genealogy of Mofes from him. All this he does with fo much particularity of time, incident, and place; as fhows him undoubtedly to have had accefs to the writings of

<sup>r</sup> P. 246.

Ἐκλυον αρχηγονοισι το μυριον, ως ποτε θεσμοις  
 Ἀβρααμ κλυτοσχεσ υπερβιον κ. τ. λ.

From thefe lines it is evident, that the name of Abraham, which is pronounced fhort by us, is really long in itfelf. See Eufebius, p. 268—269, for this Philo being a Heathen. The words are taken from Jofephus, and are thefe in his treatife Contra Apionem, p. 1351. Hudfon; ο μενοι φαληρευς Δημητριος, και Φιλων ο πρεσβυτερος, και Ευπολεμος, ε πολυ της αληθειας διημαρτον. Thofe who were not far from the truth, muft have been Heathens; and all three were equally fo. “Hence Philonem,” fays Hudfon, “inter Ethnicos recenfet Jofephus; quem fi fequamur (inquit Lowthius) concidit illorum fententia, qui Librum Sapientie ipfi tanquam Auctori, aut faltem Interpreti, tribuunt.” Thefe authors confound Philo the Elder with Philo the Younger, the Hiftorian with the Divine, and the Heathen with the Jew.

Mofes,

Moses, either in their original Hebrew, or in some translation of them<sup>s</sup>. That he had *not* inspected them in the original, the very translation of them under Ptolemy Philadelphus, by persons sent for on purpose from Judæa, and merely to grace the new library at Alexandria with a legible copy of them; is a sufficient evidence of itself. That there was no translation of them *before*, is equally evident from the making of this, and from the total non-appearance of any other<sup>t</sup>. Demetrius therefore was one of those, who with Eupolemus, Artapanus, the elder Philo, and one Theodotus, the writer of another historical poem on the Jews, all equally produced by Polyhifto<sup>u</sup>; lived after the Hebrew code was laid open to the Greeks, by the Septuagint version. The curiosity of him and of them was very strongly excited, by those records of heaven

<sup>s</sup> P. 247—249.

<sup>t</sup> A Jew, who lived about a hundred and thirty years after the Septuagint translation was made, alleges there was another before (Eusebius, p. 388). But he alleges it, merely to favour an hypothesis of his own; that the coincidence of sentiments concerning God in many Heathens with the Bible, was occasioned by their knowledge of Moses' writings: when it was plainly occasioned, by the original theology of both being exactly the same. The Jewish and the Heathen theologies were two streams, flowing from the same fountain of revelation; only separating very early, then sadly stained in one, and remaining pure in the other. And even he does not pretend to adduce any proof, or even to assign any reason but his own hypothesis, for his allegation.

<sup>u</sup> Eusebius, p. 249.

(as it were) being now unrolled for the first time, to the eye of Heathenism; and by the primitive history of man, being now revealed at last to the nations of the globe. And he was in fact that very Demetrius Phalereus, who gained himself so much honour by his government of Athens; and who had even the higher honour, of being an instrument in the hands of Providence, for publishing the Jewish Revelation to the kingdoms of the earth. He lived therefore about two hundred and eighty years before our Saviour, about eighty before Polyhistor, and about six hundred before Eusebius\*.

\* Eusebius, p. 206, from Aristæus speaks of Δημήτριος ο Φαληρεὺς advising the translation; then gives us a letter from "Demetrius Phalereus," which begins thus, "To the great king from Demetrius;" in p. 241 cites Aristobulus at second hand for saying, that there was a translation "before Demetrius;" and in p. 247 produces Polyhistor as saying, "Demetrius tells us that Jacob" &c. The same personage is spoken of by a continuity of reference, in all these places. And in another quotation made by Eusebius, as I have already shown, Josephus adds; that "*Demetrius Phalereus*, and Philo the Elder, and Eupolemus, were not far from the truth." The historian, the archon, and the adviser, therefore, were one and the same person. Demetrius must have advised the measure of a translation, either instantly upon the commencement of the sole sovereignty of Philadelphus, as he continued not a favourite long after; or else in the time of Philadelphus's joint sovereignty with his father, by whom the library was founded. See Ant. Univ. Hist. ix. 370—373 and x. 238—245. In the latter volume, the writer, who was the late Mr. Palsmanazar, has made some objection to Aristæus's history of this version, from Demetrius being said to advise the measure; forgetting the interval of favour at the beginning of Philadelphus's reign, and overlooking all the joint sovereignty before.

Yet



Yet even he, in reciting the actions of Jacob, catches so much of the spirit of the Jews in understanding them; that he speaks thus of the Being who appeared to Jacob at Peniel, and whom the Scriptures themselves call a Man from his human appearance, but intimate plainly to be God. "As Jacob was coming into Canaan," he says, "an *Angel* of God wrestled with him." That the Jews in all ages understood this Being, to be the only *human* exhibitor of the Godhead in himself, the Logos; we have seen before from Philo and the antient rabbies. But we may see it again, from an authority much older, as well as much superior; one of the prophets. "Jacob," says God in Hosea, "—took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with GOD; yea, he had power over the *Angel*, and prevailed; he wept and made supplication unto *him*; he found *him* in Bethel, and there he spake with us, even THE LORD GOD OF HOSTS, the Lord—his Memorial <sup>2</sup>." The plural number, in which God here speaks of himself, is very remarkable, though it has never (I think) been no-

<sup>1</sup> P. 247. Πορευομενω δε αυτω εις Χανααν αγγελον τε θεου παλευσαι.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. xii. 3—5. I have united the two verses together, the verb *is* of the latter being merely supplemental in our translation. And verse 9th "I that am the Lord thy God," shows God to be the speaker here.

ticed; is exactly in the style of other passages, that we have seen before; and unites with them, if there is any propriety in God's own language concerning himself, to indicate a positive plurality in the Godhead. Nor can the mode of speech which has been so often adduced, to take off the force of this argument; prove any thing but the folly of its adducers. On this wild plea, God is supposed to have used the plural style in speaking of himself, *because it would be the style of majesty three or four thousand years afterwards*, and in a north-western *angle of Europe*. But, even if this style had been as ancient as it is modern, and as general as it is confined, that a single being, a king, should speak of himself as not single, as more than one; is an absolute barbarism in itself, however familiar to *our* ears. And any inference from such a fantastical absurdity, to Him who is Propriety itself; is a gross illusion of the understanding. As God speaks of himself occasionally in the plural number, though generally in the singular; he must certainly be both plural and singular, and therefore is plural in his personalities, for he is undoubtedly singular in his nature.

“When Jacob was come to Luz of Bethel,” adds Demetrius in the same strain with Hosea, “God said that he should be called Jacob no longer, but Israel.” The original history,

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, p. 248. Φασις του θεου.

however,

however, is still stronger. "GOD said unto him," it tells us of Jacob returned to Bethel, "Thy name is Jacob; thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name; and he called his name Israel: and GOD said unto him, I am GOD ALMIGHTY <sup>b</sup>." And the prophet adds, we see, that he was the *Lord*, the *Lord God of Hosts*. That the same Being appeared to Jacob, both at Bethel and at Peniel; is evident from the same appellation of God, being attributed to him at both these appearances; and from the same declaration concerning the name of Jacob, being made by him at both. Yet the prophet and the historian unite, to declare him in the most explicit terms, to be God. And Demetrius, who calls him an Angel in the one place, denominates him God in the other; just as Hosea lends him the appellation of Angel, and then names him expressly the Lord God of Hosts. But Demetrius took the name of Angel, which is not in the Scriptural narrative, from the Jews about him; as they took it from the prophets, and from their own traditions antecedent to the prophets. In consequence of all, the word *Angel* was their customary designation for the Logos. They owned him, as the God of themselves and of their ancestors; but then they very properly distinguished him from God the Father, by

<sup>b</sup> Chap. xxxv. 10—11.

calling him occasionally an Angel. Hosea and Demetrius call him an Angel and God, in the same breath. And he was the Angel-God, the Missionary Jehovah, of their religion. That this is true, is demonstratively evident from what I have said. But let me prove it additionally from another prophet, one who was the last of the number, and lived about a hundred years only before Demetrius. "Behold, I will send my messenger," says the *Logos* in Malachi concerning John the Baptist; "and he shall prepare the way before ME; and THE LORD whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to HIS temple; even the *Messenger*" or *Angel* "of the Covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith THE LORD OF HOSTS<sup>c</sup>." Here then the *Logos* calls himself at once, the Angel of the Covenant, and the Lord, even the Lord of Hosts; *that*, to mark his originate subordination, and *these*, to indicate his intrinsic Deity. The Jews of Demetrius's time, only caught the light of truth from Malachi, from Hosea, and from Moses. Demetrius only received the light, which issued from *them*. And the vivacity of the gleam reflected to him, shows the brightness of the mirror reflecting it in them<sup>d</sup>.

But

<sup>c</sup> Chap. iii. 1, in the Septuagint version ο αγγελος της διαθηκης.

<sup>d</sup> "I can add—their [the Jews] version of the 3d of Daniel, ver. 25; *Species quarti similis Filio Dei*, as saith Aquila a Jew, who  
"lived

But Demetrius, like Artapanus and Eupolemus, refers to other and earlier authors for some of his intelligence. Thus Eupolemus, from some testimony extraneous to the Septuagint Scriptures, relates Moses to have been “the first who taught letters to the Jews;” when the fact is utterly incredible in itself, and directly confuted by the Christian Scriptures citing an *ante-diluvian* writing<sup>e</sup>. Artapanus also, from some authority that is equally extraneous, and yet, from its chronological accuracy and minute particularity, is assuredly genuine; describes the very *person* of Moses, and says he was “tall, fresh-coloured, grey-headed, long-haired, and very venerable, being then about eighty-nine years of age<sup>f</sup>.” And Demetrius quotes at large one Ezekiel, who appears from his name to have been a Jew, and who was a composer of tragedies; the only play-wright, I think, that we have in all the history of the Jews. But his plays were merely such spiritual dramas, as were formerly common in our own country, and are so still in other regions of Christendom. Of such, that most religious of

“lived under Hadrian; but the ancient Greeks had translated it *similis Angelo Dei*, as faith an old Scholion related by Drufius in *Fragmentis*, p. 1213; which shows, that the *ancient* Hellenist had the *same* notion of the *Angel* of God, as of the *Son* of God” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 110).

<sup>e</sup> Eusebius, p. 252, and Jude 14.

<sup>f</sup> Eusebius, p. 255. Γεγονεναι δε φησι τον Μωυσον μακρον, πυρρακη, ποδλιον, κομηλην, αξιωματικον· ταυτα δε πραξαι περι εη ενια ογδοηκαιια εννεα.

all our old poets, Milton, appears from some loose sketches still preserved in his own handwriting, to have formed several plans. His Paradise Lost, it is well known, was originally modelled for a tragedy; and the address of Satan to the sun, was the opening of it. But Ezekiel had formed, like Shakespeare, a train of plays upon a succession of events in the history of his country. It began with the migration of Jacob to Joseph in Egypt<sup>s</sup>; and pursued the course of facts, till the narrative of a family swelled out into the history of a nation. He then wrote one tragedy, upon the departure of the Jews out of Egypt; and denominated it *Ἐξαγωγή*, or the Education<sup>h</sup>. In this play Ezekiel notices of course, that introductory incident to all the greater events of Moses's life; the appearance of the glory in the burning bush. Philo has already *intimated* the glory, to be that of the Logos. But Ezekiel expresses the sentiment *in terms*. And Demetrius gives a *Divinity* to this Logos, in some occasional notices which he has derived from Ezekiel, and attached to the margin.

“ But concerning the burning bush,” says Demetrius, “ and the mission of Moses to Pharaoh; “ Ezekiel again introduces by turns, Moses holding “ a dialogue with God. Moses says:”

‡ Eusebius, p. 255.

h Ibid. p. 257.

“ Stop, what is this appearance from the bush ?  
 “ A prodigy beyond the faith of men.  
 “ Sudden the bush is flaming with much fire,  
 “ But green upon it every leaf remains.  
 “ How’s this ? I’ll go, and view with nearer eye  
 “ This prodigy too mighty for belief.”

“ Then GOD addresseth him:”

“ Stop, O most worthy, nor approach thou near,  
 “ O Moses, till thy foot-string thou hast loos’d ;  
 “ For holy is the ground on which thou stand’st,  
 “ And from the bush THE HEAVENLY LOGOS shines.  
 “ Be bold, my Son, and listen to my words :  
 “ To see my face is all impossible  
 “ For mortal man ; but thou may’st hear my words.  
 “ To utter them I’m come, I am the GOD  
 “ Of those thou call’st thy fathers, Abraham,  
 “ Isaac, and Jacob in succession third.  
 “ Remembering them, and my donations too,  
 “ I’m here to save my Hebrew race of men ;  
 “ For I have seen my servants’ grief and toil.  
 “ But go, and in my words announce again,  
 “ First to the very Hebrews all at once,  
 “ Then to the king, what is by me enjoined ;  
 “ That out of Egypt thou shalt bring my race.”

“ Then subjoining some lines in return, Moses  
 “ himself speaks:”

“ I’m not by nature form’d an orator,  
 “ My tongue is often stubborn to my will,  
 “ And gives a hesitation to my voice ;  
 “ I cannot therefore speak before the king.”

“ Then GOD answers him thus:”

“ Send for thy brother Aaron instantly,  
 “ Then tell him all which thou hast heard from me ;

“ And

“ And he shall be the speaker to the king.”

. . . . .

“ And Ezekiel — introduces God speaking thus,  
“ concerning the wonders:”

. . . . .

““ For three whole days a darkness I will give;  
““ Locusts I'll send, which all around shall eat  
““ The fruits of man, and e'en the verdant leaf;  
““ And, added to all this, my hand shall slay  
““ The first-begotten child of every house.

. . . . .

““ But thou shalt tell my people, when at eve  
““ They sacrifice the Paschal Lamb to God,  
““ That they shall touch their outer doors with blood;  
““ And *the dread Angel*, seeing, shall pass by<sup>1</sup>.”

A play

<sup>1</sup> P. 258—259. Περι δε της καιομενης βαβη, και της αποστολης αυτης της προς Φαραω, παλιν παρεισαγει δι' αμοιβαίων του Μωσην τω θεω διαλεγόμενοι. φησι δε ο Μωσης\*

Εα. τι μοι σημειον εκ βαβη τοδε;  
Τερασιον τε, και θρολοις απιστον αν\*  
Αφω βαβησ μεν καιειται πολλη πυρι,  
Αυη δε χλωρον παν μενει το βλασανον.  
Τι δη; προελθων αψομαι τερασιον  
Μεγιστον. ε γαρ πωσιν ανθρωποις φερει.

Ειλα ο θεος αυη προσομιλει\*

Επισχεσε, ω φερισε, μη προσεγγισσης,  
Μωση, πριν η των σων ποδων λυσαι δεσιν.  
Αγια γαρ η γη, οπη συ εφεσηκας, πειλει\*  
Ο δ' εκ βαβη σοι θειος εκλαμπει λογος.  
Θαρσησον, ω παι, και λογων ακα' εμων.  
Ιδεν γαρ οψιν την ερμην αμηχανου  
Ονησον γεγαλια. των λογων δ' εξεσι σοι  
Εμων ακθειν. των εννεκεν εληλυθα.  
Εγω θεος σων, ων λεγεις, γεινηθωρων,



A play like Ezekiel's would be a prodigy, even in this land of Christianity; and one more wondered at

Ἄβρααμ τε καὶ Ἰσαακ καὶ Ἰακώβ τρεῖς.  
 Νιησθεῖς δ' εἰκένων, καὶ εἴ' ἐμῶν δώρημαίων,  
 Παρεμί σωσαι λαὸν Ἑβραίων ἐμῶν,  
 Ἰδὼν κακῶσιν καὶ πονοῦν δέλων ἐμῶν.  
 Ἄλ' ἔρπε, καὶ σημαίνε τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις,  
 Πρῶτον μὲν αὐτοῖς πασὶν Ἑβραίοις ὄμμε,  
 Ἐπεὶ αὖ βασιλεῖ, τὰ ὑπ' ἐμῆ τέλαγμανα,  
 Ὅπως σὺ λαὸν τοῦ ἐμῶν ἐξαγάγῃς χθόνος.

Εἶπα ὑπόβας τίνα ἀμοιβαῖα, αὐτὸς ὁ Μωσῆς λέγει.  
 Οὐκ εὐλογὸς πεφυκᾶ, γλωσσᾶ δ' ἐστὶ μοῖ  
 Δυσφραστὸς, ἰσχυροφώνος, ὡσεὶ μὴ λογῆς  
 Ἐμῆς γενεσθᾶι βασιλεὺς ἐναντίον.

Εἶπα πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ ἀποκρινέται.  
 Ἀαρῶνα πέμψον σοὺ κασιγνήτον ταχὺ,  
 Ὡ παῖτα λέξεις ταξὶ ἐμῆ λελεγμένα·  
 Καὶ αὐτὸς λαλήσει βιαιλῶς ἐναντίον.

. . . . .

Ἐζηκίηλος . . . λέγει, περὶ μὲν τῶν σημείων τοῦ θεοῦ παρεισαγῶν λεγούσθα  
 εἰώς.

. . . . .  
 Σκόλος δὲ θῆσω τρεῖς ἐφ' ἡμερᾶς ὅλας,  
 Ἀκρίδας τε πέμψω, αἰ περὶ τὰ βρωμαῖα  
 Ἀπαλὶ ἀναλωσῆσι, καὶ καρπῆ κλοπῆ.  
 Ἐπὶ πασὶ τέλοισι, τεκν' ἀποκίλων βροσίων  
 Πρωτογόνα. . . . .  
 Λέξεις δὲ λαμ' παῖτι, . . . . .  
 . . . . . το Πασχα θυσαῖας θεῶ  
 Τῆ πρὸσθεν νυκτὶ, αἰμαλὶ ψαυσαι θυρας,  
 Ὅπως παρελθῆ σημά δεινὸς ἀγγελὸς.

That this is all quoted from Ezekiel by Demetrius, is evident. In p. 257 Eusebius cites Demetrius; and, at the end of a passage from Demetrius, enters upon these extracts from Ezekiel, as cited by Demetrius

at than admired. The introduction of an Angel, and especially of the Godman, into a tragedy, however religious in its design, and however conformable to Holy History in fact; would be considered as licentious profaneness by many of the serious, and as sanctified impertinence by all the giddy. We do not love to mingle our religion with our amusements. And we seem desirous to keep the former, sequestered from all the gaieties of life, and reserved for the solemnities of recollection. There is more or less of this spirit, in all nations and all ages. But *we* have carried the humour, much farther than our fathers did. Shakespeare's mind, however great and exalted in itself, was un-

metrius from him. In p. 259, before he has closed these extracts, he says thus: ταῖσις επαγει μέλα τινα τα μέλαξυ αὐτῶ εἰρημενα, λεγων ταῦτα δε, φησιν, εἰω και Εζρηκηλος εν τη Εξωγωγη λεγει: "to these he [Demetrius] adds, after some things said betwixt by himself, saying, " Ezekiel says in his Education." In p. 260 Eusebius speaks thus: παλιν μετ' εἰερα επιλεγει· φησι δε και Εζρηκηλος εν τῷ δραματι κ.τ. λ.; "again after other things he [Demetrius] subjoins," "and Ezekiel also says in his Drama" &c. And in p. 262 Eusebius once more tells us: "and again in a short time they [the Israelites] marched from the Red Sea three days, as *Demetrius* himself tells us."

Artapanus, quoted equally from Polyhistor by Eusebius, "says "the fire was suddenly kindled out of the earth, and burned though "there was no wood or any other fuel at the place; that Moses in "fear fled; and that the Divine VOICE," a term used hereafter by another Heathen for the Divine WORD (See eighth part of this Section at the end), "spoke to him:" αἰφνιδίως φησιν εκ της γης πυρ αναφθῆναι, και τελο καεσθαι, μητε υλης μητε αλλης τινος ξυλειας υσης εν τῷ τοπω· τον δε Μωυσοι, δεισαντα το γενοσ, φευγειν, φωνην δ' αὐτῶ θειαν εἰπειν (p. 253).

happily tinged too little with religion. Yet even he has thrown out those strokes of religiousness at times, which every great and exalted mind must occasionally conceive; which no aversion to such strokes in the audience of a playhouse then, solicited him to suppress; but which no modern play-writer now dares to imitate. And that fine address of his Henry the Fifth to God, the night before the battle of Agincourt, has shocked the prejudices of many (I believe) in the present generation, though it pleasingly awes the heart of the judiciously religious. But the plays of Ezekiel were not calculated, for exhibition on the stage. The Jews, I think, had no playhouses. Like Milton's Sampson, and perhaps like all his other projected tragedies, they were intended only for the closet. This circumstance undoubtedly allowed a greater scope, for the introduction of heavenly personages. Ezekiel accordingly introduces an Angel, in a part of the tragedy which I have not cited; relating the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea<sup>k</sup>. And, as we have seen above, he even brings in God himself holding a dialogue with Moses. But then it is *the Human God*; it is the Logos, who so frequently appeared in a human form, to the worthies of the Old Testament; and who at last came, and *tabernacled* as a human being among us, at the commencement of the New<sup>l</sup>.

<sup>k</sup> Eusebius, p. 262.

<sup>l</sup> John i. 14. *εσκηνωσεν*.

Of the extraordinariness of such a conduct in Ezekiel, and consequently of the pre-eminence of such a faith in his cotemporaries, we may form a judgment at once; from the light in which a play-writer would appear to us at present, who should take that similar incident in the Christian dispensation, the appearance of our Saviour to St. Paul near Damascus, and insert it in a tragedy for the parlour. A glory superior to that of the burning bush, and even more vivid than the meridian lustre of a Damascus sun, would be described as bursting suddenly from the sky, over the head of St. Paul. A human form would be said to appear before his lifted eye, arrayed in all the lightening of the Godhead, and leaning from the clouds towards him. And a human voice would be equally said, to address him in that "voice of God" thunder; as he lay thrown to the ground, upon his back; and as he was gazing in wild amazement, at the terrible splendors of the Logos of Moses before him: to expostulate with him, on his opposition to irresistible Power; and to declare the God seen by and talking to him, to be that very Jesus whom he was opposing<sup>m</sup>. Such a tragedy as this, was never  
planned

<sup>m</sup> Acts ix. 3. "suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven," xxii. 6. "a great light," xxvi. 13. "above the brightness of the sun," and ix. 17. "the Lord, even Jesus,—appeared" to Saul. In ix. 10—15. *our Saviour* "the Lord" says  
to

planned for an English reader. Milton, whose high-set soul was set so much higher still, by the elevating spirit of religion within; is the only one of our old writers, I think, who projected any religious tragedies at all. He even projected a number of them; one upon each of various incidents in the Jewish history. Yet, in none of these, did he venture to think of introducing God, even the God who is so often introduced in the history. In his room, he brings in those fancy-formed existences, Justice, Mercy, and Wisdom; and so violates the essential laws of the Drama, by introducing the personified Attributes of God, to avoid the introduction of the Divine Person himself<sup>a</sup>. And, since the days of Milton, I know not of any writer, that has projected a tragedy founded on religious story; except only one, whose slightest merit is to be a woman of genius and taste, as religiousness is infinitely superior to any mental accomplishments. Yet even Miss H. More has not ventured in her Sacred Dramas, to introduce any supernatural personage. She has even, like Ezekiel, a tragedy upon Moses; but on Moses in the bulrushes, not at the burning bush. Ezekiel, however, knew his countrymen to be better theologues in general, than

to Ananias, "Go thy way, for he [Saul] is a *chosen* vessel unto me;" and in xxii. 14. Ananias says to Saul, "*the God of our fathers* hath *chosen* thee."

<sup>a</sup> See his Smaller Poems by Newton (2d. edit.) I. 327—329 and 331—335.

Englishmen are; more studious to form just notions, concerning the elementary principles of their religion; and more tenaciously adhering to them, when they had formed them.

This extract from Ezekiel, therefore, is peculiarly important. So implicitly received among the Jews, was a faith in the Divinity of the Logos; so universally did the faith spread, through all ranks and degrees of life among them; and so interwoven was the faith, with all their common and all their solemn thoughts; that, even in a play, Ezekiel explicitly and familiarly announced this Divinity. He brings in GOD himself; a Being marked expressly as GOD by him, and by Demetrius from him; speaking to Moses. But he makes this God immediately declare himself, to be GOD the SON, the Divine LOGOS of God the Father. Yet he ascribes to him, the full efficacy and compleat energy of the Godhead. "To see MY face," he cries, "is all impossible for mortal man." He even affirms himself expressly, to be GOD; to be too that very GOD, who had shown himself so often to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and who had so graciously condescended, to call himself the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. The firmness of the popular belief is strikingly shown, in the solemnity of making *God himself* say this in a *play*. The sentiment was evidently lodged in the very heart of his readers, there acted

as the vital spark of their religion, and was there felt as the animating soul of their theology<sup>o</sup>.

Nor is this all. The same Being is expressly introduced twice again, as GOD. He also declares himself to be the very Being, who is going to show all the wonders of his power upon Egypt. “*I* will give darkness,” he says; “*I* will send locusts;” and “*MY* hand shall slay the first-begotten child of every house.” He thus grasps in his hand, as it were, the whole thunder of Omnipotence in the Godhead.

He particularly affirms he will do that, which he is made by the Book of Wisdom to do; when, as we have seen before, the ALMIGHTY WORD of God, this very LOGOS and GOD of Ezekiel, leaps from the throne of the Godhead in heaven, and fills the land of Egypt with death. The union of Philo and Ezekiel on such a point, and at such a distance

<sup>o</sup> “ R. Menachem—and his authors teach constantly, that it was the Shekinah [or Logos] which—appeared to *Jacob* at night, fol. 36. col. 2,—and to the *same* upon the ladder, fol. 41 and 42;—appeared to *Moses* Exod. iii. fol. 55. col. 2, and to the *people upon Mount Sina*, fol. 56. col. 2; *spoke to Moses*, and gave the law to the people, fol. 57. col. 2 and 3, fol. 58. col. 1, and fol. 84. col. 1. and col. 2” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 165). “They say, that—the Shekinah alone was intrusted with the care and conduct of Israel, fol. 28. col. 3 and fol. 153. col. 2” (p. 166). “Moses being—employed by the *Word* of God” at the burning bush, as his messenger to the children of Israel; for the discharge of his ministry, had both his instructions and credentials from the *Word*, according to the Targums” (p. 215—216).

of time, gives the stamp of stability and the seal of sameness to the national faith, in this article.

But Ezekiel makes the Logos afterwards, to call *him* who was to slay the first-born, “the dread angel;” as distinct from, and inferior to, himself. He speaks of God also as distinct from himself; when he mentions the Israelites, “sacrificing the paschal lamb to God.” Nor does he mean any real distinction, by either. He has declared himself expressly, to be the God of the patriarchs and of the Jews; the God to whom *those* offered their sacrifices, and the God to whom *these* were to sacrifice their paschal lamb. He has likewise declared himself to be the very God, whose hand was to slay all the first-born. And he now shows us, as Demetrius has shown us before, in the same reference to the Logos for an angel; that originate subordination of the Logos to the Father, which is requisite to accompany his exhibited consubstantiality of Godhead with him. So much were the understandings of the Jews familiarized, to all the parts of this prime sentiment in their creed; that they were not perplexed with what English readers in general, from their habits of half-thinking about it, are pertly apt to call the niceties of artificial and scholastick theology; the Divinity of the Logos, positive in itself, yet subordinate to God the Father’s, and yet co-essential with his! Perplexity of ideas on a subject clear though complicated,



plicated, is always the child of unthinkingness, and the parent of presumption, among mankind. And, in the belief of the Jews, *this* angel who slew the first-born in Egypt, and *that* angel who wrestled with Jacob at Peniel, was the Angel of the Covenant from God the Father to mankind; even the Logos or Son of the Father, GOD ALMIGHTY, and THE LORD OF HOSTS; the JEHOVAH whom Abraham adored, whom Isaac worshipped, whom Jacob saw, and whom Moses beheld; the Lord of the temple at Jerusalem, from the time of Solomon to the time of Malachi; and the Sovereign of the universe, from the days of Moses, to the days of Hosea, to the days of Ezekiel, and to the days of Demetrius †.

6.—Nor is Demetrius the only author, who is cited by Eusebius in confirmation of his position, concerning the Jewish faith in this point. Having produced some passages of scripture in evidence, he then turns thus to his Heathen reader. “ But

† “ R. Menachem—and his authors—look upon the Shekinah [or Logos] as *the living God*, fol. 2, col. 1, the *God of Jacob*, “ R. Men. fol. 38, col. 3, and—that very *angel*, whom *Jacob* looks “ upon as his Redeemer, his Shepherd, and whom the *prophets* call “ the *Angel of the Presence* and the *Angel of the Covenant*, *ibid.* “ fol. 73, col. 1, and fol. 83, col. 4” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 166). They say also, that he “ *smote the Egyptians*, fol. 56, col. 4” (*ibid.* *ibid.*). “ *All the signs and wonders which the Lord sent him [Moses] to do,—according to the Targums,—*“ ‘The *Word* of the “ Lord sent him to do, in Egypt, to Pharaoh and his servants, and “ all his land” (p. 216).

“ that you may not think,” he says, “ I am putting my own construction upon these extracts; I will present to you, as an interpreter of the meaning of scripture, a Hebrew who is accurate in the domestick opinions of his country, and learnt the sentiments from his masters; for such in your estimation is Philo<sup>9</sup>.”

Eusebius then adduces three passages out of Philo. These I have previously laid before my reader, in all their force and power. But it is requisite to give a little abstract of them here, in order to continue these necessary links in the chain of Eusebius’s evidence.

The first then says, that when God is mentioned in scripture to have made man in the image, not of himself, but of God; and so “ another God” seems to be introduced; there is a reference “ to the second God, who is his Logos<sup>r</sup>.” The next affirms God, to “ have set his right Logos and First-begotten Son over all things, who will accept the charge, as in some measure a governor under a great king .” And the third declares “ the

<sup>9</sup> P. 190. *ἵνα δὲ μὴ σοφίζεσθαι με ταῦτα νομισῆς, ἐρμηνεῦσαι σοὶ τῆς ἐν τῇ γραφῇ διανοίας, Ἑβραίων ἀνδρᾶ παραστήσω, τὰ οἰκεία πατριῶν ἀκριβέστερα, καὶ παρὰ διδασκάλων τὸ δόγμα μεμαθηκότα· εἰ δὲ σοὶ τοιαῦτα ὁ φίλων.*

<sup>r</sup> P. 190. *Ὡς περὶ ἐτεροῦ θεοῦ φησί, καὶ πρὸς τὸν δευτέρου θεοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ἄλλος λόγος.*

<sup>8</sup> P. 190. *Προστήσαμεν τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον καὶ πρωτογονοῦν υἱόν, ὅς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, ὡς τὶς μεγάλου βασιλέως ὑπαρχῶν, διαδέχεται.*

“ Eternal

“ Eternal Logos of the Everlasting God, to be the  
 “ very strong and very firm support of the uni-  
 “ verse.” So fully does Philo here corroborate,  
 what Eusebius has said, and what Demetrius has  
 affirmed, concerning the Deity of the Son of God!  
 If to be a joint Creator with the Father; if to be  
 called upon by the Father, in order to join in the  
 act of creation with him; if to be the very Creator,  
 who stamped his own image upon man; if to pre-  
 side over the universe which he thus formed, and to  
 govern it under the Father; if to be as eternal in  
 duration as the Father, and to be the very strong  
 and very firm supporter of that universe, which he  
 now governs, and which he originally created: if all  
 this united is to be God, as every one of the cha-  
 racters, alone and by itself, undoubtedly is; then the  
 Logos is most undoubtedly, what Eusebius has said  
 the Jews believed him to be, and what Philo here  
 calls him expressly, a “ GOD, Second” indeed to  
 the Father, but a GOD, at once different from the  
 Father and the same with him, co-equal with him  
 in continuity of existence, and therefore co-equal  
 too in substantiality of nature<sup>u</sup>.

7.—But

<sup>i</sup> P. 190. Λογος δ' ο αίδιος θεος τε αιωνιος, το οχυρωτατον και βεβαι-  
 οτατον ερεισμα των ολων εστιν.

<sup>u</sup> To this let me subjoin a parallel passage in Justin Martyr, be-  
 cause it wants a little vindication, from the wrongs equally of the  
 printer and the translator; and because it is very striking in itself:  
 η οταν λεγη, “ when the scripture says,” εβρεξε Κυριος πυρ παρα Κυ-  
 ρισ

7.—But Eusebius proceeds still farther. He not only ascribes to the Jews this explicit profession of belief, in the equal Divinity of a Second Being with the First; but also maintains, that they believed in the Divinity of a Third with Both. He thus completes the circle, of his Christian theology among the Jews; gives to *them* equally as to *us*, a Godhead with a triple personality; and sets at the head of both systems of religion, a Trinity of persons in an Unity of essence.

Παυτι γαρ εν κοσμῳ λαμπει Τριας, ης Μοναξ αρχει.

A Triad shines, a Monad reigns in each \*.

ριε εκ τη θρανῳ, “ the Lord rained fire from the Lord out of heaven;” δυο ανταξ αριθμων μηνυει ο λογῳ ο προφητικῳ, “ the Word of Inspiration indicates two numerical Existences;” τον μεν, επι γης οντα, “ the one existing on earth,” ος [it should be, ον] φησι καταβηκειναι ιδειν την κραυγην Σοδομων, “ whom it reports to have come down in “ order to examine the cry of Sodom;” τον δε, εν τοις θρανοις υπαρχοντα, “ the other abiding in the heavens,” ος και τη επι γης Κυριε Κυριῳ εστιν, ως Πατηρ και Θεῳ, “ who is also the Lord of the Lord “ on earth, as being Father and God,” αιτιος τε αυτω τη ειναι, “ and “ the Cause of existence to him,” και δυνατω, και Κυριω, και Θεω [not, as in the Latin translation, “ auctor eidem est, ut sit, atque equidem præpotens, et Dominus, et Deus ut sit,” but thus, “ auctor eidem ut sit, ipsi quidem præpotenti, et Domino, et Deo”], “ though he [the second Lord] is powerful, and LORD, and GOD “ himself.” Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 358.

\* This Greek line “ is inserted among the Oracula Zoroastri in “ Platonicis Collecta, p. 8. This treatise of Zoroaster’s is published “ by Franc. Patricius, at the end of his Nova de Univerfis Philo- “ phia, fol. edit. Venet. an. 1593” (Lesley’s Theological Works, i. 245). It is an “ oracle cited out of Damascius by Patricius” (Cudworth’s Intellectual System, p. 294. edit. 1678).

“ Would

“ Would not this then be a speech the most  
 “ worthy of God, of the rational and all-wise pow-  
 “ er of God, to refer the principle of the framing  
 “ of the universe, rather to the very Wisdom and  
 “ the very Logos of God, than to the elements that  
 “ have no souls and no reason? For such indeed  
 “ among the Hebrews, were the opinions concern-  
 “ ing the principle of all things. And let us see  
 “ also what they teach, concerning the framing of  
 “ the rational beings, that are after the First Prin-  
 “ ciple. . . . .  
 “ . . . . After the uncaused and ungenerated  
 “ person of God the universal king, they tell us of  
 “ a Principle that was generated from no other  
 “ than the Father, being the First-begotten, the  
 “ Coadjutor of the Father’s council, and imaged  
 “ after him; which Principle presides over all the  
 “ things, that were afterwards created; for which  
 “ reason also, they have been accustomed to call it  
 “ the Image of God, and the Power of God, and  
 “ the Wisdom of God, and the Logos of God, yea  
 “ and even the General of the host of the Lord<sup>y</sup>,  
 “ and the Angel of the Grand Council:—the Pow-  
 “ er of the God of all, which is great without  
 “ bounds and beyond expression, taking in all

<sup>y</sup> So Clemens Alexandrinus observes, that “ all the army of an-  
 “ gels and of Gods has been subjected to the Son of God,” *τατα  
 πασα υποτετακται στρατια αγγελων τε και θεων* (Stromata, vii.  
 p. 831).

“ things at once; and the Second after the Father,  
“ being the equally fabricating and enlightening  
“ power of the Divine Logos. Wherefore also the  
“ Hebrews love to name him, both the true Light  
“ and the Sun of righteousness: there being like-  
“ wise, after the Second person, a Third,—the Holy  
“ Ghost, which very Being they rank in the first and  
“ royal dignity and honour of a Principle of the uni-  
“ verse; he himself being constituted by the Maker of  
“ all, a Principle of the things created afterwards, I  
“ mean of the things that were inferior and want  
“ aid from him. But this Being, holding the  
“ third rank, assists those who are inferior to him  
“ with his better powers; yet indeed receives not  
“ the powers from any other, than from the God  
“ Logos, who is truly higher and better, and whom  
“ we have said to be the Second to the Most High  
“ and the ungenerated person of God the universal  
“ king: from whom even he himself, the God Lo-  
“ gos, receiving aid and drawing Divinity, as from  
“ a perpetual and over-flowing fountain of Divini-  
“ ty, communicates the splendours of his dome-  
“ tick light to all, as well as to the Holy Ghost  
“ himself, who is nearer to him than all, and very  
“ nigh, and to the intelligent and divine powers af-  
“ ter him, abundantly and without envy: and that  
“ the ungenerated Principle of the universe, be-  
“ ing the fountain of all Good, of Divinity, and  
“ Life and Light, and the cause of every virtue;  
“ and

“ and being the Primary of the Primaries, and the  
 “ Principle of Principles, and rather beyond the  
 “ Principle and the First, and every imagination  
 “ spoken or apprehended; communicated to the  
 “ First-begotten alone, all whatever he held in-  
 “ volved in his unspeakable powers, as to Him  
 “ who alone was capable of taking in and receiving  
 “ that, which is not to be attained or taken in by  
 “ others, the abundance of the Father’s goods; and  
 “ affords them in part to those who are partially  
 “ worthy, by the ministry and mediation of the  
 “ Second One, as every person can attain: of which  
 “ the perfect and the highly sacred things, were  
 “ imparted by the Father himself to the Third  
 “ One, the Ruler and Governor of them below,  
 “ who through the Son receives the things of the  
 “ Father. And from hence all the Divines of the  
 “ Hebrews, after the God over all, and after his  
 “ First-begotten Wisdom, deify the Third and  
 “ Holy Power, calling him Holy Ghost; by whom  
 “ also those were enlightened, who were inspired  
 “ by God<sup>z</sup>.”

In

<sup>z</sup> P. 191—192. Ἀρ ἐν ἑχ τῆσ' λογῶν εἴη ἂν ὁ θεοπρεπὲς αὐτός, δυνα-  
 μει θεῶν λογικῆ καὶ πανσοφῆ, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτῆ σοφίᾳ καὶ αὐτῷ θεῷ Λογῷ,  
 τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀνατίθει; τῆς τε παντῶσ' συστάσεως, ἢ τοῖς ἀψυχοῖς καὶ ἀλο-  
 γοῖς σοιχειοῖς; ἀλλὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα παρ' Ἑβραίοις, καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς τῶν  
 ὁλῶν ἀρχῆς. σκεψώμεθα δὲ καὶ ἅ περὶ τῆς τῶν λογικῶν συστάσεως, τῶν με-  
 τα τὴν Πρῶτην Ἀρχὴν, ἐκδιδασκῆσι. . . . .  
 . . . . . Μετὰ τὴν ἀναρχοῖ καὶ ἀγεννητοῖ τε θεῷ παμῶσασιλευς ἕσιαν,

την

In this illustrious description, of the nature and quality of the Jewish Godhead; in which there is some

την εκ αλλοθεν η εκ τῆ Πατρῶ γεγεννημενην Αρχην, Πρωτοτοκον τε ἔσαν, και συνεργον της τῆ Πατρῶ βουλῆς, προς αυτον τε απεικονισμενην, διδασκεισι· ταυτην δε των μετα ταυτα γενητων απαντων πρωτευειν· παρ' ο και Εικονα Θεῶ αυτην, και Θεῶ Δυναμιν, και Θεῶ Σοφίαν, και Θεῶ Λογον, και μιν και Αρχιστρατηγον δυναμειῶ Κυριῶ, μεγαλης τη Βουλῆς Αγγελον, αποκαλειν ειωθασι.—Τα παντα μιν αθροῶς απολαβουσης της ανεκφραστῆ και απειρομεγεθῆς δυναμειῶς τῆ Θεῶ των ολων, δευτερευσης δε μετα του Πατερῶς της δημιουργικῆς ομῆς και φωτισικῆς δυναμειῶς τῆ Θεῶς Λογῶ· διο και φως Αληθινον και Δικαιοσυνης Ηλιον, Εβραίοις φιλον αυτον ονομαζειν. Τριτης δε ἡδη μετα την δευτεραν ἔσαν—καθισταμενης, τῆ Αγιῶ Πνευματῶ, ο και αυτο εν τῇ πρωτῇ και βασιλικῇ της των ολων Αρχῆς αξία και τιμῇ καταλεγμισιν· εις Αρχην των μετα ταυτα γενητων, λεγω δε των υποδεθηκοτων, και της παρ' αυτῆ χορηγίας επιδεομενων, και αυτῶ προς τῆ των ολων ποιητη κατατεταγαμενω. αλλα τῆτο μιν, τριτην επεχον την τάξιν, τοις υποδεθηκοσι των εν αυτῶ κρειττονων δυναμειῶν επιχορηγει, ἔ μιν αλλα και αντιλαμβάνει παρ' ἑτέρῃ τῆ ἡ παρῶ Θεῶ Λογῶ, τῆ δε και ανωτέρῃ και κρειττοτῶ, ον δη δευτερευειν εφαιμεν της ανωτατω και αγεννητῆς φυσειῶς Θεῶ τῆ παμδασιλειῶς. παρ' ἔ δη και αυτῶ επιχορηγημενω ο Θεῶ Λογῶ, και ωσπερ ἐξ αιωνῶς πηγῆς θεοτητῶς αναβλασανουσης αεζομενω, τοις πασι ομῆ και δη και αυτῶ τῷ Αγιῷ Πνευματι, μαλλον απαντων αυτῶ προσεχει και εγγυτατῶ οντι, ταις τε μετα τῆτο νοστῶς και θεῶς δυναμεισιν αθροῶς και ανεπιφθονῶς των τῆ οικειῶς φωτῶς μαρμαρυγῶν μεταδιδωσι. την δε των ολων αγεννητον [it should be, αγεννητον, as before] Αρχην, αγαθων απαντων ἔσαν πηγην, θεοτητῶς τε και ζωῆς ομῆς και φωτῶ, και πασης ἀρετῆς αιτιον, και Πρωτην γε ἔσαν των Πρωτων και Αρχων Αρχην, μαλλον δε και Αρχῆς και Πρωτῶ, και πασης ρητῆς τε και καταληπτῆς επινοιας επεκεινα, τα μιν παντα, οσαπερ εν ἀρετῶς δυναμεισιν περιεβλήφε, τῷ πρωτῷ γενηματι κοινωνειν μονῷ, ως αν μονῶς οἶν τε χωρειν και αποδεχεσθαι, την τοις αλλοις εκ εφικτην ἔδε χωρητην, τῆ Πατρῶ των αγαθων αφοβαιν. τα δ' εν μερει τοις κατα μερος ἀξίοις, δια της τῆ Δευτερῶς διακονιας τε και μεσιτειας, κατα το εκασῷ εφικτον εμπαραχειν. ον τα τελευτα, και ακρως αγια, τῷ Τριτῷ μιν ἀφ' εαυτῶ, αρχοντι τε και ἡγεμενω των μετεπειτα, δια τῆ Τιῶ τα περι τῆ Πατρῶ επικομιζομενω, δεδωρησθαι. εἴθε οι παντες Εβραϊων θεολογοι, μετα του επι παντων θεου, και μετα την Πρωτοτοκον αυτῆ Σοφίαν,



some confusion as to the disposition of the parts, from the tumultuous crowding of ideas upon the mind of the relator; but over which is a strong lustre of useful intelligence; the Son of God comes forward to our view, arrayed with peculiar pomp of Deity. He is “the very Wisdom and the very “Logos of God,” that was “the Principle of all “things,” and “the Principle of the framing of “the universe.” He was “generated from no “other than the Father.” He is “the First-be- “gotten” of the Father, “the Coadjutor of the “Father’s council, and imaged after him.” He “presides over all things that were created after- “wards.” And the Jews have therefore “been “accustomed to call him, the Image of God, and “the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God, “and the Logos of God; yea and even the Gene- “ral of the host of the Lord, and the Angel of the “grand council.” With such a “fulness of the “Godhead” internally, with such a plenitude of power and such a splendour of glory externally, was the Son of God believed by the Jews to appear, in the presence of the angels and on the throne of their Divinity!

But all this is again repeated in other words, and so is enforced the more upon the mind. The Son

φίαν, την Τρίτην και αγίαν δύναμιν, Άγιον Πνευμα προσειπόντες, αποδεικ-  
 ζουσιν υφ' ε και εφωτισονται διορθωμενοι. See note to the extract in  
 text. 2d, before.

is “ the Second after the Father, being the equally  
 “ fabricating and enlightening power of the Divine  
 “ Logos.” He was therefore called by the Jews,  
 “ the true Light, and the Sun of Righteousness.”  
 He is in fact “ the GOD Logos.” He draws  
 “ Divinity” from the Father, “ as from a perpe-  
 “ tual and over-flowing fountain of Divinity.” He  
 “ is the First-begotten,” to whom “ alone the Fa-  
 “ ther “ communicated,—all whatever he held in-  
 “ volved in his unspeakable powers.” And he  
 “ alone was capable of taking in and receiving  
 “ that, which is not to be attained or taken in by  
 “ others; the abundance of the Father’s goods.”  
 Such a bright blaze of Divinity from the very  
 Sun of Divinity in the Father, is lodged in the  
 bosom of the Logos; the only orb competent to re-  
 ceive it, within all the range and compass of possi-  
 bilities<sup>2</sup>.

Yet an addition is even made to this. A Third  
 Person in the Godhead, is now noticed; and his Di-  
 vinity gives an extraordinary confirmation, to the  
 Divinity of the Son. There is, “ after the Second  
 “ person, a Third; THE HOLY GHOST.” This

<sup>2</sup> “ The Jews commonly call him,—the *Second Glory* and the  
 “ *Crown of the Creation*. Rittangelius brings their authorities for  
 “ this, in Seph. Jetzira, p. 4 and 5” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 173).  
 “ The Jews believe till this day, that, although the λογος is *Jehovah*,  
 “ nevertheless the Father is *the Superior Light*; and they call it *the*  
 “ *Great Luminary*. R. Men. fol. 135, col. 2” (p. 334).

“ very

“ very Being” the Hebrews “ rank, in the first and  
 “ royal dignity and honour of a Principle of the  
 “ universe; he himself being constituted by the  
 “ Maker of all, a Principle of the things created  
 “ afterwards.” Thus holding “ the third rank” in  
 the Deity, he “ assists those who are inferior to  
 “ him with his better powers,” and so becomes  
 “ the Ruler and Governor of them below” him.

Nor are we, independently of Eusebius’s very satisfactory evidence, without full testimony from other quarters, of the Jewish belief in the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. This third sharer in the essence of the Godhead, must have been as familiarly known as the Godhead itself, to the Jews of Moses’s days; or he would have conveyed no ideas to them, when he wrote for their instruction these words: “ In the beginning GOD created the heaven  
 “ and the earth; and THE SPIRIT OF GOD moved  
 “ upon the face of the waters.” He is accordingly noticed by a Jew, a hundred and fifty years prior to our Saviour; as “ *the Divine Spirit*, by which  
 “ Moses was also proclaimed a prophet<sup>b</sup>.” In the book of Judith also, which is supposed to have been written in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, and was certainly written in Chaldaick for the exhortation of the Jews; the hymn of thanks to God runs thus: “ Lord, thou art great and glorious,

<sup>b</sup> Eusebius, p. 221. Το Θεῖον Πνεῦμα, καθ’ ο καὶ προφητῆς ἀνακηρύσσεται.

“ wonderful in strength, and invincible; let all  
 “ creatures serve thee; for thou spakest, and they  
 “ were made, thou didst send forth thy *Spirit*, and  
 “ it created them.” He is noticed too by Philo,  
 in the Wisdom of Solomon, under his *evangelical*  
 appellation; Philo saying to God in a just strain of  
 devotion, “ thy counsel who hath known, except  
 “ thou give wisdom, and send *thy Holy Spirit* from  
 “ above<sup>d</sup>.” And he is equally noticed under his  
*evangelical* appellation, by the Jewish author of the  
 Second Book of Esdras; who prays God to “ send  
 “ *the Holy Ghost*” into him, that he may write the  
 history of the world from the beginning<sup>e</sup>. These  
 Jews speak of him in all the easy manner, in which  
 we Christians speak of him at present. In the  
 same manner does John the Baptist also mention  
 him, in the Gospel narration of his preachings.  
 He announces to his hearers the speedy appearance  
 of the Grand Reformer, who “ shall baptize them  
 “ with *the Holy Ghost* and with fire<sup>f</sup>.” The Holy  
 Ghost therefore was familiarly and equally known,  
 to the Baptist and to his hearers. But, even when  
 the birth of the Baptist was promised to his despair-  
 ing father, the promising angel uses the same lan-  
 guage exactly; and tells the Jewish priest, that this  
 miraculous son of old age and barrenness “ shall be  
 “ filled with *the Holy Ghost*, even from his mother’s

<sup>e</sup> Judith, ch. xvi. 13—14, Grotius, and Allix, p. 70.

<sup>d</sup> Wisdom, ix. 17.

<sup>e</sup> II. Esdras, xiv. 22.

<sup>f</sup> Mat. iii. 2.

“womb<sup>g</sup>.” The promise was conveyed in language, no doubt, well known in its sound to the ears of the priest, and carrying clear and appropriate ideas to his mind. Even when the same angel appears to that Jewish heroine in humility and faith, the Virgin Mary; and assures her she was selected by God, to be the mother of the Messiah; in the same language and with the same ideas, he explains the miraculous mode by which she was to become so. “*The Holy Ghost*,” he says, “shall come upon thee; and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee<sup>h</sup>.” These words must have conveyed the same meaning to her, which they convey to us. The Holy Ghost must have been a personal Principle of Power, in the universe; as much believed and revered by her, as he is by us. And by the instant transition of the angel’s ideas and words, from “the Holy Ghost” to “the Power of the Highest;” and by his immediate reference of the same act, to both; we see the Holy Ghost at once, in her opinions and in his, and in those of the whole nation, to be “the” very “Power of the Highest” himself. Such casual strokes as these, when so large and so broad, prove authentic vouchers for the general faith; and show the Jews at the time, to have adored God the Holy Ghost, equally with God the Son, and equally as “the Power of the Highest<sup>i</sup>.”

But

<sup>g</sup> Luke i. 15.

<sup>h</sup> Luke i. 35.

<sup>i</sup> The Jews “knew the third person” in the Trinity, “by the

But then this very Being, in the estimation of the Jews, is inferior to the Son. The powers, which he is declared by Eusebius and the Jews above to possess, "he receives," as Eusebius adds, "not from any other than from the God Logos, who is truly higher and better, and whom we have said to be the Second, to the Most High and the ungenerated person of God the universal king." It is the Logos too, that "communicates the splendours of his domestick light to—the Holy Ghost himself, who is nearer to him than all, and very nigh." But it is the Father, who originally communicates them through the Son. "The Father's goods" the Father "affords,—in part to those who are partially worthy, by the ministry and mediation of the Second One, as every person can attain; of which the perfect and the highly sacred things, were imparted by the Father himself to the Third One, who through the Son receives the things of the Father." So thoroughly and completely God is the Logos, that through him the Sun of the Father's Divinity penetrates, to form another Sun of Divinity in the Godhead, and to consummate the shining Triad in the reigning Monad of the Deity!

"name of Binah or Intelligence, because they thought it was He that gave men the knowledge, of what God was pleased to reveal to them. In particular, they called him the Sanctifier, and the Father of faith; nor is any thing more common among them, than to give him the name of the Spirit of Holiness, or the Holy Spirit" (Allix's Judgment, p. 173).

"From

“ From hence,” as Eusebius finally tells us, “ the Hebrews, *after* the God over all, and *after* his First-begotten Wisdom, DEIFY the Third and Holy Power, calling him Holy Ghost; by whom also those were enlightened, who were inspired by God.” The original Sun of Divinity, and his two successively formed *Parbelii*, these the necessary and co-eternal effusions of that, and of the same splendour and greatness with it; all unite to constitute that awful system of Intellectual Light, which is at once the cause, the centre, and the soul of the universe; from which all existences derive their commencement and receive their continuance, and to which they are like so many stars attending upon it: some of a superior lustre, as the angels; some of a dimmer brightness, as men; and some of a grosser beam, as the animate and inanimate objects around us; but all, like stars, sinking into a temporary annihilation, when this Triple Sun puts forth its splendours, and only to be seen when it wraps itself in the shades of night. And, with such lively and glowing colours, has the Divinity of the Son been peculiarly blazoned forth to the world; as the foundation of all rational hope in him, who by the energy of his preachings, the virtue of his life, and the efficacy of his death, was to ransom us from the captivity of sin and misery: that Jews and that Christians, in all ages before and since his coming for this purpose, have firmly believed him to be

God, while they expected him to be man, while they beheld him a man, and even while they acknowledged him to have been a man; contemplating the Deity, in the very clouds and darkness around him; and viewing that darkness and those clouds, lined with a light of glory within, more than human, more than angelick, and all Divine<sup>k</sup>.

## 8.—To

<sup>k</sup> “As the first Christians make use of the word *number* when they speak of the Divine Wisdom, acknowledging that it differs in number, but not in substance, from the Eternal Father (So Justin doth against Tryphon); and do acknowledge some *degrees* between the three persons (so doth Tertullian in some places); and afterwards have made use of the word *person* [rather thus: and—have made use of the word *person*, and afterwards do acknowledge some *degrees* between the three persons]: so the ancient Jews have among them the same terms, which shews they had the same ideas. They speak of the *Sephiroth*, that is of the *numbers*, in the Godhead; they speak of the several *Madregoth*, which is *degrees*; they speak of *Profopin* [from the Greek  $\pi\rho\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu$ , see p. 160], which is *persons*” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 163). Of “the third *Sephirah*, which they call *Binah*, and which we take justly to be the Holy Ghost,—they teach that it proceeds from the first *by* the second” (p. 165—167). “They attribute equally the name of *Jehovah*, to the second and the third *Sephirah*” (p. 168). “The author of *Zohar* cites these words of R. Jose (a famous Jew of the second century), where examining the text, Deut. iv. 7, “Who have their *Gods* so near to them,” “What” faith he, “may be the meaning of this? It seems that Moses should have said, Who have *God* so near them. But—there is a *Superior God*, and there is *the God who was the fear of Isaac*, and there is an *Inferior God*: and therefore Moses faith, The *Gods* so near. For there are many virtues that come from *the Only One*, and *all they are One*” (p. 169). And as Methodius calls the Son expressly, “the all-powerful and strong *band* of the Fa-  
“ther”



8.—To these evidences, so powerful and so irresistible, I shall add merely the evidence of an early Jew, as it is produced by Eusebius; in order the more amply to prove, that Eusebius's descriptions of the Jewish theology are perfectly Jewish in themselves. This new witness is Aristobulus, who lived at Alexandria, like Philo; but lived long before him, being tutor to Ptolemy Philometor, and about a hundred and fifty years prior to the Christian æra. He was also, what seems very extraordinary to our imaginations in a Jew, one of the Peripatetick philosophers of antiquity. And some fragments of a work of his, that has since perished, are luckily preserved by Eusebius<sup>1</sup>.

In one of these, Aristobulus speaks of a "Second Cause" in the formation of the world, like Philo; but, like him too, speaks of it easily and familiarly, as a Principle known and acknowledged among his countrymen; and, like both Philo and Eusebius, gives it the appellation of "Wisdom." These are, says Eusebius, "Aristobulus's words concerning  
 " THE SECOND CAUSE. " And let *this* be transferred also to THE WISDOM. For all light is  
 " from it. Wherefore some also [of the Jews]

" ther" (Bull, p. 148); so do the Jews in their Targums, &c. call him and the Holy Ghost *the two hands* of the Father, by which he founded the world, &c. (Allix's Judgment, p. 150 and 162). So does likewise Irenæus call them (iv. 37. p. 330).

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, 190, 221, and 241, and II. Maccabees, i. 10.

“ have said, being of the sect of the Peripateticks ;  
 “ that this has the office of a lamp, for they who  
 “ follow it continually, shall through all their life  
 “ remain without trouble. But one of *our* proge-  
 “ nitors, Solomon, more plainly and more beauti-  
 “ fully said; that it existed before the heavens and  
 “ the earth<sup>m</sup>.” In this short passage; we see the  
 sentiments of Aristobulus and his countrymen,  
 concerning the Logos; a full century and a half be-  
 fore Philo. They called the Logos “ the Wisdom”  
 of God. They considered him as equally acting with  
 God the Father, in the formation of nature; as  
 being equally a “ Cause” of that formation, with  
 him; and as being a “ Second Cause,” while he  
 was the primary. They also revered him, as we  
 ourselves revere him at present, for the great “ Fa-  
 “ ther of Lights” to men, and for “ the true  
 “ Light, which lighteth every man that cometh in-  
 “ to the world<sup>n</sup>.” They even looked up to him,  
 like us Christians, as the mighty centre of souls to  
 man; that happy point, to which the good are con-  
 tinually gravitating; on which, with a vivid feeling  
 of consolation from it, they are leaning secure; and

<sup>m</sup> P. 190—191. Αριστοβουλος περι τε αυτε [τε Δευτερας αιτις].

Μεταφοροειτο δ' αν το αυτο και επι της Σοφιας, το γαρ παν φως εστιν εξ  
 αυτης. διο και τινες ειρηκασι των εκ της αιρεσεως οντες εκ τε περιπατη,  
 λαμπτηρος αυτην εχειν ταξιν' ακολουθοντες γαρ αυτην συνεχως, αταραχαι  
 κατατησανται δι' ολε τε βιω. σαφεσερον δε και καλλιον των ημετερων προ-  
 γωνων τις ειπε, Σολομωνι, Ηγο ησαν και γης αυτην υπαρχειν.

<sup>n</sup> Ep. of James, i. 17, and John, i. 9.

from which, under all the labours of life, and amidst all the distractions of the world, they are perpetually “ finding rest unto their souls °.” And they awfully acknowledged him, with all this friendliness for man, to be infinitely dignified above him; to have existed, before the heavens were expanded over his head, and before the earth was spread under his feet; and indeed to have acted, in spreading and expanding them for him.

But Aristobulus proceeds in another fragment, to a more lofty account of the Logos; though it must still turn upon the same incidents, in his personal and official nature. The finest parts of the creation, are formed of simple elements of matter. The Sun is compounded of the same ingredients, as a rose. But the Sun is much more brilliant, though both are beautiful. And Aristobulus thus unveils his Sun to our eyes.

Endeavouring to show, how much “ the Greeks “ owed to the philosophy among the Hebrews;” he tells us: “ Pythagoras, and Socrates, and Plato, “ seem to me to have *surveyed all [the law of Moses]* “ *with a curious eye*, and to have followed him in “ saying, that the materials of the universe heard “ the voice of God; all accurately believing it to be “ made by God, and to be incessantly bound together by him. And Orpheus also, in his poems

° Mat. xi. 29.

“ on the things said to him according to the Sacred  
 “ Word, declares thus concerning all nature hav-  
 “ ing been made, and being now preserved, by the  
 “ Divine Power; and concerning God being over  
 “ all. And he says thus P.” Aristobulus here  
 makes these very remarkable lines of Orpheus,  
 which (if not his) appear at least, from being so  
 early attributed to him, to be of a very remote an-  
 tiquity; *all his own*, and evidences equally of the  
*Jewish* as of the Christian faith: by citing them for  
 proofs, of what the Greeks in general had borrowed  
 from “ the philosophy among the Hebrews,” and  
 of what had been said to Orpheus in particular,  
 “ according to the Sacred Word.” And, as I shall  
 not affect to give these, any more than those from  
 the Jewish play before, *additional* elegance and spi-  
 rit; I shall confine myself, as I did before, to blank  
 verse in my translation, that the copy may not lose  
 any of the marking touches of the original, and so  
 the English bard prove an unfaithful representative  
 of the Græcian <sup>q</sup>.

To

P Eusebius, p. 388. Οπως και προ ημων Αριζοβουλος ο περιπατητικος,  
 εκ της παρ' Εβραϊοις φιλοσοφιας αμολογει της Ελληνας ωρμασθαι . . .  
 . . . . . δοκωσι δε μοι, περιτειχασμενοι παντα, κατακολληθηκεναι  
 Ηυθαγορας τε και Σοκρατης και Πλατων, λεγοντες ακθειν φωνης τε θεσ  
 την κατασκευην των ολων, συνθεωρουντες ακριβως υπο θεσ γεγονυιαν και  
 συνεχρημενην αδιαληπτως. επι δε και Ορφους, εν ποιημασι των κατα τον ιε-  
 ρον λογον αιτω λεγομενων, ετως εκτιθεται περι τε διακρητειςθαι θεσ δυ-  
 ναμει τα παντα και γενητα υπαρχειν, και επι παντων ειναι τον θεον. λεγει  
 δ' ετως.

<sup>q</sup> These reputed poems of Orpheus, who himself lived near thir-  
 teen

To whom I should, I'll tell (but, ye Profane,  
 Shut close the doors, and fly the just man's laws)  
 That Rule Divine, which is to all proposed:  
 And thou attend, the Son of Mene bright,  
 Musæus; for some solemn truths I'll speak:  
 Nor let what is already in thy breast,  
 Rob thee of this delightful age to come.

ON THE DIVINE LOGOS look, approach him near,  
 To him direct thy intellect and heart,  
 Walk firmly in his path, and gaze upon  
 The sole, th' immortal Maker of the world:  
 For all THE ANCIENT LOGOS shines in him.  
 He is the One consummate in himself,  
 And all things take their finish'd form from him.  
 With them he is encircled; nor can any  
 Of mortal spirits see him, for he is  
 By the mind only to be seen at all.  
 But he from good educes never ill  
 To mortal men; though love and hate attend him,  
 Famine, and war, and much-lamented woes.  
 Nor is there other one; and all you'll see  
 At once, if first you see him here on earth.

To you, my Son, I'll show him, when I view  
 The steps and strong hand of the mighty God.

teen hundred years before our Saviour, are ascribed by Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 397, and by Tatian, p. 173 (Paris, 1626, along with Justin Martyr), to Onomacritus of Athens, who lived in the time of the Pisistratidæ, about five hundred and thirty before our Saviour. But they are attributed by an authority much earlier than these or any other witnesses, even by Aristobulus here; to Orpheus himself. Upon any scale of chronology, however, they are very ancient. And this particular poem has been mis-interpreted by ancients and by moderns, from an error in the first concoction, concerning the scope and aim of the whole; and from a want of attention, to the particular turn and manner of the original.

But

But him I see not; for around him spreads  
 A thick dark cloud, and from me hides the rest;  
 While tenfold darkness hides him from mankind.  
 Of tribe-form'd men no one shall see him reign,  
 But he alone, who was a branch broke off  
 From the high stem of the Chaldæan race;  
 And who was skill'd in the sun's orb and path,  
 How round the earth it forms its circle just,  
 And on its spindle moves exactly true;  
 How through the air, and through the deep of waves,  
 It guides the winds, and flames a blaze of fire.

But fixed THE LOGOS is in ample heav'n,  
 There mounted on his golden throne he sits,  
 And rests his feet upon the earth below.  
 To Ocean's bounds his right hand he has stretch'd;  
 The hills are trembling to their base within,  
 His wrath's dread weight unable to sustain.  
 But still to heav'n his person he confines,  
 And thence performs whate'er he wills on earth;  
 Having within himself at once the End,  
 The Midst, and the Beginning, of all things.

As the great LOGOS of the Antient Times,  
 Who is of matter to be born, ordain'd;  
 I've had the law all folded up from God:  
 Or else I should not dare to speak of it.  
 E'en now I shake through all my shuddering limbs,  
 Though from the sky, I know, he reigns o'er all.  
 But, O my Son, do thou these thoughts receive,  
 A sacred silence keep concerning them,  
 And in thy bosom lay them safely up.

In

r P. 388—389.

Φθεγξομαι οἷς θεμῖς ἐστὶ (θυραὶ δ' ἐπιθεσθε βεβηλοῖ,  
 Φευγῶντες δικαίων θεσμῶς) θεῖοιο τιθεῖλος

In this curious extract from one of the poems of Orpheus, with equal concern and admiration we see the

- Πασι νομῶ· συ δ' ἀκθε, Φαεσφορῶ εὔλονε μηνῆς  
Μησαι'. ἐξερῶ γὰρ ἀληθεῶ· μῆδε σε τὰ πρῖν
5. Ἐν γηθεσσι φανεύια, φίλης αἰωνος ἀμερση.  
Εἰς δὲ λόγον θεῖον βλεψας, τῆλ' ὑποπροσεδρευε,  
Ἰθύνων κρᾶδης νοερον κύλος· εὐ δ' ἐπιβᾶινε  
Ἄβραπίη, μῖνον δ' ἐσορα κοσμοιο τυτώλην  
Ἀθανάλιον· παλαιος δὲ λόγος περὶ τῶδε φαεῖναι.
10. Εἰς εἰς' αὐλολελης, αὐλε δ' ὑπο παύλα τελεῖται·  
Ἐν δ' αὐλοῖς αὐλος περινοσσεῖται· ἔδε τις αὐλον  
Εἰσορα φυχῶν θνήλων, ἠὲ δ' εἰσορααῖται.  
Αὐλος δ' ἐξ ἀγαθῶν θνήλοισ κακῶν ἐκ ἐπιελλες  
Ἀνθρωποῖς· αὐλῶ δὲ χάρις καὶ μῖσος ὀπηδεῖ,
15. Καὶ πολεμος, καὶ λοιμος, ἰδ' ἀλγεα δακρυοεῖα...  
Οὐδὲ τις εὐθ' εἶερος· συ δὲ κεν ρεῖα παύλ' ἐσορησαις,  
Αἰκεν ἰδῆς αὐλον πρῖν δὴ πόλε δεῦρ' ἐπι γαῖαν.  
Τεκνον ἐμον, δεῖξω σοὶ ὀπηνικα δερκομαι αὐλε  
Ἰχθια, καὶ χεῖρα σῖβαρην κρᾶλεροιο θεοιο.
20. Αὐλον δ' ἐχ ὄρω· περὶ γὰρ νεφος ἐσηρικῖαι  
Λοῖπον ἐμοι, γασιν δὲ δεκα πύχαι ἀνθρώποισιν.  
Οὐ γὰρ κεν τις ἰδοὶ θνήλων μεροπῶν κραινοῖα,  
Εἰ μὴ μνηνογενῆς τις ἀπορρωξ φυλε ἀνωθεν  
Χαλδαίων· ἰδρὶς γὰρ ἐν ἀγροιο ποροεῖς
25. Καὶ σφαιρης, κινήμ' ἀμφὶ χθόνα ὡς περιελλεῖ,  
Κυκλιότερες γ' ἐν ἰσῶ κατὰ δὲ σφείερον κνωδάκα·  
Πνευμάλα δ' ἠνιοχεῖ περὶ τ' ἠερα καὶ περὶ χεῦμα  
Ναμάλιος, ἐκφαῖναι δὲ πυρος σελᾶς φηγενηε.
30. Αὐλος δὴ μεγαλ αὐθὶς ἐπ' ἔρανον ἐσηρικῖαι,  
Χρυσῶ ἐνὶ θρονῶ· γαῖη δ' ὑπο ποσσι βεβῆκεν·  
Χεῖρα δὲ δεξιέρην ἐπὶ τερμασιν ὠκεανοιο  
Ἐκλείακεν, ὄρεων δὲ τρεμει βασις ἐνδοθὶ θυμῶ,  
Οὐδὲ φερεῖν δύναται κρᾶλερον μενος. εἰς δὲ παύλας  
Λύλος ἐπεραμος, καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ παύλα τελεῖται,
35. Ἀρχὴν αὐλος ἐχῶν καὶ μεσσοῦν ἠδὲ τελεῖτην.

the old bard, searching out for his Redeemer amidst  
the clouds of Heathenism, catching a strong and lively  
glimpse

Ὡς Λογος αρχαιων, ως υλογενης, διελαξεν,  
Εκ θεοθεν γνωμαισι λαβων [λαβων] καλα διπλακα θεσμον·  
Αλλως ε θεμιτον δε λεγειν· τρομεω δε γε γυια·  
Εν νομ εξ υπαλι κραινει περι πανι' ενι ταξει.  
40. Ω τεκνον, συ δε τοις νοισι πελαζεο, γλωσσην  
Ευ μαλ' επικραλειων· σερνοισι δε ειθεο φημην.

Many of these lines are equally cited, by Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 63—64, and 723—724; and by Justin Martyr, p. 15—16, and 104—105. But it is apparent from a collation of all, that neither they nor Aristobulus quote the lines, regularly as they stood in the original. They leap over some, and yet continue the metre. The broken lines are made to unite and knit together, just as if they had never been broken. By this kind of critical chirurgery, Aristobulus has omitted some which they supply, and they have dropt others which he furnishes. And though the weight of my argument must rest, only on what Aristobulus has given himself; yet the elucidation of the sense, requires all the scattered parts to be re-united here.

Thus, to overlook little variations that affect not the sense, the second line is entirely omitted by Justin, in both his citations; and the third is connected thus,

Γκαλιες ομως· συ δ' ακυε, κ. γ. λ.

What is surprizing, the very same suppression, and the very same connexion, are in Clemens, p. 63. At the eighth line, the last word is *ανακλια* in Justin and in Clemens; and the first of the next line, *αθαναλιον*, is omitted in Justin, but preserved by Clemens (p. 63 and 723). Clemens also omits all the rest of the ninth line, as Justin does the whole. The tenth to the thirteenth lines are read thus, by both Justin and Clemens; only Clemens in the eleventh reads the verb, as Aristobulus does:

Εις εσ' αυλογενης, ενος εγγονα πανια τελακλαι,  
Εν δ' αυλοις αυλος περιγυνηλαι· εδε τις αυλον  
Εισοραχ θνητων, αυλος δε γε πανιας οραλαι.



glimpse of him at times, and then losing him again in the gathering thickens of his atmosphere. We see him  
him

He is the One *produced by himself*,  
And all creation is *the child of one* ;  
With that he is encircled ; nor can any  
Of mortal spirits see him, *while himself*  
*Sees all.*

The thirteenth to the fifteenth lines run thus in Justin and in Clemens, with only *φύεται* in the latter (p. 725) for *δίδωσι* in the former ;

Οὐλος δ' ἐξ αγαθοιο κακον θνητοις διδωσι,  
Και πολεμον κρυσεια, και αλγεα δακρυσεια.

But he from good educes ill to men,  
And bloody war, and much-lamented woes.

The fourteenth line is entirely dropt. And, in consequence of this, the whole passage is made to affirm in Justin and Clemens, what the former part of it denies in Aristobulus. In the sixteenth line, there is an omission of a contrary nature. Aristobulus leaves out what Justin retains, but what indeed is not necessary to the fullness, though it is to the clearness, of the sentiment :

Ουδε τις εσθ' ελερος χωρις μεγαλη βασιληος,

Nor is there other *than the Mighty King.*

The rest of the sixteenth, and all of the seventeenth to the nineteenth lines, is omitted by Justin. The twenty-first is also omitted by him, and these two are subjoined to the twentieth :

Πασιν γαρ θνητοις θνηται κοραι εσσιεν εν οσσοις,  
Ασθενεις δ' ιδειεν Δια τον παντων μεδεονια.

For mortal are the pupils in the eyes  
Of mortal men, too weak to look on Jove  
The King of all.

At the twenty-third line Clemens remarks, that Orpheus, “ having pronounced God to be invisible, says he is to be known only by a  
“ certain

him very naturally exulting in the view; calling on his son Musæus, to share it with him; yet considering

“certain person, by birth a Chaldæan; meaning either Abraham “or a son of his” (p. 723). Clemens certainly did not understand the passage. It speaks not of the general invisibility, but of the particular appearance, of the Logos. Orpheus too means Abraham only. This is plain from the double description of him, as an exile from Chaldæa, and as a proficient in astronomy. Eusebius (p. 244—246) cites Berofus, who lived near three hundred years before our Saviour, witnessing that Abraham was “skilled in the knowledge “of the heavens,” *τα θρανια εμπειρος*; Eupolemus of nearly the same age, that “he was even the discoverer of the Chaldæan astrology,” *την αστρολογιαν και χαλδαϊκην ευρειν*; Artapanus of nearly the same, that from Chaldæa “he went forth to Phœnicia, and taught astrology “to the Phœnicians,” *πρωτον μεν ελθειν εις φοινικην, και τες φοινικας αστρολογιαν διδαξαι*; Eupolemus again, that “he came and dwelt in “Phœnicia, and taught the Phœnicians the changes of the sun and “moon, and all the other things” relating to astronomy, *τροπας ηλιου και σεληνης, και τα αλλα παντα, διδαξαντα τες φοινικας*; and Nicolaus Damascenus, who was nearly cotemporary with our Saviour, that “he taught arithmetick and astrology to the Egyptians,” *την τε αριθμητικην αυτους χαριζειναι, και τα περι αστρολογιαν παραδιδωσι*. Thus does the best of mere men, who stands so distinguished in Sacred History, as one whom God peculiarly honoured with the high title of his friend; stand equally recorded in Profane History, as the inventor of astronomy for the Chaldæans, the first astronomers upon earth; and as the teacher of it and of arithmetick to the Egyptians and Phœnicians, the earliest scholars and navigators of antiquity. And, as he is equally marked for a great astronomer here; so is he here introduced, to be the representative of the nation that descended from him.

Clemens recites the whole passage concerning Abraham, with Aristobulus; but Justin recites the twenty-ninth line afterwards, in this manner:

*Ουλος γαρ χαλκειον ες θρανον εσηρικται,*

ing himself in the act, as presuming to undraw the curtain of the sanctuary, and to disclose the solemn

turning the *ample* heaven into a *brazen* one. Justin also gives us the thirty-second and thirty-third lines, in which Clemens agrees with Aristobulus; after this very different form from both:

Πανλοθεν εκλίτακεν\* περι γαρ τρεμει υρεα μαυρα,  
Και ποταμοι, πολιος τε βαθος χαροποιο θαλασσης.

. . . . His right hand he has stretch'd  
On every side, and round him trembling lie  
The hills, the rivers, and the hoary deep.

The thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh are omitted by Clemens, though he produces the lines immediately antecedent and subsequent. And what is very singular, and shows at once the cause of all these variations; Clemens, who in p. 723 exhibits the lines thirty to thirty-three in their regular and proper form, in p. 725 exhibits them again in this contracted and deranged manner:

Χειρα δε δεξιητην επι τερμαλις ωκεανοιο  
Πανλοθεν εκλίτακεν, γαιη δ' υπο ποσσι βεβηκεν.

To Ocean's bounds his right hand he has stretch'd  
On every side, and rests his feet on earth.

In the third line I have chosen to understand *μνη* as an appellative, the real name of Musæus's mother. Where we have so much of sound theology; it seems quite ridiculous with the other interpreters, to describe Musæus as the son of the moon. And Musæus, who is here addressed as the son of Orpheus and the offspring of Mene, appears from both appellations to have been the real child, and not the literary one, the son and not the disciple, of Orpheus.—In line thirty-sixth, *υλογενης* I have rendered, “he that is of matter to be born;” considering it in unison with the whole context, as predictive of the future, and only in the present time by a prophetic anticipation.—Line thirty-seventh is very obscure. There is certainly one false reading in it. This I have corrected, by inserting in a hook what I think the true one. And I have given the whole the only sense, which I think it is capable of admitting.

secrets of God; and so standing forth the venerable prophet of the Messiah, to the early ages of Heathenism. His historical knowledge concerning the great Chaldæan, induces us the less to wonder at his theological acquaintance with the Logos. He had access to some sources of information, which have been long useless to the world, and have therefore been lost by it. And the current from them runs with an amazing clearness and force, through the pages of this poet.

“The Divine Logos,” he cries, “is to begin upon earth a delightful age to come;” and let no prejudices of opinion or of practice, rob man of the blessing. Look on him, ye future ages; approach to him, ye nations of the world. Bend your understandings, and mold your hearts, to his “Rule Divine; that is to all proposed,” but is particularly intended to be “the just man’s law.” Walk firmly in the path, which he prescribes to you; and gaze upon him, as “the only, the immortal Maker of the world.” He is “the Antient Logos;” “the Logos of Antient times;” and the August Personage, that has been so long proclaimed to the ages of mankind. He is all-sufficient in his nature; being “the One” Existence, who is ever “con-summate in himself.” He is the Person, from whom “all things took their finished form,” at the creation. He is also the vivifying spirit of the world, at present; invisible to the eye, and discernible

ible only by the mind, of man. "From the sky, "I know, he reigns over all." Thus is he the controller and governor of man, a powerful controller and a gracious governor; never punishing his creatures, by turning their goodness into evil to them; but showing "love" to the good, and "hate" to the wicked; and sending his attendants, "Famine, "War, and Woes," to chastise a sinning world. "Nor is there other one" in all the universe, but He, the mighty monarch of it. And men will "at "once" find all this account of him, however grand, to be just; when they shall "see him, here on "earth" and "born of matter." I shall then be happy, to point him out to the eye of man, to show the wonders of power on the hand, and to mark the wonders of kindness in the steps, of this "Mighty "GOD." But alas! I shall not see him then. For he vanishes in a thick cloud from my sight, and the hour of his coming is concealed from me. But the rest of mankind, I see, do not enjoy even my views of him; and are in a "darkness" concerning him, "tenfold" greater than my own. Indeed "of tribe- "formed men, no one" shall see him "reigning" by residing upon earth; except only he, who is derived from the Refugee of Chaldæa, that father of astronomy to the earth. In the mean time, however, the Logos is in heaven; there "sits upon his "golden throne;" and all the while "sets his feet "upon the earth." But lo! from thence, at this

instant, I see him doing an act of vengeance on the world. He has already extended his right hand, "to the bounds of the ocean." And "the hills" are trembling within to their base," as unable to sustain the weight of his wrath. Yet he still confines his person to heaven. He thence exerts his arm of energy, and executes all his purposes upon earth. And he comprehends within himself, at once the Beginning, the Middle, and the End, of every Being in the whole compass of nature.

Such is the astonishing delineation of the Grand Saviour of mankind, by the very early pencil of this respectable Heathen! It is very like the delineation of him, given us by Virgil before. Both are, no doubt, copies taken from the same primitive original. This copy by Orpheus, is awfully pleasing and agreeably striking. The veil of Heathen ignorance, indeed, has thrown a shade over some of the finer features of the face. But the figure comes lively and boldly forward, upon the canvas. We hail with religious rapture the Evangelical Restorer of man, we gaze with devout fondness upon our Patron and our Benefactor, in this antient portrait by the hand of Heathenism. And in reverential silence we contemplate, the dignity of the Godhead on his brow, the luster of the Godhead in his eye, and the majesty of the Godhead through all the lineaments of his face. Such is the *Jove* of the Christians, as formed by this *Phidias* of little fame!

It serves wonderfully with Virgil's, Epicharmus's, and all the other accounts before; to show us what an insight many good men had, in the early ages of Heathenism, into the great counsels of Heaven for the recovery of man. It particularly shows us in conjunction with them, with what a strong effusion of light they saw the *nature* of Him, who was to be the agent in carrying those counsels into execution, and in effecting that recovery by them. And it finally unites with all, to show us the three grand divisions of past and of present mankind, Heathens, Jews, and Christians; all concurring to ascribe the plenitude of derivative Divinity, to their common Logos; and all in concert acknowledging him with pious awe, as their *Brother* by a material birth, as their *Instructor* and *Exhorter* by office, and yet, under the Father, as their CREATOR originally, their GOVERNOR and PRESERVER at present, and their LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT for ever<sup>s</sup>.

## CHAPTER

<sup>s</sup> Justin Martyr, p. 16, repeats these lines additional, from the same poet :

Ουρανον, ορκιζω σε, θεε μεγαλε, σοφε, εργου  
 ΑΥΔΗΝ ορκιζω σε Πατρος, την φθεξαλο πρωτον,  
 Ηνικα κοσμον απαυια εαις σθηξαλο βυλαις.

Thee I adjure, O heav'n, the work of Him  
 Who is the wise and mighty God; thee too,  
 VOICE of the Father, I adjure, whom first  
 He into being spoke, when all the world  
 By his own counsels he established.

## CHAPTER THE FOURTH.

## — I. —

IN this decisive and demonstrative manner, have we seen the original opinions of the Jews, all fixedly centered

We have seen the Logos called the φωνη or *Voice* of God, by Artapanus before (Part Vth. a note); as he is here called the Αυδη or *Voice* of the Father, by Orpheus. Orpheus thus notices the Logos for the first time, as the *Son* of God; by denominating God his *Father*. He also represents him, just as Philo and the first Christians do, even those who give him a positive *co-eternity* with the Father; as produced by the Father, *when* he deputed him to create the world. And Justin, p. 24, cites these wonderful words from Plato, which are in his Book De Legibus, lib. iv. p. 600. (Opera Omnia, Genevæ, 1590); ο μὲν δὴ ΘΕΟΣ, ὡσπερ καὶ Ὁ ΠΑΛΑΙΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ, Ἀρχὴν καὶ Τελευτήν καὶ Μεσὰ τῶν πάντων ἐχῶν; “GOD, as also THE “ANCIENT LOGOS, has the Beginning and End and Middle of “all things in himself.” Justin strangely applies, as the modern translators do, “the Antient Logos” or “Word” to the law of Moses. Just so have the translators and interpreters done, with the same words in the poem of Orpheus. But the acquaintance of Orpheus or of Plato with the law of Moses, is an incident not attested by any evidence, in the slightest degree historical; and in the real state of that law, all locked up as it was from inspection of Heathens by its Hebrew language, is impossible to be true in itself. The mere reading indeed of the *poetical* extracts, shows the meaning of it beyond a doubt. Nor can even the *prosaical*, by any laws of construction, admit of a different meaning. And Orpheus’s application of the very same words to his God Logos, and Philo’s application of similar words to him, λογος ο περιεσφιδατος, or the very Antient Logos



centered in the belief of a Trinity in the Godhead. But how long they retained these opinions, is not so clear. The latest authority which Eusebius has adduced, is that of Philo the cotemporary of the Apostles. So late are we sure that the Jews still persisted, in the sentiments of their Fathers and the Patriarchs. But a revolution of such a magnitude as this, a revolution that changed the whole position of the globe, as it were, and totally inverted the poles of it; would require a long continuance of time afterwards, to effect it. It openly began, I fear, immediately after Philo. But it made only a slow and un-alarming progress, for a long time afterwards. This the Book of Baruch, the Second Book of Esdras, and the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs, very plainly concur to tell us. The mode, in which these three works assert the Divinity of the Son of God, like that of the Book of Wisdom and all the other works of Philo; incidental in itself, professing no opposition to audacious hereticks among their countrymen, and expecting no encounter from formidable hereticks among them;

Logos (iii. 6); unite to point out to us at once, what the obvious import of them in Plato would induce us, and what the necessary principles of construction must compel us, to consider as their genuine meaning. Thus interpreted, Plato concurs with Orpheus, Virgil, Epicharmus, and all the Jews, in giving a positive Divinity to the Logos; and so closes an astonishing chain of evidence, for this primitive truth, this great principle of natural as well as of revealed religion.

speaks sufficiently to the point, and shows the general faith to be still the same in the time of all. And the Jews continued, like their enemies the Christians, to worship a God of three persons in one substance; and the second of these persons, as peculiarly the Lord of nature, and the God of their nation: even when they had crucified him in a human form, upon one of their hills near Jerusalem; when they had repeated their rebellion against him, by persecuting his followers on every side; and when his religion, in spite of all their efforts, had taken deep root in their soil, had shot out its branches into the nations around, and was preparing to cover the whole world with its shade.

As late then as the beginning of the second century, did the Jews generally continue in the faith of their ancestors and of all mankind, concerning the Deity of the Logos or Son of God. So far did the heaven-descended Nile flow on, generally pure and limpid in its waters. But it soon contracted an apparent foulness, from the muddy soil through which it was now running. In half a century, it became discoloured all over; and has continued so ever since. This the dialogue of JUSTIN MARTYR with TRYPHO the Jew, which was written about the year 155<sup>t</sup>, comes in with a melancholy efficacy to show us.

<sup>t</sup> See Mod. Un. Hist. xiii. 164.

“The prophets,” says Trypho, “glorified the Creator of all things, God, even *the Father*; and proclaimed him that was to come from him, *Christ his Son*.” The Jews, like our modern Arians, still acknowledged their Messiah to be the *Son of God*; but, like them, in some equivocal and ir-relative sense, that was incompatible with his Scriptural attributes of honour, incompatible with his Scriptural investment of Divinity. “As to what you say,” adds Trypho afterwards, “that this **CHRIST EXISTED AS GOD FROM ALL ETERNITY,** and then endured to be born and become man, and yet not man off man; *seems to me,—not only paradoxical, but also foolish*.” “I,” says Justin, “replied to this,” that “I know the account seems paradoxical, and *principally to the men of your nation*;—but I can show, that **HE EVEN PRE-EXISTED THE SON OF THE CREATOR OF ALL THINGS, being GOD, and was born man through a virgin**.”

“*We all,*” as Trypho rejoins, “*expect Christ to be born a man off men*;—answer me therefore first, how you can show that there is *any other God,*

<sup>u</sup> P. 225. Τον ποιήτην των όλων θεον και Πατέρα εδοξαζον, και τον παρ αυτη Χριστον υιον αυτη κληγγελλον.

<sup>x</sup> P. 267. Το γαρ λεγειν σε, προυπαρχειν, θεον ούλα, προ αιωνων τυλον Χριστον, ειλα και γεννηθηναι ανθρωπον γειομενον υπομειναι, και οτι εκ ανθρωπος εξ ανθρωπου, ε μονον παραδοξον δοκει μοι ειναι, αλλα και μωρον.

<sup>y</sup> P. 267. Οιδ' οτι παραδοξος ο λογος δοκει ειναι, και μαλιστα τοις απο τη γενεα υμων— αποδειξαι—δυναμαι, οτι και προυπηρχεν υιος τη ποιητη των όλων, θεος ων, και γεγεννηται ανθρωπος δια της παρθενε.

“besides

“ besides the Creator of all things<sup>z</sup>.” “ Show me,” he repeats again, “ that there is *any other* confessed “ by the spirit of prophecy to exist, besides the “ Creator of all things<sup>a</sup>.” Justin accordingly sets himself to show, that “ in the beginning, before all “ creatures, God GENERATED a certain Rational “ Power OUT OF HIMSELF, which is also called by “ the Holy Ghost” in Scripture, “ THE GLORY OF “ THE LORD, and sometimes SON, and sometimes “ WISDOM, and sometimes ANGEL, and sometimes “ GOD, and sometimes LORD and LOGOS;” that this Being “ is testified by the Maker of all things, “ to be WORSHIPPED as both GOD and CHRIST;” and that the Jews were all called upon, to know “ GOD who CAME FORTH FROM ABOVE, and who “ BECAME MAN AMONG MEN, and who is again to “ return, when *they who pierced him* shall see and “ lament<sup>b</sup>.”

“ Ye ought to blush,” answers Trypho, “ at say-

<sup>z</sup> P. 268. Πάντες ἡμεῖς τον Χριστον ανθρωπον εξ ανθρωπων προσδοκωμεν γεννησεσθαι. P. 269. Αποκριναι εν μοι προλερον, πως εχεις αποδειξει, οτι και αλλος Θεος παρα τον ποιητην των ολων.

<sup>a</sup> P. 274. Αποδειξον ημιν, οτι ελερος Θεος παρα τον ποιητην των ολων, υπο τη προφητικη πνευματος ωμολογηται ειναι.

<sup>b</sup> P. 284. Απο των γραφων δωσω, οτι αρχην, προ παντων των κτισματων, ο Θεος γεγεννηκε Δυναμην τινα εξ εαυτη λογικην, ηλις και Δοξα Κυριω υπο τη Πνευματος τη Αγιω καλειται, ποτε δε Υιου, ποτε δε Σοφια, ποτε δε Αγγελος, ποτε δε Θεου, ποτε δε Κυριου και Λογου. P. 287. Οτι γην και προσκυνητος εστι, και Θεου και Χριστου, υπο τη αυτα ποιησαντος μαρτυρημενος. P. 288—289. Ινα και Θεου ανωθεν προελθουσα, και ανθρωπον εν ανθρωποις γενομενον, γνωρισητε, και παλιν εκεινον παραγεννησμενον, ου οραν μελλουσ και κοπιεσθαι οι εκκενησαντες αυτου.

“ *ing these things*; and rather say, that this Jesus  
 “ *was a man off men*: for you attempt to demon-  
 “ *strate a point incredible, and almost impossible*, that  
 “ *God endured to be born, and to become man<sup>c</sup>.*”  
 “ *Since you say,*” he subjoins, “ *that Christ was*  
 “ *pre-existent AS VERY GOD, and by the will of*  
 “ *God was made flesh, and born man off a virgin;*  
 “ *how can ye demonstrate his pre-existence<sup>d</sup>?*”  
 Justin therefore proceeds to demonstrate it, assert-  
 ing Joshua to have given only a temporary inherit-  
 ance to the Jews, “ *as being not Christ THE GOD,*  
 “ *or THE SON OF GOD;*” and noticing the Sacra-  
 ment of the Eucharist, as “ *a memorial of the*  
 “ *Passion, which GOD suffered IN THE VERY GOD<sup>e</sup>.*”  
 And at the close Justin says thus: “ *if ye had known*  
 “ *these things, O Trypho, ye would not have blas-*  
 “ *phemed him, who has now been come, been*  
 “ *born, has suffered, and has ascended into heaven;*  
 “ *who shall also appear again, and then shall your*  
 “ *twelve tribes mourn: for if ye had understood the*  
 “ *sayings of the prophets, ye had not denied him to*

<sup>c</sup> P. 291. Ὑμεῖς, τὰ αὐτὰ—λεγοῦντες, αἰδεῖσθαι οφειλίη, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λεγόμενοι λέγειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν θεῖον. P. 292. Ἀπίστων γὰρ, καὶ ἀδυνατῶν σχεδόν, πρᾶγμα ἐπιχειρεῖς ἀποδεικνύσαι, ὅτι θεὸς ὑπομείνει γεννηθῆναι, καὶ ἀνθρώπος γενεσθαι.

<sup>d</sup> P. 314. Χριστὸν,—καὶ θεὸν αὐτὸν, προϋπαρχοῦντα λέγεις, καὶ, κατὰ τὴν ἑλληνικὴν θεῶν σαρκοποιήθειαν, αὐτὸν λέγεις διὰ τῆς παρθενῆς γεγεννησθαι ἀνθρώπων· πῶς δυνατὸν ἀποδειχθῆναι προϋπαρχῶν.

<sup>e</sup> P. 340. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ προσκαιρὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὴν κληρονομίαν, αἷς ἔχριστος ὁ θεὸς ὢν, ἠδὲ υἱὸς θεοῦ. P. 345. Ἐν ἧ καὶ τῆ παθῆς, ὁ πεποιθεὲς ἐν αὐτῇ ὁ θεὸς τῆ θεῶν, μεμνηταί.

“ be GOD, the *Son* of the only and un-begotten and  
 “ un-describable God <sup>f</sup>.”

— II. —

So evidently had the Jews *then* made a grand turn, in that prime principle of theology, which they had professed for so many ages before. The turn indeed is an amazing one. They had veered round the whole compass of their belief, in this point; and the needle now stood pointing to the opposite pole. And as this had been effected, no doubt, by a gradual advance of variation; so was that variation, we may be sure, produced by the concussions, which their faith received from the assaults of the Christians. In the violence of their opposition to the Christians, and in the animosity of their zeal against these *new* professors of *their own* theology; they abandoned their theology, in order to be dissimilar to them. With the natural trepidation of minds, that have more of passion than principle within them; they precipitately ran from *them* and from *themselves*, at once.

But, besides this general reason, they had a peculiar one of their own. They would feel most

<sup>f</sup> P. 355. Εἰ ἐγνωκείη, ὁ Τρυφων, — ἔκ αν εβλασφημείη εἰς αὐτον ἡδὴ και παραγενομενον, και γεννηθεντα, και παθοντα, και αναβαιντα εἰς τον ορανον· ος και παλιν παρῆσαι, και τοις κοψονται υμων αι δωδεκα φυλαι. ἔπει εἰ νενοηκατε τα εἰρημενα υπο των προφητων, εκ αν εξηρησεθε αὐτον εἶναι θεον, τω μονῳ και ἀγεννητῳ και ἀρρητῳ θεῳ υἱον.

forcibly the strong reproach of the Christians against them, derived from the Divine Nature of their Messiah. They had crucified him, when he came to them. They had thus crucified the Son of God, the God of their fathers and of themselves. This crucified personage the Christians had now received for *their* God, denominating themselves from his Greek appellation of Messiah, and discriminating themselves by the *adoration* of his Divinity. And, in order to escape from this horrible imputation, the Jews were impelled by every sense of shame, and instigated by every principle of passion; to alter the tone of their belief in this point, and to deny what they had so long acknowledged. They thus retired from the holy ground, on which they and their fathers had stood posted for so many ages; and fell back to new ground, that bordered on the very region of infidelity.

That, in the first and second century, the Christians *did* discriminate themselves from the Jews, by the direct and profest adoration of our Saviour as God; is evident from a variety of testimonies Hea-then and Christian, that singly are some of them well known, and yet are few of them known in their union. St. Stephen's dying recommendation of his soul to THE LORD JESUS, so similar in its import to our Saviour's recommendation of his to the Father, and so closely accompanied with that act of more than human generosity in both, the  
prayer

prayer of intercession for their murderers, then in the very deed of murder; carries the worship of our Saviour, to the highest point possible of Christian antiquity<sup>g</sup>. The general mode of commencing and concluding the Epistles of St. Paul, in a prayer of supplication for the parties, to whom they were addressed; in which he says, "Grace to you and Peace from God our Father, and"—from whom besides? "THE LORD JESUS CHRIST;" in which our Saviour is at times invoked *alone*, as "the Grace of OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST be with you all," and is even invoked the *first* at times, as "the Grace of THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, *and* the love of God, *and* the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all;" shows us plainly the practice of the original Christians, in the conduct of this greatest of all the apostles, and in the behaviour of that first of all the martyrs<sup>h</sup>. And the practice was so predominant among these, our earliest ancestors in the religion of the Gospel, that it became their own designation for themselves; the historian of the apostles, and the principal writer of the apostolical epistles, familiarly characterizing them by the descriptive title, of "all that in every place CALL UPON THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD<sup>i</sup>."

<sup>g</sup> Acts vii. 59—60.

<sup>h</sup> Romans i. 7 and xvi. 24, 1 Cor. i. 3 and xvi. 23, 2 Cor. i. 2 and xiii. 14, Gal. i. 3 and vi. 18, Ephes. i. 2 and vi. 23, &c.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. i. 2, Acts ix. 14 and 21, and 2 Tim. ii. 22.



So interwoven with the very frame and texture of our religion, with the first threads and original web of it, does the invocation of Christ appear to have been; by the very hand of Christ himself! Accordingly we see all ages of the Christians afterwards, represented in the historical symbols of St. John, as associating our Saviour with God in their worship; saying to him, “ THOU wast slain, and hast re-  
 “ deemed us to God by thy blood out of every  
 “ kindred and tongue and people and nation,—and  
 “ we shall reign on the earth;” adding, “ Worthy  
 “ is THE LAMB that was slain, to receive Power,  
 “ and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and  
 “ Honour, and Glory, and Blessing;” and repeat-  
 ing, “ Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, and  
 “ Power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne,  
 “ *and* unto THE LAMB, for ever and ever<sup>k</sup>.” This  
 singular prophecy, which binds up the very worship  
 of our Saviour with the very truth of our religion,  
 by declaring the worship shall go on with the re-  
 ligion in all ages, and be the marking element of  
 it in all; has been actually fulfilled to the honour of  
 our religion, in all ages since it was uttered; the  
 main body of Christians in every period and through  
 every nation, however differing in other points,  
 having united with the apostles and Evangelists, in  
 “ calling upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.”

<sup>k</sup> Rev. v. 9—10, 12, & 13.

Heathens concur with Christians, to show this in the first and second century.

That famous epistle of Pliny to Trajan, comes immediately in proof; in which the Christians of his time are reported, from *their own* accounts, in their Sunday meetings for worship before daylight, and in their liturgical service antecedent to the Eucharist, principally and particularly to “sing hymns to CHRIST as GOD;” and which Eusebius in a later period quotes for history, and by quoting corroborates, thus, “they sung hymns to Christ ACCORDING TO THE FORM OF WORSHIPPING GOD<sup>1</sup>.” A very little later than Pliny was Polycarp, who

<sup>1</sup> Pliny x. 97. “Carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere;” and Eusebius Eccl. Hist. iii. 33. p. 128. τοῦ χριστοῦ θεοῦ δίκην ὑμνεῖν. In this passage of Pliny’s Epistles, the word *sacrament*, which is not repeated by Eusebius, is *first* used for one of the discriminative formalities of Christian worship, and for that which we peculiarly denominate *the* Sacrament at present. The Christians declared of themselves, says Pliny, that they used “se—SACRAMENTO non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent: quibus peractis,” after the Sacrament, “morem sibi discendendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen, et innoxium,” in their *Ἀγάπαι* or love-feasts; “quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo, secundum mandata tua, hetarias esse vetueram.” So old is the present language of Christians, concerning the Eucharist! The language is only what was used by the Christians to Pliny, and re-used by Pliny to the Emperor. And the Christians appear from all, to have met for publick worship *every Sunday*, “*stato die*,” to have paid their worship to Christ *every Sunday*, and *every Sunday* to have received the Sacrament at the close of it. So usefully liturgical is Pliny!

shows

shows us the usage of his cotemporary brethren, in writing thus to the Philippians, " May the God  
 " and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, *and* may  
 " HE HIMSELF, the Eternal High-Priest, the Son  
 " of God, Christ Jesus, build you up in faith and  
 " truth—; and give to you a lot and part among  
 " his faints, and to us with you, and to all who are  
 " under heaven, who shall believe in our Lord  
 " Jesus Christ *and* in his Father:" and in beginning  
 his epistle to them like a genuine apostle, thus,  
 " Mercy and Peace be multiplied unto you, from  
 " God Omnipotent, *and* from THE LORD JESUS  
 " CHRIST our Saviour<sup>m</sup>." But in another work  
 we see Polycarp and his cotemporaries, still more  
 strikingly portrayed to us as the worshippers of our  
 Saviour. In that circular letter, which gives us so  
 pleasing and pointed an account of the martyrdom  
 of this hero in Christianity, *immediately after it hap-*  
*pened*; which Scaliger declared to be so affecting to  
 him in the perusal, as to transport him beyond him-  
 self; and which is addressed by the whole assembly  
 of Christians at Smyrna, to all the assemblies of

<sup>m</sup> Ruffel's Patres Apostolici, ii. p. 228. Epist. ad Philipp. Ελεος  
 υμιν και ειρηνη παρα θεου παντοκρατορος, και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου τε σωτηρος  
 ημων, πληθυνθεισιν; and p. 247. sect. xii, where the Greek is lost,  
 " Deus—et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et ipse Sempiternus  
 " Pontifex, Dei Filius, Jesus Christus, ædificet vos in fide et veritate,  
 " —et det vobis sortem et partem inter sanctos suos, et nobis vobif-  
 " cum, et omnibus qui sunt sub cælo, qui credituri sunt in Domi-  
 " num nostrum Jesum Christum et in ipsius Patrem."

their brethren “in every part of the Holy and Catholic church;” the introductory prayer runs in this very style of Polycarp and of the apostles, “May Mercy, Peace, and Love, be multiplied to you, from God the Father, *and* from our LORD JESUS CHRIST.” In the account itself, Polycarp, who declares he had now served Christ “for eighty-six years;” whom the Heathens of Smyrna declared, to be “the Master of Asia, the Father of the Christians, and the Overthrower of their Gods;” and whom the Christians revered so much in their common intercourses with him, as to press to touch his very skin<sup>n</sup>; thus pays his dying acknowledgments to our Saviour, in conjunction with the Father and the Holy Ghost. “I praise thee,” he says to God the Father as he stood at the stake, “I bless thee, I glorify thee, *with* the Eternal and Heavenly JESUS CHRIST, thy beloved Son; *WITH WHOM* to thee *and the Holy Ghost* be glory, both now and to the future ages. “Amen.” This illustrious martyr, like his leader

<sup>n</sup> Ruffel, ii. p. 323—324. Κατα πάντα τοπον της αγιας και καθολικης εκκλησιας, and ειλας, ειρηνη, και αγαπη απο θεου Πατρος, και του Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου, πληθυνειν. See also the note for Scaliger.

<sup>o</sup> P. 340. Sect. ix. Ουδνηκοιτα και εξ ειη εχου δελευων αυτη. Sect. xii. p. 346. Ο της ασθενας [rather Δισιας] διδασκαλος, ο πατηρ των Χριστιανων, ο των ημετερων θεων καθαιρετης, and p. 350. Sect. xiii. Δια το ασκασον των πιτων σπαδαζαν, ος τις ταχιον τε χρωλος αυτη αφηλαι.

P. 352. Sect. xiv. Ανω σε, ευλογω σε, δοξαζω σε, συν τω αιωνι και επερανω Ιησω Χριστω, αγαπητω σε παιδι· μεθ' ε σοι και Πνευματι Αγιω η ύδα, και νυ και εις τες μελλουσας αιωνας. Αμην.

in martyrdom St. Stephen, worships our Saviour with his last breath.

But the describers of his death, who appear to have been present at all this impressive scene of martyrdom, inform us of an additional circumstance; that is very remarkable in itself, and very signally indicates the general worship of our Saviour, among the Christians of the time. The *Jews*, who had concurred with the Heathens in the executive part of this martyrdom, suggested and urged, say the narrators; that the body of Polycarp should not be given to the Christians, for the rites of sepulture; lest they, “*leaving* “the crucified man, should begin to *worship* Polycarp.” So apparently in the opinions of the Heathens, did the Christians worship Christ! But as the narrators remark with a just indignation, at the idea of Christians worshipping any *created* being; “they know not that WE CAN NEVER LEAVE CHRIST, “—OR WORSHIP ANY OTHER; FOR WE ADORE HIM, “AS BEING THE SON OF GOD.” So avowedly, in the acknowledgments of the Christians themselves, did they worship Christ! And they even derived their very appellation, we may be sure, from the most obvious and most striking manifestation of their attachment to Christ, that which was infinitely more

† P. 360. Sect. xvii. Μη, — αφενεις τον εσαυρωμενον, τελον αρχωνται σεβασθαι.

† Ibid. ibid. Αγωνεις, οτι εις τον Χριστον ποτε καταλιπειν δυνασομεθα, — εις ειρον τινα σεβασθαι. Τελον μιν γαρ, υιον οντα τε θεου, προσκυνημεν.

striking and obvious than their belief in him, and that by which (as we have just seen) they were expressly denoted among themselves; their “calling upon the name of Jesus Christ their Lord,” or, in other words, their adoration of him as their God.

The martyred Polycarp, adds the narration, “having by patience subdued the unjust governor, and having so received the crown of immortality; exulting *with the apostles and all the just*, glorifies God even the Father, *and* blesses OUR LORD<sup>s</sup>.” The narration also fixes the time of the martyrdom, in this extraordinary manner; saying it was “when Philip the Trallian was Highpriest, when Stratius Quadratus was Proconsul, and when JESUS CHRIST WAS KING FOR EVER; TO WHOM be glory, honour, majesty, an everlasting throne, from generation to generation. Amen<sup>t</sup>.” And it concludes with this speaking form of doxology, in honour of the whole Trinity; exhorting the Christians to “walk in the evangelic word of

• P. 362. Sect. xix. Δια της υπομονης—καταγωνισαμενος τον αδικον αρχηλα, και εως τον της αφθαρσιας στεφανον απολαβων, συν τοις αποστολοις και πασι δικαιοις αγαλλιωμενος, δοξαζει τον θεον και Πατερα, και ευλογει τον Κυριον ημων.

† P. 366. Sect. xxī. Επι αρχιερευς Φιλιππου Τραλλιανου, ανθυπατευουσιος Στρατιου Κοδρατου, Βασιλευσιος δε εις της αιωνιας Ιησου Χριστου ω η δοξα, τιμη, μεγαλοσυνη, θρονος αιωνιος, απο γενεας εις γενεας. Αμην.

“Jefus Chrif, WITH WHOM be glory to God even  
“the Father *and the Holy Ghoft* <sup>u</sup>.”

With fuch an affemblage of evidences, for the univerfal worship of our Saviour by his followers, at this period; has the little history of Polycarp’s martyrdom fupplied us. But let us again appeal to a Heathen testimony, for the general fact. We have another epiftle like Pliny’s, yet much lefs known, and written by the emperor Adrian to one, who was conful in 134<sup>x</sup>. In this, a patriarch of the Jews<sup>y</sup> is faid by the Emperor, to have been “urged” on his coming into Egypt, “by one  
“party,” the Heathens, “to worship Serapis,  
“and by another,” the Chrifians, “TO WORSHIP  
“CHRIST<sup>z</sup>.” The worship of Chrif, we fee, was as much the test and touchftone of a Chrifian in Egypt; as the adoration of Serapis was of a Heathen there. But, a few years after this epiftle was

<sup>u</sup> P. 367—368. Sect. xxii. Στοιχεύνας τῷ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον λόγῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· μετ’ ἐδοξά τῳ θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ καὶ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι.

<sup>x</sup> “Serviano Cos.” This is C. Julius Servilius Urfus *Servianus*, Consul in 134, and Consul in 111, under the title of C. Julius Urfus Servilius *Servianus* (Fasti Consulares); called simply Ser. *Servianus* in one infcription of the time (Grævius’s *Thefaurus* xi. 444. edit. 1694); more simply *Servianus* in another (*ibid.* 445), juft as he is in the prefent epiftle; and *Servianus* again, in the very life of Adrian by Spartian (*ibid. ibid.*).

<sup>y</sup> Mod. Un. Hift. xiii. 144—145.

<sup>z</sup> Vopifci Saturninus, Aug. Hift. Scriptores, Lug. Bat. p. 959.  
“Ipfe ille Patriarcha,—ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur  
“Chriftum.”

written, lived Justin Martyr. “ We worship and “ ADORE,” he says to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, in his apology for universal Christianity, “ God, *and* his SON, who came from him and “ taught us these things, — *and* the Prophetick “ Spirit.” “ We are not like Atheists,” he adds in another part of the same work, “ as we wor- “ SHIP the Fabricator of this universe; — *and* — “ JESUS CHRIST, — *having learned* him to be the “ Son of him who is truly God, and holding him “ in the *second* place; *and*, in the *third* order, the “ Prophetick Spirit.” So generally and so fixedly was Christ worshipped in union with the Father, by the Christians of the *middle* of the second century; that Justin notices it in an apology to a Heathen emperor, and notices it as one of the grand signatures of Christianity.

Yet let us turn to an authority, a little later in time, and Heathen in its nature. Heathen testimonies take faster hold upon the mind, than Christian do; because this circumstance must have been exceedingly prominent upon the face of Christianity, to arrest the attention of a Heathen. Lucian wrote a very few years after Justin, in order to ri-

<sup>a</sup> P. 56. Επειδὴν τε, καὶ τὸν παρ’ αὐτῆς υἱὸν ἐλθούσα, καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, — Πνεῦμα τε τὸ Προφητικόν, σέβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνούμεν.

<sup>b</sup> P. 60. Ἀβίου μὲν ἐν ὧς ἐκ ἐσμεν, τὸν δημιουργὸν τούτου τοῦ κόσμου, — καὶ — Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, — υἱὸν αὐτῆς τῆς οὐλῆς θεῶν μακάριον, καὶ ἐν ἀδελφῶν χωρῆς ἐχούσης, Πνεῦμα τε Προφητικόν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει.



dicule (as ridicule is the only argument of the profligate and the filly) that religion, which was then rising into great consequence, and which was yet exposed to infinite discouragements; and makes use of his acquaintance with the nature of the Christian Deity, to point his weak weapons against it. He objects in express terms to the Christians, that “they ADORE the very SOPHIST WHO WAS FASTENED UPON A CROSS<sup>c</sup>.” He also introduces a Christian, as instructor to a Heathen in the new theology of the world. His Heathen comes in abusing “those most accursed Sophists” the Christians, for some things which he had just heard from them; and swearing by the Jupiter of heaven. The Christian reproves him for the oath, because of the inability of his Jupiter to punish him, if he swore

<sup>c</sup> Opera Omnia (Basil. 1563) iv. de Morte Peregrini, p. 277.

Θεοὺς μὲν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀπαρησώνται, τὸν δὲ ἀνεσκολοπισμένον ἐκείνον σοφιστὴν αὐτῶν προσκυνῶσι. So p. 275, τὸν μέγαν γὰρ ἐκείνον ἐτι σεβῆσαι ἀνθρώπου, τὸν ἐν τῇ Παλαιῇ ἀνασκολοπισθέντα. See Pearson on the Creed, p. 203, for σκολοψ. “These unhappy men,” says Lucian, the wretched despiser of all that was great and lovely in human nature, “are persuaded they are wholly immortal, and shall live “for ever; wherefore they even contemn death, and many voluntarily “offer themselves to die. After their First Lawgiver persuaded “them, to be all brothers to one another; then they at once revolted, denied the gods of the Greeks, and now adore,” &c. Πειθῆκασι γὰρ αὐτοὺς οἱ κακοδαίμονοντες, τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀθάνατοι εἶναι, καὶ βιωσέσθαι τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον· παρ’ οὗ καὶ καταφρονεῖ τὸ θάνατον, καὶ ἔχοντες αὐτοὺς ἐπιδιδῶσιν οἱ πολλοί. ἔπειτα δὲ ὁ νομοθετὴς ὁ πρῶτος ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἀδελφοὶ πάντες εἶναι ἀλλήλων, ἐπειδὴν ἀπαξ παραβάντες, θεοὺς μὲν, κ. τ. λ.

falsely; and then holds up the whole system of Hea-then mythology, to the ridicule which it so naturally provoked from its intrinsic absurdities<sup>d</sup>. “ I will “ teach thee,” he adds, “ what is the universe, and “ who is he that was before all things, and what is “ the frame of the universe. For I myself was “ once in your unhappy situation, when the GALI- “ LEAN met with me. This *bald-beaded* and *book- “ nosed* man, having mounted through the air to “ the third heaven, and having learned there things “ of the fairest kind; has renewed us by water, has “ guided our feet into the steps of the Blessed, and “ has ransomed us from the regions of the ir-reli- “ gious. And I will make you, if you will listen “ to me, a man in reality.”

“ There was,” he subjoins concerning the chaos of “ the universe, “ He who was Light Incorruptible, “ Invisible, Incomprehensible, which dissolved the “ darkness, and chased this deformity away, a word “ only being spoken by *him*; as the Stammerer hath “ recorded. *He* compacted the earth upon the waters,

“ *he*

<sup>d</sup> P. 460. Philopatris. Των τρις καταρατων εκεινων σοφιστων, p. 461, εν τον Δια τον αιθεριον, and 461—468.

<sup>e</sup> P. 468—469. Εγω γαρ σε διδαξω τι το παν, και τις ο πρην παντων, και τι το συστημα τε παντ. και γαρ πρην κρω ταυτα επασχον απερ συ, ηνικα δε μοι Γαλιλαι ενετυχεν. αναφαλαντιας, επιρρη, ες τριτον θρανον αεζοδατησας, και τα καλλιγα εκμεμαθηκας, δι' υδατ ημας ανεκαινισεν, ες τε τα των μακαρων ιχθια παρεισωδευσε, και εκ των ασεβων χωρων ημας ελυτρησατο. και σε ποιησω, εν με ακηης, επ' αληθειας αυθηρων.

“ *he* stretched forth the heaven, *he* configured the  
 “ fixed stars, *he* commanded the course of those  
 “ whom

The personalities here concerning our Saviour, are very remarkable. But both these strong marks of similarity, the *hooked nose* and the *baldness*, are wholly discarded by our painters. Yet the authority of so early a writer as Lucian, is sufficient to assign them both to our Saviour. We have even the latter confirmed, in a signal and unnoticed passage of ecclesiastical history. Near the end of the fifth century, a painter of Constantinople (says Theodorus) “ presumed “ to draw our Saviour in the character of Jupiter,” *τε εν ταξει Διὸς τον Σωτηρα γραψαι πολμησαντος*. Like a second Phidias, no doubt, he drew him from the original of Jupiter in Homer :

Η, και κυανησιν επ' οφρυσι νευσε Κροτων  
 Αμβροσιαι δ' αρα χανται επερρωσαντο ανακτος,  
 Κρατος απ' αθανατοιο.

Jove spoke, and nodded with his dark-blue brows :  
 And on the head of the immortal king  
 Loose flowed his tresses scented with ambrosia.

The dark brows and the flowing tresses were given to our Saviour ; and our Jupiter was decorated with the two great ensigns of Homer's. But, what strongly shows the aversion of the age to such a portrait, the painter is said to have been punished by a miracle, for his rashness. And, as the historian remarks very appositely to Lucian's intimation, “ a different figure for our Saviour, one with *curled and thin* “ hair is more true ;” *το αλλο σχημα τε Σωτηρος, το ελον και ολιγοτριχον, υπαρχει το αληθεστερον* (Reading's Eccl. Hist. iii. 566). See also Pearson on the Creed, p. 87—88, for some more questionable particulars concerning the person of our Saviour. These attentions to it, are very pleasing to a pious mind. We are gratified by notices of this kind, when we meet with them about one of the heroes of antiquity. But we are gratified in a tenfold higher degree, by reverence mingling with our curiosity, and by the gratitude of piety enhancing our general antiquarianism ; in this Hero of the human race,

“ whom you worship as Gods. *He* also beautified,  
 “ the earth with flowers, produced man out of  
 “ non-entity

race, this grand Model of man, and this Affociator of our nature with Divinity.

Let me subjoin a remark merely critical, concerning the eye-brows of Jupiter above. They are considered as *black* by all the commentators and translators, but I have presumed to make them *darkly blue*. This seems strange, and yet it is just. ΚΥΑΝΕΟΣ in Greek, and *Cyanus* in Latin, have the idea of blue predominating in all their senses. Of this we cannot have a fuller proof, than that passage of Pliny: “ De Jaspidium Generibus:—magnitudinem jaspidis  
 “ undecim unciarum vidimus, formatamque inde effigiem Neronis  
 “ thoracatam: reddetur et per se CYANOS, accomodato paulo ante  
 “ jaspidis nomine, colore cæruleo” (xxxviii. 9). This was probably used in powder and infusion, by the ancient dyers; as Pliny says of the stone, that the ancients *stained* it, and that their dyers used Indian amethysts: “ adulteratur maximè tineturâ, idque in gloriâ regis Egypti ascribitur, qui primus eam tinxit;” and “ ad hanc,” the amethyst, “ tingentium officinæ dirigunt vota” (ibid). The Romans had also a *flower* of the name: “ in Italiâ violis succedit rosa,  
 “ huic intervenit liliū, rosam *cyanus* excipit, *cianum* amarantus” (xxi. xi). But how come the eye-brows of Jupiter, to be of the same colour with either the flower or the stone? They *were so* died, no doubt. The custom had previously prevailed among the Greeks, for *their own persons*; and was still kept up in Homer’s days, for the *statues of Jupiter*. Mahomet the impostor is declared to have died *the hair of his head*, with “ *al Henna* or *Cyprus indigo*,” and other plants (Mod. Un. Hist. i. 232). The women “ of better condition” in Egypt, to this day “ paint their feet with a dye made of  
 “ a seed called *Hennah*; and they colour their eye-lids with black lead,  
 “ and so do many even of the men among the *Turks*” (Pococke, i. 192—193). The ΚΥΑΝΟΣ of the Greeks, the *cyanus* or *cianus* of the Latins, is evidently in its origin nothing more, than the *Henna* of the Egyptians and the Arabs, or the indigo of Cyprus; which being brought to us in cakes from the East-Indies, where the best is still made, by the Portuguese at first (I suppose), assumed among us the  
 Portuguese

“ non-entity into being, and is in heaven beholding  
 “ the just and unjust, and writing their deeds in  
 “ books,

Portuguese appellation, of *indico*, indigo, or the Indian blue; and which, being transplanted much earlier and over land in the seed into Egypt and Cyprus, retained its Indian appellation of *chenna* or *benna*, and gave name to a blue stone and a blue flower among the Greeks and Latins. This, when it is used by itself in painting, forms a blackish or dark blue. With this, no doubt, the Greeks painted the eye-brows of Jupiter's statues; and the poet borrowed the epithet from the custom. This indeed throws a circumstance into the description, which sounds strangely to *our* ears, and takes off from the sublimity of the whole. But then it accounts precisely for the introduction of the term, and gives us the full scope of the author's idea. And we have a remarkable passage in Pliny, that shows the painting of the statues of Jupiter, to have been once in high use even at Rome, and still to have continued in Ethiopia. “ *Invenitur in argentariis metallis,*” he says, “ *minium quoque, et*  
 “ *nunc inter pigmenta magnæ auctoritatis, et quondam apud Roma-*  
 “ *nos non solum maximæ, sed etiam sacræ: enumerat autores Ver-*  
 “ *rius, quibus credere sit necesse, Jovis ipsius simulachri faciem die-*  
 “ *bus festis minio illini solitam, triumphantumque corpora; sic Camil-*  
 “ *lum triumphasse; hæc religione etiam nunc addi in unguenta cœnæ*  
 “ *triumphalis, et a censoribus in primis Jovem miniandum locari:*  
 “ *cujus rei quidem causam miror; quanquam et hodie id expeti*  
 “ *constat Æthiopum populis, totisque eo tingi proceres, huncque ibi*  
 “ *deorum simulachris colorem esse”* (xxxiii. 7). We thus see the practice of painting the face, beginning with the human person, then communicated to the Divine statue, once retained by both at Rome; and, as late as the days of Pliny, retained by both in Ethiopia. But we may come still nearer to the point. In Judæa, in Greece, and at Rome, the women; and in Media, sometimes in Parthia, the very men; actually coloured over their *eye-brows* with a wash of antimony, that gave them a black appearance (Xenophon's *Κυβερηταίρια*, p. 15, Hutchinson, edit. 3d; and Ainsworth under *Stibium*). Even now, as appears from Mr. Bruce's Travels, the Ethiopians at times blacken their *lips* with antimony; and, as equally appears from Mr.

“ books, and will repay to all in the day which he  
 “ himself has appointed <sup>f</sup>.” Thus does Lucian re-  
 present the system of Christianity in that early day  
 of it, to have considered “ Him who is Light In-  
 “ corruptible, Invisible, Incomprehensible;” Him,  
 who at the creation “ dissolved the darkness, and  
 “ chased the deformity away, a word only being  
 “ spoken by him, as [Moses] the Stammerer hath  
 “ recorded;” Him, who then “ compacted the  
 “ earth upon the waters,” who “ stretched forth  
 “ the heaven,” who “ configured the fixed stars,”  
 and who “ commanded the course of those whom  
 “ the Heathen worshipped as Gods;” Him, who  
 afterwards “ beautified the earth with flowers,”  
 then “ produced man out of non-entity into being,  
 “ and is” now “ in heaven beholding the just and  
 “ unjust, and writing their deeds in books;” Him  
 therefore, who was so confessedly God in the opi-  
 nion of the Christians at that time, and who is so

Franklin's Travels into Persia, the Persian women rub their *eye-brows* and *eye-lids* with the black powder of antimony, which they call *Surmia*, and from which the native lustre of their eyes acquires an additional brilliancy.

<sup>f</sup> P. 469—470. Ην φως αφθιτον, ασρατον, ακατανοητον, ο λυει το σκοτος, και την ακοσμιαν ταυτην απηλασει, λογω μονω ρηθεντι υπ' αυτη, ως ο Βραδουγλωσσος απεγραψατο· γην επιξεν εφ' υδασιν, υρανον ταυτισεν, αστρας εμορφωσεν απλανεις, ορομον διαταξατο, ως συ σεβη θεως. γην δε τοις ανθεσιν εκαλλωπισεν, ανθρωπον εκ μη οντων εις το ειναι παρηγαγε· και εστι εν υρανω βλεπων δικαιως τε καδικως, και εν βιβλοισ τας πραξεις απογραφομενης, ανταποδωσει δε πασιν, ην ημεραν αυτος ειπεταιλο.

apparently

apparently the God of us Christians at present; to be our Saviour himself, “ the Judge of all the “ earth” in the language of the Old Testament, or, in the language of Christianity then as repeated by Lucian, Him, who “ will repay to all in the day “ which he himself has appointed.” From the minute particularity and the just accuracy of his notices here, Lucian plainly appears to have known the whole creed of our religion thoroughly; and to have seen the Christians univervally acknowledging one Being, for their original Creator, their present Inspector, and their future Judge. And, as we all confess the Judge to be in our estimation, and to have always been in theirs, our Great Redeemer himself; we must equally confess our Redeemer, to have always been in theirs what he is in ours, the present Inspector and the original Creator of man. “ Are “ then,” asks the Heathen with a well-preserved propriety of character, and in a natural tone of amazement at a doctrine, so wonderful in itself, and so formidable to our feelings, as God’s eye constantly surveying our actions, and God’s hand constantly recording them in writing; “ are then “ the acts even of the Scythians, written in heaven?” “ All of them are,” answers the Christian, “ for CHRIST is also among the Gentiles &.”

Lucian

† P. 473. Εἶπε, ἡ καὶ τὰ τῶν Σκυθῶν ἐν τῷ ἕρανῳ εὐχαριστῆσι. Τρ. πάντα, ἡ τυχοὶ γε Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν ἐθνεσιν. The Heathen mode of writing  
the

Lucian thus *expresses*, who his Judge, his Inspector, and his Creator to the Christians is. “ You talk,” replies the Heathen in ridicule, “ of many writers “ in heaven, for all things to be written down.” “ Be decent,” rejoins the Christian, “ and say nothing contemptuous of the propitious God; but “ be catechised and persuaded by me, if you wish “ to live for ever <sup>h</sup>.” Lucian thus owns the Christ of the Christians, to be their God. And I have cited these passages, as useful in themselves, and as introductory to another. They lay the foundation for the Christian adoration of our Saviour, in the Christian ascription of positive Divinity to him.

The original Creator of the world and of man, the present Inspector and Recorder of his actions, and the future Repayer of them at his own appointed day of judgment; was then in the opinion of the

the name of our Saviour, *Christus* instead of *Christus*; is well known. It is in Suetonius. It is here. And it is noticed by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Lactantius, and some others, as prevalent among the Heathens then; in their calling his followers *Christians*, instead of *Christians* (Bingham’s Orig. Eccles. Book I. ch. 1. sect. xi.). But though it was common among the Christians too, yet it has never been observed it was the mode of *pronouncing* the name, that gave rise to it among both. *Christus* was pronounced *Christus* by both, and was therefore written so by the Heathens. It is still pronounced so, by the French. And the name of St. Catherine’s *Cree* church in London, and of *Chrest*-cross row among our children, show our ancestors to have pronounced it in the same manner.

<sup>h</sup> P. 473. Κε. πολλας γεγραφεας φησ εν τω θρανω, ως απαντα απογραφεσθαι. Τρ. ευσομει, και μηδεν επισης φλαυρον δεσ δεξιω, αλλα κατηχημει. <sup>Θ</sup> πειθα παρ’ εμω, ειπερ ζην χρηζεις εις τον αιωνα.

Christians,



Christians, as was well known to the Heathens, CHRIST, the acknowledged and “ the propitious “ GOD” of Christianity. Christ was certainly, therefore, *worshipped* by those who *deified* him. We find him accordingly said expressly by Lucian before, to be worshipped. And we find that solemn appeal to him which an oath makes, and which is in substance a real act of worship, made to him in this manner. “ Whom then shall I adjure,” enquires the reprovèd Heathen. The Christian answers thus :

“ The God who keeps his residence on high,  
 “ The Great, th’ Immortal Sovereign of the sky ;  
 “ THE SON of the Father, THE SPIRIT proceeding  
 “ out of the Father, ONE OUT OF THREE, and  
 “ THREE OUT OF ONE : consider THESE as JUPI-  
 “ TER, esteem HIM as GOD.” This is evidently intended as a fair and undistorted representation, of the grand article in the catechism of the Christians then. And the Heathen is made to reply to it, with all the rash wit of a modern Arian. “ You teach “ me arithmetick,” he cries, “ and the oath is “ arithmetical ; for you even play the arithmeti- “ cian, like Nicomachus the Gerafene : and I know “ not what you say, ONE THREE, THREE ONE ; “ are you speaking of the Tetractys, or the Ogdoas “ and Triakas, of Pythagoras<sup>1</sup>?” Lucian here makes

<sup>1</sup> P. 468. Κρ. και τινα επαμοσομα, γε ; Τρ. Υψιμεδαντα Θεον, μεγαλη, μιβροταν, υρανιωνη, Υιον Πατρῶ, Πνευμα εν Πατρῶ εκπορευομενον, Εν

makes his Heathen do, as the Heathens undoubtedly did at the time, and as we hear some Christian Heathens occasionally doing at present; confound what is wholly distinct, substitute interchangeably the Essence for the Personality and the Personality for the Essence, and perversely apply the Unity to

ἐκ Τριῶν, καὶ ἐξ Ἐνὸς Τρία. Ταῦτα νομιζέ Ζηνα, τὸν δ' ἡγεῖ Θεον. Κρα-  
αριθμεῖν με διδασκεις, καὶ ὀρχῶ ἡ ἀριθμητικῆ· καὶ γὰρ ἀριθμεῖς, ὡς Νι-  
κομαχος ὁ Γερασηνος. ἐκ οὐδα γὰρ τί λεγεις, ἐν τρία, τρία ἐν. μὴ τὴν τε-  
τρακτεῦν φησ τὴν Πυθαγορῶν, ἢ τὴν οὐδοαδα καὶ τριακὰδα;

As Homer (I apprehend) supplies the first part of the Christian's answer, so Euripides certainly furnishes the close of it. Athenagoras quotes Euripides saying impiously by one of his characters, that "if Jupiter is in heaven, he ought not to make this good man miserable," and that in fact "the high, the unbounded æther, which clips the earth round in its moist arms, is Jupiter:"—

Τετον νομιζέ Ζηνα, τὸν δ' ἡγεῖ Θεον.

See Athenagoras's *Legatio pro Christianis*, p. 5, in the Cologne edition of Justin Martyr. And the same line is also quoted from Euripides, by Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* v. p. 717. The line, therefore, was well known formerly; and is actually quoted, as the note on Clemens shows, by Cicero and by Plutarch also.

Socinus rates this testimony of Lucian very highly. "I have not met with any thing like this," he says, "which seems more in favour of that Triune God, who was then received and worshipped by the Christians; than what is adduced in proof of it from the dialogue, which is denominated *Philopatris*, and inserted among the works of Lucian." "Nec vero nobis quidquam hætenus legere contigit, quod Trini istius Dei, a Christianis jam tum recepti et culti, fidem facere videatur magis; quam quæ ex dialogo, qui *Philopatris* inscribitur et inter Luciani opera numeratur, ad id probandum affert Genebrardus, l. 1 et 2, de Trinitate" (*Socini Opera*, ii. p. 698, Irenopoli, 1656). Nor can it be rated too highly.

the

the three Persons, and the Trinity to their one Nature. But he also shows us in his faithful glass of characters, a lively reflected image of the Christian deification of our Saviour. This awful personage is the Son of the Father, and with him and with the Spirit forms the Divinity of Heaven; being One of the Three that are personally distinct and substantially united, being with them considered as Jupiter was by the Heathens, and with them esteemed as God was among the Christians; an object of religious worship to the latter, and the centre of solemn appeals with them. And thus, from the suspended state of his mind betwixt Christianity and Heathenism, and from his consequent ability to keep up an historical exactness in his speakers, the profane satyrist becomes an useful witness, and the bold blasphemer materially serves the cause of the Gospel.

But I beg to make use of Lucian once more, and so to close my evidence for the adoration of our Saviour. The Christian Triephton comes at last to ask the Heathen Critias, what had occasioned the agitation of spirits, in which he appeared to be at their meeting. Critias at first refuses with an oath, to tell him. But his oath is no longer an appeal to Jupiter. It is a Christian oath, as of a man now half converted to the Gospel. "By the SON," he says, "HIM WHO IS FROM THE FATHER,

U

" I will

“ I will not tell you.” “ Tell me,” replies Triephon, “ and receive the power of telling me from *the Spirit.*” Critias then tells him, of his seeing “ a very large company” of Christians, “ whispering one another in the ear;” of his going up to them; of his finding them listening to an orator, a little old man, that “ coughed” and “ spit” and “ spoke with a thin weak voice;” of another speaking at intervals, who had “ a very shabby gown, no shoes to his feet, and no covering to his head,” and who “ gnashed his teeth” as he spoke. The subject of their conversation was the calamities, that they thought were coming on the empire. He was therefore leaving them with indignation. But one of them, who “ had the fierce look of a Titan,” laid hold of him by the gown; and carried him “ through gates of iron and paths of brass, and by very many circling staircases, into a hall roofed with gold,” and the Heaven of the Christians in the sky, I suppose. There he saw the inhabitants, “ bowing down” as in prayer, “ and very pale-faced” from their fasts. But at the sight of him they raised their heads with joy, and advanced to meet him, “ for they said we should bring them some bad news; as they appeared to pray for the most unhappy events, and rejoiced over calamities, like the avenging Furies in the theatres.” They then put their heads together, whispered, and said:

said: “ Who, whence art thou, what is thy city, “ and what thy parentage, for thou shouldst be “ CHRIST from thy figure ?” he himself, I suppose, being bald and hook-nosed. He told them. They enquired after “ the state of the city [Rome], “ and the state of the world.” “ These prosper “ and will prosper,” he replied. But they “ de- “ nied it with their nodding brows,” said the fact was not so, and declared the city to be in great pangs of labour; predicting “ disorders and con- “ fusions to come upon the city, and the armies to “ be vanquished by the enemy.” This they knew, they said, because they had “ continued fasting ten “ days, and, while they were watching at *their sing- “ ing of hymns* through the whole night, dreamed “ such things.” And it was this circumstance, which had thrown him into the agitation of spirits at first<sup>k</sup>. The Christian very properly advises him,

<sup>k</sup> P. 475. Κε. Νη τον Υιον τον εκ Πατρ<sup>ου</sup>, ο τετο γεννησεται. Τριτ. Λεγε, παρα τε Πνευματος δυναμιν τε λογε λαβων—; ωληθος παμπολυ, εις το ος ψιθυριζοντας—; p. 476. ανθρωπισκος τις,—σεσημειον γεροντιον, κ. τ. λ.; p. 477. τριβωνιον εχων πολυσαθρον, αναποδετος τε και ασκεπος, μετεπειτε, τοις οδωσιν επικροτων; p. 478. εις δε δριμυ και τιτανωδες ενιδων, κ. τ. λ.; p. 479.—δηλωμεν σιδηρας τε πυλας, και χαλκειας οδως, αναβαθρας δε πλειστας περικυκλωσαμενοι, a strong evidence, that our geometrical strain cases were then as well known, as they are at present, ες χρυσοροφον οικον ανηλωμεν, οισιν Ομηρος τον Μενελαω φησι, alluding to the lines which Mr. Fope has translated thus:

him, to sooth his passions into peace, by dismissing his anger at the Christians, and by using their forms of supplication to God. "Let the men alone," he says, "and begin with the prayer to the Father, and add *the Song of many names* at the close<sup>1</sup>." What was this Song? We have just

Then to the dome the friendly pair invite,  
Who eye the dazzling roofs with vast delight;  
Resplendent as the blaze of summer-noon,  
Or the pale radiance of the midnight moon.

. . . . .  
Above, beneath, around the palace shines  
The sumless treasure of exhausted mines;  
The spoils of elephants the roofs enlay,  
And studded amber darts a golden ray:  
Such, and not nobler, in the realms above,  
My wonder dictates is the dome of Jove.

## ODYSSEY IV.

There, he says, he saw not Helen, but *ἀνδρας επικεκυφοντας και κατωχρησμενους*, . . . . . *εφασκου γαρ, τινα λυγοαν [λυγραν] αγγελιαν αγαρομεν'* εφαινοντο γαρ ετοι; ως τα κακιςα ευχομενοι, και ιχαιρον επι ταις λυγροις, ωσπερ αι Ποινοποιαι επι θεατρα; . . . . . *τις, ποθεν εις ανδρων, ποθι σοι πολις, ηδε τοκης; Χρησος γαρ αν εις απο γε τε σχηματ;* p. 480. *πως τα της πολεως, και τα τε κοσμη' η' ο' εγω, χειρησι γε παντες, και επι γε χαρησονται' οι δε ανευεσαν ταις οφρυσιν, εχ' ετω, δυσκοι γαρ η πολις;* . . . . . p. 481. *αταξιαι δε και ταραχαι την πολιν καταληφονται, τα στρατοπεδα ηττονα των εναντιων γενησονται'* and p. 482. *ηλις δεκα ασιται διαμενεμεν, και επι πανυχις υμνηδίας επαγρυπνευτες, ονειρωτουμεν τα τοιαυτα.* So Julian the apostate speaks of Diodorus the Christian, as having "a face dreadfully pale," "*faciem pallore confectam*" (Facundus, iv. 2, p. 59). Lucian shows, that the Heathens fancied this paleness in the Christians, because of their fasting.

<sup>1</sup> P. 484. *Εασον τετες, την ευχην απο πατρος αρξαμενος, και την πολιωνυμον ωδη' εις τελος επιθεις.*

seen the chanted services of the Christians, to form the principal part, and so to give the general denomination, of their nocturnal devotions. Pliny also informs the emperor, that the Christians met “ before day, and *sung a hymn alternately to Christ as “ God<sup>m</sup>.*” But these songs of the church always terminated, with a “ Song of many names.” They terminated with that short hymn of glorification, which we still sing *to the whole Trinity.* We terminate every psalm so. So have all the western churches done, except the Roman; from and before the beginning of the fifth century. But the eastern and the Roman “ added the Song of many names,” only “ at the close” of all<sup>n</sup>. The Christians thus appear

<sup>m</sup> Epist. x. 97. “ Ante lucem convenire, *carmenque* Christo, “ *quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem.*”—There is a Greek hymn to Christ in Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 312; which has been conjectured by Bull, p. 169, to be either one of the very hymns here alluded to by Pliny, or one composed in imitation of them. But the reading of it is sufficient in my opinion, to show it is not the former. It is too wild, too figurative, and too abstracted, ever to have been used in any popular assembly. Nor does it divide itself into alternate parts. But it addresses our Saviour, as “ King of Saints, the “ All-conquering Logos of the Most High Father, Ruler of Wisdom,—Heavenly Way, Everlasting Logos, Infinite Duration, “ Eternal Light,” &c. And it is introduced thus: “ As we are “ now in the *church*, let us sing praises to the Lord” (p. 311).

<sup>n</sup> Cassian, lib. ii. cap. 8. “ Illud etiam quod in hac provinciâ “ [Galliâ] vidimus, ut, uno cantante, in clausulâ psalmi omnes astantes *concinant* cum clamore, *Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui “ Sancto*; nusquam *per omnem orientem* audivimus, sed cum omnium “ silentio,

appear in the time of Lucian, to have spent a portion of the night in publick devotions to God, to have made alternate psalmody the main substance of them, to have begun with a set prayer to God the Father, and to have ended their psalmody, as we end every psalm, and as we conclude our whole service, with an address to the Father, SON, and Holy Ghost, all specifically named together. And this testimony exactly coincides with a Christian and comprehensive one, about the *conclusion* of the second century; one Caius, a presbyter of Rome, saying expressly, that “the holy psalms and songs of the brethren, which *from the beginning* have been written by the faithful, are hymns DEIFYING CHRIST THE WORD OF GOD.”

We

“*silentio, ab eo qui cantat finito psalmo, orationem succedere, hanc vero glorificationem Trinitatis tantummodo solere antiphona terminari [antiphonam terminare].*” Bingham’s Orig. Eccl. Book xiii. chap. x. sect. 14. See also xiv. 1, 8.

° Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. v. 28. Ψαλμοὶ δὲ οσοὶ [it should be οσοῖοι] καὶ ὠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν, ἀπαρχῆς [ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς] γραφείσθαι, τὸν ὄγον τε θεῶν τὸν Χεῖρον ὑμνεῖν θεολογούντες. Irenæus adv. Hær. i. 5, p. 16, also shows us, that *at this very time* the Christians used the whole doxology, just as we now use it; he referring to the very close of it, *world without end, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων*. See Grabe’s note. That the *Messiah*, in the opinion of the very Jews themselves, *was* to be *worshipped*; see Allix’s Judgment, p. 290—291. Photius, in the note to Eusebius, points out the person who is the author of this testimony.

This dialogue of Lucian’s was written about 165, as appears from the close. “The pride of Persia,” says a person hastily coming in, “that has been formerly reported so loudly, is fallen, and

“Susa,



We have thus Heathens and Christians; the deferters of Christianity, the insulters of its founder, and

“Susa, the great city;” *πεπτωκεν οφρως η παλαι βρωμενη Περσων, και Σουσα, εκεινην αυτη* (p. 484—485). Lucian himself notices these events, in his treatise “*Quomodo Historia scribenda sit.*” He speaks of the war as just over, *τον αυτον τουτον πολεμον*, (ii. p. 39). This is called “the war of the *Parthians* and the Romans,” *τον πολεμον των Παρθυαιων και Ρωμαιων* (p. 381). He then speaks of “the king of the *Persians*,” *των Περσων βασι'εα*, as opposed to “our general” *ημετερον αρχοντα* (p. 379—380). He afterwards calls this king of the Persians expressly, *Vologesus* (380, 386, &c.). He notes “the ruin brought upon *Nisibis*, because it would not take part with the Romans,” *οιον Νισιωνοις λοιμον, τοις μη τα Ρωμαιων αιρεμειαις, επιγαγε* (p. 382). He hints at *Osroes* swimming across the Tigris, and hiding himself in a cave (p. 386—387). He also speaks of a great battle at *Europus* (p. 388 and 396), a town in Mesopotamia (p. 392), and of an assault made upon *Edejsa* (p. 389); and observes in general “of the things *now* done by the Romans in Armenia, and Mesopotamia, and Media,” *των εν Αρμενια και Μεσοποταμια και εν Μεδια Ρωμαιοις νυν πραχθεντων* (p. 401). And finally he notices *Priscus Severianus* or *Severinus* (p. 343 and 344), *Saturninus*, *Fronto*, and *Titianus* (p. 388), as all engaged in the war; when they were actually the generals of the Romans in it. See *Anc. Un. Hist.* xv. 213—214, from Dio and others. Only the account in p. 214, which “Lucian is not ashamed to tell us;” is merely an account, that is expressly ridiculed by him for its monstrous absurdity (p. 388). Nor is the note in p. 138 less false, which attributes this dialogue to Trajan's victories and the year 115. He who mentions facts that happened in 165, could hardly have hinted at a fact as very recent, which happened half a century before. The same events are undoubtedly alluded to, in both these tracts. And the Christian in Philopatris adds, with an immediate reference to Christ, upon these great events: “I, O Critias, leave these things to our children, to see Babylon destroyed, Egypt enslaved, the children of the Persians spending their days in slavery, the excursions of

and the ridiculers of its doctrines, united with evangelists, apostles, and martyrs; all proving beyond a possibility

“ the Scythians refrained, I wish I could say precluded; and we, having found *him who was unknown at Athens*, and worshipping him, will stretch out our hands to heaven, and thank him, for being thought worthy to be subjected to the power of *such a Being* ;” Καγω, ο Κριτια, ταυτα καταλειπω τοις τεκνοις, ως ιδειν Βαδουλιωνα ολλυμενην, Αιγυπτον δελεμενην, τα των Περσων τεκνα δελειον ημαρ αγοντα, τας εκδρομας των Σκυθων παυομενας, ειτ' ουν και ανακοπτομενας\* ημεις δε τον εν Αθηναις αγνωστον εφευροντες και προσκυνησαντες, χειρας εις ουρανον εκτειναντες, τουτω ευχαριστησομεν, ως καταξιωθεντες τουτου κρατους υπηκοοι γενεσθαι (p. 485—486). Such a conclusion as this to the dialogue, however favourable to my argument, seems rather unfaithful to the purpose of Lucian. But this and several passages before, unite to show his intimate acquaintance with the Holy Books of our religion, both the Old and the New; and corroborate the opinion which has long been entertained from Suidas, that he originally professed our religion. None but a professor could have been so thoroughly conversant, with all the principles, practices, traditions, and scriptures of Christianity. And though that spirit of profligacy, which loses all vigour of intellect in the laxity of laughing at every thing, and is holding up a glass of deformity to all but its own absurdity, induced him at first probably to desert the happy system which he had embraced, and instigated him to ridicule after he had relinquished it; yet he seems, even in this, the most bitter perhaps of all his satires against his former religion, to have revered even while he ridiculed, to have been checked in his satiricalness by a consciousness of his own impiety, to have retained too much of the Christian to be an outrageous vilifier, so to have injured his cause by his modesty in the course of the dialogue, and to have abandoned it at last in his impotent and betraying conclusion. And I have entered into this long note concerning it and him, to answer the surmises of the Arians, who would fain annihilate the authority of this strong evidence against them, by idle objections and frivolous exceptions. Socinus is their model in this and in other points. He

possibility of doubt, the adoration of Christ's Divinity to have been as popularly practised by the Christians, in the first and second century of our religion, and under the purest and strongest runnings of it, as it now is by ourselves, in these lees and dregs of the Gospel-times<sup>p</sup>. In this state of worship among the Christians, when the father of their faith was peculiarly the object of their adoration; the Jews would be violently tempted, to separate themselves more decisively than ever, from these sectaries of their own religion. These had taken *their* faith, were playing back *their* professions upon them, and, under the banners of the very God whom *they* had crucified, were triumphing over the Gentiles with a success, which *they* had never been

urges strongly for the *modern* date of it. He then supposes it *may be* Lucian's. And even then "perhaps" it shows the faith, to be only partial. "Diximus autem *fortasse*," he adds (ii. p. 698). So loth to allow, what he could not oppose!

<sup>p</sup> The reader, who would wish to see the evidences for this point, carried on to a still later period; may consult the work that first gave me the hint of what I have said upon it, the only work indeed that has drawn the evidences in a regular train together; Bingham's Orig. Eccl. Book xiii. chap. 2. And after such a long and splendid train of witnesses, as I have here produced, we must say of any man, who should dare to deny the worship of our Saviour in the first and second century; that *ignorance* may affirm in the very face of facts, without any infringement upon its *veracity*; and that *impudence* may assert to the very teeth of history, without any impeachment of its *knowledge*.

able to obtain themselves<sup>9</sup>. “Ye not only did not  
 “repent,” says Justin Martyr to them, “when ye  
 “learned that he was risen from the dead; but ye  
 “appointed chosen men, and sent them out into all the  
 “world, to say that a certain atheistical and lawless  
 “heresy had been begun by one Jesus a Galilean;  
 “whom when we had crucified, his disciples stole him  
 “by night out of the tomb, in which he had been laid  
 “when taken down from the cross<sup>r</sup>; and are de-  
 “ceiving men, by saying he is risen from the dead  
 “and gone back into heaven; perversely asserting  
 “him to have taught such things, as ye, in opposi-  
 “tion to those who confess him to be Christ, and  
 “their Teacher, and the Son of God, say to be in  
 “the opinion of all mankind, atheistical, lawless,  
 “and unholy. Additionally to this, and *since your*  
 “*city has been taken and your land desolated, ye repent*  
 “*not, but even presume to curse him and all that*  
 “*believe on him.*” They actually presumed to  
 frame

<sup>9</sup> The Jew at present “reads how his ancestors saw him [Jesus]  
 “adored by the Christians, in the *first* century; and he proves it—  
 “from the *Talmud*, wherein are *divers* relations of R. Eliezer, the  
 “great friend of R. Akiba, who lived in the *end* of the *first* century  
 “and the *beginning* of the *second* century, concerning the Gospels,  
 “and the *publick worship* rendered to Jesus Christ by the Christians”  
 (Allix’s Judgment, p. 432).

<sup>r</sup> How much does this confirm the narration in Mat. xxviii. 13!

<sup>9</sup> Justin, p. 335. Ου μοιον ε μετενοησατε, μαθοντες αυτον ανασαντα εκ νεκρων, αλλ’—ανδρας χειροτονησαντες εκλεκτους, εις πασαν την οικουμε-

frame a formal prayer against the Christians, in which, as Epiphanius informs us, “at their rising in the morning, and at mid-day, and about the evening, thrice in the day when they say their prayers in the synagogues, they imprecate wrath against them, and anathematize them; calling upon God to curse the Nazarenes.” And a prayer remains to this day in the liturgy for the service of the synagogue, imploring the vengeance of God upon the Christians; not indeed under the appellation of Nazarenes, which we know to have been their marked and invidious name among the Jews<sup>u</sup>; but with the softer and yet coœval title, of Hereticks and of Apostates<sup>x</sup>. “Let there be no hope to *them*,” they pray,

ἰνῆ ἐπεμψάτε, κηρυσσοντας οτι αἰρεσις τις αθεος και ανομος εγγηγεσται απο Ἰησοῦ τινος Γαλιλαίου πλανηῶν ὃν σαυρωσαντων ἡμων, οἱ μαθηται αὐτοῦ κλεψαντες αὐτον απο τῆς μνηματος νυκτος, ὁποθεν κατετεθη αφελωθεισ απο τῆς σαυρης, πλανωσι τῆς ανθρωπινης, λεγοντες εγγηγεσθαι αὐτον εκ νεκρων, και εις θρανον ανεληλυθεναι, κατειποντες δεδιδαχεναι και ταυτα, απερ, κατα των ομολογητων Χριστον και Διδασκαλον και Υιον Θεου ειναι, παντι γενει ανθρωπων αθεα και ανομα και ανοσια, λεγετε. Προς τῆτοις, και αλωσης υμων της πολεις, και της γῆς ερημωθεισης, ἔμετανοειτε, αλλα και καταρασθαι αὐτε, και των πισευοντων εις αὐτον παντων, τολματε.

<sup>t</sup> Epiphanius, i. 124. Ανισταμενοι εσωθεν [εωθεν], και μεσης ημερας, και περι την εσπεραν, τρις της ημερας οτε ευχας επιτελωνσιν εν ταις των συναγωγαις, επαρωνται αυτοις, και αναθεματιζουσι, φασκοντες οτι επικαταρασαι ο θεος της Ναζωραιης.

<sup>u</sup> Acts xxiv. 5. St. Paul is called “a ringleader of the sect of the *Nazarenes*.”

<sup>x</sup> Acts xxiv. 14. “This I confess unto thee,” says St. Paul, “that after the way *which they call heresy*, so worship I the God of  
“ my

pray, “ who apostatise from the true religion ; and  
 “ let Hereticks, *how many soever they be*, all perish  
 “ as in a moment: and let the Kingdom of Pride,”  
 not the Roman empire surely, as the words are in-  
 terpreted, but uniformly with the words before, and  
 with the frequent words of John the Baptist, of our  
 Saviour, and of his evangelists and apostles, *the*  
*Kingdom of God* under Christianity, then exulting in  
 its numbers, and elevating itself over Judaism, “ be  
 “ speedily rooted out, and broken in our days:  
 “ blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who destroy-  
 “ est the wicked and bringest down the proud<sup>y</sup>.

This spirit of rage against the Christians, ap-  
 pears to have been inflamed by an incident, which  
 should have extinguished it; that astonishing erup-

“ my fathers ;” Acts xxi. 28. “ This is the man,” St. Paul, “ that  
 “ teacheth all men every where *against*—the law ;” and Bingham’s  
 Orig. Eccl. Book xiii. chap. v. sect. 4.

<sup>y</sup> Prideaux’s Connections, ii. 128 (Edinburgh, 1779, edit. 14th),  
 for the prayer itself and a note upon it. “ This prayer—was added  
 “ by Rabbi Gamaliel, or, as others say, by Rabbi Samuel the Little,  
 “ who was one of his scholars” (ibid.): “ Gamaliel, a man, accord-  
 “ ing to them,” the Jews, “ of unsufferable *pride*:—in his days  
 “ flourished Samuel the Less, who composed a prayer full of the  
 “ bitterest curses against Hereticks, by which he means the Chris-  
 “ tians, and *which is still in use to this day*: Gamaliel was no less an  
 “ enemy to them.” And as “ these,—the Rabbies tell us, *preceded*  
 “ the *destruction* of the *temple*” (Mod. Un. Hist. xiii. 142—143);  
 so would the fact (if true) furnish us with a new argument, for “ the  
 “ kingdom of pride” meaning not the Romans, but the Christians.

See next note.

tion of vengeance from God, the destruction of their capital, the dispersion of their nation, and the desolation of their country. With this they proceeded to the last limit of fury, against the triumphing Christians; to forswear all their old faith concerning the Messiah, to pretend they expected now a mere man in him, and so to oppose him the more to the Messiah and God of the Christians. And this poison of perverted faith, dubiously insinuated at first, and boldly diffused afterwards, would be quickened in its progress, by the exultation of the Christians over their state of punishment at present, and by the exasperated spirit of the Jews, under a keen feeling of both; and by the middle of the second century, we see, had spread its morbid influence through the whole body of the Jews<sup>2</sup>.

### III.—Nor

\* There are four prayers for the grand service of the Jewish Temple, and eighteen for the slihter service of the Jewish Synagogue, which are asserted by antient Jews, and believed by modern Christians, to have been certainly used by the Jews in the days of our Saviour (Bingham, xiii. v. 4 and Prideaux, ii. 126—130). But both Christians and Jews are mistaken, in the early date of these prayers. This the prayers themselves show. In one of the four for the Temple, God is desired to “*restore the service to the oracle of his house* ;” and in another, to “*bring back their captivity to the courts of his holiness*” (Bingham, p. 124—125). In those for the Synagogue, God is equally desired to “*restore them their Judges as at the first, and their Counsellors as at the beginning* ;” to “*restore his worship to the inner part of his house* ;” to “*build Jerusalem with a building to last for ever, and to do this speedily, even in their days* ;” to “*convocate them together by the sound of the great trumpet,*

## — III. —

Nor do we know this extraordinary fact, merely from the pointed contrast which we find in the second

“trumpet, to the *enjoyment* of their *liberty*, and lift up his ensign to “call together all of the *captivity*, from the *four quarters of the earth*, “into their own land” (Bingham, p. 127—128 and Prideaux, p. 128—129). These prayers were apparently written at a period, when the service of God was no longer kept up in the Temple, when the daily sacrifice had ceased when Jerusalem was destroyed, when the Jews were reduced into captivity, and when they were carried captive out of their own land, to the four quarters of the earth. These passages indeed may be supposed, as they are by Dr. Prideaux (p. 126), to be interpolations of the original prayers. But no interpolations are to be admitted, on a *supposition*. The passages stand strikingly discriminative, on the face of the prayers; and must so stand, till they are *proved* to have been interpolated. They are, no doubt, authentick parts of the original prayers. They consequently prove the prayers, to be posterior to the destruction of Jerusalem. And accordingly there is no such notice of the *Son* or *Word* of God, in any of them; as we see in the *Son* of Sirach, in Philo, in Esdras, in the testaments of the twelve Patriarchs, in the Book of Baruch, and even in the Chaldee Paraphrasts above.

A froward and sensible Jew, however, in an address to the usurping rebels of our country during 1656, has taken some pains to vindicate the liturgy of his countrymen, from this charge of imprecation against Christians. This Divine, Physician, and Rabbi acknowledges, “there is in the daily prayers a certain chapter,” just as it is recited above. But then he says, “speaks nothing of Christians originally, but of the Jews who fell in those times,” the days of Ezra, “to the Sadducees and Epicureans, and to the Gentiles, as “Moses of Egypt faith—; and by Apostates and Hereticks are not “to be understood, all men that are of a diverse religion, or Heathens, or Gentiles, but those renegado Jews, who did abrogate  
“ the



second century, to what we observe in the first and in the days of our Saviour. We actually see some particular

“the whole law of Moses, or any articles received thence.” I have already shown the prayers, to be later than the dissolution of the Jewish polity by the Romans, and yet to be as early as Epiphanius and Justin. *Then* the Jews could not but consider the Christians, as primarily “renegado Jews,” and as therefore “abrogating the whole law of Moses.” But, as Manasseh Ben Israel adds, “neither the kingdoms nor kings that are Christians, or Hagarenes [meaning Mahometans], or followers of other sects, are cursed here, but namely the kingdom of pride: certain it is, that in that time (wherein our wise men added to the daily prayers the foresaid chapter) there was no kingdom of Christians.” That the prayer was put into the Liturgy in the days of Ezra, I have shown before to be false. That there was then no Christianity, is therefore impertinent to be urged. And that there was then no kingdom of Christians, is worse than impertinent. “What therefore that kingdom of pride was, should any man ask; who can plainly show it? *So much as we can conjecture by it*, it is the kingdom of the Romans, which *then* flourished, which did rule over all nations tyrannically and proudly, especially over the Jews.” Here the Rabbi brings down the date of the prayers unthinkingly, from the days of Ezra to the æra of commencing Christianity. And the context, as I have observed above, plainly refers the Kingdom of Pride to the hereticks and apostates before. Consistency of ideas is the grand clue to all meanings. The Jews accordingly “repeated the same words of the prayer,” when the Roman empire was *no longer* a kingdom of pride, when Christianity alone *could possibly be meant*, and, as Manasseh pretends forsooth, “only of an antient custom.” The object in fact remained, when the Romans were gone. The Jews *therefore* continued their prayer, *to the last century*. And *now* truly in all their books *printed again*, the foresaid words “are wanting, lest they should *now* be unjustly objected against the Jews: and so for Apostates and Hereticks, they say Secret Accusers or Betrayers of the Jews; and for the Kingdom of Pride, they substitute all *Zedim*, that is, Proud Men.” See Phenix, ii.

particular movements, in the opinions of the Jews about the Messiah; that are nearly allied to this, and throw a strong kind of collateral light upon it.

That famous passage in Isaiah; “Behold, a virgin shall conceive;” we know to be *now* interpreted by the Jews, in their eagerness to wrest such a weapon of offence out of the hands of assailing Christians, “Behold, a young woman shall conceive.” But this interpretation is not the manufacture of the modern Jews. It was fabricated many centuries ago. It is even as old, as the beginning of the second century. And it is actually noticed by Justin Martyr in his Dialogue, as then in circulation among the Jews<sup>a</sup>. This is evidently a part of that grand system of alterations, which the Jews were now introducing into their creed, concerning the Messiah. They now discharged, what they had always maintained before; and what their ancestors had therefore asserted, in the Septuagint translation of this very passage; the miraculous derivation of their Messiah, from a virgin mother<sup>b</sup>.

In the same spirit, but with a still bolder hand, they have, says Justin, “completely cut out of the 407—408 and 416. They continued their prayers against Christians, till Christian states began to take offence at the prayers; and then for fear altered, what the original cause had induced them to continue, by still continuing itself. See also Allix’s Judgment, p. 431.

<sup>a</sup> P. 297.

<sup>b</sup> Η παρθενος εν γαστρι ληφεται.

“Septuagint,”

“Septuagint,” and consequently out of the Hebrew original too, “many passages, in which this crucified personage was expressly announced as GOD and as Man, and was expressly predicted to be crucified and put to death<sup>c</sup>.” In confirmation of this charge, Justin alledges some specific proofs. These words, he says, were originally in the Book of Ezra: “and Ezra said unto the people, This passage over is *our Saviour* and *our Refuge*: and if ye will consider, and it shall enter into your heart, that we are going to humble *him* in a *figure*, and that *after* this we may *hope* in *him*; this place (saith the Lord of Hosts) *shall not be made desolate for ever*: but if ye will *not* believe in *him*, or hearken to *his* preaching; *ye shall be a laughing-stock* to the nations<sup>d</sup>.” These also, he notes, have been cut out from the words of Jeremiah: “I am *as a lamb carried to be sacrificed*; over me

<sup>c</sup> P. 297. Πολλας γραφας τελευσεν περιβιλον απο των εξηγησεων των γεγενημενων υπο των παραι Πτολεμαιω γεγενημενων πρεσβυτερων, εξ ων διαρρηδη—τος αυτος ο σαυρωθεις, οτι θεος και ανθρωπος και σαυρωμενος και αποθνησκων, κεινηρυγμενος αποδεικνυται.

<sup>d</sup> P. 297—298. Και ειπεν Εσδρας τω λαω· Τελο το Πασχα ο σωτηρ ημων, και η καιαφυγη υμων· και εαν διανοηθητε, και αναδη υμων επι την καρδιαν, οτι μελλομεν αυτον ταπεινεν εν σημειω, και μετα ταυτα ελπισωμεν επ' αυτον, ο μη εξημωθη ο τοπος αυτος εις τον απαντα χρονον, λεγει ο θεος των δυναμεων. εαν δε μη πιστευσητε αυτω, μηδε εισακησητε τε κηρυματος αυτου, εσεσθε επιχαζμα τοις εθνεσι. This passage, says Justin, was among των εξηγησεων ων εξηγησατο Εσδρας εις τον νομον του περ τε Πασχα. It was therefore in Ezra vi. 19—22, and probably between the 20th and 21st verses.

“ they thought thoughts, saying, Come ye, let us  
 “ cast wood-ashes upon his bread, and *destroy him*  
 “ *out of the land of the living*, and his name shall  
 “ be remembered no more <sup>e</sup>.” These also in the  
 same prophet, he avers, have shared the same fate:  
 “ THE LORD GOD OF ISRAEL hath remembered his  
 “ dead, which are sleeping in the land of their  
 “ graves; and HE WENT DOWN TO THEM, TO  
 “ PREACH TO THEM THE GOOD TIDINGS OF HIS  
 “ SALVATION <sup>f</sup>.” And, in the ninety-sixth Psalm,  
 he asserts the words ran originally thus: “ say

<sup>e</sup> P. 298. Εγω ως αρειον φερομενον τε θυεσθαι· επ’ εμε ελογιζοντο λογισμον, λεγουσιν, Δευτε, εμβαλωμεν ξυλον εις τον αρτον αυτου, και εκλειψωμεν αυτον εκ γης ζωνων, και το ονομα αυτου ε μη μνησθη εκεινι. This passage is yet in the Septuagint and the Hebrew. It runs thus in our translation: “ I was like a lamb *or an ox* that is brought to the slaughter, “ and *I knew not* that they had devised devices against me, saying, “ Let us destroy *the tree with the fruit thereof*, and let us cut him “ off from the land of the living, that his name may be no more re- “ membered” (xi. 19). This is somewhat different from Justin’s extract; but the Septuagint very nearly accords with the latter. And the main difference between the Septuagint and the Hebrew, arises from the Septuagint missing what our English translation has caught, the true sense of the original concerning the *tree* and the *fruit* (literally, *bread*) thereof. See Lowth on the place. I have given the error in the Septuagint, the only good sense which it can possibly admit.

<sup>f</sup> P. 298. Εμνησθη δε Κυριος ο Θεος απο Ισραηλ των νεκρων αυτου των κεκοιμημενων εις γην χωματος, και καλεση προς αυτους, ευαγγελισασθαι αυτοις το σωτηριον αυτου. Where this passage was, can only be conjectured at present. It was perhaps in xxiii, between the 6th and 7th verses.

“ among

“ among the Heathen, that THE LORD reigneth  
 “ from THE TREE <sup>g</sup>.”

Bishop Pearson indeed has asserted concerning the last of these passages, what is naturally suggested to the critical mind by all; that, “ though the  
 “ Jews had rased it out of their own” copies,  
 “ yet it *appeareth not how* they should have gotten  
 “ it, out of the Bibles in the Christians hands <sup>h</sup>.”  
 But this is reducing the credibility of facts, to the mere standard of *appearances*. When a fact is sufficiently attested, the appearances must bend to the testimony. And moral improbability must be swept away, before the tide of positive assurance. Yet there is no such improbability, in the present case. The *Hebrew* Scriptures, *at first*, were confined al-

<sup>g</sup> P. 298. Ο Κυριος ἐβασιλευσεν απο τῆ ξυλας. Justin cites these words as once in the ninety-fifth psalm, τῆ ενενηκοντα περιπτῆ; but means *our* ninety-sixth. “ The ninth and tenth psalms,” says an author, “ which are *several* in the Hebrew and Chaldee and Syriack, “ are united and conjoined in the translation, at least the copies “ which we now have, of the lxxii; and so in the Latin and Arabick “ and Æthiopick, which follow the cxxii [lxxii]. And so from “ that tenth psalm forward, the numbers differ, the eleventh in the “ Hebrew being but the tenth in the Greek, &c.; and so in the rest, “ to psalm clvii [cxlvii], which being by the LXXII divided into “ two, their cxlvi and cxlvii,—by this means the number of cl is “ completed by the LXXII and those that follow them, as also by “ the Syriack; who, though they join not the tenth to the ninth “ psalm, yet unite cxiv and cxv, and so would come short of the “ number also, if they did not with the LXXII divide the cxlvii.” (Hammond on the Psalms, p. 3. edit. 1659).

<sup>h</sup> Creed, p. 201. edit. 12th.

most entirely to the *Jews*; scarcely any even of the principal Christians, being yet acquainted with the language itself. This is apparent from the very case before us at present, and from the reference of Justin for the excisions to the Septuagint only. This translation of the Scriptures into Greek, would also be limited to a *few* of these *Christians*. The *New Testament* alone was the *general* object of regard among them. So it actually is at present, we see, from the poverty of numbers of Christians; at a time, when the rich are equally Christians with the poor, when the charity of *these* is peculiarly exerted in donations of Bibles to *these*, and when Bibles are multiplied at an expence infinitely less than they were then. So therefore, and in a much more extensive degree, must it have been; when the multitude of believers, as of mankind, was principally of the poor, when the rich were still Heathens, and when copies of the Scriptures were very dear. To know the true state of the Christians formerly in this point, is not to guess at it from merely ideal pictures; but to look out into life before us, to mark historically the difference of circumstances, and then to modify our ideas from both.

Nor is there more weight, in what Pearson has additionally urged; that this clause is not to be found, “in any translation extant,—or—in the *Catena Græcorum Patrum*.” Hammond says more circumstantially, that “the copies which have come  
“ down

“ down to us have it not, nor the vulgar Latin,  
 “ nor yet the Arabick, nor Æthiopick, which all  
 “ follow the LXXII; nor the version of St. Je-  
 “ rome, much less the Chaldee or Syriack <sup>i</sup>.” But  
 both Hammond and Pearson here do, what men of  
 learning are apt to do; make merely a parade of  
 erudition; and throw the dust of literature in our  
 face, to blind the eyes of our discernment. To say  
 that the translations and the Catena have not the  
 clause, is to say nothing to the purpose; *unless* they  
 are proved to have been *prior*, to the period of the  
 alledged excisions. If *posterior*, they prove only  
 what our own translation proves, the non-appear-  
 ance of the clause upon their respective originals.  
 Such a non-appearance there would certainly be,  
 upon most of the antient copies, and all perhaps of  
 the antient translations; from an excision so early  
 and so general, as this is attested to have been.  
 What may therefore be the *effect* of the excision, can  
 never be used to disprove the reality of it. Most  
 of the translations and copies are certainly *posterior*  
 to this. And *none* of them can be *shown* to be  
*prior*.

Nor let us startle at the *crucifixion* of the Messiah,  
 being so plainly pointed out in the original psalm.  
 This was written by David <sup>k</sup>; and is acknowledged  
 by both Jews and Christians, actually to refer to the

<sup>i</sup> P. 482.

<sup>k</sup> Chron. xvi. 23, &c.

Messiah<sup>1</sup>. This very David, we know, “in spirit” calleth that Messiah “Lord,” who was to be “his Son<sup>m</sup>;” thus acknowledging his Divinity. David also hints at the *crucifixion*; when in the very character of the Messiah he says, “they pierced my hands and my feet<sup>n</sup>.” And if the Jews have *actually altered* the words of the original, in *this* passage; and have even *attempted to alter* them, in that correspondent passage of Zacharias, which is repeated and applied by St. John<sup>o</sup>, “they shall look on me whom they have pierced<sup>p</sup>;” as Hammond and Pearson unite to prove they have done, though in an age much later than the bold excisions of Justin<sup>q</sup>; those acts look with a full aspect back upon these, and serve at once to illustrate and confirm them<sup>r</sup>. Even “the Masorah in several places confesseth,” as Pearson himself informs us, “that *eighteen* places in the Scriptures have been *altered* by the Scribes .”

This charge of Justin’s against the Jews, therefore, stands unshaken in its authority. It rests firmly upon its own *substratum* of evidence. He

<sup>1</sup> Hammond, p. 481—482.

<sup>m</sup> Mat. xxii. 43—45.

<sup>n</sup> Psalm xxii. 16, Mat. xxvii. 46, John xix. 24, and Rev. i. 7.

<sup>o</sup> John xix. 37.

<sup>p</sup> Zacharias xii. 10.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. Ibid.

<sup>r</sup> The very turn of the psalm marks the coherence of Justin’s passage with the whole. “God reigneth *from the tree*,” ἀπο τῆ ξύλας; and therefore “all the trees of the wood,” πάντα τὰ ξύλα τὰ ὄξυρα, are said *with peculiar propriety* to “rejoice before the Lord.”

<sup>s</sup> Creed, *ibid.*



has asserted it, who from his earliness had the power of knowing it. He has asserted it, whose judgment could not be deceived in such a substantial fact, and whose veracity is beyond all exception. Irenæus accordingly, as Pearson himself has noted in another place, though Irenæus wrote about twenty years only after the martyrdom of Justin, and yet refers to Justin occasionally; has no less than three times adduced the *second* passage of Jeremiah above: attributing it once to Isaiah, then to Jeremiah, and finally to a prophet without a name; and every time appealing to it without hesitation, as a passage either yet remaining, or certainly known to have lately remained, upon the volume of inspiration<sup>t</sup>. Only forty or fifty years afterward, and exactly in the same spirit, has Tertullian referred to the passage above in the Psalms, equally without hesitation, and equally without vouching what must have been his and Irenæus's authority for the texts, the testimony of Justin<sup>u</sup>. About a century afterwards, Eusebius more comprehensively and more accurately notes, as one of the memorable truths in the writings of Justin; that this author "mentions some express passages of the prophets,

<sup>t</sup> Irenæus Adv. Hær. iii. 23, "Esaïas ait," iv. 39, "Hieremias ait," v. 34, "Propheta ait," and Pearson, p. 242. For Irenæus speaking of Justin, see Adv. Hær. i. 31, &c.

<sup>u</sup> "Age nunc, si legisti penes Prophetam in Psalmis, Deus regnavit a ligno" (Adv. Jud. x. Op. 196. Rigalt). "Age nunc si legisti penes David, Dominus regnavit a ligno" (Adv. Marc. iii. 19. p. 408).

“ which he says the Jews had cut out of the Scripture<sup>x</sup>.” Those who lived nearest to the time of Justin, and knew him best, relied implicitly, we see, upon the evidence of Justin for these excisions. And the acknowledged conduct of the Jews in later ages, lends a decisive energy to all.

This charge, however, seems to have startled our modern criticks by its boldness. But our modern criticks are some of them, men much better calculated to raise doubts and to infuse fears; than to catch the strong points of an argument, to hold them firmly, and to wield them with efficacy against an adversary. Others of them are much better pioneers, than soldiers; fitter to undermine a fortress, than to assault it. And others again, in the fashionable *perfidiousness* of Christian writers *at present*, are more inclined to spread alarms, and propagate timidity, in the army of believers; than to lead them on like red-cross knights, against the host of the Paynims. They have thus been deterred from repeating it, and even precluded from attending to the plenitude of evidence for it. The crime alledged is indeed, as Justin very candidly pronounces it, an act seemingly incredible in itself; being more horribly flagitious, than the formation of the golden calf by their fathers, than the oblation of their children to devils, or the murder of the prophets themselves<sup>y</sup>.

<sup>x</sup> Eusebius Hist. iv. 18. p. 180. Ρητων δε των προφητικων μνημονευει, —ως αν περιτομωτων αυτων Ιουδαιων απο της γραφης.

<sup>y</sup> Justin, p. 299.

Yet the deed is too plain from the evidence. And the excision of these passages by the Jews, in the infinitely greater rarity of copies then than now; and in the equal disruption of the Jewish nation then, into infinite atoms of parties; is too possible not to be considered as practicable, is too historically attested not to be believed as certain, and has been actually detected in the principle and in the operation, upon other passages of Scripture, and in later periods of time.

But we have more facts still, in the history of the Jews since our Saviour; that show the same spirit predominating in their hearts, which impelled them to reject the faith, and to garble the Scriptures, of their fathers. One is the fact, that we all know and all acknowledge. We all know of the exclusion of Daniel, for his *chronological* prophecy of our Saviour's sufferings, out of that very list of prophets, in which Josephus expressly places him; and in which one infinitely greater than Josephus, also concurs to place him<sup>2</sup>. And we all acknowledge their reduction of him, from this honourable pre-eminence of

<sup>2</sup> Josephus Ant. Jud. x. 7. p. 465. calls him "one of the greatest prophets," ἐν τινὶ τῶν μεγίστων—προφητῶν; says "the Jews were convinced from his writings, that he conversed with God," πεπιστευκαμεν ἐξ αἰῶν, ὅτι Δανιηλος ὠμιλεῖ τῷ Θεῷ; and declares, that "from the completion of his prophecies, he bore a character of veneration, and also a reputation of Divinity, among the multitude," ἀπο δὲ τῶ τελευτῆς αἰῶν, ἀληθείας πιστῶν, καὶ δόξαν ὡς θεοειδὴς, παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀποφεροσθαι. For our Saviour, see Mat. xxiv. 15.

character,

character, into that lowest class of scripture-writers, which they merely call the *Hagiography*. Another fact is the wild and audacious calumny, which we equally know the Jews to have raised against the Christians; at the introduction of the Gospel into the regions of Paganism. They then reported the Christians in their religious meetings, *to feed upon the flesh of a sacrificed boy*, afterwards to put out their light, and *to mix, men and women, in the casual embraces of darkness with each other*. This calumny, says Origen, “formerly kept up an hostility to the Gospel, in great numbers of the Heathens.” And, as he adds, “at this day it deceives some into such an aversion to us, as will not permit them to hold the slightest conversation with us.” But what is finally confirmatory of all, is that astonishing incident, which so dreadfully unites into a point with all. In the second century, and with a bold and daring range of impiety, they *superseded* their whole code of Scripture at once, by the formal in-

<sup>a</sup> Origen contra Celsum, lib. vi. p. 293—294. Cantab. Δοκῆ μοι παραπλησίον Ἰουδαίσις πεποιηκεναι, τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆ Χριστιανισμῶ διδασκαλίᾳ κατακτεθεῖσασιν δυσφημίαν τῆ λόγῳ· ὡς ἀρα καταβύταντες παῖδιν, μεταλαμβάνουσιν αὐτῶ τῶν σαρκῶν· Καὶ πάλιν, ὅτι οἱ ἀπο τῆ λόγῳ, τὰ τῆ σκοτῆ πρᾶττειν βηλομενοὶ, σέβουσιν μὲν τὸ φῶς, ἕκαστος δὲ τῆ παρατυχησῆ μιγνυται· ἢ τῆς δυσφημίας παραλογῶς πάλαι μὲν πλείων ὄσων ἐκρατεῖ, πείθεσα τῆς ἀλλοτρίης τῆ λόγῳ, ὅτι τοιοῦτοι εἰσι Χριστιανοί· Καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐτι ἀπάτα τινὰς, ἀποτρέπομενος διὰ τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ εἰς κοινῶν ἀπλῆθεραν λόγων ἔχειν πρὸς Χριστιανούς. This slander is also noticed by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Minucius Felix, in Reeves's Apologies, i. 52, 152, 177, and ii. 61. edit. 2d.

troductioῦ

roduction of their written Cabbalah; in order to elude the positive declarations of God about their Messiah, by some insolently alledged traditions of men<sup>b</sup>. It was, I may venture to say, only an inferior spirit of impiety to this, which earlier in the same century, and before the days of Justin Martyr, induced them to recoil from that very line of faith, in which the author of Baruch, the framer of the Patriarchal Testaments, the writer of the second Book of Esdras, and Philo Judæus, were walking after the middle of the first century; and in which *all* the Jews were walking, during and before the days of our Saviour. Yet, as Justin declares those excisions of the Scripture, to have been made by the teachers and leaders of the Jews<sup>c</sup>; so he notices one of them, *that* relating to the *former* of the two passages in Jeremiah, to have been made

<sup>b</sup> This *Cabbalah* or tradition is comprized in the *Talmud*, and consists of two parts, the *Mishna* and the *Gemarrab*, “to which they give by far the preference, with respect to the *written books*; whence that saying of theirs, The *Mikdash*, or Old Testament, is like *water*, the *Mishna* like *wine*, and the *Gemarrab*, more plain and perfect, like *hippocras*, or the richest of wines” (Ant. Un. Hist. iii. 5). The *Mishna* was written by Judah Hakkadosh. “The most probable opinion is, that he finished it *about the year of Christ 180*” (Mod. Un. Hist. xiii. 158). And the *Gemarrab* is a comment upon this, written by R. Jochanan “the great disciple of *Judah Hakkadosh*,” about 225 (ibid. 170—171). These two works form the *Jerusalem Talmud*. Another *Gemarrab*, being equally a comment on the *Mishna*, and written by Ase a disciple of *Jochanan*, forms the *Babylonish Talmud* (ibid. 171—172).

<sup>c</sup> P. 297 and 299.

only “ a little time before <sup>d</sup>.” This occasioned the passage even then, to be “ still remaining in some “ copies used by the Jewish synagogues <sup>e</sup> ;” and has since caused it to be recovered, into our own copies at present. And the whole combines together with an amazing force of evidence, to show the new belief of the Jews in the mere humanity of their Messiah, to have been taken up by them, and incorporated into their creed, in the BEGINNING of the SECOND century.

Thus taken and thus incorporated as the belief was, they soon carried their zeal against the Divinity of their own Messiah, now adored among the Christians ; into a savage intemperance of blasphemy. In the very commencement of the next century, one of them had the effrontery to parade through the streets of Carthage, then abounding with Christians ; and to exhibit the picture of a being half beast and half man, wearing a long robe, but hooped in two of his feet, having ass's ears, and carrying a book in his hand ; with this inscription to the whole, *the asinine God of the Christians* <sup>f</sup>. And such

<sup>d</sup> P. 298. Πρὸ ὀλίγου χρόνου.

<sup>e</sup> P. 298. Ἐπὶ εἶναι ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν τισὶν ἀντιγραφαῖς τῶν ἐν συναγωγαῖς Ἰσραηλινῶν.

<sup>f</sup> Tertullian, a Roman of Carthage, in his Apol. adversus Gentes, xvi. p. 16, says thus: “ Nova jam *Dei Nostri* in istâ proxima civitate editio publicata est ; ex quo quidem [quidam] frustandis bestiis mercenarius noxius picturam proposuit, cum ejusmodi

such an extraordinary outrage as this, at once marks that audaciousness of violence in the Jews against the Christians, which had originally prompted them to throw off their old faith, and adopt a new one; and displays to our very senses, as it were, the fixed belief of the Christians in our Saviour's Divinity, and the actual adoration of our Saviour by them §.

## IV.—In

“modi inscriptione, *Deus Christianorum Onochoetes*. Is erat auribus “asininis, altero pede unglatus, librum gestans, et togatus.” Rigalt supposes “Judæum Nebulonem Græcæ compositionis vocabulum perperam extulisse,” in *Onochoetes*; “cum intelligi vellet “onocoiten, *ονοκοιτην*.” And “noxium dicit mercenarium, qui “toties bestias frustraverat, elusis ac declinatis agilitate suâ ferarum “dentibus; quasi non bonâ fide verus, cum ad eas sese locasset.” That the fraudulent combatant of beasts was a Jew, is inferred from the transition of this too lively and rapid writer. These words immediately precede the passage: “si die solis lætitiæ indulgemus, aliâ “longè ratione quàm religione felis; secundo loco ab eis sumus, “qui diem Saturni otio et *viclvi* decernunt, *exorbitantes et ipsi ab “Judaico more, quem ignorant: sed nova jam Dei nostri”* &c.

§ Yet some learned individuals among the Jews in several ages since, invited by the strong light of their original faith, have broken away from the covert of darkness, in which the nation has wrapped itself up; and have asserted explicitly the Godhead of their Messiah. See instances of this in notes before; in Pearson on the Creed, p. 148; in *Ant. Un. Hist.* iii. 11—13, where I consider the book of Zohar as posterior to the Mishna and Gemarrah, as it actually quotes an author of the second century (Allix's Judgment, p. 169); and in the Discussion of the Socinian Controversy, by that clearest and most convincing of all human reasoners, Charles Lesley, M. A. among his theological works, i. 245 and 250. But to these I wish to add three instances, that are much less known, two of them very distinct in time, and all singularly expressive. “Midras Tillim super  
“Psalms

## — IV. —

In this manner began to appear that novel faith of the Jews, which we now find to be so firmly established among them, and so boldly daring to claim the authority of their primogenial principles. But error, once set in motion, is seldom at rest. It always finds many too weak to discern, and too indolent to examine, the difference between truth and

“Pſalm x. v. 2,” quoted by Grabe in *Spicilegium*, i. 363, and referring to the Rabbi, whom I have noted before to have drawn up the Gemarrah in A. D. 225; “*Tribus annis et dimidio fuit DIVINITAS—in Monte Olivarum ſtans, et vociferans*” &c. See alſo Allix’s Judgment, p. 290, and Leſley, i. p. 68. “In Bereſchith “*Rabba ſive Commentario—R. Moſes Hadarſan ſuper Genef. xlv. “18,*” which was written about A. D. 1070 (*Mod. Un. Hiſt. xiii. 256*), is this queſtion and this answer, ſays Grabe, i. 362 and 364, about rejoicing and exulting in God. “*Quando hoc fiet? Quando “aſcendent captivi ex inferno, et DEITAS—in capite eorum.*” See alſo Pearſon on the Creed, p. 270. Theſe words ſufficiently aſcertain their own meaning, to a Chriſtian ear. And that this is alſo their Jewiſh meaning, is plain from theſe words preceding: “*Quando “nos gaudebimus? Quando ſtabunt pedes DIVINITATIS in Monte “Olivarum*” (i. 365). See alſo Pearſon, *ibid.*

“We ſee in the moſt antient books of the Jews, as in the books “called Rabboth, Mechifta, and in their old Midraſhim, almoſt all “compoſed before the 7th century; and in the Talmud of Babylon; “*the ſame ideas and the ſame doctrine*, which we meet in the Apo- “cryphal books and in Philo’s writings. And thoſe ideas have been “*conſtantly* followed, by *the moſt conſiderable* part of the Jews; thoſe “very men, who have their name [of traditioniſts, ſee p. 158] from “their conſtant ſticking to the old tradition of their forefathers” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 98).

faſehood.



falsehood. Some are even vain enough to take up falsehood in preference to truth, by way of decoration and distinction; as savages carry scalps, for horrible ornament of their persons. And the monster, thus generated among the Jews, was afterwards transmitted by them to the MAHOMETANS.

I.—In all the *national* history of man, there is no person who stands so strikingly prominent upon the page, as the great and venerable Abraham. He is at this moment, as it was predicted almost *four thousand years ago* he should be, the common “father of many nations<sup>b</sup>.” As the founder of the *Jews*, he appears with a luster of radiance, which is derived from the very glory of that Godhead, which owned him for its friend, and used his children for the special ministers of its providence. As the progenitor of the *Arabs*, he wears an additional crown of glory; fainter indeed in its radiance, but yet bright and lustrous. These two nations appear to their brothers of the globe, marked with a strange singularity of adventures, and sealed on their foreheads (as it were) with that lively signature of God, the stamp of prophecy. That the son of Abraham by Hagar, should be “a wild man;” that “his hand should be against every man,” and that “every man’s hand should be against him;”

<sup>b</sup> Gen. xvii. 5.

but that he should still “ dwell in the presence of all “ his brethren<sup>i</sup> ;” was a prophecy seemingly personal in itself, but eventually shown to be national. It has proved as truly prophetic concerning his distant descendants, through a long course of ages ; as the parallel prediction concerning him, that, “ because he was the seed” of Abraham, he should become “ a nation,” “ a great nation,” and one formed like the Jews into twelve principalities or tribes, proved in his immediate offspring<sup>k</sup>. And the empire of prophecy over man, is signally displayed at once, in the perpetuity of the Jews, and in the invincibility of the Arabs. The elder and legitimate branch of the Abrahamick line, has been kept totally distinct from the mass of mankind, in spite of every moral and political principle, that was busily operating to confound them. The Assyrians, the Græcians, and the Romans, successively conquered them by their arms, but could never incorporate them with their people. They were transplanted by violence, and dispersed by accidents, into various regions of the earth ; yet they mingled not with their human brothers, in any. A supernatural principle of cohesion between themselves, and a divine spirit of reluctance to an union with others, still kept them distinct and separate. No power of earth could make this stubborn element, to amalgamate with the rest. And accordingly the three em-

<sup>i</sup> Gen. xvi. 12.      <sup>k</sup> Gen. xvii. 20, xxi. 13, and xxv. 12—16.

pires rose and fell one after the other, while the Jews alone continued. *These* have all vanished from the globe, like the gigantick shadows that sometimes attend upon the sun, and sweep across our fields; while *these* have remained like the sun itself, sometimes clouded and sometimes setting, but still bursting out from their clouds, still rising from their settings, and shining out in full luster again. Even now when the Jews are in a state of civil dissolution, and their body politic has been for seventeen hundred years reduced to its constituent particles; they still exist as numerous and as remarkable as ever. And a secret spark of immortality, is active and vigorous within them, lives in their very ashes, and animates the flying dust of their urn. Nor are the Arabs very much inferior to the Jews, in this providential view of history. That moral hostility to mankind, which the separation of the Jews perversely excited in the latter, became a political hostility in their cousins the Ishmaelites. The descendants have equally with their ancestor been "wild men," whose "hand was against every man;" and therefore "every man's hand was against them." They have continued to provoke the world, by the practice of prædatory expeditions into it. Yet they have always been saved from the avenging arm of the world. The three empires attempted in their turns to reduce them; to tame these savage sons of the desert, to bring

them within the pale of civility, and so to suppress this bold warfare of ages upon man. But their efforts were all baffled. The broad hand of the Assyrian could not lay them in the dust. The heavy foot of the Græcian could not crush them there. The formidable javelin of Rome was launched in vain, to bear them down. And even the scymitar of the Turks has in vain been sharpened, to cut them in pieces. They still “dwell in the presence of all their brethren.” Their “hand” is still “against every man.” “Every man’s hand” is still “against them.” They remain the lords and sovereigns of their original wilds, and the uncontrolled plunderers of the rest of mankind. And the great current of human actions in the Arabs, in the Jews, and in all the numerous nations connected with either; has now, for four thousand years, wound its waters freely, yet in the very course and channel, which had been marked for it by the finger of God before<sup>1</sup>.

These invincible warriors, though descended from Abraham the father of astronomy to the world,

<sup>1</sup> This extraordinary part of the human history, the actual invincibility of the Arabs in every age, has been very properly laid open in *Ant. Un. Hist.* xx. 157. Mr. Gibbon however has denied the fact, and yet—acknowledged it. This has been shown by an author, in the *English Review* of Mr. Gibbon’s three last volumes, December 1788; for all whose remarks upon Mr. Gibbon, in the months immediately preceding and subsequent, I acknowledge myself responsible to the publick.

fool lost all the spirit of science in their original founder, and sunk into the lowest savageness of ignorance. They had forgotten those very first elements of all literature, the arts of reading and writing. Even in their principal and central town of Mecca, not a man could either write or read at the beginning of the 7th century; except one, who had turned Jew and then become Christian, and so had learned to write Arabick with the Hebrew letters. And the inhabitants in general were distinguished from those of Medina, a town half filled with Jews and half with Christians; by the appellation of *the illiterate*, in opposition to *the people of the book*. Such a necessary connection has the Revelation of God, with the improvement of Reason in man<sup>m</sup>! By the same scale of degradation, they equally went downwards into polytheism. Though they were the

<sup>m</sup> Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, p. 36—37. edit 1697. That Mahomet could really write, has been lately furnished (after Wosheim's Eccl. Hist. ii. 6. Maclaine. 2d. edit.) by a gentleman in the first rank of knowledge concerning him; from two facts, one asserted by Al Bokhari, and another affirmed by all authors; *that* being Mahomet's miraculously writing at the treaty with the Meccans, in the 6th year of the Hegira, or A. D. 627; and *this*, Mahomet's calling for ink and paper in his last illness, in order to write a new Koran for his followers (White's Lectures, p. 205. and notes, p. xxxvi—xxxvii). But, as the last fact is attributed by all his biographers to the influence of a delirium, so the former is denied by all but Al Bokhari; they asserting *Ali* to have been the writer at the command of Mahomet (Mod. Un. Hist. i. 143). Ali must have learned to write, *since* the Christian had.

children of that respectable man, whom God had set up as his glorious antagonist to the rising idolatry of the world; though the ennobling fact should have gone with an awful and salutary influence for ages, through the courses of his descendants; and though it did actually go with such an influence through the Jews, and the main line of the Abrahamick family was, equally with Abraham, the champions of God against idolatry: yet the collateral line revolted from the family and from God, and became gross polytheists. Their country was also the scene of almost all the Mosaick prodigies. They saw with their own eyes that loose block of red granite, which is traditionally denominated the Rock of Moses to this day; with its twelve fissures for fountains, apparently supernatural in themselves; and with its channel for the water, discoloured by the long running, and even incrustated with the earthy particles, of it<sup>n</sup>. Moses struck the marble with his rod; a miraculous spring burst out from the solid veins; and a miraculous stream continued to flow from it, to attend the movements of the Jews, and to water successively their stations<sup>o</sup>.

The

<sup>n</sup> Journal from Grand Cairo to Mount Sinai, published by Dr. Clayton, Bishop of Clogher, 2d edition 1753, p. 35—37, and the notes.

<sup>o</sup> 1 Cor. x. 4. The Koran actually mentions this rock thus: "We [God] said [to Moses], Strike the rock with thy rod; and there gushed thereout *twelve fountains* according to the number of

"the

The tradition of all must have been peculiarly powerful, at the very spot. And, in every age, the history must have been substantiated by the objects present, into something like actual vision. Their plains also were covered every morning for forty years together, with the miraculous dew of Manna; the food of angels regularly administered to man; and the bread of heaven supplied to a whole nation on earth. Even one of their mountains had been witness to such displays of the God-head, as the world had never seen before, and has never seen since; the whole hill flaming with the glory, and shaking (as it were) under the feet, of the descending God. Yet they became idolaters. And they became so humble and abject in their idolatry, as to deify even Ishmael and Abraham, and even to worship a quadrangular stone<sup>1</sup>.

*“ the tribes; and all men knew their respective drinking-place ”* (ch. 2. p. 8). “ The commentators say,” Mr. Sale informs us concerning the rock, “ this was a stone which Moses brought from Mount “ Sinai ” (ibid.). They also “ describe it to be a square piece of “ white marble [*red*, in Journal above], shaped like a man’s head ” (ibid.). In p. 134. chap. 7. are the very same words of the text repeated, and this additional note: “ according to a certain tra- “ dition,—the water issued thence by three orifices on each of the “ four sides of the stone, making twelve in all; and that it ran in so “ many rivulets, to the quarter of each tribe in the camp.” See Sale’s Translation of the Koran from the original Arabick, 1734.

P Prideaux, p. 123, Sale’s Preliminary Discourse to his Koran, p. 20, 21, and Bibliotheca Biblica, Oxford, 1720, vol. i. p. 613.

In this defection from the family-faith, however, the Arabs still retained a full conviction on their minds, of their relation to the Jews. This appears sufficiently, from their deification of Abraham and Ishmael. Even at present, and within the inclosure of their grand temple at Mecca, they show a white stone which they call the sepulcher of Ishmael, whom they believe to have lived and died there; another stone, on which they believe Abraham to have stood when he built the temple; and a well, which they pretend to be the very fountain, that was miraculously opened in the wilderness for Hagar<sup>a</sup>. “Verily,” says the Koran itself, “the *first* house appointed unto men to worship in, was that which is in Becca [Mecca, differently pronounced]—: therein are manifest signs, *the place where Abraham stood,*” &c.<sup>r</sup> And as they actually form the genealogies of their principal families, in a direct course of descent, though with much ignorance of the principles and facts of chronology, from Ishmael and from Abraham; so they have or had a building close to their temple at Mecca, denominated expressly the *Cupola of Judæa*. In this hereditary predominance of family-spirit, they equally adopted

<sup>a</sup> Sale’s Discourse, p. 118, Mod. Un. Hist. i. 208—209 and 213—214, and Prideaux, p. 95.

<sup>r</sup> Koran, chap. 3. p. 47—48.

<sup>s</sup> Mod. Un. Hist. i. 2—7 and 209, and Sale’s Discourse, p. 114, a plan.



the name with which they appear for the first time in the writings of Dioscorides, and by which they became so formidable to the most distant parts of the earth afterwards; that of *Saracens*. Much labour has been lost, and much learning exhausted, in attempting to account for this appellation. But, in the province of etymology, the obvious analysis is almost always the right one. Very properly denominated *Ismaelites* and *Hagarenes* by others, they affectedly called themselves *Saracens*; thus rejecting their descent from the concubine, and challenging it from the wife, of Abraham; till at last they became noticed under that appellation by Dioscorides, by Ptolemy, and the Jerusalem Targum itself. And this etymology, which coincides so closely with the history of their affection for Abraham, and speaks so strongly for itself from all, is confirmed by a curious circumstance, that has never been observed. The *origins* of nations, like the springs of the Nile, have been generally concealed in the clouds. But the Hebrew code comes like another BRUCE, to put aside the clouds, and to unveil the source to the sun. The *names* of nations are generally more obscure still. They are derived from what Homer with a happy fantasticalness calls, *the language of the Gods*; as being a language either no longer spoken, or but little understood, upon earth.

† Ant. Un. Hist. xviii. 340—343, 345, 368—370, and an authority omitted there, Psalm lxxxiii. 6.

Among these names, there are some which have never been known to the world at large, and yet were preserved with fondness by the nations themselves. Thus the denomination of *Gaul* for a *Briton*, appears in none of the earlier records of our history; and yet shows itself conspicuous, in some of its later incidents. The Britons of Kent, Suffex, Hampshire, Dorsetshire, and Wiltshire, of Bedfordshire, Somersetshire, Cheshire, and Clydesdale in Scotland, are called Welsh or Gauls by the Saxon chronicle; those of Cornwall are once denominated *the Western Welsh*, by the same chronicle; all from the Friths of Forth and Clyde to the Channel, are called by it the *British Welsh*; and the Irish and Highlanders name themselves *Gael* or *Welsh*, at present. And we have just such a glimpse of historical light, though a fainter one, accidentally breaking in upon us concerning the appellation of *Saracens*. It was once the indigenous title, which *the very Jews applied to themselves*. Descending directly from Sarah, they had a full right to it. But it is very surprising, that we meet with them using it only once. It probably occurs, however, in other passages of topical or of national history. And the very name of *Gaul* for a *Briton*, however conspicuous on the page of our Saxon history, and in the appellatives of particular places within our island,

▪ The History of the Britons asserted, p. 77. edit. 2d. and Sax. Chron. p. 72.

was first pointed out by myself. I wish therefore to point out this also. The Jews were formerly very numerous in Cornwall; attracted by the lucrative commerce of tin, and engaged in managing the mines of it. In the windows of the church of St. Neot there, says an author, “are several pictures  
 “relating to some particular traditions of the Jews,  
 “which are *exactly delivered* in a *Cornish* book, now  
 “in the public library at Oxford, Archiv. B. 31:  
 “it is probable, *they had these traditions immedi-*  
 “*ately from the Jews themselves*, who were here in  
 “great numbers about the tin\*.” This is in the  
 cast

\* Gibson in his Camden, c. 19. edit. 3d. But, as a late author says, “none of these windows have any other relation to the Jews, than as they contain a portion of the Scripture history of the Old Testament;—and require no other explication, than the Latin inscription still remaining under each compartment.—The windows —are *seventeen* in number. *Two* contain the Old Testament history, from the creation to the death of Noah, in different compartments; with an inscription under each, explaining its subject. *Thirteen* either have, or plainly have had, full-length figures of saints. *Two* contain the acts of St. George and of St. Neot” (From *some account of the church and windows of St. Neot’s in Cornwall, London, printed by H. and E. Ledger. Maze-pond. South-wark, 1786*; and drawn up for private inspection only, by an ingenious and judicious clergyman in the neighbourhood). According to this representation then, the windows are not charged with any tale of Jewish traditions at all. And the express reference to “a Cornish book, now in the Publick Library at Oxford,” and so specifically pointed out as “Archiv. B. 31” there, for these “particular traditions” being “*exactly delivered*” in it; forms an authority merely calculated to deceive. On examination of the Cornish Book,  
 the

east of the county. In the west we have an evidence still more remarkable. We have a *town* denominated

the reference to it is found to be a most unaccountable mistake. "Archiv. B. 31" is indeed a Cornish work, yet is only an *Ordinale* or Scriptural interlude, which exhibits the creation of the world, and the history of it to the deluge; and was written by "William "Jordan" of Helston, so late as "the xii of August A. D. 1611." To this sacred Drama of Cornwall, which was written in order to be acted in one of those amphitheatres, that still remain under the name of *Rounds*; are many notes and directions, in the prevalence of a new and encroaching language at the time, set down in *English*. Thus does it begin:

"The creation of the world, the first daie of play—;

|                                    |  |   |                           |   |   |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|
| <p>"The Father<br/>"in Heaven.</p> | <p>Ego sum Alpha<br/>et Omega.<br/>Heb. allathe na<br/>dowethva.</p> | } | <p>Pur wyz<br/>me eo.</p> | { | <p>The Father must be<br/>in a cloude, and when<br/>he speaketh of Heaven,<br/>let theys open."</p> |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|---|---|

How this was to be done with the poor machinery of a Cornish Round, I do not understand. Perhaps it would puzzle our London theaters, in all their amplitude of expedients, to do it. It was done however, we may be very sure, with no great dexterity of manner. But there are some notes relating to the death of Adam, that are particularly worthy our notice. "Death" appears to Adam, "smyt-  
"ith hem with hes spear, and he falleth upon a bed;" he makes a speech, "Devylls" come, but back "they go to Hell with great  
"noyes;" then "an Angell conveyeth Adams soole to lymbo," and "lett Adam be buried in a fayre tombe with some churche songs  
"at his buryall;" next "an Angell goeth to the tree of lyfe, and  
"breaketh an apple, and taketh iii coores," pips or seeds, "and  
"giveth y<sup>r</sup> to Seyth;" afterwards "Seyth goes to his father with the  
"coores and giveth y<sup>r</sup> hem," and, adds a note, "the 3 kernells put  
"in his mouthe and nostrells." All this presents us with some idea, of those extraordinary Dramas of our British ancestors, which the Cornish called *Guary-meers* or Great Plays, and *Guare-mirkl* or Miracle Plays. But all shows much more the wildness of Bishop

nominated expressly from the Jews, MARAZION and MARKET-JEW; *Marghas-Jewe* being in its character

Gibson's reference to this work, for any account of the windows at St. Neot's, and of "particular traditions of the Jews" delineated on them. This work is merely a play, founded on realities and embellished with fictions. And the Bishop must have been strangely imposed upon, in his reference.

Yet he is perfectly right in his assertion, and perfectly just in his language, concerning the *windows* themselves. On a closer inspection of these by the judicious and ingenious gentleman above, there appear in the eastern window of the south ayle, which is the most perfect of any in its preservation, and the most rich in its colouring; three lights pointed at the top, ornamented with tracery, and containing each three ranges, with five histories in each range. In the first history is God represented, planning the work of the creation, just going to give our world its magnitude and its form, and, what is singularly curious, furnished exactly as Milton describes him, with a pair of compasses.

. . . . . In his hand  
 He took THE GOLDEN COMPASSES, prepared  
 In God's eternal store, to circumscribe  
 This universe and all created things:  
 One foot he center'd, and the other turn'd  
 Round through the vast profundity obscure,  
 And said, Thus far extend, thus far, thy bounds,  
 This be thy just circumference, O World.

But whence did Milton derive an idea, so judicious in itself, and so poetically apposite for bodying forth the operations of a spiritual Being upon the universe of matter? "The thought of the golden compasses," says Addison, "is conceived altogether in Homer's spirit;" and "the golden compasses" themselves "appear a very natural instrument, in the hand of him whom Plato somewhere calls the Divine Geometrician." Yet Milton drew not the imagination, from either Plato, Homer, or himself. He adopted it from Solomon, who says expressly of God and the chaos at the creation,

ter of the 37th of Elizabeth described, as a trading town of great note before it was taken and destroyed by

tion, "He set a *compass* upon the face of the *depth*" (Prov. viii. 27). And the coincidence of the Cornish window with Milton, *that* delineating in general what *this* describes in particular; serves happily to confirm the derivation of the idea, from one common source of intelligence to the painter and the poet, the fountain of Jewish traditions. Then come twelve histories purely Scriptural. But the thirteenth has this inscription, "Hic Lamech sagittat Cayn;" and the fourteenth this, "Hic Seth ponit tria ova sub linguâ Adæ." Both these, consequently, are painted from the stores of Jewish tradition. The tradition concerning Lamech's killing Cain, as I find from the private information of a Jew, is still believed among the Jews; and is traceable in Ant. Un. Hist. i. 159, up to St. Jerome for Lamech's killing him with a *stone*, and up to *Rabbi Gedaliah* for his killing him (as *here*) with an *arrow*. But of Seth and the eggs I can find no trace. Only there is a story in Ant. Un. Hist. i. 167, very similar to this; which has been fathered upon some *Jew*, by Cornelius a Lapide citing Pinedo, and which is actually repeated with some little variation, in the Cornish Interlude above; that Seth, at the command of an Angel, put into Adam's mouth when he was dead, a seed of the Tree of *Knowledge*, or (as the Interlude more properly says) some seeds of the Tree of *Life*. But, what comes closer to the painting, I find it is a custom still among the Jews, for the nearest relation to the deceased, as Seth was to Adam, to live upon *eggs* for the thirty days of mourning; for the deceased himself to have one *egg*, one slice of bread, and a basin of water, placed near him and upon one side of his head, in the room where he is laid out during the short time previous to the funeral; and for all persons, perhaps derivatively from these customs, perhaps (as the Jews themselves think) from some original combination of ideas, to consider *eggs* as *an emblem of mortality*. And, just so, does Seth in the window put *three* eggs, into the mouth and under the tongue of the deceased Adam; as the same person in the Interlude, with a more elevated pitch of thought, puts *three* seeds of the Tree of *Life*, one into

by the traitors of Edward the 6th; *Markeſion* or *Markaſion*, as denominated in the Endowment of the Vicarage of St. Hilary, A. D. 1261, and in the Biſhop's approbation of it, A. D. 1313, being evidently Marghas-Sion; and both appellations being apparently derived to the Corniſh, from the relation of its inhabitants to the *Sion* of Jeruſalem, and from the Jews who had eſtabliſhed a *Marghas*, *Marbas*, or *Market*, in it. There is accordingly a tradition in the town, that there was a market of the Jews formerly there, and that it was held on the weſtern ſtrand of the ſea. Under ſuch a ſettlement

into the mouth, and one into each noſtril, as an equal emblem of *im*-mortality.

Thus are there ſtill “in the windows” of St. Neot's church, whatever Mr. Gough has finally ſaid to the contrary, in his late edition of Camden's Britannia; and preciſely, as Biſhop Giſbon had written before; “*ſeveral* pictures relating to *ſome* particular traditions “among the Jews.” Mr. Gough was miſled by the pamphlet above, to which he was a ſubſcriber. The windows actually contain *traditional* and *Jewiſh* hiſtories, as well as Scriptural. Even the Biſhop's reference to the Corniſh Interlude, as *explanatory* of the *Jewiſh traditions* in the windows, is ſo far juſt; that the windows and the Interlude run parallel each with the other, in general deſign and in particular execution; in the general derivation of the hiſtory from Scripture, and in the particular intermixture of Jewiſh traditions with it. They are even *very ſimilar*, in one of the traditions. And ſo the painting and the play unite together at laſt, to ſhow the intimate acquaintance of the Corniſh, with the popular traditions of the Jews concerning their Scriptural narratives; and to prove the readineſs which the Corniſh had imbibed from the Jews, for mingling theſe traditions with the narratives themſelves, inſerting them equally in the biography of the Patriarchs, and placing them in the ſame rank of reality with the very incidents of Scripture.

of Jews in Cornwall; when they had raised themselves a humble Sion, on the brink of the Western Ocean; and when the natives had become so far connected with them, as to listen to their *traditions*, to record them in *writings*, to exhibit them in *paintings*, and even to *mix* them with the facts of Scripture itself; we cannot wonder at this Jewish appellation of *Saracens* from the Jews, which had gone on like a subterraneous current for ages, breaking out so strongly as it does in Britain. That the Jews were once the monopolists of the tin of Cornwall, there is the strongest tradition in the west of the county. When the present tanners also discover the remains of an old smelting-place for tin, they always denominate it a *Jews House*. Old blocks of tin, too, are occasionally found of a peculiar configuration; and are constantly called *Jews Pieces*. And the stream-works of tin, that have been formerly deserted by the labourers, are now stiled in English *Jews Works*, and were used to be stiled in Cornish “Attal SARASIN,” or “the “leavings of the SARACENS.” The Jews therefore denominated themselves, and were denominated by the Britons of Cornwall, SARACENS, as

‡ From the information of my very obliging acquaintance Mr. Hitchings, Vicar of St. Hilary, near Marazion, and composer of the Nautical Almanack for the Board of Longitude; Borlase's Natural History, p. 163—164 and 190; Camden, c. 4. Gibson, &c. All this proves the Jews to have been the managers of the mines, not merely (as is said by Borlase and others) for the reign of John, but for a very long period,



the genuine progeny of Sarah. The same name, no doubt, carried the same reference with it, as borne by the genuine, and as usurped by the spurious, offspring of Abraham. And all the violent distortions of it, to which literature has had recourse, are here superseded by an explanation, which is so obvious, that it has long occurred; so easy, that it needs no recommendation; and yet for these very reasons rejected by those, who love to bewilder themselves in the mazes of literature.

Among these Saracens of Arabia, under this general darkness of ignorance, and amidst this national night of polytheism, did that grand impostor arise, who has made the name of MAHOMET to be nearly consonant to that of ANTICHRIST, in the ears of every true Christian; and who has become the father of a new and numerous race of *Arians*, in the earth. *His* Scripture is one grand system of Arianism. And like a savage Prince of antient Germany, that was proudly setting his naked foot in a dream, upon the collared neck of a Roman Emperor; this Illiterate Barbarian steps in fancy upon the back of our Saviour, and vaults into our Saviour's throne in imagination.

2.—The genius of the man is stamped in a bold relief, upon the face of his religion. With a mind naturally vigorous in itself; and impelled into a full exertion of all its vigour, by the strongest spurs which

which can harrow up the sides of human activity; he came forward upon the stage of Arabia, to gratify his avarice for fame, and to indulge his ambition for power. He became the ignorant apostle of an ignorant nation. And he betrayed his ignorance in a form, so very palpable and gross, upon his very Koran; as seems to be intended for the mint-mark of God himself, in order to show the falsity of his inspiration to every eye.

Even *beneath his pretended inspirations*, he was still so astonishingly ignorant; as not to know the difference between Mary the mother of our Lord, and—Miriam the sister of Aaron. In the third chapter of his Koran, he speaks of the Virgin Mary as the daughter of *Amran*. The title prefixed to the chapter, is *Surato'l Amran*, or the chapter of *Amran*<sup>2</sup>. “God,” says the chapter, “hath surely chosen Adam, and Noah, and the family of Abraham, and the family of *Amran*, above the rest of the world—: remember when the wife of *Amran* said,—Lord, verily I have brought forth a female—, I have called her *Mary*—; and *Zacharias* took care of the child—: and—the angels said, “O *Mary*, verily God sendeth thee good tidings, that thou shalt bear the WORD proceeding from himself, his name shall be Christ Jesus, the Son

<sup>2</sup> Prideaux's Letter to the Deists, bound up with his Life of Mahomet, p. 83.

“of Mary<sup>a</sup>.” Here Mary, the mother of our Saviour, is explicitly declared to be the daughter of *Amran*. She is thus confounded with Miriam, the sister of Moses and the real daughter of Amran. This appeared so evident to Andrew Du Ryer, that French translator of the Koran, from whom we formerly borrowed our only copy of it in English; that he presumed to correct the text in order to conceal the blunder, and silently substituted *Joachim* for *Amran* through the whole chapter. This was knavish, but it was prudent. Nor had the English reader any information of the fraud put upon him, till Dr. Prideaux exposed it properly to the nation<sup>b</sup>. And the late Mr. Sale, our English translator of the Koran from the Arabick, who inherited the very spirit of the French one, did all that could be done after such a detection, and attempted to divert what could be no longer concealed. This, he says, is “such an intolerable anachronism, if it were

<sup>a</sup> Sale’s Koran, p. 38, 39, 40. Only I have changed his *Imran* into *Amran*, as it ought to be. What prevented it from being so in his translation, is pretty obvious; as the *Ibrahim* of the original is every where *Abraham* in the version. But he chose to depart from himself and from propriety here, in order to disguise the name of Amran the better; and yet to preserve some appearances of fairness, by saying once in a note, as he says in p. 38, “Imran or “Amran.”

<sup>b</sup> Prideaux, p. 83. So also in Sale’s Koran, ch. lxxv. p. 458, God speaks of “Mary the daughter of Amran, who preserved her chastity, and into whose womb we breathed of our spirit” &c.

“certain,” as “is sufficient of *itself* to destroy the pretended authority of this book<sup>c</sup>.” And some Mahometan commentators on the Koran, as we find from him, have accordingly endeavoured to hide the shame of their prophet, behind a screen of their own erection. *Amran*, they pretend, is the *Mahometan* name for the *Joachim* of the Christians<sup>d</sup>, and the real father of the Virgin Mary; and is only by a casual coincidence, the same with that of the father of Mi-

<sup>c</sup> P. 38. There was in Mr. Sale a strange confusedness of understanding, which will account for his attachment to Mahometanism. Of this I shall give one instance here. “The hour of judgment approacheth,” says the Koran, ch. liv. p. 428, “and the moon hath been split in sunder.” “Some imagine,” as Mr. Sale remarks, “the words refer to a famous miracle supposed to have been performed by Mohammed; for it is said that—the moon appeared cloven in two—. Others think the preter tense is here used in the prophetic stile, for the future; and that the passage should be rendered, The moon *shall be* split in sunder; for this, they say, is to happen at the resurrection. The FORMER opinion is supported by reading, according to some copies, wakad inshakka 'lka-marō, i. e. since the moon *hath already been* split in sunder: the splitting of the moon being reckoned by some, to be one of the previous signs of the last day;” which is evidently in favour of the LATTER opinion. Mr. Sale has thus produced an argument in favour of the moon *having been* split, which tends to prove it had *not* been split, but *is to be* split hereafter. And can we wish for a more clear evidence of that inverted kind of Judgment, which reasons in a retrograde course, and counteracts its own purposes? After such an evidence, we shall have no need to wonder at some instances of Mr. Sale's conduct hereafter.

<sup>d</sup> See Joachim so early as Epiphanius, HÆR. lxxviii. 17. p. 1049.

riam and of Aaron<sup>e</sup>. Such a coincidence as this, however, can never be admitted by a critical mind; unless there is positive evidence adduced, for its reality. But neither these commentators, nor their European friend, pretend to adduce any. *Those* perhaps are not in the habit of arguing; but he is. Yet even he adduces none. And so weak is the reliance of both upon their own allegation, that he tells us “they suppose” in opposition to it, *the sister of Aaron* “to be meant in this place,” in the clause concerning the *family* of Amran; “or rather *both* “of them,” *both* Miriam *and* the Virgin Mary, “to be meant<sup>f</sup>.” So completely do they betray their cause, in attempting to defend it! They scarcely leave us any occasion of observing, that the Virgin Mary is stiled expressly in *another* part of the Koran, not merely “the daughter of Amran,” but even “the sister of Aaron<sup>g</sup>.” This goes with an amazing flash of conviction, to every mind. It carries at once the flame and the bolt of lightning with it. *Amran*, we see decisively, was made the father of the Virgin Mary, *because* he was the actual father

<sup>e</sup> Sale's Koran, p. 38. These, and the commentators hereafter, all knew enough of chronology, to see there were many hundreds of years intervening, between the real Amran and his suborned representative. “The commentators accordingly fail not to tell us,” says Mr. Sale, p. 38, “that there had passed about one thousand “eight hundred years” between them. They for *that* reason invented these devices.

<sup>f</sup> Koran, p. 38.

<sup>g</sup> Koran, p. 39 and 251.

of Miriam, the sister of Aaron. Yet, not to be wanting to their prophet in this blasting hour of distress, they have ventured to stretch forth their hand again, and receive the lightening upon it. But they have stretched it forth, only to be blasted themselves with their prophet. They alledge *another* coincidence of casualties, and form a *second* world of combining atoms. The Virgin Mary, they pretend, had not only a *father* called *Amran*, exactly as Miriam had; but had also, like her, a *brother* of the name of *Aaron*<sup>h</sup>. Nothing is too bold to be alledged by those, who can think such a fardle of unconnected impertinences, such a string of eternal repetitions, and such a mass of legendary anecdotes, to be the oracles of God. Nor can we hesitate a moment to believe, that had the Virgin Mary been additionally denominated “the sister of Moses,” even if such an addition *could* have made the anachronism, more notorious than it is at present; commentators, European or Arabian, with a Mahometan audacity, would instantly have created for her a brother of the name of Moses. And, in a perfect congruity of assurance with this belief, “some Mahometan writers have imagined,” says Mr. Sale himself without any reprobation, “that  
 “*the same individual* Mary, THE SISTER OF MOSES,  
 “*was miraculously preserved alive from his time till*

<sup>h</sup> Koran, p. 251.

“*that of Jesus Christ*, purposely to become the mo-  
 “*THER* of the *LATTER* <sup>i</sup>.” With such an unintended  
 but real perfidy, continuing *the original blunder of*  
*Mahomet in themselves*, and only endeavouring, by a  
 poor fraud of supposition, to reconcile it with their  
 present knowledge; do these native and auxiliary  
 advocates for the Koran, again surrender it up to  
 the trampling feet of hostility, and to the insulting  
 voice of victory <sup>k</sup>!

Mahomet was confounded in his extreme igno-  
 rance, at the very moment when he pretended to

<sup>i</sup> Koran, p. 39.

<sup>k</sup> Mr. Sale, in his friendship for the Koran, has said, “such a  
 “mistake” as I have here detected in the plainest manner, “is in-  
 “consistent with a number of—places in the Koran; whereby it mani-  
 “festly appears, that Mohammed well knew and asserted, that Moses  
 “preceded Jesus several ages” (p. 38). But this is only adding a  
 contradiction to a blunder. Mahomet was originally so ignorant, as  
 to make Miriam and the Virgin Mary the same persons. He was af-  
 terwards taught to know, that Moses the brother of Miriam was some  
 ages prior to Jesus the Son of Mary. But he had not recollection or  
 attention enough, to look back to what he had previously written,  
 and to correct it by this. Some of his commentators, as we have  
 just seen, had adopted the original blunder from him, had found its  
 inconsistency afterwards with the truths of history, yet retained both  
 in their belief, and only fabricated a ridiculous supposition to re-  
 concile them. Mahomet went so far as to retain both, but either  
 was not sensible of the contradiction between them, or would not  
 take the trouble of reconciling them. From the imposture of pre-  
 tending to revelations, he probably became a dupe at times to his  
 own impositions, fancied he had revelations, and acted in a lazy  
 confidence on the fancy. He certainly became very negligent, in  
 framing the several parts of his Koran. And I shall soon show a  
 variety of contradictions in it.

be illuminated from heaven; by the name of the Virgin Mary, and the name of the sister of Aaron, being written in Arabick exactly after the same manner, *Miriam*<sup>1</sup>. He had no light of chronology, to disclose the personal difference to him, amidst the perplexing sameness of appellations. He very naturally, therefore, *thought* the same names to indicate the same persons. The Alexander of the Roman empire, became the military hero of Macedonia; in the *opinion* of the historically blind. Then the presumption of the prophet, lent a boldness to the blind man. He *mentioned* the Virgin Mary expressly, as “the daughter of Amran.” He was too confident, to suspect his own absurdity. He went on in the hardness of pretended illumination and of real blindness, to mention her again as “the sister of Aaron.” He has thus fixed such a stigma of forgery upon his oracles, as lies level to the understandings of all mankind. An anachronism like this, strikes more strongly upon the minds and spirits of the un-reasoning multitude; than all the doctrinal arguments in the world. For that reason, have the friends of Mohametanism run up

<sup>1</sup> This name “the Orientals always write Maryam or Miriam” (Sale’s Discourse, p. 54. a note). The name is written the same in *Greek* too; the Virgin Mary being called *Mariam* in Mat. i. 20, xiii. 55, and in Luke i. 27, 30, 34, 38, 39, 46, 56, ii. 5, 16, 19, 34. And Miriam herself is called *Mariam*, *Μαριαμμη*, in Josephus Ant. Jud. ii. ix. 4. p. 75; and *Mary*, in St. Ambrose and others (Pearson on the Creed, p. 169).



hastily, to the tottering edifice of Gothick absurdity; endeavoured to rear their equally Gothick buttresses, in order to support it; and laboured to prop up a fabrick of falsehoods, by an accession of fictions. But their props have only served, to show the tottering state of the edifice the more. And this broad brand of imposture, is only made by the attempts for preventing its application; to be more decisively applied, and more deeply indented, upon the clumsy forehead of Mahometanism. Mahomet, the prophet of God, and the superior of our Saviour, appears before all the world; annihilating no less than fifteen hundred years, in the fathomless abyss of his own ignorance.

But this is not the only instance of the kind, in the self-convicted Mahomet. Imposture may pretend to inspiration, but only real inspiration can illuminate ignorance. It was only the spirit of God, that brooded upon the dark face of the chaos. And we have another blunder of chronology, in Mahomet's Koran; that has never been noticed like the former, and yet is more glaring (I think) than it. God is said "to show" something to "*Pharaoh*, and *Haman*, and their forces;" to pronounce "*Pharaoh*, and *Haman*, and their forces,—*sinners*;" and to make *Pharaoh* thus address *Haman*, "*Wherefore do thou, O Haman, burn me clay into bricks, and build me a high tower, that I may ascend to the God of Moses, for I verily believe him*

“to be a liar<sup>m</sup>.” This is plainly an astonishing jumble of *three* points of history into *one*. The minister of Ahafuerus at the captivity, is made by a vault of dexterity over a line of nearly nine centuries, minister to Pharaoh at the Exodus; and both he and Pharaoh are engaged in doing, what was done near seventeen centuries before the captivity,—in building the Tower of Babel. And the Mahometan commentators, with an unhappiness very similar to what we have seen before, and proving them to be only *less* ignorant than their master; say “that *Haman*, having prepared *bricks* and *other materials*, employed no less than *fifty thousand men*, “beside labourers, in the building; which they “carried to *so immense a height*, that the workmen “could no longer stand upon it; that Pharaoh” could though the workmen could not, and, “ascending “this tower, *threw a javelin towards heaven*” from it, though the workmen could not stand upon it, “which fell back again” upon the tower (I suppose) “stained with blood: whereupon he impiously “boasted, that he had killed the God of Moses; “but at sunset God sent the angel Gabriel, who with “one stroke of his wing *demolished the Tower*; a “part whereof, falling on the king’s army, *destroyed “a million of men*”.” This wild and legendary tale

<sup>m</sup> Ch. xxviii. p. 320. See also ch. xl. p. 385.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. p. 321. See also in p. 131 a note of Mr. Sale’s own, referring to all this as true.

of the Koran, let us compare with the intimations in some antient authors; and we shall then see it referring directly to the Tower of Babel. A very antient historian of Assyria, Abydenus, says concerning the latter; that “the men erected a fortress of towers fit to ascend to the sun, and were now near heaven;” and that “the winds, assisting the Gods, threw down the structure on their heads.” This is exactly similar to the Koran, in those four grand particulars; the height of the tower, the design of erecting it, the overthrow of it by God, and the fall of it on the heads of the builders. An historical Sibyl of some antiquity too, speaks exactly in the same manner concerning the same tower; saying “they builded a very lofty tower, as going to mount up into Heaven by it;” and adding that “the Gods sent winds, and overturned the tower P.” And Eupolemus subjoins, that “the tower” of Babel “fell down under the operation of God 9.” These evidences are sufficient to show the sameness. But let us come nearer to the native country, of this Bible of the Saracens; and we shall see the sameness

o Prepar. Evang. p. 243. Πυργων τυχσιν ηλιδατον αιρειν, να αυν Βαβυλων εστιν ηδη τε ασσον ειναι τε θρανε και τες ανεμας, Θεοισι Βαθεολας, αναλρεψαι περι αυλοισι το μηχανημα.

P Ibid. p. 244. Πυργον ακοδομησαν τινες υψηλοτατον, ως επι του θρανου αναδρησομενοι δι αυλα οι δε Θεοι, ανεμας επιπεμφαητες, ανελρεψαι του πυργου.

9 Ibid. p. 245. Πολιν Βαβυλωνα πρωτον μεν κτισθηται—, οικοδομει δε του ισοθρημενον πυργου· πεσοντος δε τειε υπο της τε θεε ενεργειας, κ. 7. λ.

still

still plainer. An author of *their own* informs us, that “*Nimrod* built this tower, *that he might ascend to Heaven to see Abraham’s God*, who had delivered him from the fiery furnace, into which that tyrant had cast him: they worked at this building three years; and, when *Nimrod had got on the top of it*, he wondered to see the Heaven as far from him as before; but his astonishment increased, when this tower, and another which he had built for the same purpose, were successively *overthrown*.” Even the very *commentators on the Koran* in another place, speak of “the tower which *Nimrod*—built in Babel, and carried to an immense height (five thousand cubits, say some), foolishly purposing thereby to ascend to Heaven, and wage war with the inhabitants of that place; but God frustrated his attempt, utterly overthrowing the tower by a violent wind and earthquake.” Here we have almost all

Ant. Un. Hist. i. 278, and Sale’s Koran, p. 216, note. See also Koran, p. 269, for *Nimrod* and *Abraham*. So *Abulfuragius* says, that the tower of *Nimrod* was “overthrown by tempestuous winds” (Ant. Un. Hist. i. 283). These evidences for the overthrow of the Tower of Babel, are the more remarkable; as the only authentic history of the erection, says merely the men “left off to build the city” (Gen. xi. 8); and ascribes the defeat of their project, not to any overthrow of the tower, but to a very different cause, a miraculous confusion of their language. Yet even *Tertullian* in the west, has the same account in a passage, that also marks the Divinity of our Saviour: “*Filius itaque est qui ab initio judicavit, turrim superbissimam elidens, linguasque dispersiens*” (Adv. Praxeam, c. xvi. p. 509). And this serves to show the derivation of the circumstance in all, from traditional history.

the

the omitted strokes of similarity in the preceding intimations, supplied at once by the hand of *Arabians* themselves. And the tower of the Koran appears indubitably at the close, to be the very Tower of Babel itself, beheld through the disguising mirror of popular romances and Mahometan fictions united; and built in the peculiar and double blunder of Mahometan ignorance, by the command of Moses's Pharaoh, and under the direction of Ahasuerus's Haman.

I dwell the longer upon these proofs of Mahomet's ignorance, because they carry such an energy of detection with them; have been endeavoured to be disingenuously softened away by Mr. Sale, in one of the instances; and have not been noticed, by the elegant, the refined, and the judicious Mr. White, in either. Mr. White stations himself in a higher element of the Mahometan region, and takes a more comprehensive, and a kind of bird's-eye, view of the Mahometan system beneath him. I come down to the system itself, range over it with a human eye, and set my foot upon some mountainous deformities in it. In this mode of acting, let me add one observation more, upon the general tenour of the Koran. There is a strange variety of *contradictions* in it. The whole forms merely a chaos of contending elements. Of this I shall notice one instance, because I know not that it has been noticed before, and because it is a very signal one. "Believe in  
" God,"

“ God,” says Mahomet, “ and his apostle the illiterate prophet,—and follow *him* that ye may be *rightly directed*; of the people of *Moses* there is a *party*, who *direct others with truth*.” Here *some* of the Jews are declared, to be friends and favourers of Mahometanism. But he, who may as justly be called “ the contradictory prophet” as the illiterate one, in another place supercedes his own assertion thus. “ O true believers,” says Mahomet again, “ take not the *Jews* or *Christians* for your friends; they are friends the one to the other; but whofo among you taketh them for his friends, he is surely *one of them*; verily God directeth not *unjust people*.” “ Thou shalt surely find,” adds Mahomet in the *very same* chapter, “ the most violent of all men in enmity against the true believers, to be the *Jews* and the *Idolaters*; and thou shalt surely find those among them, to be the most inclinable to *entertain friendship* for the true believers, who say we are *Christians*: this cometh to *pass*, because there are *priests* and *monks* among them, and because *they* are not *elated with pride*.” “ How are they infatuated?” exclaims Mahomet in a subsequent chapter against the *Christians*; “ they take their *priests* and their *monks*, for *their lords* *besides God*;—verily many of the *priests* and *monks* devour the substance of men in vanity, and *obstruct the way of God*.” And, as Mahomet similarly says in a fifth passage, “ O ye who have received

“ceived the Scripture, come to a just determination between us and you, that we *worship* not any except God, and that *the one of us take not the other for lords beside God.*” Thus those Jews, some of whom were embracing Mahometanism, and inducing others to embrace it, are *all* of them the “most violent of—men in enmity” against it. Thus also those Christians, who are proscribed as equally enemies to Mahometanism with the Jews, in one passage; are noticed as peculiar friends to it, in another. Those priests and monks too, who are said to make them friends, are declared to prevent them from being so. And those, who are humbly leading them to own the unity of God with Mahomet, are proudly setting themselves up for lords together with God; and are proudly attracting the worship of the Christians, to themselves conjointly with God. Perhaps confusion itself can hardly furnish out in all its wide wilderness, a contradiction more massy and substantial than this. Many more of the same nature might be specified. But I need not dwell upon any more, because they are acknowledged in general by the Mahometans themselves. Too plain to be denied, and too gross to be refined away, they stand equally with the chronological blunders before, as an illumination on the face of the False Prophet,

\* Sale's Koran, ch. vii. p. 134, ch. v. p. 89 and 93, ch. ix. p. 153, and ch. iii. p. 44.

apparent to every eye<sup>t</sup>. The Mahometans, however, have very naturally done all that could be done, to obscure and hide the present illumination. They have had recourse, to the only expedient left them for the purpose. They suppose a principle of abrogation, to be at work in the Koran itself, to be exercising its hostility against *parts*, and so to be virtually dissolving the authority of the *whole*. And the only check which they have upon such a principle, and the only barrier which they raise to its ravages, is a *chronological* one. The earlier passages are abrogated by the later. “For they say,” as Mr. Sale himself informs us, “that God in the Koran commanded *several* things, which were “for good reasons *afterwards* revoked and abrogated<sup>v</sup>.”

One of these instances ought to be particularly recited, in order to set the character of this extraordinary man, in its true light. He had expressly forbidden fornication, by the mouth of God. “The whore and the whoremonger,” God says, “shall ye scourge with an hundred stripes; and let “not compassion towards them prevent you from “executing the judgment of God, if ye believe in

<sup>t</sup> The mark by which Mahomet was known, say the Mahometans, “was the prophetick light which shone on his face” (Prideaux p. 9).

<sup>v</sup> Sale’s Discourse, p. 66.



“ God and the last day\*.” But an unlucky accident interposed afterwards, to annul the positive command, and to indulge the prophet in a breach of the prohibition. A handsome girl raised a flame in the heart of the libidinous Mahomet, that dissolved at once the divinity of his revelations, and unlaced the reputation of the prophet. He committed the prohibited act with her. He thus fell, as many have fallen before him. But his fall was distinguished, by a pre-eminence of iniquity above them all. One of his wives heard of it, and very properly reproached him with it. He was now, by his own revelation, to be “ scourged with a hundred stripes;” and his followers were to “ let no compassion prevent them from executing this judgment of God, “ *if they believed in God and the last day.*” But, in hopes of stifling the discovery made of his shame by her, he solemnly promised her with an *oath*, to have no future communication with the woman. She however exposing the sunken prophet to some of his other wives, he found himself so openly detected, that he became most profligately resolute. Awed by no principles of religion within, and controuled by no fears of shame without, he threw off all reserves of modesty, broke through all restraints of his oath, and abandoned himself to an open dissoluteness with her, for a whole month. By this time the *lecher*

\* Sale's Koran, chap. xxiv. p. 287.

was gratified, and the *prophet* had power to act. He saw the deed which he had done, to be expressly contradictory to the prohibition of God, and to bear upon it the superadded pollution of perjury itself. He began probably to tremble for the consequences. How then did he attempt to prevent them? He left not the lasciviousness to plead *its* excuse in *his* weakness, by adverting only to the perjury. This pressed, no doubt, with peculiar force upon his character. But the other pressed also. Under the load of guilt from both, any but an impostor of the first magnitude for confidence and courage, must have sunk discredited for ever. But his confidence rose with his guilt, and his courage mounted directly into audacity. And he introduced God in a new chapter of the Koran, *licensing* him to commit fornication with Mary, and, what is still more, *authorizing* him to violate his oath<sup>v</sup>. “O prophet,” *now* cries his varying God, “why holdest thou that to be prohibited which God hath ALLOWED THEE,” though God had actually prohibited it before, “seeking to please thy wives; since God is inclined to forgive and be merciful?” These last words imply it still to be prohibited, though he has just said that God hath allowed it to him. “God hath allowed you *the dissolution of your oaths*; and God is your master, and he is know-

<sup>v</sup> Mod. Un, Hist. i. 159—160.

“ing and wife<sup>z</sup>.” Thus does the God of Mahomet, with some confusion of ideas and some contradictoriness of expressions, abrogate his own recent prohibition of fornication, and cancel his own eternal interdict against perjury. The abrogation, in the *terms* of it, is confined to Mahomet. But, as it is not expressly restrained to him; and as no reason is assigned for the abrogation to *him*, which does not equally extend to all; the abrogation in its *consequence* becomes universal, and a general fornication is permitted by the God of Mahomet; by that very God too, who had been faithful enough to himself and to holiness, to forbid it a little before, but who recollected himself afterward, then untied all the bands of human purity, and so left the exorbitance of human lust to rove at full liberty over the world. Such a Cyprian Deity, has the hand of Mahomet set up in heaven! But that hand has done still worse, in the present passage. His God has “allowed “you the dissolution of your oaths.” The very *terms* here are general. An universal perjury is sanctioned by the Koran. And the *Jupiter* of the Mahometans expressly “allows” them, to violate every oath, and to range from perjury to perjury, without check and without limit. Mahomet has thus done the worst that a fiend from hell could do, to break down all the fences of modesty, to tear up

<sup>z</sup> Sale's Koran, ch. lxvi. p. 455.

all the barriers of society, and to turn out the wild beast man, loose upon the common of nature<sup>a</sup>.

So

<sup>a</sup> Prideaux in p. 147, has, by some strange mistake, added to the passage in Koran, chap. lxvi. this clause, "God hath granted "unto you to lie with your maid-servants." These words, says Sale, "are not to be found here or elsewhere in the Koran, and "contain an allowance of *what is expressly forbidden therein*,—"chap. xxiv. p. 287" (p. 456). The words are certainly not in our copies at present. But the "allowance of what is expressly forbidden" before, is just the same without them as with them. "Why holdest thou that to be prohibited," says God *here* concerning what he had *there* prohibited himself, and what he *now* says "God hath allowed thee?" The preceding prohibition, therefore, is annulled at present. Nor is it annulled to Mahomet alone. The prohibition was general, the annulling is not expressly particular. The annulling indeed seems as general, as the prohibition. And what is now allowed to Mahomet, was certainly prohibited to him before. There is no exception to Mahomet in the prohibition. Nor does what Mr. Sale says in p. 456, avail a straw. Prideaux "proceeds to tell us," he says, "that in this chapter Mohammed "brings in God allowing him and all his moslems, to lie with their "maids when they will, notwithstanding their wives; whereas the "words relate to the prophet only, who *wanted not any new permission* for that purpose, because *it was a privilege already granted "him* (chap. xxxii. p. 348—349), though to none else." But, to the honour of Mahomet be it spoken, he had no such privilege of fornication. He had only the privilege of—marrying as many wives as he pleased. "O prophet," says God in the pages referred to, "we have allowed thee thy *wives* unto whom thou hast given their "dower, and also the *slaves* which thy right hand possesseth, of the "booty which God hath granted thee; *and* the daughters of thy "uncle, *and* the daughters of thy aunts,—who have fled with thee "from Mecca, *and* any other believing woman, if she give herself "unto the prophet; *in case the prophet desireth to take her to wife*. "This is a peculiar privilege granted unto thee, above the rest of  
" the

So plainly was Mahomet himself the first, that introduced this principle of abrogation into the Koran! But his commentators have digested it into a kind of plan or system; a plan of disorder, and a system of confusion. " Passages abrogated," they say, " are distinguished into three kinds; the first,

" the true believers" (p. 348—349). Accordingly Mr. Sale himself remarks upon this passage; that " no moslem can legally *marry* " above four *wives*, whether free-women or slaves; whereas Mohammed is, by the preceding passage, left at liberty *to take as many [wives] as he pleases*, though with some restrictions" (p. 349). And " it is related of Omm Hâni, the daughter of Abu Taleb," he says in another note, " that she should say, The apostle of God courted me for his *wife*, but I excused myself to him, " and he accepted of my excuse: afterwards this verse was revealed; " but he was not thereby allowed to *marry* me, because I fled not " with him" (p. 348). So inconsistent is Mr. Sale with himself, as in p. 456 to plead that part of the Koran for a sanctioned pre-eminence in fornication to Mahomet, which in p. 348—349, and at the place, he had shown to be merely an extended right of polygamy to him. In discourse, p. 137, inconsistent with himself in both these passages, he makes it to extend to polygamy *and* to fornication. The facts also, which I have related in the text, and which are equally related by Mr. Sale in p. 456—457, of Mahomet's secretly committing fornication with Mary; of his being discovered by one of his wives; of his being reproached by her; of his promising with an oath, never to do so again (see also p. 413); of her communicating the secret, to some of his other wives; of his plunging desperately, when thus detected, into an open course of fornication; and of his having final resort to a new revelation, in vindication of his impurity, and in absolution of his perjury: all show him to have been prohibited from fornication before. And, as the *substance* of what Prideaux has asserted, though not the *form* of it, stands fully justified; so the Mahometan doctrine of abrogation, is strikingly exposed by all.

“ where the *letter* and the *sense* are *both* abrogated; “ the second, where the *letter* only is abrogated, but “ the *sense* remains; and the third, where the *sense* is “ abrogated, but the *letter* remains.” What infinite uncertainty such a triple series of abrogations, must necessarily make in *any* code of revelation; is obvious to every intellect. No revelation could subsist with them. As soon might the globe of the earth, according to the Mahometan mythology, be placed upon the body of an ox, which is placed upon a white stone, which is placed upon—nothing.

Yet let us notice an instance of each of the three. Mahomet, according to tradition, gave his secretary “ a verse” to be set down in the Koran. The secretary set it down. But, looking in the Koran next morning, he found the verse had vanished from the page, and the place of it was all a blank. He applied to Mahomet with the wonderful intelligence. And Mahomet “ assured him, the verse “ was revoked the same night.” The God of Mahomet, it seems, had slept after his first revelation of it; and was now sober enough, to see the impropriety of what he had done the night before. There was also, it is said, this precept originally in the Koran: “ if a man and woman of reputation com- “ mit adultery, ye shall stone them both; it is a “ punishment ordained by God, for God is mighty “ and wise.” This injunction, so proper in itself,

was

was extant in the Koran while Mahomet was alive; according to the tradition of Omar, who was afterwards Khaliff. He had seen it there. But, after the death of Mahomet, it was not to be found. How was this? When Mahomet had been guilty of adultery with Mary, it seems, he had secretly erased the punishment of stoning out of his Bible, as the pirate did the command against stealing, in tenderness to himself; and so left his followers to continue the practice, even when the injunction was privately withdrawn. And “of the last kind,” adds Mr. Sale, “are observed *several* verses in “*sixty-three* different chapters, to the number of “*two hundred and twenty-five*”<sup>b</sup>. Yet the very man who introduced the doctrine of abrogation, in order to obviate the absurdity of his own contradictions; with a contradictoriness accumulated upon the head of all, and with an effrontery completely Mahometan, denies the existence of all contradictions in his Koran; and even challenges the authority of inspiration for it, on this very account. “Do “they not,” says this boldest of all bold falsifiers, “attentively consider the Koran? If it had been “from any besides God, they would certainly have “found therein many contradictions.” He was speaking to the blind; and *therefore* had the hardi-

<sup>b</sup> Sale's Discourse, p. 64—65; and see p. 135, for the stoning.

<sup>c</sup> Sale's Koran, chap. iv. p. 71.

ness to deny the existence of a Sun, that was shining out at noon-day upon him.

Of those contradictions however, that yet remain upon the page of asserted inspiration, because the inspirer forgot to expunge, when he resolved to revoke them; who shall ascertain what is revoked, and what is not? Who shall say what is posterior, and what is prior? The *order of position* will not determine this. A part of the *ninety-sixth* chapter is generally believed, to have been the *first* revealed; while some say, the *first* was the *beginning* of the *seventy-fourth*: and the *ninth* is equally agreed, to have been the chapter that was *last* revealed; though some think the ninth a part of the eighth, which was revealed many years before. “The *first five* “*verses* of this chapter,” says Mr. Sale more circumstantially concerning the *ninety-sixth*, “are generally allowed to be the *first* passage of the Koran; which was revealed; though *some* give this honour to the *seventy-fourth* chapter, and *others* to “the *first*, the *next* (they say) being the *sixty-eighth* .” “It seems,” Mr. Sale also informs us, “that the *verse* or *passage*, wherein such word occurs” as now gives title to the chapter, “was in point of *time* revealed and committed to writing, *before* the other verses of the *same* chapter,

\* Mod. Un. Hist. i. 3, and Sale's Koran, p. 148—149, 139, 471, and 456.

“ which



“ which *precede* it in *order*; and the title being given  
 “ to the chapter *before* it was *completed*, or the  
 “ *passages* reduced to their *present* order, the verse,  
 “ from which such title was taken, did not always  
 “ happen to begin the chapter<sup>e</sup>.” This is an  
 amazing circumstance, in the Mahometan doctrine  
 of abrogations. Not only the chapters are out of all  
 historical order, but even the very verses of those  
 chapters are so. How then shall chronology come  
 in to say, which passage shall stand and which shall  
 fall? Chronology has no power over such a scene  
 of confusion. Her *fat* can never be heard by this  
 wild waste of chaos. She has no ground to stand  
 upon herself, and none even to fix her golden com-  
 passes upon. And the war of elements must con-  
 tinue to be waged for ever. We may see this ex-  
 emplified in a particular case. “ It shall not be  
 “ lawful for thee,” says God to Mahomet, “ to  
 “ take other women to wife hereafter,” besides the  
 nine which he now had, and which he was allowed  
 in a passage immediately preceding to have. But  
 some Mahometan commentators, as Mr. Sale tells  
 us, “ are of opinion, that this verse is *abrogated*, by  
 “ the two *preceding* verses *or* one of them; and was  
 “ revealed *before* them, though it be read *after*  
 “ them<sup>f</sup>.” The principle of abrogation therefore,  
 which is to reconcile all the jarring parts of the Ko-

<sup>e</sup> Sale's Discourse, p. 57.

<sup>f</sup> Sale's Koran, p. 349.

ran, by removing the historically prior, and so leaving the historically posterior at peace; is *absolutely impossible to be reduced into practice*, in general. When there is no determined priority of time, for the injunction; there cannot be any possible posteriority, for the abrogation. The injunction may be the abrogation, and the abrogation may be the injunction. And the contradictions stand in full force with the blunders, to prove the Koran not an emanation from the wisdom of God, and not even an effusion from the wisdom of man; but a composition tinctured strongly with the folly of human ignorance, and impregnated sharply with the ferment of human iniquity!

I have dwelt the longer upon these points of Mahometanism, in order to introduce with greater propriety some remarks upon the Arianism of it, and to counteract the late efforts of Mr. Gibbon in its favour. He has endeavoured to tear away the rags from the malkin of Mahometanism, and to dress it up in a holiday suit of his own. But he has made himself the very MAHOMET of history, by the attempt: an *imposter* in facts, a *satyr* in lechery; wounding himself severely, with the very point of his own *contradictions*; and yet staggering eagerly forward, to put himself at the head of the *enemies of Christ*. Nor let the reader be surpris'd, at my speaking so strongly against a man, whom I was  
once

once proud to call my friend. I honour his splendid abilities; but I must for ever protest, against his anti-christian application of them. And I wish to bear my testimony upon every occasion, against that muddy inundation of folly and of falsehood; which the unhappy dexterity of his hand, has let loose upon the Christian world. Never perhaps was literature more the impudent pander of sensuality, and never was reason perhaps more the falsifying slave of unbelief, than in his well-known history.

3. - In this state of Mahomet and his religion, the Christian Sun of Futurity broke in upon the Saracens of Arabia. It broke in indeed dreadfully discoloured by the medium, through which it passed to them. He exhibited those coming ages of existence to man, that awfully commence when life is terminated; and that naturally engage the deepest attentions of our honest selfishness, from the undefined duration of them; in an imagery, that was all corporeal, all sensual, and highly inflammatory to the combustible passions, of his own and the Arabian temper. He himself was a very prodigy of lustfulness. This it is difficult to show, without offending my own and my readers' delicacy. But it is requisite to hurt a little the sensibilities of delicacy, in order to maintain the precision of history. The lustfulness of Mahomet has always been considered, and very justly, as the marking feature of his historical face.

He

He was, in truth, a very Demi-god in obscenity. This PAN of Arabia, man, goat, and god in one, is reported by evidence that cannot be resisted in general, to have had the common sensuality of *forty* men, all united and combined in his own person. And what I add with pain, however necessary it may be to the completeness of my description, because I consider it as too pointed in itself; this PRIAPUS of Mecca is equally reported by equally competent testimony, founded assuredly on the relations of his own vaunting sensuality, to have once used all his eleven wives successively, within the compass of a single hour<sup>3</sup>. Both these representations indeed, however attested by history, must seem to *our* minds absolutely impossible in fact. But great allowance ought certainly to be made, for the superior vivacity of corporeal sensations, in an Arabian compared with a Briton. What is impossible with us, I believe, is quite possible with them. "The ardour," says even an Italian historian con-

<sup>3</sup> Prideaux, p. 149, from "Fortalium Fidei, lib. iv. confid. 2," the work of a Franciscan friar in 1459, "Guadagnol. tract. 2, cap. 7, sect. i." published by another in 1631, "Richardi Confutatio, c. 8," a book of great weight, written from a personal conversation with the Saracens about 1210, and "Disputatio Christiani, c. 6," written by one who was an officer in the very court of a Saracenic monarch before, and probably long before, 1130; for the first point: and "Johannes Andreas e libro Assamail, cap. 7," the composition of a Mahometan doctor, who was converted in 1487, and "Guadagnol. tract. 2, cap. 7, sect. i. ex eodem libro," a Saracenic work, of which nothing more is now known than from the quotations of these two authors; for the second.

cerning the Saracens, “ with which both sexes “ among them rush dissolutely into lust, is incredible in itself.” The avèrments of history, therefore, may perhaps be true to their full extent. Even if we bring them much nearer to the line of our own feelings, by considering them as heightened considerably from the vauntings of a sensuality, that was proud of its animal prowess, and pleased to enhance it by falsehoods; yet in general they serve very strongly to show us that vast enormity of lust, which, in the opinion not merely of Arabians but of Europeans, in the apprehension of Mahometans as well as Christians, actuated the body of this pretended prophet; and made him a *leader* in lustfulness among the lustful Saracens, the very *king of satyrs*. The lustfulness of him and of his countrymen, however, was not, as it has been stated to be, the result of their climate<sup>1</sup>. They must then have shared it with all their confining neighbours. And their own excess of venery could not have been, either particular in them or incredible to others. It was the consequence of long habits of indulgence. Arabia thus became the Cyprus of the continent, and from the *same* principle of idolatry. The Arabians and the Cypriots united, in that last extreme surely of

<sup>1</sup> A. Marcellinus, xiv. 4, p. 14. Valefius. “ Incredibile est, quo ardore apud eos in venerem uterque solvitur sexus.”

<sup>2</sup> Prideaux, p. 149.

reason subjected to sense, the adoration of an acknowledged whore.

In Sanaa, the metropolis of Yaman or Arabia Felix, was a temple erected professedly to the honour of the planet Venus, under the title of *Al Zohara*; which was reckoned so sacred, that death was prophetically denounced against the man, who should destroy it<sup>k</sup>. *Allat* was the idol of another tribe, and seems to have been a real Venus; the deity being a female one; the name most probably signifying the Goddess; and the *women* of the town where it was worshipped, begging of Mahomet it might not be destroyed at all, then intreating to have the destruction deferred for three years, soliciting next for a respite only of one month, and at last lamenting passionately their loss in its fate. *Al Uzab* or the Mighty was the idol of two tribes and a half, a female certainly, and a real Venus probably: being the rival of the grand idol at Mecca; and attended by a female priest, who, at the demolition of her temple, ran out of it with her hair dishevelled, and with her hands upon her head, as a suitor supplicating for its preservation<sup>m</sup>. *Manab* or the Bountiful, was another Venus, I suppose; being the female idol of two tribes, and (according to some)

<sup>k</sup> Sale's Discourse, p. 17. See also John of Damascus, and St. Jerome, in Reland. de Reb. Mah. chap. v. for the Arabians worshipping the star Lucifer or Venus, to the days of Heraclius.

<sup>l</sup> Sale's discourse, p. 18. <sup>m</sup> Sale's Discourse, p. 18 and 136.

of three others, even of the one which worshipped Allat; and being in itself only *a large stone*." These were all *three* reckoned most high and beautiful damsels, as well as objects of adoration. But on two mountains adjoining to Mecca, were also two idols, one male, the other female; who are said by the Arabians themselves, to have been natives, that *committed whoredom together in the temple of Mecca*, that were therefore converted into *stone*, and afterwards *worshipped* by the Meccans". Indeed "*several*" of the Arabian idols, as Mr. Sale informs us, "*were no more than large rude stones*." And I therefore consider *the black stone* at Mecca, as another idol of Venus among the ancient Meccans; they who professedly worshipped a whore in stone, they who worshipped professedly the planetary and probably the real Venus, and most probably in a large stone too, very probably worshipping the real Venus in this. This is *set in silver*, and fixed at the south-eastern angle of the temple without, about seven spans from the ground. There it is exceedingly respected by the Mahometans. It marks the angle, from which the pilgrims begin their processions of seven circuits round the temple; and is kissed by all the pilgrims at every circuit with great devotion, either immediately with the lips them-

<sup>n</sup> Discourse, p. 18 and 136.

<sup>o</sup> Koran, chap. xxii. 279.

<sup>p</sup> Discourse, p. 20.

<sup>q</sup> Discourse, p. 20, and See

Koran, chap. v. p. 82.

selves, or mediately through the hand that touches it. It was used by Mahomet himself, *before* he established his religion at Mecca, as a kind of altar or divinity; to which he led his slave Zeid, and at which he formally adopted him for his son. And it is even called by some of the Meccans, from a high and traditional reverence for it, THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD ON EARTH. The Meccans equally relate it from tradition, to be *one of the precious stones of paradise*; that fell down to the earth with Adam, was preserved by an angel, and afterwards brought to Abraham *when he was building the temple*. Even since they became Mahometans, they offered no less than *five thousand pieces of gold* (or 3334 pounds sterling) for it, to an enemy who was taking it away. The enemy refused to accept even such a ransom for it, *intending by it to draw away all the pilgrims from Mecca*; and the Meccans, on recovering it, say they proved its identity by a miracle, the heavy mass floating upon water<sup>r</sup>. All shows the stone to have been formerly an object of worship, and in all probability a symbol of Venus herself. Accordingly those processions round the temple, which still form the principal part of the worship, were all made by the worshipping men and women *quite naked*; are now made by the men *nearly naked*; and were allowed to be made by Mahomet himself, with the

<sup>r</sup> Discourse, p. 117—118, and 119, and Mod. Un. Hist. i. 195, and Koran, p. 347.



liberty of taking *any* of the *women* into a *secret place*, and of *lying with them there*. Such an additional proof have we here of the shameless exorbitance of his lusts, in the impurities of his religious worship at the temple of Mecca! So plainly too was the temple of Mecca, a very temple of whoredoms! And the surprising co-incidence of a new testimony with all, which asserts the stone to have the figure of a *head* upon it, and of a *crescent* to mark the head for that of a *Venus*; and which is as surprisingly corroborated again in the *mythology*, by the Græcian historians declaring the ancient Arabs, to have actually worshipped Urania (or Venus), under the title of Allat; and by the Syrian and Arabian Venus, being always exhibited with a crescent as Urania: proves the temple of Mecca beyond a doubt, to have been originally that temple of Venus, in which men and women committed whoredom as an act of worship; the black stone to have been that idol of it, before which they thus worshipped; and that ensign of Mahometanism, the crescent, to have been originally derived from both.

Such

\* Mod. Un. Hist. i. 213, Sale's Discourse, p. 16, and Bibliotheca Biblica, i. 613—614. "According to Euthymius Zigabenus," says the first work, "there appears the figure of a human head cut in it, which some take to be the head of a Venus; but this is not sufficiently supported by any Arab author." An Arabian author would be the *best* witness, undoubtedly. But, in matters of testimony, we must not always expect the best. A second-rate testimony

Such a mode of devotion, which exalted whoredom into worship, was sure to go with a sweeping tide

is all, that we can ordinarily expect. And such is that of Euthymius, here cited; especially when not opposed by any other evidence whatever. And when it coincides with a long train of testimonies, and forms a happy link to an extended chain of evidence, as it does here; then the attestation becomes decisive. “The black stone,” says Mr. Parker in the last work, “is an oblong square, about four feet in length and two in breadth, as it were a cube upon a cube, within a greater cube, which is the Mahometan Caaba;” a name for the temple of Mecca, that is probably derived from its quadrangular form (Sale’s Discourse, p. 114). “At first it was placed not within any temple or mosque, but in the open fields; and these grounds, so long as it continued in them, the Arabians pretend were made happy and fruitful by it, and freed from all noxious creatures.—Whether it was originally designed for a talisman of Mars or of Venus, admits of some dispute; Suidas affirming, that the Arabians worshipped the god Mars, under the species of a quadrangular stone of such a dimension; but others, with equal assurance, maintaining it to be the stone of Cabar, or the tabernacle of the star Venus;—and it is said the figure of Venus is seen to this day engraved upon it, with a crescent.—The very Caaba itself was at first an idolatrous temple, where the Arabians worshipped Al-Uza, that is, Venus.—The ceremonies which are used in visiting this stone, the salutation made to the Caaba and to the stone, and the prayer which is to be said in approaching it [the Caaba, I suppose], are to be found in the account of Bobovius published by Dr. Hyde.—The sculpture of a little crescent upon this stone, remarkably discovers the genius and original of this sect; and the Arabian as well as Syrian Venus having been commonly taken for the moon in all these parts, the day of Venus, which is Friday, came to be in such veneration among this people as their weekly *giuma*, and the ridges of their houses and the tops of their mosques to be adorned with this symbol (*Uranixæ corniculatæ sacrum. Seld. de Venere Syriacâ*).” In Cyprus was “a temple to Venus, probably Venus Urania or the chaste Venus; for there  
“ was

tide of impurity through the land. Mahomet therefore drest up his ages of futurity, as his ancestors had drest up their devotions, in the warmest colours of sensuality. The paradise or heaven of Mahomet, for his heaven he calls paradise, has accordingly been considered in every age since he arose, as one of the most pregnant proofs of the spirit of his religion, and of the source of his revelations. To pleasant gardens, bubbling fountains, flowing currents, and shading trees, he has taken particular care, to add beds of fine carpets and green cushions for the blessed, and a variety of females to share the beds with them. These females are not their former wives, the women with whom

“ was a city in this part called Urania,—and it was not lawful for  
 “ *any woman to enter this temple*” (Pococke, ii. part i. p. 218). See also Ant. Un. Hist. xvii. 270—273, for Urania being considered as Venus and the Moon: and that the Arabians made their processions round the temple, all naked; see Sale’s Discourse, p. 121. Even now the men-pilgrims at the different stations near Mecca, where they assemble in order to enter Mecca, and begin their approach to the temple, “ put on the *Ihrâm* or sacred habit; which  
 “ consists *only* of two *woollen wrappers*, one wrapped about their middle  
 “ to cover their privities, and the other thrown over their shoulders” (p. 119). See also Koran, chap. vii. p. 119, and note, p. 149, for the pilgrims being naked before; and Mod. Un. Hist. i. 260, for this privilege of Mahomet’s. The temple of Mecca itself is ornamented with crescents innumerable, one upon each of the cupolas, minarets, stations, &c.; as a curious plan of the buildings in Sale’s Discourse, p. 114, very pleasingly shows us. Accordingly Anna Comnena and Glycas in Reland. de Mah. say, that “ the Mahometans,” whom they inaccurately confound with their ancestors the pagans, “ do worship Venus.”

they have contracted honourable friendships, and towards whom their souls have been drawn out, in long scenes of affectionate tendernefs; their wives being either annihilated by the hand of this un-appropriated voluptuary, or (what is nearly the fame in the estimate of good husbands) banished into another abode, separated from their wedded loves, and even debarred by this pretended friend and real tyrant of the fex, from having any new lovers. But, for the comfort of *his* part of human nature, all the other glories of paradife will be eclipsed, he tells them, by the refplendent and ravifhing girls of paradife. Thefe are not to be created of clay, as their wives of earth were, but of fomething much more refined, even of—pure mufk. Yet they are to be real females, though fubject to no female diforders. They are to be of equal age with themfelves, and to have large black eyes, fwelling breasts, and countenances bright as the ruby and the pearl. But, as fenfualifts always love the very modetty which they are always labouring to deftroy, thefe blooming maids of heaven are to be rigidly modett; fo at leaft, as not to have been deflowered by either men or genii. They are therefore to be fecluded from the eye, even of the paradifaical world; in pavilions of hollow pearls, many furlongs, or (what is the fame in the estimate of fuch a fairy tale as this) many miles in extent. But, on the day of commencing felicity in paradife, they are to come forth  
from

from their pavilions, lie down with their paramours, and give them all the pleasures of love.

Thus shall the faints of Mahomet solace themselves with sensual delights, to all eternity. Nor shall variety be wanting, as a new stimulus for enjoyment. Every man shall have no less than *seventy two* of these beautified whores, for his own seraglio; a circumstance, that shows in the fullest light the rampant lasciviousness, which I have noted before in the Arabians and in their prophet. Not one of these shall ever cast an eye of regard, upon any other than himself. None of them too shall conceive by him, unless he desires it. He himself also, whatever be his age when he dies, shall be raised in the youthful vigour of manhood, and shall continue in a state of youthful manhood for ever. But for fear the powers of nature should still sink, under this accumulated weight of sensuality; they are to be recruited continually with draughts of wine. Nectars of the most delicate flavour shall be perpetually supplied, in cups of gold, and in glasses of diamonds, by some handsome Ganymedes running round the beds of these celestial mortals. Bacchus shall thus be still the minister of Venus. Under the management of both, the bodily enjoyment of their Mahometan votaries in heaven, shall be perpetually stretched to its full bent, and continually wound up to its highest pitch. They shall love, they shall drink, and then—they shall love again. They shall not even need to

seek the shade of privacy, for the consummation of their loves. They shall indulge them in the open face of heaven, the same work going on in every part of the celestial region, one couch answering to another, and each attended by its listening Ganymedes. These alone will be wretched, being set to listen to the acted loves around them, and yet provided with no blooming Hebes for themselves. And to crown all this exhibition of happiness, merely obscene, every man is to have the most exquisite fruition of it, by having the ability of a hundred men (when Mahomet is said before to have had only that of forty), centred in himself<sup>t</sup>. So completely did Mahomet indulge, the passionate pruriency of his own and the Arabian genius; in his delineation of heaven to them. Never was the common sense, and common decency, of mankind so grossly insulted, as in the appearance of Mahomet among them; he pretending to carry the illumination of a prophet in his face, actually sounding at times the notes of a real prophet with his tongue, and yet all the while holding the ensign of Priapus impudently displayed in his hands<sup>u</sup>.

But

<sup>t</sup> Prilcaux, p. 25—26, Sale's Discourse, p. 96, 99, 97, and 102—103, *Med. Un. Hist.* i. p. 344 and 348, and Koran, chap. lxxviii. p. 479, chap. lv. p. 453, chap. xlvii. p. 410, chap. xxxviii. p. 376, chap. lxxxviii. p. 489, chap. xv. p. 212, chap. xxxvii. p. 367, and chap. xliii. p. 400.

<sup>u</sup> It has been remarked by Mr. Sale, and from him by Mr. Gibbon, that the Mahometans do not make "the happiness of the blessed,

But had he done no more than this, *he* would never have been a prophet of celebrity among the sons

“to consist *wholly* of corporeal enjoyments;” because Mahomet “is reported to have said,—He will be in the highest honour with God, who shall behold his face morning and evening; and this favour Al Ghazâli supposes to be that additional or superabundant recompence, promised in the Koran, chap. x” (Discourse, p. 100). But the passage of the Koran runs thus, in Mr. Sale’s own translation: “God inviteth unto the dwelling of peace [Paradise];—they who do right shall receive a most excellent reward, and a superabundant addition; neither blackness nor shame shall cover their faces: these shall be the inhabitants of Paradise, they shall continue therein for ever” (p. 169). This evidently has no relation to the beatific vision. The interpretation of it by Al Ghazâli, therefore, is only one of the many attempts made by more refined Mahometans, to take off from the disgusting grossness of their real Paradise. And the *report* of what Mahomet *said*, must be attributed to the same principle; what he *received by revelation*, and *got to be written as revelation*, being confessedly all gross and sensual. Accordingly we see the *Mahometans themselves*, considering the sensuality of their Paradise to be the characteristick circumstance of it; as, “when they would bind the Christians in the *most* strong and sacred manner,—they make them swear that, if they falsify their engagement, they will affirm, that there will be *black-eyed girls* in the next world, and *corporeal pleasures*” (Discourse, p. 102). And Mahomet, as *Mr. Sale himself* allows, “judged, it is to be presumed, from *his own inclinations*; that, like Panurgus’s ass, *they would think all other enjoyments not worth their acceptance*, if they were debarred from *this*” (p. 102). We shall consequently hear no more from Mr. Gibbon, or *any other Mahometan*, of the *spiritual* pleasures of this *sensual* Paradise.

Sensualists never *respect* women. They use them indeed, as implements for their own indulgence. But they never *respect* them. It is apparent in Mahomet, that prince of sensualists; from his providing a heaven for his males, furnishing them there very carefully with new and celestial wives, but either annihilating their former wives,

sons of men, and *they* would never have become a nation of conquerors among them. *They* would have slumbered in indolence and voluptuousness, with their earthly *Houris* by their side. And *he* would have proved only one of the many preachers of sensuality, who have appealed in every age to the lower and bestial part of man, have profelyted those who were already profelyted by their own passions, and have at last sunk under the general contempt of a world, that is still sensible of its relation to the Father of Spirits, still happy in the idea of its connection with the world of spirits, and expecting to be happier still in the society of them, and of Him, hereafter. But Mahomet's mind, amidst all his libidinousness, had a strong spring of activity within. Like another Cæsar, he used pleasure for his pastime, and business for his employment. He therefore infused into his followers, what he felt in him-

or banishing them and *all the virgins of earth* to another region, and leaving them without any provision of lovers at all. Accordingly "he was used to say, that among *men* there were *many* perfect; "but of *women* he would allow only *four* to be such; and these were "Asiah the wife of Pharaoh, Mary the mother of Christ, Cadigha "his wife, and Fatima his daughter" (Prideaux, p. 88). He thus denies the existence of that degree of goodness, which he allows many to have shared among men, to all women but *one* in effect; as his three others stand for nothing: and so reduces that sex much below ours in goodness, which in goodness is certainly very much superior to it. And "the greater part of the wretches confined in hell," adds Mahomet, consists of whom think ye,—"of *women*" (Mod. Un. Hist. i. 345).

self;



self; a vigorous portion of military energy. This coincided as much with that turbulence and bravery of spirit, which had made them the perpetual plunderers of their neighbours, and the invincible resistors of their invasions; as the other did with their sensuality. And the general rewards, which, in the grossness, the fantasticalness, and the puerility of his paradisaical images, he assigned to those who fought for Mahometanism, by declaring paradise to be placed “under the shadow of swords<sup>x</sup> ;” and the particular remunerations, which he reserved for those who died in battle, by ranking them as the martyrs of Mahometanism, and resting them “in the crops of green birds, which eat of the fruits and drink of the rivers of paradise<sup>y</sup> ;” gave a violent and military impulse to both. But this alone could not be sufficient, for a rational creature. Mahomet therefore tempered all, with the enthusiasm of religion. Like Prometheus, he stole a fire from heaven, to operate as the soul of his new man. With an useful judiciousness, he enjoined prayer to his disciples, as the pillar of religion and the key of paradise<sup>z</sup>. And, with an absurdity equally useful, he fixed all the incidents in their lives, under the bondage of an ir-resistible decree from God<sup>a</sup>.

Beneath the influence of a religion, that was equally

<sup>x</sup> Mod. Un. Hist. i. p. 392.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. p. 107.

<sup>y</sup> Sale's Discourse, p. 77.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. p. 103.

devout, fenfitive, and warlike; they started up at once a race of fanatic foldiers, bold in the confidence of predeftination and prayer, fearless of death in the field, and even ambitious of falling in fight. Under the guidance of their grand “ prophet of war,” and with his fucceffors, their priestly princes, directing them; they burft in upon the Roman empire, difmembered it of nearly all its provinces, conquered Perfia, and subdued Indoftan. They thus reduced almoft all Afia, under the obedience of Mecca; transferred the feat of fovereignty, firft to Damafcus and then to Bagdad; fo revived fucceffively a kind of Syrian and Affyrian empire in the world, but extended it westerly to the fartheft bounds of Africa, and thence carried it northerly into Spain, France, Sicily, and Italy. At laft they had the diftinguifhed honour, of finally fubverting that wonderful work of ages, that feemingly eternal fabrick of folidity, the Roman empire; and of fweeping it away from the face of the earth, for ever. And they fixed the crefcent in the room of the crofs, upon the imperial church of Conftantinople. But, what was more extraordinary ftill, they profelyted as they conquered, and even as they were conquered. They drew in the Perfians, the Indians, the Tartars, and the Turks, to wifh for the paradife that was “ under the “ fhadow of fwords;” the meaner of them, to fight for the en.braces of their black-eyed maids of paradife;

radise; and the more generous, even to contend for “ a rest in the crops of their green birds” of paradise. This globule of foul water, as it rolled along, licked up the dust of the ground, sometimes an end of straw, sometimes a grain of sand, and sometimes a particle of metal; attached them all to its mass; and so formed itself into a ball of magnitude, from the congregated dirt of the earth. And the Saracens established Mahometanism, and with it established Arianism, over a full quarter of the globe.

4.—<sup>b</sup> Arianism is too plainly apparent upon the Koran. “ Say not there be three Gods,” says Mahomet,

<sup>b</sup> Before I enter on the new part of my argument, let me make one remark here. Mahomet has thrust himself, as I have said before, into the throne of our Saviour. This relates merely to the prophetick character. Mahomet has set himself, as a teacher to mankind, higher than our Saviour. But, in dignity of nature, he sets himself lower; whatever has been confidently said, and hastily believed, to the contrary. “ The true or orthodox mollems,” says an author in *Mod. Un. Hist.* i. 70, “ consider our Saviour as *a creature*, “ and Mohammed at the same time as *scarce inferior* to God himself;” certainly not as God, certainly inferior therefore, and certainly a creature. Mahomet in the opinion of his followers, says the same author in another place, “ was the first of the prophets in the order of *creation*, “ though the last in the order of *mission*; *Adam*, and all *other* creatures, *having been created by him*” (i. 255). This is carrying the dignity of Mahomet, very far indeed. But the words mean not all, that they seem to import by their sound. They make not Mahomet more than human. He is only “ the *first* of the *prophets* in the order “ of creation.” And, if he was a creator, he was only of “ *Adam*, “ and all other” *human* “ creatures,” all the creatures that were posterior to Adam. “ He surpassed all the *rest* of *mankind* in sense “ and

homet, “—there is but one God<sup>c</sup>.” So exactly did Mahomet talk, as our modern Arians do; mistaking the very principles of the Christian theology; and making the three Persons in one Godhead, as actually believed by the Christians, into three Persons and three Godheads, as pretendedly believed by them! “They are certainly infidels,” he adds, “who say, God is *the third of three*, for there is no God besides one God<sup>d</sup>.” Mahomet thus ad-

“and understanding, and particularly in every branch of divine knowledge;” while “his breast was miraculously opened by angels,” and “angels sheltered him with their wings from the heat of the sun” (i. 255—256). “God has commanded the world to obey him;” “he will be the first of the sons of Adam that shall rise from the dead, and advance to the place of judgment on his beast Al Borak, escorted by 70,000 angels” (i. 259); “he will be called by his own proper name, to the place of judgment;” “will carry in his hand the standard of glory, under which Adam and all his followers will range themselves;” “will be the great pontiff of the faithful, their orator and conductor;” and, in short, he is and will be “the prince and lord of all the children of Adam,” and “more noble in the sight of God, than any of his other creatures,” meaning only his *human* creatures (i. 258, 259). All shows Mahomet to be raised indeed by the folly of Mahometanism, into a feat of high honour. But then the honour is not angelick. It is merely human. He only stands in their belief, the human lord and the human creator of the race of man, created first himself, and then empowered to create his brethren. And he says expressly himself, “*I say not unto you, The treasures of God are in my power; neither do I say, I know the secrets of God; neither do I say unto you, Verily I am an angel: I follow only that which is revealed unto me. Say, shall the blind and the seeing be held equal?*” (ch. vi. p. 103). “Verily, I am only a *man* like you” (chap. xli. p. 389).

<sup>c</sup> Sale’s Koran, chap. iv. p. 81.

<sup>d</sup> Chap. v. p. 92.

vances, in his Arian mis-representations of the faith of Christ. He has already exhibited our Divine Persons in the Godhead, as so many distinct Gods in our belief. He now exhibits them, as in our belief two *creatures* united with God; thus contradicting directly his previous representation of them. But he does even more than this, in his account of us. He makes our Deity to consist of two creatures conjoined with God, and—God only ranking as “the *third* of the three.” And he thus places, for us, the two creatures prior in the order of position, and God himself posterior to them. “They are surely infidels,” he farther tells us, “who say, “Verily God is Christ the Son of Mary<sup>e</sup>.” This is another mis-representation of the catholick doctrine, in Mahomet. But it is an Arian one. We say not that God is Christ, but that Christ is God. We own a Divine Person in the Godhead, as much superior to Christ in origin, as a father is to his son. And we only say, that Christ shares the nature of the Godhead with this Being, as a son shares the nature of his father. Yet the meaning of Mahomet is very plain, in all this. He means, like Trypho the Jew, to deny and to oppose the Divinity of our Saviour, as asserted by the Christians around him. He thus stands forth an incontrovertible evidence himself, of the actual belief in the Trinity, and of the actual adoration of our Saviour, by the Christians

<sup>e</sup> Chap. v. p. 85.

of the seventh century. He is an equal witness also, to his own falsifying wilfulness, or his own mis-apprehending ignorance, in all. And he shows the one or the other still more, afterwards. By an absurdity *all his own*, he makes the Christian Trinity to consist of God the Father, God the Son, and—the Virgin Mary. “ God shall say unto Jesus at “ the last day,” he assures us, “ O Jesus, Son of “ Mary, hast thou said unto men, Take me *and my* “ *mother* for two GODS, beside God<sup>f</sup>.” By an absurdity equally *all his own*, he maintains that “ the “ *Jews* say, *Ezra* is the son of God, and the *Christians* say, *Christ* is the Son of God: this is their “ saying in their mouths; they *imitate the saying of* “ *those, who were unbelievers in former times*.” He thus shows us his full conviction, of a belief in the Trinity being a leading principle of Christian faith, in former times as well as in the present. And he also furnishes us with an opportunity, of showing our candour even to a Mahomet; of vindicating him from the charge of falshood, and of attributing all to his folly; that folly, which made him to contradict himself so pointedly, and occasioned him to blunder so egregiously, in some grand circumstances before. “ God,” he adds in a juster spirit to the Christians, and in a fairer opposition to Christianity, “ is but one GOD; far be it from him, that

<sup>f</sup> Chap. v. p. 98.

‡ Chap. ix. p. 152—153.

“ he should have a SON <sup>h</sup>.” He here considers the *Son of God*, in the belief of the Christians *then* and *formerly*, as *such* to be *God*. We have accordingly a spurious Gospel, which carries the name of St. Barnabas as the author, yet is ascribed by some to an heretical Christian, but is plainly one regular and consistent fabrication of Mahometan imposture being made assuredly just after the Koran, and in order to corroborate it, by one who had more knowledge in the records of Christianity, than Mahomet; in which the Christian cotemporaries of the forgery are equally attested, to call our Saviour expressly *Son of God* and *God*, or *God* and *his Son*<sup>i</sup>.

But

<sup>h</sup> Chap. iv. p. 81.

<sup>i</sup> This Gospel I have cited before in iii. 2, 1, a note, as making the Christians to call our Saviour *the Son of God* and *God*, and as attributed by Mr. Sale and Mr. White to some heretical Christian. But it is, I am persuaded, purely a Mahometan forgery. The original is found only in *Arabick*, and only among the *Mahometans* (Sale's Discourse, p. 74). This distinguishes it decisively from a spurious work of a similar nature, *the Revelation of St. Peter*; which the Mahometans have equally in *Arabick*, but which was not unknown in the original to the primitive Christians (Mod. Un. Hist. i. 337). From that *Arabick* original of St. Barnabas, the Moriscoes of Africa have a *Spanish* translation (Discourse, p. 74); one undoubtedly made for their use, when they exercised their Mahometanism in Spain. From the Spanish do we derive the only translation, which we have in English (White, p. xlii). Merely eight chapters of the English have been published. But from them we see enough to show, that the piece is the forgery of a *Mahometan Jew*. The English translation being *literal* from the Spanish (White, p. xli), the name of Joseph of Arimathea is twice disfigured in this manner,

“ Joseph

But Mahomet assigns a reason, for God not having a Son; which is worthy of the materialized intellect of a Mahomet. "He—*hath taken no wife,*" he says, "nor hath he begotten any issue<sup>k</sup>." Or, as he expresses himself more pointedly in another place,

"Joseph Abarimatheas" (p. lxxi. and lxxvi). The *Jew* also is detected in the following sentence: "the disciples, who did not fear God with truth, *went by night, and stole the body of* the supposed Jesus, "and hid it; *spreading a report that he had risen again*" (White, p. lxxii). And the *Mahometan* is apparent in all the stronger features of it; in all those particularly, which have compelled even such as think it the fabrication of a Christian heretick, to pronounce it interpolated by a Mahometan (Sale's Discourse, p. 74, Koran, p. 42—43, and White, p. 353); and especially in those references to Mahomet as a future prophet, which are the grand object of the whole, and form so useful a foundation for the Koran (Sale's Discourse, p. 74—75, and White's notes, p. lxxvi. xliii. and xliii—xliv). The whole was evidently forged for the introduction of these, and most probably by the Jew hereafter mentioned. The Mahometans, according to M. D'Herbelot, have equally a spurious copy of the *Psalms*; and even, according to another author of credit, a spurious copy also of the *Pentateuch* (Mod. Un. Hist. i. 330); both equally in Arabick with this of the Gospels, and equally with it, I suppose, formed by the same Jew for a support of the Koran. And as interpolations alledged without evidence, prove nothing but the wishes of the alledger; so are those very interpolations generally, for that very reason, the prominent and marking element of the whole. See also a note hereafter, v. 3; where the reader will find an *intimation* in the Koran, expanded into a *regular history* by the Gospel of St. Barnabas. Yet in either light, considered as the fabrication of some heretical Christian, or as the posterior forgery of a Mahometan; it proves the point for which I adduce it here, and have adduced it in iii. 2, 1, a note; and attests the Christians cotemporary with the forgery, to have called our Saviour the *Son of God* and *God*.

<sup>k</sup> Chap. lxxii, p. 468.



“ how should he have issue, *since he hath no consort*’?” And he thus presents his Arianism, with its naked front of assurance, and in its full dress of stupidity, before us.

Yet in other places he speaks of our Saviour, in a manner very different: “ O Mary,” God is introduced saying to the Blessed Virgin, “ verily God sendeth thee good tidings, that thou shalt bear the WORD *proceeding from himself*!” He thus seems to give a consubstantiality of divine nature to our Saviour, as the Logos or WORD of the Father. He also says of John the Baptist, that he “ shall bear witness to the WORD which *cometh from God*.” “ Verily Christ Jesus the Son of Mary,” he adds, “ is the Apostle of God, and his WORD, which he *conveyed into Mary, and a Spirit proceeding from him*.” And there is a peculiarity in the language of Mahomet concerning God, that is very remarkable in itself, yet has never been noticed, and directly coincides with all this. He repeatedly uses the scriptural phrase of *plurality*, in the speeches of God concerning himself. Of this I will give one striking instance. “ When thy Lord,” the Koran tells us, “ said unto the angels, *I am going to place a substitute on earth,*—God answered, “ Verily *I know that which ye know not,*—declare

<sup>l</sup> Chap. vi. p. 109.

<sup>n</sup> Chap. iii. p. 40.

<sup>m</sup> Chap. iii. p. 40.

<sup>o</sup> Chap. iv. p. 80—81.

“ unto *me* the names.—God said, Did *I* not tell  
 “ you that *I* know.—And when *we* said unto the  
 “ angels, Worship Adam,—and *we* said, O Adam,  
 “ —*we* said, Get ye all down from hence, hereafter  
 “ shall there come unto you a direction from *me*,  
 “ and whoever shall follow *my* direction,” &c.  
 “ But they who shall—accuse *our* signs, of fal-  
 “ hood,” &c. “ Remember *my* favour wherewith  
 “ *I* have favoured you, and perform your covenant  
 “ with *me*, and *I* will perform *my* covenant with  
 “ you; and revere *me*, and believe in the revelation  
 “ which *I* have sent down,—neither exchange *my*  
 “ signs, and fear *me*.—Remember *my* favour,—and  
 “ that *I* have preferred you [Jews] above all  
 “ nations.—Remember, when *we* delivered you  
 “ from the people of Pharaoh,—when *we* divided  
 “ the sea for you,—when *we* treated with Moses  
 “ forty nights,—*we* forgave you;—*we* gave Moses  
 “ the Book of the Law,—*we* caused clouds to over-  
 “ shadow you:—they injured not *us*.—*We* said—  
 “ *we* will pardon,—*we* sent down, and—*we* said.”

This passage will stand as a sufficient specimen, of  
 the general style of the Koran in this point. The  
 transition from the singular number to the plural,  
 the return from the plural back to the singular, the  
 recurrence again from the singular to the plural,  
 and even the immediate interchange of both at times;  
 are very extraordinary. The God of Mahomet thus

speaks of himself as a plurality, exactly as the God of the scriptures does. Even he who is merely one person in one nature, speaks of himself as a plurality *much oftener*, than He who is three in one. So plainly was the Koran a system of orthodoxy once, though it is now of heresy! Both systems are apparent there at present; *this* prominent and triumphant, *that* latent and overwhelmed by the other. And Mahomet in another place decisively degrades the WORD of God, from all that participation of Divinity, which he has given to him before; by abruptly cutting him off from all filial relation to God, in these words: “ this was Jesus the Son of Mary, “ the WORD of Truth, concerning whom they [the “ Jews] doubt; it is not meet for God, that He “ should have any SON, God forbid<sup>g</sup>.”

Mahomet indeed makes the Logos or our Saviour, and the Holy Ghost, to be a couple of Angels; the Logos to be Michael, the friend and protector of the Jews; and the Holy Ghost to be Gabriel, whom he constitutes superior to Michael or the Logos<sup>r</sup>. “ *We*,” says God, “ formerly delivered “ the law unto Moses, and caused apostles to suc- “ ceed him, and gave evident miracles to Jesus the “ Son of Mary, and strengthened him with *the* “ *Holy Spirit*<sup>s</sup>.” “ But we must not imagine,”

<sup>g</sup> Chap. xix. p. 251.

<sup>r</sup> See Sale's Discourse, p. 2.

<sup>s</sup> Koran, chap. ii. p. 12.

Mr. Sale remarks, that “ Mohammed here means the  
 “ Holy Ghost, in the Christian acceptation: the  
 “ commentators say, this spirit was the angel Ga-  
 “ briel, who sanctified Jesus, and constantly at-  
 “ tended on him †.” And “ the commentators  
 “ say,” as Mr. Sale informs us, “ that the *Jews*  
 “ asked, What angel it was that brought the divine  
 “ revelations to Mohammed; and being told it was  
 “ Gabriel, they replied that he was their enemy,  
 “ and the messenger of wrath and punishment; but  
 “ if it had been *Michael*, they would have believed  
 “ on him, because that angel was *their friend*, and  
 “ *the messenger of peace and plenty*.”—But “ when the  
 “ Son of Mary was proposed for an example,” adds  
 God to Mahomet, “ behold, thy people cried out  
 “ through excess of joy thereat, and they said, Are  
 “ our GODS better, or HE?” This evidently alludes to  
 the recent introduction of Christianity into some parts  
 of Arabia, and the preference which some of the Ara-  
 bians were giving to our Saviour as a GOD, before  
 their own Gods. “ This passage,” Mr. Sale ob-  
 serves, “ is generally supposed to have been revealed,  
 “ on occasion of an objection made by one Ebn al  
 “ Zabári, to those words in the twenty-first chapter;  
 “ by which all in general who were worshipped as  
 “ DEITIES besides God, are doomed to Hell:  
 “ whereupon the infidels” or Heathen Arabs “ cried

† Koran, ch. ii, p. 22.

‡ Koran, p. 13.

“ out” by the mouth of Ebn al Zabári, “ We are  
 “ contented that our GODS should be with JESUS,  
 “ for HE ALSO IS WORSHIPPED AS GOD.” But, as  
 Mahomet’s God proceeds, “ Jesus is no other than  
 “ a servant, whom we favoured with the gift of pro-  
 “ phecy; and we appointed him for an example  
 “ unto the children of Israel; if we pleased, verily  
 “ we could *from yourselves* produce ANGELS, to suc-  
 “ ceed you in the earth.” As far as we can see  
 into the meaning of Mahomet, through that in-  
 distinctness of expression, which is perhaps the  
 natural concomitant of imposture concerning hea-  
 venly objects, as having no heavenly arche-  
 types before its suggestors; and which certainly  
 spreads a thick cloud over the Koran, to every  
 reader of it; Mahomet evidently makes *him* an *An-  
 gel*, born indeed of woman, but yet an ANGEL,  
 whom the Christians were adoring as a GOD, and  
 whom some of the Arabs had been lately going to  
 receive as a GOD, together with his religion. Ac-  
 cordingly Mahomet, in his famous journey to Hea-  
 ven, meets with our Saviour there, and *recommends  
 himself to our Saviour’s prayers*; though he makes  
 Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and the Baptist,  
 all successively recommend themselves *to the prayers  
 of Mahomet* y. So much superior does Mahomet  
 consider our Saviour, to himself and to all mankind!

x Koran, ch. xliii. p. 399.

y Prideaux, p. 62, and Mod. Un. Hist. i. p. 70.

So likewise he says of our Saviour, that "his name shall be Christ Jesus the Son of Mary, honourable in this world and the world to come, and ONE OF THOSE WHO APPROACH NEAR TO THE PRESENCE OF GOD<sup>2</sup>." And he adds in another place, what sufficiently explains this characteristick description; that "Christ doth not proudly disdain to be a servant unto God, neither [do] the ANGELS who *approach near to his presence*<sup>3</sup>." Mahomet thus makes our Saviour, to be equally an Angel with the Holy Ghost. Mahomet accordingly thought him to be the Angel Michael, the only Angel besides Gabriel, that is noticed with particular respect by the Koran. He is noticed equally with Gabriel by it, and noticed as equally with Gabriel an Angel and an Apostle from God. "Whosoever," let me repeat after Mahomet, "is an enemy to God, or his *Angels*, or his *Apostles*," the speaker still keeping himself among the inhabitants of Heaven, as appears from what immediately follows; "or to *Gabriel*," as one of the Apostles and Angels, "or *Michael*," as another of them; the author specifying these, as the only two of the Angels, that had been sent as Apostles upon earth, *this* as Christ to preach to the world, and *that* as the Holy Spirit to strengthen *him*, and to inspire Mahomet; "verily God is an enemy to the

<sup>2</sup> Koran, ch. iii. p. 40.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. ch. iv. p. 81.

“unbelievers,” and will assert the honour of the two Angels delegated by him<sup>b</sup>.

Mahomet thus began a course of Arianism, which has since continued in the Christian world; and the ignorance of Arabia has been strangely transplanted, to take root in the enlightened soil of the British islands. This very folly, of making Gabriel the Holy Ghost, and Michael the Logos; which we should naturally have thought, to be the exclusive property of Mahomet; has been recently revived, by what happily appears a monster of absurdity to these later ages, an Arian Bishop of the church. Bishop Clayton revived it, in his Essay on Spirit<sup>c</sup>. He revived it, perhaps without knowing the original author, and perhaps by actually adopting it from the Koran and its commentators. So closely allied is Arianism to Mahometanism, that it is either fighting against the Gospel, with weapons of its own all truly Mahometan, when it thinks nothing of its disgraceful connexion with the Koran; or else is wield-

<sup>b</sup> Koran, ch. ii. p. 13. So the Son of God is said by Justin Martyr, to be called “Angel and *Apostle*” (p. 96); as Christ is called “the *Apostle* and Highpriest of our profession,” in Hebrews iii. 1; and is again called in the Koran itself, “the *Apostle* of God, and his “Word” (see p. 383).

<sup>c</sup> P. 75. “As it appears, that the archangel *Michael* is that person, who is called the Second Essence by the *Jews*; so upon enquiry we shall find, that the Angel *Gabriel* has a very good title, towards being considered as that *Third Essence* or Being, to which the *Jews* paid divine honours.”

ing weapons in a cause truly Mahometan, that are borrowed from its confederates of the Koran, and furnished from the magazines of Mahometanism!

But whence did Mahomet derive his Arianism? The Christians about him, as we have already seen, acknowledged the Divinity of their Founder, and are reproached by him for it. He could not deduce it, like a modern Arian, from his own perversion of the Scriptures. He could neither read nor write. And he could have the heresy only from the JEWS, those original fathers of it.

So ignorant himself, as to have been the first man in such a state of ignorance, who pretended to introduce a new religion into the world; and yet so artful and so attentive, as merely by his own management to succeed amazingly; he must have had the sagacity to chuse proper persons, for his instruments in the work of imposition. The *first* and *foremost* of these was a foreign Jew; a man so well instructed in all the learning of the Jews, that he had commenced Rabbi among them<sup>d</sup>. “We also know that they say,” God speaks of Mahomet, “Verily, a certain man teacheth him to compose the Koran: the tongue of the person unto whom they incline, is a foreign tongue; but this, wherein the Koran is written, is the perspicuous Arabic tongue.” The fact therefore was known and

<sup>d</sup> Prideaux, p. 41—44.

<sup>e</sup> Koran, ch. xvi. p. 223.



urged, in the very days of Mahomet. Nor could he alledge any thing in bar of the accusation, we see, but what was compleatly irrelative and impertinent; that the foreigner could not suggest to him the *sentiments* of the Koran, because he could not—write the *language* of it. Who this foreigner was, we are authentically informed by an author, who, being a Dominican Friar of the name of Richard, had the good sense and the vigour in 1210 to travel to Bagdad, for the sole purpose of studying Mahometanism in its own records, in order to refute it. Such a spirit was sure to be eminently useful. He accordingly published on his return, a learned and judicious refutation of the Saracenick law. Even learned and judicious it is, as it appears only in a translation of it into Greek, and a re-translation of it into Latin; the original itself being lost. In this work he tells us, that “Mahomet, being an illiterate  
 “ person, had for his helper in the forging of his  
 “ imposture, among others, one ABDIA BEN SA-  
 “ LON, a Jew; whose name Mahomet afterwards  
 “ changed, to make it correspond with the Arabick  
 “ dialect, into *Abdollah Ebn Salem*†.” The Friar also informs us in another part of his work, that this Abdiah or Abdollah was the very person, who was pointed at in the above-cited passage of the Koran<sup>g</sup>. We have also a second author, Johannes Andreas,

† Prideaux's Life, p. 41, and Letter, p. 178—179.

g Life, p. 42.

who was originally a Doctor of the Mahometan law in Spain, but was converted to Christianity in 1487, and wrote a work in confusion of the Mahometan Sect. He and the Friar, from their superior acquaintance with the subject, are the best authorities which the West furnishes, for any account of Mahometanism. He assures us from authentick testimonies of those Arabian works, with which he was intimately acquainted; that Abdollah Ebn Salem, or (as he miscalls him) Abdala Celen, “was for “ten years together *the person, by whose hand all the “pretended revelations of the impostor were first “written* <sup>h</sup>.” And we have in Arabick a work, that has been translated into Latin; and is denominated “a Dialogue of Mahomet with Abdollah Ebn “Salem,” as Mahomet’s chief helper in forging the imposture<sup>i</sup>. In forming this connection, no doubt, Mahomet was determined as far as his policy permitted him a choice, by the principles of consanguinity. Equally pretending with the Jew to be a Son of Sarah, and being equally with him a derivative from Abraham; nature drew the cords of conjunction very close. The union appears to have been very strong, from its duration. It lasted no less than *ten* years together. In this period, all the constituent parts of the monster must have been put together, and the blood and spirits infused into it.

<sup>h</sup> Life, p. 43. and Let. p. 177.    <sup>i</sup> Life, p. 43. and Let. p. 162.

Accordingly

Accordingly the Koran speaks expressly and vauntingly, of “ a witness of the children of Israel, bearing witness to its consonancy with the law, and “ believing therein.” The Jew outlived his Prophet many years; and had what the world will call perhaps, the rare felicity of seeing his and Mahomet’s Koran before his death, carried triumphantly on the point of the Saracen lances, over a full eighth of the globe<sup>k</sup>. And from him it comes, that we even see the *general* complexion of Judaism, plainly apparent in the features of the Koran.

We thus find the Mahometans, like the Jews, reducing Daniel to the lowest degree in the scale of inspiration<sup>l</sup>; feeding the Believers at the Day of Judgment, upon the ox Balâm and the fish Nûn, as the Jews do upon Behemoth and Leviathan<sup>m</sup>; like them, asserting the incorruptibility of the rump-bone<sup>n</sup>; and agreeing with them in their opinions, concerning alms<sup>o</sup>, fasting<sup>p</sup>, prohibited meats<sup>q</sup>, usury<sup>r</sup>, marriage, and divorces<sup>s</sup>. This glaring coin-

<sup>k</sup> Koran, ch. xlvi. p. 406, and Mod. Un. Hist. ii. 62. Mahomet died in A. D. 632 (Mod. Un. Hist. i. 227), and Abdia thirty-two or thirty-three years after him. Several of Mahomet’s companions outlived Abdia (ii. 64, 69, 70, &c).

<sup>l</sup> Mod. Un. Hist. i. 331. <sup>m</sup> Ibid. 345 and 347.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. 333—334. <sup>o</sup> Ibid. 354. <sup>p</sup> Ibid. 355.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. 361—362. <sup>r</sup> Ibid. 368.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. 367—368 and 370. See also Sale’s Discourse, p. 72, 73, 77, 79, 85, 87, 88, 89, 93, 95, 98, 100—101, 104, 106, 109, 110, 113, 114, 126, 127, 128, 133, 135, 136, 137, 140, 141, &c.

vidence of opinions, on sentiments not familiar to mankind in general, but of an extraordinary and devious nature in themselves; proves them to have been transmitted, from the one people to the other. And history now comes in to show, by whom they were transmitted. From the same son of Abraham did Mahomet equally receive, all those rites and customs of the Jews, which he has interwoven with his own imposture; and those wild and fantastical accounts, which he has given us of Heaven, of Angels, of Genii, and of Hell: many of them drawn from the recesses of rabbinical erudition, and all uniting to form a considerable part of his Koran<sup>t</sup>. From him also he adopted the custom, which he enjoined to his followers *at first*, and which he continued to enjoin them *for several months*; of praying, like the Jews, with their faces towards JERUSALEM, in honour of the once-existing Temple there: even though his own countrymen were actually praying at the time, with their faces towards their own existing Temple at Mecca<sup>u</sup>. Strong indeed and violent must have been the influence from without, upon his mind; that could thus counteract all the warm partialities of prejudice, and overbear all the energetick powers of policy, in his ever-working mind. But he proceeded even to a greater

<sup>t</sup> Prideaux's Life, p. 42.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. p. 92--94, and Koran, ch. ii. p. 17, and ch. iii. p. 47.

length, in opposition to both. In the very language of the Jews, and in direct contradiction to all the passions of his countrymen; he gave JERUSALEM, and not *Mecca*, the title of *the Holy City*, and *the City of the Prophets*. He once intended also, to have made JERUSALEM the grand center of his religion, by constituting it the chief place of worship for his followers, and by ordering all their pilgrimages to it; when *Mecca* was the center to his countrymen, already\*. He actually describes himself in the Koran, and is described by what is of *equal* authority with the Koran, the *Sonna* or Traditions concerning it; in that maddest of all mad fables, his night-journey from *Mecca*, to have been first carried miraculously to JERUSALEM; and to have *there* met all the Saints and Prophets of the Jews, particularly Abraham, Moses, and our Saviour. He met them, he pretended, at the gate of the modern building, which he ignorantly mistook for the antient temple, because it was popularly called, as it still is, the Temple of Solomon; but which only stood on the site of the Temple, and was in reality *a Christian church* at the moment. He went with them, he said, into *the principal oratory* in it; the modern church assuredly, like the neighbouring and probably coeval church of the Holy Sepulcher, having oratories or side-chapels within it; having them in the grand colonades of

\* Prideaux, p. 93. See also Koran, ch. xxi. p. 270.

Corinthian architecture, that encircle the body of the church; and having the principal one, in the ample space which has an extraordinary portal to it, at one of the angles: while the antient temple had none at all<sup>y</sup>. And *there*, he affirmed, he united in prayer with them; and *thence* ascended by a ladder of light, to Heaven<sup>z</sup>.

All shows the lively and vivid colouring, which the continued influence of this Jew preceptor for a course of ten years, threw over the imposture of Mahomet. It made Mahometanism a kind of wild and Jewish heresy in our religion, rather than a distinct religion itself. And it threw over all, no doubt, that wretched hue of Jewish *Unitarianism*, as this heresy is ridiculouſly denominated at times; which has covered over the doctrine, that Mahomet was taught originally by the Christians, the personal plurality in the essential unity of God, the existence of our Saviour as the WORD of God, and the procession of our Saviour as the WORD from God himself. This was taught him principally, we may be sure, by that Nestorian Monk of Syria; who is known to the West by the name of Sergius, and to the East

<sup>y</sup> There were in the antient temple, chambers for bed-rooms, but no side-chapels. See a plan and description in *Ant. Un. Hist.* iv. p. 193 and 203—204. And see Pocode's *Travels*, ii. p. 14 and 16, plan and description, for what is now called Solomon's Temple, and for the church of the Sepulcher.

<sup>z</sup> Prideaux, p. 54—55, Koran, ch. xvii. p. 227, and *Mod. Un. Hist.* i. 67—68 and 78.

by the appellation of Boheira; who is asserted by the Christians, to have been very assistant to him in the formation of his Koran; and is allowed by some of the Mahometans themselves, to have instructed him in the tenets of the Gospel. This man, being expelled from his monastery, and excommunicated from the church of Christ, for some great crime; fled to Mecca at the very *outset* of Mahomet as a prophet, and was entertained by the Impostor in his own house. There he instructed the Arabian in that grand principle of the Gospel, which Mahomet acknowledges without the slightest exception, to be the faith of *all* the Christians about him; the doctrine of the Trinity. Mahomet therefore knew of no Arians, among the followers of Jesus. He knew of none but worshippers of their Master, who considered our Saviour as a *companion* to God, and who *associated* our Saviour with God. The Monk thought exactly, as the whole church about Mahomet thought; and from him and them did the Impostor come to speak of God and of our Saviour, in the Christian language which he has used. And the Koran thus bears witness, to the relations of history. The influence of the Jew was now anticipated by the interest of the Christian, in the mind of Mahomet. The balance of Mahometanism was inclining strongly, in favour of truth and the Trinity. On such a nice point was suspended, the religious fate of millions of men through a long train of ages! At last the Jew came,

came, and the scale sunk in favour of Arianism. Mahomet quarrelled with the Monk and with Orthodoxy. Being as sanguinary as he was sagacious, and as savage as he was sensual, he put the Monk to death. He set himself in a state of professed and pointed hostility, to the whole body of the Christians; as acknowledgers of our Saviour's Divinity, and as worshippers of a Trinity in the Godhead. And he has connected Arianism with Mahometanism, by a band of steel for ever<sup>a</sup>.

In this manner has the spirit of Arian Herefy, successively marked the two grand systems of Judaism and the Koran, throughout their whole substance. It began with the Jews, and was taken up by the Mahometans. It was the spurious child of Judaism, and became the adopted brat of Mahometanism. And it now remains an evidence of Jewish perverseness, a proof of Mahometan stupidity; a defection from

<sup>a</sup> Koran, ch. xvi. p. 224. a note, Mod. Un. Hist. i. 25 and 318—319, and better than either, Prideaux, p. 44—47 and 15, from Richard, &c. See a mistake therefore in St. John of Damascus, who makes Mahomet to have conversed with Arian Christians (Mod. Un. Hist. i. p. 319), in opposition to the plain evidence of the Koran itself. See also Koran, ch. iii. p. 44, ch. iv. p. 67 and 75, ch. v. p. 92, ch. vi. p. 100, ch. ix. p. 153, ch. xvii. p. 237, and ch. xxii. p. 276, &c. for what are in Mahomet's language called Companions to God, and for those who in the same language Associate beings with God. And in Discourse, p. 64, Mr. Sale allows, concerning the assistance lent to Mahomet in composing the Koran; that "Dr. Prideaux has given *the most probable account of this matter*, though "chiefly from Christian writers."



the Law, a rebellion against the Gospel; and only then in its proper and natural place, when it is united with the glaring contradictions, with the wild blunders, with the naked sensualities, and with the licensed perjuries, of the Koran<sup>b</sup>.

## CHAPTER

<sup>b</sup> Mr. Lesley published an address from the Socinians of England, to the Mahometan ambassador of Morocco in the reign of Charles the second; "a rarity," he says, "which I take to be so, because of the difficulty I had to obtain it;" and "a copy of which I have from unquestionable hands." In this they declare themselves, to be "of that sect of Christians, that are called Unitarians; who first of all do both in our own names, and in that of a multitude of our persuasion, heartily salute and congratulate your excellency and all that are with you, as *votaries* and *fellow-worshippers* of that sole supreme Deity of the Almighty Father and Creator." "We—," they add, "with our Unitarian Brethren were in all ages exercised, to defend with our pens the faith of one Supreme God (without personalities or pluralities); *as he hath raised your Majesty to do the same with the sword, as a scourge on those idolizing Christians.*" And "of late years in Europe," they subjoin, "stood up the pious and noble personage *Fauslus Socinus*, and his *Polonian association* of learned personages, that writ many volumes against *that and other sprung-up errors among Christians*" (Theol. Works, i. 205, 217, 207—210, and 217). Such a detection as this publication made, of a confederacy avowed between the Socinians and the Mahometans; naturally raised some emotions of shame, on the cheek of Socinianism in this island. The authenticity of the address was denied. The whole was said to be an *invention* of Mr. Lesley. But to any one who knew the character of Lesley, a man in the first rank of honour for probity and for judgment; nothing was requisite in addition to his testimony. Yet a large addition has been happily made by Bishop Horsley. The original letter is in the library at Lambeth, with this attestation to it and to three other papers. "These," it says, "are the original papers, which a cabal of Soci-

"nians

## CHAPTER THE FIFTH.

## — I. —

ARIANISM thus appears to be the revolting perverseness of Judaism, in its origin. It first made its entry into the world, from that accursed spirit of opposition to Heaven, for which the Jews soon ex-

“nians in London offered to present to the embassadour of the king of Fez and Morocco, when he was taking leave of England. August 1682. The said embassadour refused to receive them, after having understood that they concerned religion. The agent of the Socinians was Monsieur Verze\*. Sir Charles Cottrell, Kn. Mr. of the Cerem. then present, desired he might have them; which was granted: and he brought and gave them to me Thomas Tenison, then Vicar of St. Martin’s in the Fields, Middl.” (Tracts in controversy, &c. p. 272—273). The disgraceful fact, therefore, is too plain. But, however the Socinians may consider Mahomet, as “the scourge of God upon the idolizing Christians” who worship Christ; yet Mahomet would disown *them* for his disciples, even in the article of the Trinity. He who, with Bishop Clayton, considered our Saviour and the Holy Ghost to be the Angels Michael and Gabriel; would equally with the Bishop have disclaimed the Socinian impiety, of making our Saviour a mere man, and of reducing the Holy Ghost into a mere quality. The truth is, that even Mahomet himself, weak and wicked as he was, never ventured out into the high blasphemies of Socinianism. He was merely an Arian. And the Arians alone can claim him for their confederate. *Go now, thou Arian, and shake hands with thy brother of the Koran.*

\* *Two were intended.* See p. 209, “two single philosophers,” and p. 211, “us two.”

changed situations with the Gentiles; for which they were cast off by God, as the Gentiles had been before; have continued cast off, for nearly the same period of time that the Gentiles were; and will continue, we know, till they return to their first faith, return to Messiah their Prince, and prostrate themselves in an agony of repentance, before their crucified Lord and God.

Many of the Jews however, from the natural impulse of their original principles, leaned strongly to Christianity at first. Many stepped boldly forward, to profess it. But some of these came to it, as we have seen in the authors of the Patriarchal Testaments, of the second Book of Esdras, and of the Book of Wisdom; with rabbinical extravagances of sentiment. And others came with a portion of that Arianism, which had been long creeping into the minds of individuals, and was openly professed at last by the whole nation. That this had been creeping into their minds before, is clear from a remarkable incident in the life of our Saviour, which has been little understood hitherto.

The existence of such a sect as the Sadducees among the Jews, is a wretchedly illustrious proof of the perverseness of the human passions, and of the inefficacy of the human reason to resist it. The Sadducees were confined entirely to the wealthy\*.

\* Josephus Ant. Jud. xiii. x. 6. p. 583. Τῶν μὲν Σαδδουκαίων τὰς εὐπέρους μόνον πειθομένων.

They relished the pleasures and the grandeur of life, their hearts became centered in them, and they wished for nothing beyond them. Such was the mean and groveling temper of their souls! But, though they did not wish for any Heaven beyond the verge of this life, yet they dreaded a Hell. Hope may be easily subdued in the bosom, by an acquired and cherished ignobility of spirit. But fear cannot. A heavier weight must be laid upon it, to keep down its natural elasticity, and prevent it from springing back in the face of the sinner. Reason must be made an accomplice with passion, in the work. Principles of unbelief must be admitted. And the whole man must be bent backward, into infidelity. So were the Sadducees bent. They learned to say, "that there is no resurrection, neither Angel, nor Spirit<sup>b</sup>." They particularly denied what they particularly feared. They "annihilated the "soul with the body<sup>c</sup>." They denied "the continuance of the soul" after the death of the body, "and the punishments and rewards of futurity<sup>d</sup>." They thus sunk into that horrible infidelity, to which the corrupted heart of man naturally gravitates, and towards which it is perpetually drawing down the reluctant intellect. But such a system as this will

<sup>b</sup> Acts xxiii. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Josephus Ant. Jud. xviii. 1. 4. p. 793. Σαδδουκαιοις δε τας ψυχας ε λεγει συναφανζει ταις σωμασι.

<sup>d</sup> Josephus Bell. Jud. ii. viii. 14. p. 1065. Ψυχης τε την διαμονην και τας καθ' ηδου τιμωριαν και τιμας αναιρεσι.

not only *originate*, among the wealthy. It will long be *confined* to them. The great source of infidelity is only with *them*. The Sadducees, therefore, were comparatively few in number, as late as the days of Josephus; and the multitude was all found in their principles of belief, and all attached to the opposite sect of the Pharisees<sup>e</sup>. Yet these few were men of consequence. They were, says Josephus expressly, “the first in honours<sup>f</sup>.” They were men of the greatest authority in the state. The Scriptural history of our religion accordingly informs us, that Infidelity had even taken its stand by the altar of God, and that it even went into the Holy of Holies beyond. “Then *the High-priest* rose up,” it tells us, “and *all they that were with him*, which is THE SECT OF THE SADDUCEES; and were filled with indignation,” at the prevalence of Christianity<sup>g</sup>. But, such was the just unpopularity of their Epicurean notions, that they were obliged to conceal them. In the dignities which they hold, adds Josephus, “nothing (as I may say) is done by them; for when they come into high offices, unwillingly and of necessity they accede to the tenets of the Pharisees, because they would not otherwise be tolerated

\* Ant. Jud. xviii. 4. p. 793. Εἰς ὀλίγους τε ἀνδρας ἕως ὁ λόγος ἀφίχεται, and 3. δι' αὐτὰ τοῖς τε δήμοις πιθανολαλοῖ τυγχάνουσι [οἱ Φαρισαῖοι]; and xiii. x. 6. p. 588. Τῶν μὲν Σαδδουκαίων—το—δημόσιων εὐχόμενοι αὐτοῖς ἐχούτων, τῶν δὲ Φαρισαίων τὸ πλῆθος συμμαχῶν ἐχούτων.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. 793. Τῆς μάλιστα πρώτης τοῖς ἀξιώμασι.

<sup>g</sup> Acts v. 17.

“by the multitude<sup>h</sup>.” Yet they were known, in spite of all their concealments. There were some, who were not in any dignities, that made this hypocrisy necessary to them; and who, therefore, avowed their sentiments openly. Such we see continually, in the Evangelick and Apostolick histories. We find them once in the latter, forming nearly an equal balance to the Pharisees, in the great council of the nation<sup>i</sup>. Even in their highest dignity, they were known to St. Luke at another time. And they were particularly pointed out under all their disguises, by our Saviour upon a third occasion.

Having come to our Saviour with that objection of theirs to a resurrection, which smells so rank of the pert presumption of a modern Infidel, and is founded so similarly on a mere supposition, and a false one too; and having been exposed for their folly, to the full conviction of the orthodox multitude<sup>k</sup>: some of those, who were *outwardly* Pharisees and *inwardly* Sadducees, came in to the aid of the baffled Sadducees, and endeavoured to *avenge their defeat* by a victory of their own. “When the Pharisees had heard,” says St. Matthew, “that he had put the Sadducees to silence; they,” being (as St. Luke tells us) “certain of the Scribes,” “were

<sup>h</sup> Josephus, *ibid.* 793. Πρασσαίαι τε απ αυτων εδεν ως ειπειν οτι εις γαρ επ' αρχαις παρελθοιεν, απεσιως μιν και καθ' αναγκας προσχωρησι δ' εν ως ο Φαρισαίος λεγει, δια το μη αλλως ανεκτως γενεσθαι τοις πληθεσιν.

<sup>i</sup> Acts xxiii. 6—10.

<sup>k</sup> Mat. xxii. 23.

“gathered

“gathered together,” having now assembled for the purpose. “Then one of them, which was a lawyer,” and therefore (as St. Mark informs us he was) “one of the Scribes,” “asked him a question, “tempting him<sup>1</sup>.” This *tempting* question being answered by our Saviour, to the satisfaction of the very Scribes themselves; our Saviour turned upon the Scribes, and put a question to *them*. “How say the Scribes, that Christ is the Son of David<sup>m</sup>?” “What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son<sup>n</sup>?” And as St. Matthew adds, though St. Luke subjoins the latter half of the remark to the question immediately preceding, and it is therefore applicable to both; the immediately preceding question being the last of the sort, ever put to our Saviour; and the confusion occasioned by our Saviour’s replies, being greatly enhanced by his own question: “No man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man (from that day forth) ask him any more questions<sup>o</sup>.”

“Lord God of Israel,” cries Solomon at the de-

<sup>1</sup> Mat. xxii. 34—35, Mark xii. 28, and Luke xx. 39.

<sup>m</sup> Mark xii. 35.

<sup>n</sup> Mat. xxii. 42—46.

<sup>o</sup> Luke xx. 40, Mat. xxii. 45.

dication of the Temple to God, "there is no God like thee, in Heaven above or on Earth beneath; —*thou*, even *thou only*, knowest the *hearts* of all "the children of men". From his communion of Godhead with the Father therefore, did our Saviour derive that intimate acquaintance with the heart of man, by which he knew the real character of these Pharisaick lawyers or scribes; and knew the men to be such, as, in the predominancy of their earthly ideas, had sunk the Creator in their Messiah entirely out of sight, and brought him forward to their view in his created nature only. "What think ye of Christ?" he asks; "Whose Son is he? *They* "say unto him, The Son of David." Knowing them thus to be Sadducees in the disguise of Pharisees, he instantly convinces them of his being their Messiah and their God, by speaking to their *inward* sentiments; and at the same time directs their understandings to the perception of their Messiah's Godhead, by an appeal to their acknowledged Scriptures concerning him. He thus addressess himself to their

P 1 Kings viii. 23 and 39. So likewise 1 Chron. xxviii. 9, "The Lord *searcheth all hearts*, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts;" and 2 Chron. vi. 30, "Thou only knowest "the hearts of the children of men." This is very different from that miraculous "Discerning of Spirits," which the first Christians possessed (1 Cor. xii. 10), and which refers only to the knowing whether a man was inspired or not. And it entirely agrees, with what is said of our Saviour in the Revelations. "These things saith "the Son of God,—I am He which *searcheth the reins and the hearts*" (Rev. ii. 18, 23).

minds



minds and to their spirits, in the same moment of time, and with one awful flash of conviction lightening full and bright against them.

Nor is this heavenly species of oratory, this mode of God's own management with men, confined to the present passage. We see it in various others. We find the Sun of Divinity, thus radiating out from our Saviour on every side. We view him particularly appealing again, to the secret sentiments of these very "Scribes and Pharisees;" and urging in the same moment again, a miracle performed before them. "The Scribes and the Pharisees," as St. Luke assures us, "began to *reason* saying, "Who is this "which speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive "sins, but God alone? But, when Jesus perceived "their *thoughts*, he answering said unto them, What " *reason*, ye in your *hearts*? Whether is easier to say, "Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Rise up "and walk? But that ye may know, that the Son "of Man hath power upon earth to forgive sins, " (he said unto the sick of the palsy) I say unto "thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go into "thine house!" This double application must have carried all the force of DIVINITY with it, to their hearts and souls.

But we have another exhibition of DIVINITY, which I wish to lay equally before my reader; be-

9 Luke v. 21—24.

caufe it has been almoft as little underftood as my  
 prefent point, and becaufe it corroborates my pre-  
 fent reasoning upon it. Thefe very “ Scribes and  
 “ Pharifees watched him,” fays St. Luke again,  
 “ whether he would heal on the Sabbath-day; that  
 “ they might find an accusation againft him. But  
 “ he knew their *thoughts*, and faid to the man  
 “ which had the withered hand, Rife up, and ftand  
 “ forth in the mids. And he arofe and ftood forth.  
 “ Then faid Jefus unto them, I will afk you one  
 “ thing, Is it lawful on the Sabbath-days to do  
 “ good, or *to do evil?* to fave life, or *to deftroy it*?”  
 But what is the meaning of this queftion? It has a  
*private* and *personal* meaning, like the other con-  
 cerning Chrift. It is, like that, addreffed to the  
 retired thoughts of thefe “ Scribes and Pharifees.”  
 It alludes to the fecret ideas which were beginning  
 to rife in their minds, of putting our Saviour to  
 death. Our Saviour applied this probing queftion  
 to their difeafed hearts, in order to fhew them he  
 knew the corruption, that was gathering there.  
 Accordingly they were ftuck dumb, with this Di-  
 vine Appeal to what was paffing privately in  
 their own bofoms. “ They held their peace,”  
 fays St. Mark\*. Of them, as of thofe in the firft  
 paffage, “ no man was able to anfwer him a word.”  
 They were filenced, by being convicted; but they  
 were not converted. Our Saviour therefore “ look-

\* Luke vi. 7—9.

\* Mark iii. 4.

“ ed round about on them with anger, being grieved  
 “ for the hardness of their hearts †.” He then per-  
 formed the miracle. And then “ they were filled  
 “ with madness;” “ went forth; and straightway  
 “ took counsel with the Herodians against him,  
 “ how they might destroy him †.” Their spirits  
 kindled into madness, with the shame of detection;  
 and the murderous conceptions of their minds, now  
 flamed out into real resolutions of murder.

Our Saviour thus addresses his three questions, to  
 the private and concealed sentiments of the same  
 persons; and they came like three rays of light,  
 darted down from the opening Heavens, to disclose  
 the dark cells and caverns of their bosoms. But  
 the Scribes, whom he questioned concerning the  
 Christ, and whom he rebuked by his heart-directed  
 address to their secret and Sadducean spirit of infi-  
 delity, thought very differently from the main body  
 of the Jews. *These* I have already shown with an  
 overpowering body of evidence, to have expected a  
 mixed and compounded Being, a God with the  
 visage of a man, in their Messiah. But *those*, in  
 the prevalence of sense over faith; and in the gene-  
 ral triumph of earthliness, over the spiritual hopes  
 and spiritual fears of futurity; had reduced their ideas  
 concerning him, to the humble standard of created  
 infirmity. This difference between them, we see

† Mark iii. 5.

‡ Luke vi. 11, and Mark iii. 6.

strongly intimated to us in the history; when, as St. Mark directly subjoins, “the common people heard him gladly.” They heard, they understood, and received with gladness, what was so consentaneous to all their notions of the Messiah. They expected him to be a GOD; and, as such, to be THE LORD of David, to sit at THE RIGHT HAND of God the Father, and TO SIT THERE till God the Father had brought all his enemies in subjection to him. And they were pleased to see those “Doctors of the law,” who in the sensualized state of their spirits, and in the growing grossness of their intellects from it, were debasing their Messiah into a mere “Son of David;” exposed for their Sadducean and low-fouled notions by *him*, who could read the Scriptures by the light of Heaven, and could point them to their understandings with a beam of Heaven.

Those notions will appear hereafter, to have been only Arian; the Socinianism of the Sadducees, meeting with the orthodoxy of the Pharisees in the breasts of these Jews; and so forming a middle kind of system between them, that shared a little the rectitude of orthodoxy, and inherited a little the obliquity of Socinianism, not so bad as the latter, yet too bad not to be thought very much so by the former. Arianism thus began to flow among the Jews, in the days of our Saviour. But the stream

\* Mark xii. 37.

† See Section 3d. of this chapter.

had then no regular channel. It moved only in secret rills. It strayed under sunless thickets, or through subterraneous passages. And the multitude saw it dropping at times, from some rocks near the fountain-head of their faith; with an aversion proportioned to their belief of the contrary, and with a disgust equal to their gladness in receiving that for the truth. But these infected rills gradually found their way into the fountain itself, and carried their tincture with them through all the current. The general body of the Scribes learned from the few of our Saviour's days, to think nothing of those Scriptures which announced a God in their Messiah, and to think every thing of those which proclaimed him to be a man. By this principle of self-deceit, which has been the grand engine of Arian imposition in every age since, the few became the generality. Then the orthodox multitude of our Saviour's cotemporaries, were drawn off from their orthodoxy by the same sort of fraud, and settled in this new and heretical faith. And the whole nation of the Jews became Arians.

Nor did their Arianism stop here. At first it "arose a little cloud out of the sea, like a man's hand." But in a short time "the Heaven was black with clouds and wind, and there was a great rain<sup>2</sup>." All the Jewish horizon was in-

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings xviii. 44-45.

volved in the gloom. It even spread a deep shade of the darkness, over the Christian. Before the end of the first century, as we have already seen, this heresy had already infected the Jews very deeply. Before the beginning of the second, as we shall immediately see, it was conveyed by the Jews to the infant church of the Christians. The FIRST Arians that ever existed under the Gospel, were two JEWS. And their names have been consigned to an infamous immortality, for the fact; EBION and CERINTHUS.

— II. —

THE name of Ebion was given to the former, by the Christians; or rather perhaps had been previously given, and only was allusively played upon by them; these knowing him as a Jew by a Jewish appellation, and denominating him EBION or THE POOR CREATURE, in contempt of his doctrine<sup>a</sup>. His followers, says Irenæus about A. D. 167, “ reject the Apostle Paul, calling him an Apostate “ from the Law; are circumcised; and continue in “ those customs which are according to the Law,

<sup>a</sup> Eusebius Hist. iii. 27. p. 122. Λελογχασι προσηγοριας, τα Εβιωναιων ονομαλος, την της διανοιας πλωχειαν αυτων υποφαινοντοσ. Ταυτη γαρ επικλην ο πλωχος παρ' Εβραιουσ ονομαζεσται. But Epiphanius says, that this was his proper name; τω οντι Εβιων εκαλειτο (Hæc. xxx. 17. p. 141).

“ and in the Jewish modes of living; so as to worship Jerusalem, for the very house of God<sup>b</sup>.” This is the plainest of all evidences, for their founder being a Jew, when he became a Christian; and for his retaining all his Judaical principles, along with his Christianity. The Ebionites, adds Eusebius, speaking of them as then extinct, “ thought they had absolute need of the observances of the Law; “ thought all the epistles of the Apostle [Paul] were “ to be rejected, pronouncing him an Apostate from “ the Law; used only the Gospel which is called “ that of the Hebrews, making little account of the “ rest; and kept the Sabbath, with the other ceremonies of the Jews, equally as the Jews themselves<sup>c</sup>.” The Gospel according to the Hebrews, was a pretended copy of St. Matthew’s Gospel in Hebrew, and very different from it<sup>d</sup>. Epiphanius

<sup>b</sup> Irenæus Adv. Hær. i. 26. p. 102—103. Oxon. Grabe. “ Qui autem dicuntur Ebionitæ,—Apostolum Paulum recusant, Apostatam eum Legis dicentes;—et circumciduntur, ac perseverant in his consuetudinibus quæ sunt secundum Legem, et Judaico characterè vitæ, uti et Hierosolymam adorent, quasi Domus sit Dei.” The latter part of this passage is well explained, by another passage in Barnabas’s Epistle; which speaks of the Jews trusting not in God, but *in the Temple, as the House of God*. See note in Irenæus.

<sup>c</sup> Eusebius ii. 27. p. 121. Δειν δὲ παντῶς αὐτοῖς τῆς νομικῆς θρησκείας.—ἄτοι δὲ τὰ μὲν Ἀποστολῆ πάσας τὰς ἐπιστολάς ἀρνιέταις ἠγνῶσθαι δεῖν, Ἀποστατὴν ἀποκαλεῖντες αὐτὸν τὸν νομῶ· εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ’ Ἑβραίων λεγομένῳ χρῶμενοι, τῶν λοιπῶν σμικρῶν ἐποίησαν λόγον. Καὶ τὸ μὲν Σάββατον, καὶ τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν ἀλλοίαν ἀγωγὴν, ὁμοίως ἐκεῖνοις παραφυλάττον.

<sup>d</sup> Grabe’s Spicilegium i. 21—25.

accordingly

accordingly informs us, that “ it was the Gospel of “ St. Matthew, or (as they called it) the Hebrew “ Gospel, *not compleat at all, but interpolated and “ mutilated* <sup>e</sup>.” Nor let one of my readers, in the mad humour predominant among some at present, of exalting Hereticks into Apostles; suspect this Gospel, because it was written in Hebrew, to be that very original, which St. Matthew is by a strange tradition asserted to have written in Hebrew, and which somebody we know not whom translated into the present Greek <sup>f</sup>. With what an unfriendly aspect such a notion must look, upon the authenticity of the present code of Revelation; is obvious in itself. But the notion is ungrounded and false. Many arguments have been adduced, that sufficiently show

<sup>e</sup> Epiphanius Hær. xxx. 13. p. 137. *Εν τῷ γενν παρ’ αὐτοῖς εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζόμενον, ἔχει ὅλην δὲ πληρεστάτην, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένην καὶ κηρωτηριασμένην, Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τὸ τοῦ καλεῖσιν.*

<sup>f</sup> The Nazarenes, Epiphanius says, have “ the Gospel according “ to Matthew compleat in Hebrew,” *ἔχουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον πληρεστάτον Ἑβραϊστὶ.* “ For this is evidently preserved yet “ with them, as it was written originally in Hebrew characters,” *παρ’ αὐτοῖς γὰρ σαφῶς τὸ τοῦ, καθὼς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγράφη Ἑβραϊκοῖς γραμμασίαι, ἐτι σωζέται* (p. 124). The Nazarene Gospel in Hebrew, therefore, was very different from the Ebionite Gospel in the same language; this being *not* “ compleat at all,” *ἔχει ὅλην δὲ πληρεστάτην*, and *that* being quite “ compleat,” *πληρεστάτον*. We shall accordingly find the *faith* of these two parties of hereticks, to be essentially different in one point. And the difference in the two copies of the pretended original, does at once destroy the identity of them and of it.



it to be so<sup>g</sup>. But the strongest of all has been overlooked. This is an internal demonstration; and consists of some notices in the Gospel, that are incidental and yet significative. In the Gospel of St. John, which is *confessed* to have been originally written in Greek, we have three intimations of its having been written, in a language different from the Hebrew; when it speaks of one place, “which is called “in the *Hebrew* tongue, Bethesda,” of another, “that is called the Pavement, but in the *Hebrew*, “Gabbatha,” and of a third, “the Place of a scull, “which is called in the *Hebrew*, Golgotha<sup>h</sup>.” In the same Gospel we have also these additional evidences, of the Greek being its original language; “Rabboni, which is to say, Master;” “Siloam, “which is by interpretation, Sent;” “Cephas, “which is by interpretation, a Stone;” “the Messias, which is being interpreted, the Christ;” and “Rabbi, which is to say being interpreted, “Master<sup>i</sup>.” That these evince the Gospel not to have been written in Hebrew, is apparent at the first glance; as otherwise the interpretation could never have been annexed. *This* in a *Hebrew* text must have run in these impossible forms, “Rabbi, “which is to say being interpreted, *Rabbi*,” and

<sup>g</sup> See Whitby's Prefatory Discourse to his Comment on the Gospels, p. xlii—xlvi. edit. 1703.

<sup>h</sup> John v. 2, xix. 13, and xix. 17.

<sup>i</sup> John xx. 16, ix. 7, i. 42, i. 41, and i. 38.

“ the Messias, which is being interpreted, the *Mef-*  
 “ *fas*.” We have the same sort of evidence, lying  
 obvious in the Acts of the Apostles, and in these  
 notices there; “ Aceldama, that is to say, the Field  
 “ of Blood,” “ Barnabas, which is being inter-  
 “ preted, the Son of Consolation,” “ Tabitha,  
 “ which by interpretation is called Dorcas,” and  
 “ Elymas the Sorcerer, for so is his [Barjesus’s]  
 “ name by interpretation<sup>k</sup>.” We have two evi-  
 dences of this unnoticed nature, even in the Epistle  
 to the Hebrews; and in that passage, “ Melchisedec  
 “ —first being by interpretation King of Righte-  
 “ ousness, and after that also King of Salem, which  
 “ is King of Peace<sup>l</sup>.” We have several also in the  
 Gospel of St. Mark; which is *confessed* equally with  
 that of St. John, to have been originally composed  
 in Greck. Some passages present us with these ex-  
 planations, of three Hebrew names; “ Boanerges,  
 “ which is, the Sons of Thunder,” and “ Corban,  
 “ that is to say, a Gift,” and “ the place Golgotha,  
 “ which is, being interpreted, the Place of a Skull;”  
 and with these comments upon Hebrew clauses,  
 “ Talitha Cumi, which is being interpreted, Dam-  
 “ sel (I say unto thee) Arise,” and “ Ephphatha,  
 “ that is, Be opened,” and “ Eloi, Eloi, lama  
 “ sabachthani, which is, being interpreted, My  
 “ God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me<sup>m</sup>.”

<sup>k</sup> Acts i. 19, iv. 36, ix. 36, xiii. 8.

<sup>l</sup> Hebrews vii. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Mark iii. 17, vii. xi, and xv. 22; v. 41, vii. 34, and xv. 34.

And we have the very same evidence on the face of St. Matthew's Gospel, for its never having been written in the Hebrew language; and for its equal appearance with the other Gospels, with the Acts of the Apostles, and with all the Epistles, originally in Greek. "Emmanuel," says the Evangelist from the prophecy of Isaiah; but, instead of returning immediately to his narration, stops short, and explains the Hebrew word thus, "which being interpreted is, God with us<sup>n</sup>." This is at the commencement of his Gospel. Near the close he has two similar explanations, and exactly in the manner of St. Mark on the same occasions; "a place called Golgotha, that is to say, the Place of a Skull;" and "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani, that is to say, My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me<sup>o</sup>." Accordingly these annexed and expository clauses are repeatedly omitted, in that translation of the New Testament which has been made into Syriack, and which consequently gives us back the image of the Hebrew varied from itself; all being omitted of necessity where the Syriack is not varied from the Hebrew, some being retained where the variation would scarcely allow an admission, and not half of the passages above actually preserving the interpretation<sup>p</sup>. And that Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew

<sup>n</sup> Mat. i. 23.

<sup>o</sup> Mat. xxvii. 33 and 46.

<sup>p</sup> John xix. 13. "In loco qui vocatur Pavimentum Lapidum, Hebraicè autem dicitur Gaphiphata;" xix. 17. "In locum qui

Matthew therefore, which the Ebionites had in their possession; could have been nothing else, in all such parts

“ vocatur Cranium, Hebræis autem dicitur Gagultha;” xx. 16. “ Dixit ei Hebraicè Rabbuni, quod dicitur Præceptor.” Acts i. 19. “ Vocatus est ager ille linguâ regionis Chakel-demah, cujus interpretatio est, Ager Sanguinis;” iv. 36. “ Qui cognominatus est Bar-nabba ab Apostolis, quod exponitur Filius Consolationis;” xiii. 8. “ Magicam artem exercens Bar-schuma, cujus nomen exponitur Elimaus.” Hebrews vii. 2. “ Exponitur autem nomen ejus [Melchisedec], Rex Justitiæ; et rursus, Rex erat Salem, quod est Rex Pacis.” Mark iii. 17. “ Nomen Benai-Regfschi, quod est Filii Fragoris;” xv. 22. “ Gagultha locum, qui interpretatur Cranium;” xv. 34. “ Il, Il, Lemana Schevaktani, quod est, Deus Meus, Deus Meus, ad quid deseruisti me?” Mat. i. 23. “ Ammanuel, quod exponitur, Nobiscum est Deus noster;” xxvii. 33. “ Locum qui dicitur Gagultha, quod interpretatur Cranium.” And the clauses of interpretation in John ix. 7, i. 42, i. 41, and i. 38, “ Rabbi, which is to say, being interpreted, Master,” are omitted, though a passage exactly similar to the last, “ Rabbuni, which is to say, Master,” in xx. 16, is retained. Those in Acts ix. 36, vii. xi, v. 41, vii. 34, and that in Mat. xxvii. 46, “ Eli, Eli,” &c., are equally omitted; though that in Mark xv. 34, “ Eloi, Eloi,” &c. is retained. All shows the Syriack to have omitted them, because the expositions were so consonant to the words expounded; to have retained them, whenever it well could; and to have sometimes omitted the very clauses which at other times it retained, from the very nearness of identity. And from the expression of the *Hebrew* tongue in John v. 2, xix. 13, 17, and 20, in Acts xxi. 40, and xxvi. 14, in Luke xxiii. 38, and in Rev. ix. 11. and xvi. 16; from the repeated interpretations of *Hebrew* words above; and from the repeated denomination of the Jews as *Hebræus*, in Acts vi. 1, 2 Cor. xi. 22, and Phil. iii. 5; the Hebrew language, whatever is said to the contrary, appears *still to have been spoken by the Jews, after the Babylonish captivity, and even down to the final subversion of their state*; with only such variations, as were sure to happen in so long a course of time, either in words themselves, or in

parts of it as harmonized with the present Gospel, but, like the Syriack version to which I have referred, a mere version of it from the present Greek into Hebrew; *this* being the mother language, and *that* the daughter.

But what precisely were the opinions, of the Judaizing Christian who was the founder of the Ebionites, concerning the Godhead of our Saviour? He was plainly, in point of time, the FIRST of all Christian Arians. It is difficult indeed to distinguish from *chronological* authority, whether Carpocrates, Cerinthus, or Ebion, was the first. They were all three cotemporaries P. But circumstances often disclose, what history is too indistinct to tell. “The antients,” says Eusebius, “familiarly de-  
 “nominated his followers Ebionites, *because* they

the mode of pronouncing them. Thus the very same words are recited by St. Matthew, “Eli, Eli, lama sabaſthani,” and by St. Mark, “Eloi, Eloi, lama sabaſthani;” *sabaſthani* being *the word in the psalm then*; Ελωι being more properly written Ελωι, and actually pronounced *Eli*; and all being *spoken by our Saviour*.

P Irenæus mentions them in the order of the text; Epiphanius in the same; but Eusebius, omitting Carpocrates, speaks of Ebion, and then of Cerinthus. Epiphanius also says of Ebion, with a view to these and other hereticks: εως γαρ ο Εβίων συγχρονος μεν τωτων υπηρχεν, απ’ αυτων δε συν αυτοις ορμαται (p. 125). And, as he says of some of these hereticks, Ναζωραιο, καθ’ εξης τουτοις επονται, αμα τε αυτοις οντες, η και προ αυτων, η μετ’ αυτες, ομως συγχρονοι· ε γαρ ακριβεστερον δυναμαι εξειπειν, τινες τινας διεδεξαντο (p. 116—117). Carpocrates denied the Godhead of our Saviour, as they did (p. 102); but appears from Eusebius’s omission of him, to have been only inconsiderable when compared with them.

“ had low and poor ideas concerning Christ <sup>9</sup>.” They branded him and his followers with this opprobrious appellation, for the poorness of their sentiments concerning our Saviour. He and they, therefore, were the first that came forth into the eye of the Christian world, with the alarming stamp of Arianism on their brow. “ For,” as Eusebius adds, “ they considered Christ as a mere man, begotten by the union of Mary and her husband <sup>r</sup>.” But, as Eusebius subjoins, “ there were others besides these, who had the same appellation, who *escaped the extravagant absurdity of the preceding*, “ not denying the Lord to be born of a *Virgin* and *the Holy Ghost*; but who, like them too, not confessing him to have PRE-EXISTED as GOD the WORD and WISDOM, were involved in the impiety of the former, especially as they also laboured equally with those, to keep up carefully the bodily observances of the law <sup>s</sup>.” And this shows the spirit of Arian Judaism, to have been the impregnating principle of Ebion’s doctrines; and to

<sup>9</sup> Eusebius p. 121. Εβιωναίως τῆτος οἰκείως ἐπεφημιζόν οἱ πρῶτοι, πλῆκως καὶ ταπεινῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δοξαζόντας.

<sup>r</sup> P. 121. Αὐτὸν μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ κοῖνον ἠγάγετο, — εἰς ἄνδρος τε καὶ ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς Μαρίας γεγεννημένον.

<sup>s</sup> P. 121. Ἄλλοι δὲ παρὰ τῆτος, τῆς αὐτῆς οὐτῆς προσήγορίας, τῆν μὲν τῶν εἰρημένων ἐκτοπὸν διεδιδράσκον ἀτοπίαν, ἐκ παρθένου καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος μὴ ἀρνημένοι γεγονέναι τὸν Κύριον· ὃ μὲν εὐθὺς, ὁμοίως καὶ ἕτοι, προὔπαρχειν αὐτὸν, θεὸν λόγον ὄντα καὶ σοφίαν, ὁμολογούνης, τῆ τῶν προτέρων περιετρέποντο δυσσεβείᾳ· μαλιστα ὅτε καὶ τὴν σωματικὴν περὶ τοῦ νόμου λατρίαν, ὁμοίως ἐκείνοις, περιεπέειν ἐσπυδαζόν.

have been received and felt by *both* the divisions of his followers, by one of them with an absurdity simply Arian, and by the other with an extravagance fermented into Socinianism.

When that race of Jewish infidels arose, which are denominated Sadducees; their thoughts must have been some time working in their minds, before they could have settled down into those lees and dregs of all rational sentiment, a denial of the immortality of the soul, and a consequent disbelief of future rewards and punishments. They must have gone in a regular process, to this dreadful extremity. They first perhaps questioned the *nature* of that immortality, then found themselves unable to fix it upon any spiritual principle, resorted therefore to a material one for the purpose, and at last resolved the whole into nothing. Some such movements must have been made by their disquisitive intellects, to bring them down into a positive denial of its immortality. In the same mode of retrograde progression, must they equally have descended in their opinions, concerning the nature of their Messiah. The sentiments of some in the days of our Saviour, and of all in the time of Trypho, seem to have been, that he was to be a mere man, a mere Son of David. But they could never have come from that belief, which was so prevalent among the people in our Saviour's time, and which must therefore have been

originally their own; at one leap to this. The body can never bear to pass, from the torrid zone at once into the frigid. Nor is the temperament of the mind at all different. The Jews therefore could never have reduced our Saviour in one act of their minds, from God the Son of God into a mere Son of David. Some intermediate operation must have taken place. The mind must have rested, in its descent with the Messiah from the throne of the Godhead, upon some middle point of existence; before it could have reached that lowest round of the ladder, a state of absolute humanity. Arianism must thus have preceded Socinianism, in this grand revolution of the Jewish creed. Arianism and not Socinianism, therefore, was probably the opinion of those, who had received a taint of Sadducean infidelity in the days of our Saviour. Even when Socinianism seems to have been predominant among the Jews at the time of Trypho, in the expectation of a mere man; in all probability they were only Arians. They probably considered our Saviour to be a mere man, with an angel attached to him. When some have continued in the faith of their fathers, and through all ages have acknowledged the Deity of their Messiah; others, no doubt, have only reduced their God into an Angel, and have abhorred the idea of levelling him with man, as much as our Arians abhor Socinianism at present.

And



And I shall soon show this to have been actually the case. With Arianism, Ebion came into the church. He denied our Saviour to "have PRE-EXISTED as " GOD the WORD and WISDOM." He asserted him to have been " born of a *Virgin* and *the Holy Ghost*." He thus coincided, with what his brother Jew taught Mahomet afterwards. But he coincided still more. He believed, like Mahomet, our Saviour to have been an Angel; and yet, like him, propounded his belief so faintly, that we know it by inference and deduction only. "Ebion," says Tertullian, "made our Saviour a man, yet " one who is plainly somewhat more glorious than " the prophets, so that *an Angel may be said to " have been in him*." And he therefore "escaped " *the extravagant absurdity* of those" among his followers, who afterwards assumed his name, and yet, in opposition to the genuine disciples of Ebion, "considered Christ as a mere man, begotten by the " union of Mary and her husband<sup>x</sup>."

Ebion

<sup>u</sup> Tertullian de Carne Christi xiii. p. 319. "Constituit Jesum " planè prophetis aliquò gloriosorem, ut ita in illo Angelus fuisset " dicatur."

<sup>x</sup> "Remember in the Book of the Koran the story of Mary; " when she retired from her family to a place towards the east, and " took a veil to conceal herself from them; and we sent our Spirit " Gabriel unto her, and he appeared unto her in the shape of a per- " fect man. She said, I fly for refuge unto the merciful God, that " he may defend me from thee; if thou fearest him, thou wilt not

Ebion was thus the person, who brought Arianism into the bosom of Christianity. He is accordingly asserted in express terms by Theodoret, to have “*led the phalanx*” of the Christian Arians. Even the heresy of Arius himself is said by Alexander his Bishop, to be “the doctrine of *Ebion*, of Artemas, and of Paulus Samosatensis, now lately making a new insurrection against the religion of the church.” “We anathematize,” cries Damasus, Bishop of Rome, a little later than Alexander, “Photinus, who, renewing the heresy of *Ebion*,” the Socinian part that was taken up by some of his followers, “confesses our Lord Jesus Christ to be only from Mary *v.*” And as it is of those

“approach me. He answered, Verily I am the messenger of thy Lord, and am sent to *give* thee a holy Son,” as the Holy Ghost of the Koran. “She said, How shall I have a Son, seeing *a man hath not touched me*, and I am no harlot? Gabriel replied, So shall it be; thy Lord saith, This is easy with *me*; and *we* will perform it, that *we* may ordain him for a sign unto men, and a mercy from *us*; for it is a thing which is decreed. Wherefore she conceived him.” Koran, ch. 19. p. 250. See also ch. 21. p. 272. The Mahometan commentators say, that “Gabriel,” as the Holy Ghost, “blew—, and his breath—caused the conception.” A note, p. 250. This passage, however, is another evidence that the Koran was taking an orthodox direction from the hand of Sergius, before the warping hand of Arianism was applied to it by Salon.

*y* “Hæresis—eadem Ignatii ævo extitit ab Ebione profecta, et ab ipsius discipulis, et Nazaræis, atque Cerintho defensa, a Theodoro et Artemone postea resuscitata: *Ταυτης δε της φαλαγγος ηρξεν* “*Εβιον*,—ut loquitur Theodoretus” (Pearson’s *Vindiciæ Epist. Ignat.* in Cotelerius’s *Patres Apostolici*, Le Clerc’s edition, vol. ii. part 2.

those *worser* Ebionites, that Justin speaks in his dialogue with *Jews*, when he says, “there are some, O “ Friends, of *your* nation, who *confess him to be “ Christ*, but argue him to be a man off men<sup>z</sup> ;” so do the Apostolical Constitutions, pretending to be of the age of the Apostles, but refuting their pretensions by mistaking the later Ebionites for the elder, in their enumeration of heresies among the *Jews* particularize by name “the *Ebionites*, who have “ *just now* appeared among us, who will have the “ Son of God to be a mere man, generating him of “ the pleasure of marriage, and of the union between Joseph and Mary<sup>a</sup>.” All shows Ebion in the opinion of the ages nearest to him, to have been the first upon the file of Arian hereticks among us. Such was the Jewish father of Arianism, in the church of Christianity; a man contemned by the great body of Christians, for the poverty of his un-

p. 350) :—Η εναγχος επαναφασα τη εκκλησιασικη ευσεβεια διδασκαλια, Εβιωνος εστι και Αρτεμα, και ζηλος τε κατα Αντιοχειαν Παυλν τε Σαμοσατεως (Hist. Theodoreti, i. 4. Reading. iii. 15) :—and αναθεματιζομεν φωτεινον, ος την τε Εβιωνος αιρεσιν ανακακισζων, τον Κυριον ημων Ιησuhn Χριστον μονον εκ της Μαριας ωμολογει (v. xi. 209).

<sup>z</sup> Justin, p. 267. Εισι τινες, ω φιλοι, ΗΜΕΤΕΡΟΥ [it should be, as is evinced by Bishop Bull, p. 346—347, and as the very form of the sentence shows, ΥΜΕΤΕΡΟΥ] γενεας, ομολογησιτες αυτον Χριστον ειναι, ανθρωπον δε εξ ανθρωπων αποφαινομενοι. See Bull, p. 347—348, for restraining these words to the Ebionites.

<sup>a</sup> Apofl. Confit. vi. 6. in Cotelarius's Patres Apofl. i. 333. Ος εφ ημων νυν φανερες Εβιωναισι, τον υιον τε θεu ψιλον ανθρωπον ειναι βηλομενοι, εξ ποδης ανδρος και συμπλοκης Ιωσηφ και Μαριας αυτον γενωντες.

derstanding;

derstanding; a man meriting contempt, from every thinking person in our religion; who rejected nearly all the Epistles, who nearly rejected all the Gospels too, and then, very naturally, rejected also the Godhead of his Saviour<sup>b</sup>.

### III. CONCERNING

<sup>b</sup> Epiphanius informs us upon the credit of good information, *ως η ελθουσα εις ημας γνωσις περιεχει*; that this heresy began just after the destruction of Jerusalem, *γεγονε δε αρχη τυτε μετα την των Ιεροσολυμων αλωσιν*. For, as he adds, "all the [Jewish] Christians [of Judæa] dwelt principally in a town called Pella," *κατ' εκεινο καιροσ κἀληκησαν το πλεον εν Πιλλητινι πολει*. This he says, "gave Ebion an opportunity of spreading his error" among them; *γεγονεν εκ τυτε προφασις τω Εβιωνι* (p. 126). And thus Ebion, a Jewish Christian, first brought in Arianism among the Christians, and made his first proselytes to Arianism among the Jewish Christians. The Arians therefore began in the church of God at the same time, because in the same town, and under the same assemblage of Jewish Christians at it; with that other sect of Jewish hereticks in infant Christianity, which has long since vanished into air, the *Nazarenes*: *η αρχη γεγοιε μετα την απο των Ιεροσολυμων μετασασιν, παντων των μαθηταν των εν Πιλλη ψηκηστων* (p. 123). But the Nazarenes were as different in reality, as they were in name, from the Ebionites. They were *no Arians*. They retained that Trinity of their Jewish ancestors, which the Gospel had adopted, and which the Ebionites with the cotemporary Jews had rejected. Epiphanius owns, that he does not *know* they were Arians, *εκ οιδα ειπειν* (p. 123). The presumption therefore is, and equally in criticism as in charity, that they were not. Had they been Arians, this peculiar stigma of heresy would peculiarly have been remembered in the church; and they, who agreed with the Ebionites in attachment to the Jewish observances, would have had no mark of discrimination from them. But, amidst the little that we *know* of this transient heresy, we know enough to say positively they were not Arians. Like the original Jews, they acknowledged a *Son* in the Godhead; and, like ourselves, confessed our Sa-  
vour

## — III. —

CONCERNING the associate of this grand parent of error among Christians, we find that CERINTHUS WAS

viour to be *the Son of God*. “They preach up one God, and, as a “Son of him, Jesus Christ;” *ενα δε θεον καταγγελλεσι, και τον τετε παιδα Ιησυν Χριστον* (p. 122). They thus, according to the ideas of the time, as we have seen before, and according to all the proprieties of commonsense, as we have repeatedly hinted; owned a Second Being in the Godhead, who stood in a *filial* relation to the First, and so shared in his substance. They were therefore not Arians, like the earlier Ebionites, with respect to our Saviour. Nor were they, like the later Ebionites, in respect to the Holy Ghost. Epiphanius could not tell, whether they affirmed our Saviour “to be generated off “Mary by the Holy Ghost,” *δια Πνευματος Αγιου γεγεννησθαι εκ Μαρίας* (p. 123). But we can. They actually acknowledged him, to be the offspring of the Holy Ghost. This is plain from St. Jerome, and from a passage cited by him out of the very Gospel of the Nazarenes. “In Evangelio quoque Hebræorum *quod leſitant Nazaraei*, “Salvator introducitur loquens, *Modò me arripuit Mater mea*, “SPIRITUS SANCTUS.” And the Holy Ghost appears demonstrably to have been considered by the Nazarenes, as the Supernatural Parent of our Saviour’s humanity. But whence comes this extraordinary change of the *gender* here? It shows its origin by its extraordinariness, and the origin of the whole doctrine with it. It was derived with the *Divinity* of the Holy Ghost, from the antient and orthodox Jews. Those Jews, “when they speak of the third “*Sephirah*, which they call *Binah*, and which we take justly to be “the Holy Ghost,—teach that *it proceeds from the First by the Second*: “it is—the doctrine of the Zohar and of the book Habbahir, related “by R. Menachem, fol. 1. col. 3. The very book of Zohar saith, “that the word *Jehovah* expresses both the Wisdom [or Logos] and “*the Binah*, and calls them Father and Mother, R. Men. fol. 3. “col,

was a Jew, like Ebion; as he asserted, says St. Austin, “the practice of circumcision, and of the  
“equally ceremonial precepts in the Law, to be a  
“*part of our duty*.” In this he compleatly sym-

“col. 3, and fol. 10. col 4.—They call her [the Holy Ghost] upon  
“that account the *Mother of Israel* and her [Israel’s] Tutor, R. Men.  
“fol. 62. col. 3, fol. 64. col. 4. That idea of the Holy Ghost as a  
“*Mother*, which R. Menachem hath fol. 114. col. 2, is so antient  
“among the Jews; that St. Jerome witnesseth that it was the name,  
“which the Nazarenes gave to the Holy Ghost, Hieronym. in Ezek.  
“xvi. in Isa. viii. and in Mat. xiii.—On Ezek. xvi,—after noting  
“that the word *Ruach*, Spirit, in the Hebrew tongue is *feminine*, he”  
cites the passage above. “This passage of the Nazarene’s Gospel  
“would never have been understood, if we had not known that the  
“Jews call the Holy Spirit *Imma*, Mother, as well as *Binab*, Under-  
“standing” (Allix’s Judgment, p. 166 and 178). So truly ortho-  
dox concerning the Trinity were those, whom modern heresy, in the  
want of Fathers and Apostles for Arianism, would fain form into  
Arians. See also Grabe’s Spicilegium, i. 27, 28, and 30, for more of  
this Gospel to the same purport.

<sup>c</sup> De Hær. vi. p. 7. Antwerp. “Carne circumcidi oportere  
“atque alia hujusmodi Legis præcepta servari.” This comprehen-  
sive account, corroborated as it is by Epiphanius, p. 110, fixes the  
Judaical part of his character compleatly. He was compleatly Ju-  
daical, in the essence of his sentiments. And though he appears from  
Epiphanius, to have superinduced some extraneous qualities over it,  
and to have considered the Supernal Lawgiver of the Jews as a bad  
Angel; yet he still urged obedience to his precepts. “Jesus was  
“circumcised,” he cried, “be thou also circumcised: Christ lived  
“according to the law, and do thou act in the same manner” (Epi-  
phanius, p. 113). Nor should the apparent inconsistency startle us;  
and drive us, as it has driven Bull (p. 159), into the supposition,  
that he was openly a Jew, and secretly none at all. It is easily re-  
solvable, and Epiphanius actually resolves it (p. 113), into the na-  
tural contradictoriness of fluctuating folly.

bolized with him, who was at once his leader and his colleague, Ebion. He equally symbolized with him too, in general absurdity, and in particular principles concerning Christ.

“ He taught the world to be made, says Irenæus, “ not by the Prime God, but by a certain Virtue, “ very separate and distinct from that Power which “ is over the universe, and ignorant of that God “ which is over all. He made our Saviour not to “ be born of a Virgin, for that seemed impossible “ to him; but to have been the Son of Joseph and “ Mary, in the same manner as all other men are “ born. He made *Christ* to have descended upon “ him after baptism, in the figure of a dove, from “ that Power which is over all. He stated our “ Saviour to have *then* preached the unknown Fa- “ ther, and performed miracles. But Christ in the “ end, he said, flew off from Jesus, and Jesus suf- “ fered and rose again; while Christ himself re- “ mained impassible, as being spiritual <sup>d</sup>.” Ce-

“ Non a Primo Deo factum esse mundum docuit, sed a Virtute “ quâdam, valdè seperatâ et distante ab eâ Principalitate quæ est “ super omnia, et ignorante eum qui est super omnia Deum. Jesum “ autem subjecit, non ex virgine natum (impossibile enim hoc ei “ visum est); fuisse autem eum Joseph et Mariæ filium, similiter ut “ reliqui omnes homines—: et post baptismum descendisse in eum, “ ab eâ Principalitate quæ est super omnia, Christum figurâ co- “ lumbæ; et tunc annunciasse incognitum Patrem, et virtutes per- “ fecisse; in fine autem revolâsse iterum Christum de Jesu, et Jesum “ passum esse et resurrexisse; Christum autem impassibilem perfe- “ verâsse, existentem spiritalem.” Irenæus, i. 25. p. 102.

rinthus

rinthus thus taught the universe to be made by somebody we know not whom, a principle totally different from God, and even *ignorant* of him. Into such a strange shape is the creating Logos of the Father here transformed, by the Circean wand of folly! Cerinthus also would not allow our Saviour, to be born of a Virgin; though the Mahometans acknowledge he was, at present. But Salon, the Jew preceptor of Mahomet, had not drunk so deeply of Sadducean unbelief, as Cerinthus. The latter had imbibed from his brethren, all that bold spirit of dictating to God, what he *ought* to reveal; which impelled them to interpret the Virgin of Isaiah, with a full contradiction to the interpretation of their fathers, into a mere Young Woman. Reason was now perching upon the throne of Revelation. And what seemed impossible to man, was voted to be actually impossible with God, and was immediately erased from the Bible. The owl, which has optics competent only to the view of the moon, was thus pretending to judge of the splendor of the sun from it<sup>e</sup>. The blind bird was even presuming to soar with the eagle; to face the near and noonday-sun, like it, with an unshrinking eye; and even to censure the strong beam of the eagle's eye, for weakness.

Cerinthus considered our Saviour to be no more

<sup>e</sup> This allusion I borrow from the Jews themselves, in Allix's Judgment, p. 176.



than a mere man, the real Son of Joseph and Mary, and produced in the common mode of generation. He thus shot far beyond the Mahometans. But he came back to their ground again. He made his Christ, as Mahomet makes his Gabriel, to stand for the Holy Ghost. He therefore causes his Christ to “descend upon” our Saviour “after baptism, in the figure of a “dove;” and to come “from that Power which “is over all.” Ebion in effect did the same with both. We have already seen from Tertullian, that Ebion considered our Saviour as “one who is “plainly somewhat more glorious than the prophets, so that an angel may be said to have been “in him.” “Some of the Ebionites,” adds Epiphanius, “say even Adam to be the Christ, being “the first who was formed and breathed into by “the breath of God: others of them say he is from “above, and was created before all things, *being a Spirit*, and being above angels, and being Lord of all; “and is called Christ:—and again, when they will, “they say, No; but *the Spirit, which is Christ, came “upon him, and clothed him who was called Jesus*.” Ebion and Cerinthus thus acknowledge the personal

† Epiphanius, p. 127. Τις γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ Ἀδὰμ τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι λέγουσι, τὸν πρῶτον πλασθέντα τε καὶ ἐμφυσηθέντα ἀπὸ τῆς τῆ θεῶ ἐπιπνικίας. ἄλλοι δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς λέγουσιν αἰῶθεν μὲν οὐτα, πρὸ πάντων δὲ κτισθέντα, πνεῦμα οὐτα, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀγγέλων οὐτα, πάντων τε κυριεύοντα, καὶ Χριστὸν λέγεσθαι:—παλιν δὲ ὅτε βυβλοῦται λέγουσιν, ἐχί, ἀλλὰ εἰς αὐτὸν ἦλθε τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός; καὶ ἐνεδύσατο αὐτὸν τοιοῦτον καλεῖσθαι.

existence

existence of the Holy Ghost, as an angel. Under the present power of this angel, our Saviour comes forth in Cerinthus's account, exactly as he does in ours, preaching the unknown Father to the world at large, and performing a great variety of miracles. But "Christ in the end," says Cerinthus, "flew off from Jesus; and Jesus suffered and rose again, while Christ himself remained impassible, as being spiritual." The Holy Ghost of Cerinthus thus leaves our Saviour. The gift of miracles is withdrawn from him. He sinks into a mere man again. He suffers as a man; while the Holy Ghost, who is necessarily "spiritual" as an angel, and necessarily "impassible" as a spirit, shares not at all in his sufferings. And Cerinthus provides against his Angel, the Holy Ghost, partaking in the sufferings of our Saviour, almost as the Mahometans do against their Angel the Messiah; *he*, by withdrawing the auxiliary angel from him, when the sufferings begin; and *they*, by equally withdrawing the angel our Saviour himself, and substituting another in his likeness to suffer for him<sup>§</sup>.

### Cerinthus

§ Koran, chap. iii. "The Jews devised a stratagem against Him; but God devised a stratagem against them, and God is the best deviser of stratagems." "This stratagem of God's," says Mr. Sale, "was the taking of Jesus up into heaven, and stamping his likeness on another person, who was apprehended and crucified in his stead. For it is the constant doctrine of the Mohammedans, that it was not Jesus himself who underwent that ignominious death, but *somebody else* in his shape and resemblance"

Cerinthus then stands upon the same level with the Mahometans, in some articles; and even sinks beneath them, in others. Yet he sinks not to Socinianism, on the grand point. He stopt at Arianism. And he went dreadfully low, in going down to this. Indeed, as Tertullian adds, “ he made  
 “ Christ a man only, the son of Joseph, and with-  
 “ out DIVINITY.” Yet the opposition is here kept up, we see, not between the Human and the Angelical natures, but between the Divine and the

(p. 42). “ They have said,” the Koran tells us of the Jews in another place, “ Verily we have slain Christ Jesus;—yet they slew him  
 “ not, neither crucified him, but he was represented by one in his  
 “ likeness:—they did not really kill him; but God took him up  
 “ unto himself” (chap. iv. p. 79). Accordingly the Mahometan Gospel of St. Barnabas, makes four angels to come from God to our Saviour, who “ came in all haste, and bare him out of the window  
 “ which looks towards the south,” in “ the house where the disciples  
 “ slept;” and “ placed him in the third heaven:” while “ Judas the  
 “ traitor entered before the rest into the place from which Jesus had  
 “ just been taken up,” was there changed by God “ into the same  
 “ figure and speech with Jesus,” and was seized and crucified for him (White’s Notes, p. lxxix—lxxx). Yet the Koran here *conceals* itself, as in chap. iii. p. 43, it tells us, “ God said, O Jesus, verily I  
 “ will cause thee to die, and I will take thee up unto me;” which the commentators *try* to reconcile, by supposing he is to die at the end of the world, by supposing *death* here means either its likeness sleep or spiritual mortification, or by supposing he actually died, was revived, and then was taken up (see Mr. Sale’s note here). They thus prove the contradiction, by attempting to solve it; and make it the more glaring, by the foolishness of their attempts. The heretical opinion also was, that *Simon of Cyrene*, not Judas, suffered instead of our Saviour (Pearson on the Creed. p. 184 and 202).

Human. Cerinthus did not allow our Saviour to be, what the universal church asserted he was, a GOD-MAN. This is "an opinion," as Tertullian remarks in another place, "which will coincide with Ebion's, who made Jesus a mere man, only a Descendant from David, and not *also* THE SON OF GOD<sup>h</sup>." Here the same opposition is still kept up. The DIVINITY of our Saviour was torne away from his humanity, by the violent hands of Ebion and of Cerinthus. But then Cerinthus and Ebion did equally agree in another point. They left not the human nature to stand by itself. They added another nature to it. And Cerinthus, like Ebion, believed our Saviour to be an *Angel-man*. We find accordingly from Tertullian himself, that he "believed the God of the Jews to have been, not the Lord, but an Angel;" and even affirmed "the world to have been created, not by God, but

<sup>h</sup> "Cerinthus hæreticus—Christum ex femine Joseph natum proponit, hominem illum tantummodo sine Divinitate contendens" (De Præscript. Hæreticor. lxxviii. p. 221); "poterit hæc opinio Hebioni convenire, qui nudum hominem, et tantum ex femine David, id est, non et Dei Filium, constituit Jesum" (De Carne Christi, xiv. p. 319). The latter passage indeed, as the whole of this addition to Tertullian's work, is wanting in some manuscripts; and is preceded by that *Finis* of the ancients, "contra hæreticos *explicit*." The work ended there originally. But Tertullian himself made the addition. He promises it at the end of the other: "nunc quidem *generaliter* actum est a nobis adversus hæreses omnes:—de reliquo *etiam specialiter* quibusdam respondebimus." And the style, the manner; and the matter, are all apparently Tertullian's.

“ by

“ by Angels<sup>i</sup>.” His “ Virtue” therefore; by which, as we have seen before, and “ not by the “ Prime God,” a phrase evidently borrowed from the Trinity of the Christians about him, totally incongruous with his system, and yet from its familiarity sliding insensibly into his language, he supposes the world to be made; was an Angel, “ very “ separate and distinct from that Power which is “ over the universe,” that is, not he who is said to be of the same substance with God, and to be his Logos; and even “ ignorant of that God which is “ over all.” He thus reduced the Logos of the Old Testament, into a mere Angel; depriving him of the honour of creating the world, and the dignity of being the God of the Jews; and madly communicating it all to an Angel. We have seen him before from Irenæus, like the Mahometans, making our Saviour equally an Angel; like them, superadding the Angel to the mere man, and so forming Christ Jesus from both. And Tertullian himself considers him, as believing our Saviour to have had an Angel within him<sup>k</sup>. Cerinthus therefore stands distinguished

<sup>i</sup> Tertullian, p. 221. “ Ipsam quoque legem ab angelis datam perhibens, Judæorum Deum, non Dominum, sed Angelum, promens;—Hebion—Cerintho non in omni parte consentiens, quòd “ a Deo dicat mundum, non ab angelis, factum.”

<sup>k</sup> Tertullian, p. 319, speaking of some hereticks, who held this opinion of our Saviour being an Angel and a Man in one, says thus: “ Quanto ergo, dum hominem gestat, minor angelis factus est, tanto

distinguished now in the melancholy annals of heresy, as the second transplanter of the bitter root of Arianism, out of the blasted wilderness of the Jews, into the garden of Christ's church.

He and Ebion serve to show us, however, that the very Jews whom our Saviour interrogated, and even those who were cotemporaries with Justin and Trypho, both of whom professed to expect a mere son of David in their Messiah; were no more Soci-nians in reality than these, and were only Arians like them, by expecting an angel to be superinduced (as it were) over the man in Him, and by considering Him as compounded of both. The Jewish Arianism of the Koran, which is exactly this, strongly intimates the point. The agreement of Ebion with the Koran, appears to confirm it. And the agreement of Cerinthus with both, appears to give a certainty to all. With such an useful light, do these two nebulous stars in the dark firmament of heresy, this Castor and this Pollux of Arianism, dimly shine out to us. Irenæus accordingly insinuates the Jews in his time, just like bishop Clayton, to have reduced the Son and the Spirit of God into a couple of Angels. "In this," he says, "the Jews have

"non, dum angelum gestat. Poterit hæc opinio Hebioni convenire." P. 221. "Hebion fuit Cerintho non in omni parte consentiens, quod a Deo dicat mundum, non ab angelis factum." Cerinthus therefore and Hebion agreed in the other points; especially in this, of our Saviour's having an angel within him.

"gone

“ gone off from God, by not receiving the WORD  
 “ of God, but thinking they are able to know God  
 “ by himself, without the WORD, that is, without the  
 “ Son; being ignorant of Him who spoke in a hu-  
 “ man form to Abraham, and Aaron, and Moses:  
 “ —for all nature was formed from the beginning  
 “ by the Son, who is the WORD of God; the Fa-  
 “ ther having no need of *angels* for creating man,—  
 “ and again having no need of *their* ministry, when  
 “ he fabricated the world:—for to him do minister  
 “ in all things his Offspring and his Image, that is,  
 “ the Son and Holy Spirit, WORD and WISDOM,  
 “ whom *all the angels are subject to and serve*.”  
 Nor is the *present* faith of the Jews, different from  
 all. In their grand council at Ageda, A. D. 1650,  
 “ they did agree in this; that he [their Messiah]  
 “ should be born of a VIRGIN, according to the  
 “ prediction of the prophets.” They also thought  
 “ Eliah was he, if he were come, because he [Eli-  
 “ ah] came with great power, which he declared

1 Adv. Hær. iv. 17, p. 303. “ Propter hoc Judæi excefferunt a  
 “ Deo, Verbum Dei non recipientes, sed putantes per seipsum Pa-  
 “ trem sine Verbo, id est sine Filio, posse cognoscere Deum; nesci-  
 “ entes eum qui in figurâ loquutus est humanâ ad Abraham et Aa-  
 “ ron et—Mousem:—hæc enim Filius, qui est Verbum Dei, ab  
 “ initio præstruebat, non indigente Patre angelis, uti—formaret—  
 “ hominem,—neque rurâs indigente ministerio [angelorum] ad fa-  
 “ bricationem eorum quæ facta sunt:—ministrat enim ei ad omnia  
 “ sua Progenies et Figuratio sua, id est, Filius et Spiritus Sanctus,  
 “ Verbum et Sapientia; quibus serviunt et subjecti sunt omnes an-  
 “ geli.”

“ by slaying the priests of Baal; and, for the fulfil-  
 “ ing of scripture, he was oppressed by Ahab and  
 “ Jezebel; yet they esteemed him to be MORE  
 “ THAN A MORTAL MAN, because he so strangely af-  
 “ cended up into heaven<sup>m</sup>.” Accordingly many of  
 the Jews, in order to account for their Messiah’s  
 delay of coming among them, are driven to the na-  
 tural subterfuge of supposing, in a Mahometan wild-  
 ness of fancy; that he is still “ detained in PARA-  
 “ DISE” or heaven, kept from appearing by God,  
 and “ bound with” a chain of “ woman’s hair<sup>n</sup>.”  
 And all the Jews expect their Messiah at present, to be  
 an *Angel-man*. So plainly does the *heretical* faith of  
 the Jews, appear to have been only the faith of Ari-  
 anism, not of Socinianism; from the days of our Sa-  
 viour, to those of Ebion and Cerinthus, to those of  
 Irenæus and Mahomet, and to the present time!

Against the *latter* of those wretched Jews; both,  
 too contemptible for refutation from their folly, if  
 they had not become too dangerous for neglect  
 from their audacity; and *this*, the only one alive  
 probably at the time<sup>o</sup>, so particularly obnoxious  
 to a surviving apostle, that he instantly rushed  
 out of a bathing-house, when he saw “ that ene-  
 “ my of the truth,” Cerinthus, within it: did

<sup>m</sup> Phenix, i. 550.

<sup>n</sup> Mod. Un. Hist. xiii. p. 519, from David Kimchi, &c.

<sup>o</sup> It appears from Epiphanius, p. 423, that Ebion preached his  
 heresy, equally with Cerinthus, in the place of St. John’s residence.



this very apostle, then the aged and venerable St. John, peculiarly write his Gospel. "John the disciple of our Lord," as Irenæus tells us, "was willing by the publication of his Gospel, to take away the error which Cerinthus had diffeminated among men P."

We

P Irenæus adv. Hær. iii. xi. p. 218, "Hanc fidem annuncians Joannes Domini discipulus, volens per Evangelii annunciationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho infeminatus erat hominibus, errorem," &c. Yet to the amazement of my reader let me record, that, in the exorbitance of heretical wildness, "the author of a late book intitled Considerations maintains, that the Gospels have been corrupted by the orthodox party, and suspects that of St. John to be the work of Cerinthus" (Allix's Judgment, Preface, p. xiv). And thus the insanity of some ancient bedlamites, who loved not the Logos of St. John, who therefore rejected the writings of the apostle, and so gained the appellation of Alogi from the Christians in their sober senses (Epiphanius, p. 424); astonishingly appeared again, among some moon-struck hereticks in England.

Epiphanius had applied the fact concerning the bathing-house, to Ebion (p. 148--149). Such colleagues in heresy were he and Cerinthus! But Irenæus, on the positive authority of some then alive, who had received the anecdote from Polycarp; applies it directly to Cerinthus, and fixes Ephesus as the scene of it: ΕΙΣΙΝ οι ακηκοτες αυτε [Πολυκαρπη], οτι Ιωαννης ο τε κυριε μαθητης, εν τη Εφεσω παρεθεις λεσασθαι, και ιδων εσω Κηριθον, εξηλατο τε βαλανειο μη λεσαμενος, αλλ' επειπων, φυγωμεν, μη και το βαλανειον συμπεση, ενδον ουτος Κηριθς, τε της αληθειας εχθρα (Adv. Hær. iii. 3. p. 204). In an age of miraculous interpositions, such an interposition as this against such an heretick, might not unreasonably be apprehended by an apostle. And Eusebius, iii. 28, p. 123, cites Irenæus for the incident, as relating entirely to Cerinthus. Dr. Middleton indeed, in his free humour of encountering the whole history of our religion in the first ages, and so, like another Canute, pretending to stop with his voice the flowing ocean of antiquity; has objected to the relation. It has

We accordingly see one feature in the complexion of infant Christianity, one circumstance in the

only the testimony of Irenæus, he urges, and is told by him at second hand or from hearsay. But the folly of the objection is glaringly conspicuous. If such an incident as this may not be received upon the credit of *one* historian, what is to become of the general history of man? It must fall to the ground. And Polybius, Tacitus, and Thucydides, must rank with the writers of legends. Irenæus therefore, though single, is a competent evidence; and even for an incident, of ten times superior magnitude. His relation is founded primarily on the evidence of Polycarp, a cotemporary of the Grand Agent, even his disciple and companion, probably a companion at the moment, and a witness of the highest credibility in himself. This carries us up to the very fountain-head of the whole. There are few testimonies in history, superior to this. There can only be one, that of a *certain* spectator. But how was this testimony conveyed to Irenæus? Not by one relator, but by more; by persons actually alive at the time of Irenæus's writing, who had received it, not from the current talk of the times, but from the very lips of Polycarp himself, and who had themselves recited the testimony of Polycarp to Irenæus. There is only one link therefore in the chain of this historical tradition, between the actor and the narrators. If this does not form an evidence sufficiently historical, half the history of man must be struck off from the records of truth. Most of the main and capital points in our human annals, actually stand not upon such good ground of authority, as this little anecdote does. A Livy and a Suetonius particularly, whose evidence for facts prior to themselves can be evidence only at second, third, and fourth hand, must be dashed aside at once from the file of historians. And Dr. Middleton's introduction of the judiciary principles of evidence, into the region of history; would manifest its madness by its destructiveness. But the Doctor urges another, and an internal, objection to the history. St. John, it seems, does not act in it with the proper dignity of an apostle. St. Peter reproved Simon Magus, he says, St. Paul struck Elymas with blindness, and St. John only rushed out of the bathing-house,

the history of our rising religion; which has been little noticed, but is very striking in itself, and results

house at the sight of Cerinthus. Dr. Middleton, to be sure, is a competent judge of all the proprieties of apostolical conduct. He finds two incidents in this conduct. These indeed vary each from the other. But he will not allow the third to have the same variety. In the narrowness of his conceptions he makes it spurious, because it is not the same. But an apostle, like a man, varies his conduct with the circumstances. St. John knew these circumstances, infinitely better than we do; and therefore, no doubt, adapted his conduct to them. We can see however, that no reproof which he could have given to Cerinthus, and no expulsion of him from the bathing-house; even if he could have expelled him, without a recurrence to his miraculous powers, and without shaking that building over his head, which he apprehended would fall upon it without his shaking: would have been more pointed in itself, and have spoken with more significance to the Christians, than his abruptly, and without bathing, leaving the house at the sight of Cerinthus in it; and his instantly explaining the act by the exclamation, "Let us flee, lest even the house should fall down, while Cerinthus, that enemy of the truth, is within it." This exclamation and this act told to the ears and eyes of all, the horror which St. John felt for the principles of Cerinthus, and the apprehensions which he entertained of some signal vengeance from God, upon the person of Cerinthus. And it thus answered every religious and apostolical purpose, which we can conceive St. John to have had in view. So truly impertinent are the arguments of Dr. Middleton, against the truth of this useful anecdote! Internally and externally surveyed, it is found to rest firmly upon its own supporters. See Dr. Middleton's objections in his *Miscellaneous Works*, ii. 108 and 111. In an age indeed, when the old credulity is now followed by a new scepticism; by a scepticism as fashionable, as the credulity was; and by a scepticism, that from its novelty we know not how to manage: the faith of the generality of scholars in the early and human history of our religion, is like the rocking-stone of our Heathen ancestors; a something thrown

sults entirely from this. The venerable Founder of our faith, and the dignified preachers of it to the world, as late as St. John himself; do never propose the doctrine of Christ's divinity, as a *new* article of belief, as one that had been hitherto unknown to the church of God, and that was now brought to light by the Gospel. They do not lay it before their hearers or their readers, in formal propositions. They bring it not forward to their understandings, with a solemnity of introduction; that should show their own sense of its surprizing nature, and prepare the minds of their people for the first reception of it. No! They pass imperceptibly into the subject. They insinuate rather than proclaim it. They speak of it in such a manner, as proves it to have been familiar to their own minds, and familiar to the minds of their countrymen. Whenever they notice it, they notice it as a doctrine, which had always been professed by the church of God, had always been

thrown into a tremulous agitation, *by the stalk of an asphodel* touching it; while even *the arm of a giant* cannot really unsettle it from its centre. And, not to leave the Arian any possible opening of escape from the pressure of this anecdote, let me add; that the "error" of Cerinthus which St. John meant to encounter by his Gospel, and which appears from that Gospel to have been the great "error" of *Arianism*, was undoubtedly the very "error," which *occasioned* St. John's personal abhorrence for Cerinthus; and that the two anecdotes of Irenæus concerning St. John, thus unite the one with the other, and both with the writings of St. John, to show what an object of aversion an Arian was to an apostle.

:  
believed

believed by its members, and now wanted only to be applied to the person of Jesus. This remark, which is so necessary to the right understanding of *our* scriptures, is additionally demonstrated to be true; by the evident contrast which appears in the writings of St. John, compared with all the other writings of the New Testament, concerning the present article. *Then* the article having been doubted, denied, and opposed, by Cerinthus and Ebion; that last of the apostles, whose life seems to have been continued for the very purpose, set himself to mention the doctrine in a very different manner. He no longer notes it, in the easy and transient mode of his predecessors. He asserts it in peremptory terms. He dwells upon it in circumstantial language. He does this too, at the very *commencement* of his Gospel. And there he comes over and over again with it, calls in all the emphasis of repetition, and exerts all the energy of variation; to impress the doctrine upon the minds and spirits of his readers, for ever<sup>9</sup>.

— IV. —

<sup>9</sup> Epiphanius tells us, p. 111, that Cerinthus was “one of those, who created confusion in the days of the apostles; when James and his colleagues wrote the epistle to Antioch, saying, “Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words,—to whom we gave no such commandment” (Acts, xv. 24). He adds also, that Cerinthus was “one of those who opposed the holy Peter, after he had gone in to the holy Cornelius; and was the very man, that moved “them  
“ that

## — IV. —

IN this manner did Arianism get footing among us Christians, introduced by the wild fantasticalness of a Jew, and opposed with all the weight and wisdom of an apostle. Indeed the authority of St. John must have been sufficient, we should think, to have suppressed this heresy at its rise, and to have freed the church from it entirely. But vainly is reason opposed at times, to the impertinences of folly; and in vain at times does even inspiration come forward, to check the effrontery of pride. The pride of folly, when dressed out in the borrowed livery of wisdom, disdains all controul. And the serpent of Arianism, though bruised and crushed under the feet of St. John, had yet strength enough left, to creep away into covert, there to regain its original vigour, and even to break out from thence

“that were of the circumcision to contend with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men un-circumcised” (Acts, xi. 2—3). But this was done, as Epiphanius subjoins, “before he preached his doctrine in Asia, and fell into the deeper abyss of his own destruction.” From all he appears to have been an active turbulent man, such as one should expect *him* to be, who became the second hero of Arianism; a very Erostratus in theology, whose vigour of spirit could be confined within no bounds, and who was ready for any deed that would serve to immortalize his name. Such men would set fire to the whole world, only to form for themselves a funeral pile of greater magnificence; provided they were sure of another world, to talk about it.

with

with additional vivacity again. There was now no apostle, to bruise its head afresh. But there was sufficient illumination of intelligence, and sufficient invigoration of zeal, in the church itself; to resist, to assault, and to quell the monster a second time. Three hundred and twenty three bishops were assembled, out of every region in the Christian world. These, with only *five* dissentients at first, and only *two* at last, out of the whole number; drew up a profession of the universal faith of Christendom, peculiarly pointed against this revived spirit of Judaism, and strenuously asserting the substantial Divinity of our Saviour<sup>r</sup>. And the continued use of this confession, with only some slight additions upon this and other points, in all the publick devotions of the East and West, from that period to the present; marks to us in the strongest manner, the final and complete triumph of the original principles of Christianity, over the alien and adventitious doctrines of Judaism<sup>s</sup>.

Accordingly, in all this period of triumphing orthodoxy, we see Arianism repeatedly branded as

<sup>r</sup> Socrates, Hist. i. 8. p. 22, and i. 9, p. 27, of Reading's edition, Vol. II. ΤΑΥΤΗΝ ΤΗΝ ΠΙΣΤΙΝ ΤΡΙΑΚΟΣΙΟΙ ΜΕΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΙΣ ΔΕΚΑΚΟΣΤΩ ΕΓΓΩΣΑΝ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΕΦΕΡΞΑΝ.—ΑΕΝΤΕ ΔΕ ΜΟΝΟΙ Ε ΠΡΟΣΕΔΕΞΑΝΤΟ (p. 22). These five are in p. 27 reduced to two, Theonas bishop of Marmarica and Secundus bishop of Ptolemais.

<sup>s</sup> “ Within a hundred and fifty years, or thereabouts, after their [the Arians] first rise [in Arius]; there hardly remained any “ professors of it” (Allix's Judgment, Preface, p. ix—x).

Judaism, by those venerable writers, whom good-sense and piety will always revere; whom a just and manly fondness of reverence in the orthodox, has denominated the Fathers of the church; and to whom even the heretical are happy to appeal, whenever they fancy they can. As historical authorities, they must carry a considerable weight with every one. "Come ye then all together," cries that very good man and very useful writer Ignatius, in one of his Eusebian and authentick epistles, "as into one temple of God, as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ, Him who came forth from the Father, and WHO WAS ONE, and RETURNED INTO ONE AGAIN." Ignatius thus warns his Magnesian against those hereticks the Ebionites and the Cerinthians, but the former only as included in the latter; both of whom denied the Divinity of Christ, as we have just seen, and endeavoured, as we have also seen, to introduce Judaism. "Be not deceived," he adds, "with the heterodoxies, or with the old fables, which are un-profitable; for, if even yet we live according to JUDAISM, we confess we have not received grace; for the most divine prophets lived according to Christ Jesus; therefore also they were persecuted, being inspired by his grace to convince the unbelievers, that there is ONE GOD who manifested HIMSELF through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his ETER-

"NAL



“**NAL WORD**, not coming forth FROM SILENCE,” that is, not coming forth as the *word* of God’s *mouth* after *an antecedent period of silence*; “who in all points pleased him that sent him: if then those who were engaged in old things, have come to a newness of hope, no longer keeping the *Sabbath*, but living according to *the Lord’s day* ;” &c.<sup>t</sup>. He thus glances at the Judaical origin of Arianism, in the very beginning of this period. About the middle of it, “this is a point of **JEWISH faith**,” says Tertullian, “so to believe in one God, as not to reckon to Him a **SON**, and a **SPIRIT** after the Son; for *what difference will there be but this, between us and them?* What is the work of the Gospel? What is the substance of the New Testament, which has fixed the Law and the prophets even till John; if from thence forward FA-

<sup>t</sup> Ignat. ad Magnesios, vii—viii. Παντες εν ως εις [ενα] ναον συν-ερχεσθε θεος, ως επι εν δυσιαστηριον, ως επι ενα Ιησεν Χριστον, του αφ’ ενθ’ Πατρθ’ προελθοντα, και εις ενα οντα και χωρησαντα. Μη πλανησθε ταις ετεροδοξιαις, μηδε μυθευμασιν τοις παλαιοις, ανωφελεσιν εσιν. Ει γαρ μεχρι νυν κατα νομον Ιουδαισμον ζωμεν, ομολογουμεν χαριν μη εληφειναι. Οι γαρ θειοτατοι προφηται κατα Χριστον Ιησεν εξησαν. Δια ταυτα και εδιωχθησαν, εμπνεομενοι υπο της χαριθ’ αυτου, εις το πληροφορηθηναι της απειθεντας, οτι εις θεος εστιν ο φανερωσας εαυτον δια Ιησθ Χριστν τε Τη αυτε, ος εστιν αυτε Λογθ’ αιδιθ’, εκ απο σιγης προελθων, ος κατα παντα ευηρσησεν τω περιψαντι αυτον. Ει εν οι εν παλαιοις πραγμασιν αναγραφεντες, εις καινοτητα ελπιθ’ ηλθον, μηκετι σαβδατιζοντες, αλλα κατα κυριακην ζωνν ζωντες κ. τ. λ. (Ruffel, ii. 129—130). See Cotelerius’s and Smith’s notes here, Pearson’s Vindiciæ in Cotelerius, Vol. II. part ii. p. 350, and Bull, p. 156—166.

“**THER,**

“**THER**, and **SON**, and **SPIRIT**, believed to be  
 “**THREE PERSONS**, do not constitute one  
 “**GOD**?” In these expressive terms, does Tertul-  
 lian at once show the Christian belief of his cotem-  
 poraries, in the doctrine of the Trinity; and mark  
 with disdain the Judaical leaven of Arianism, as  
 opposed to it. Novatian also, who lived just im-  
 mediately after Tertullian, and whose work upon  
 the Trinity is subjoined to the works of Tertullian;  
 says our Saviour “showed himself to be **GOD**, by  
 “coming from thence whence man cannot come,”  
 heaven. “But indeed,” he adds concerning the  
 Arians, “the **JEWS**, ignorant and un-appri-  
 zed of this  
 “his descent, **HAVE LEFT THOSE HERETICKS** their  
 “**HEIRS**.” So significantly does he note, in con-  
 firmation of the general belief in the Godhead of  
 our Saviour, the opposite doctrine to have been  
 transmitted as an inheritance of folly, from the ig-  
 norant Jews to the heretical Christians! About the  
 close of this period, that **FIRST OF GENTILE ARIANS**,

<sup>u</sup> Tertullian adv. Praxeam, c. xxx. p. 518. “Judaicæ fidei ista  
 “res, sic unum Deum credere, ut Filium adnumerare ei nolis, et post  
 “Filium Spiritum. Quid enim erit inter nos et illos, nisi differen-  
 “tia illa? Quod opus Evangelii? Quæ est substantia Novi Testa-  
 “menti, statuens legem et prophetas usque ad Johannem; si non  
 “exinde Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus, tres crediti, unum Deum  
 “sistunt?”

<sup>x</sup> “Veniendo autem inde unde homo venire non potest, Deum  
 “se ostendit verisſe; sed enim hujus ipsius descensionis ignari et in-  
 “periti Judæi, hæredes sibi hæreticos istos reddiderunt” (Tertul-  
 lian, p. 721, De Trin. lib. c. xxiii).

Theodotus the tanner of Byzantium, is declared by Epiphanius to be refuted, “ together with the UN-  
 “ BELIEVING and GOD-DENYING JEWS;” in our Saviour’s intimation, that he himself existed before Abraham was made<sup>γ</sup>. Alexander also, the bishop of Alexandria, in his long and spirited memorial against the rising heresy of Arius and his associates; says that, “ condemning all the apostolick godly  
 “ doctrine, WITH THE MANNER of the JEWS they  
 “ have been forging weapons in their workshop, to  
 “ fight against Christ; denying the DIVINITY of  
 “ our Saviour, and reducing him to an equality  
 “ with all creatures<sup>z</sup>.” And “ we,” says Athanasius, “ are separate from those who Judaize,” the real Jews, “ and those who corrupt Christianity  
 “ with JUDAISM,” the Jewish Arians, “ who, de-  
 “ nying the GOD off God, talk like the JEWS con-  
 “ cerning one God; not therefore asserting him to  
 “ be the only God, because He only is the Unbe-  
 “ gotten, and He only the Fountain of the Deity;  
 “ but as one barren and unfruitful, without a Son,

<sup>γ</sup> Epiphanius, p. 467. Ελεγχων θεοδοτον [who is called in Euseb. v. xxviii. p. 252, αρχηγον και πατερα], και τες απιστες και επαρησιβεις Ιουδαιες.

<sup>z</sup> Theodorit. Hist. i. 4, Reading, iii. 10. Οι πασης της αποστολικης ευσεβους δοξης κατηγοροντες, Ιουδαιικω προσχηματι χειρομαχον συνεκροτησαν εργασηριον, την θεοτητα τε σωτησης ημων αρνημενοι, και τοις πασι ισοι ειναι κηρυσσοντες.

“without a living WORD and a true WISDOM<sup>a</sup>.” Arianism and orthodoxy we see constantly ranged each against the other, exactly as Judaism and Christianity; the original Judaism of the Arians, being perpetually exhibited to the Christians, in the continuing and universal Arianism of the Jews before their eyes<sup>b</sup>.

Thus

<sup>a</sup> Athanasius, *Oratio contra Gregales Sabellii*, i. p. 651, Paris, 1627. Χαριζομεθα δε και των Ιουδαιζοντων, και τον Χριστηνισμον εν Ιουδαισμι παραφθειροντων, οι τον εκ τε θεου θεον αρνευμενοι, θεον ενα παραπλησιως Ιουδαιοις λεγουσι· εχ οτι μου αγεννητο και μοι πηγη θεοτητος, δια τετο φασκοντες αυτον ειναι μοιον θεου, αλλ' ως αγονον γινε και αναρπον ζαντο Λογος και Σοφιας αληθινης.

<sup>b</sup> Athanasius accordingly adds, that “the *Judaizing* Arians of this time seem to me, to be in the same situation with *Caiaphas* and the *Pharisees* of that time,” Αρειανοι δε νυν Ιουδαιζοντες ταυτον μοι δοκωσιν πασχεν τω Καϊαφα και τοις τοτε Φαρισαιοις (*Syn. Nic.* i. p. 250). “This,” he subjoins in another place, “is that undisguised opinion of *Caiaphas* and the man of *Sainofata*, which the church banished,” τετο τε Καϊαφα και τε Συμοσατεως ατεχνως εστι το φρονημα, οπερ η μεν εκκλησια εξεβαλεν (*ibid.* p. 273). And, as he finally says to the Arians, “Behold, we indeed demonstrate this our opinion to have been transmitted from fathers to fathers;” ιδε ημεις μεν εκ πατερων ως πατερας διαδεσκειναι την ταιαυτην διανοιαν αποδεικνυμεν “but ye, O recent *Jesus* and *disciples* of *Caiaphas*, what fathers have ye to shew for your assertions?” ημεις δε, ω κοι Ιουδαιοι και τε Καϊαφα μανταται, τιας αγα των ρηματων υμων εχετε δεϊξαι πατερας; “yet not one of those prudent and wise men can ye mention,” αλλ' εδενε των φρονον και σοφον αν ειποιτε· “for all persons are averse to you, except the devil only,” παντες γαρ υμας αποστρεφονται, πλην μου τε διαβολε, “and he only was the father of such an apostasy to you,” μοις γαρ υμων ετος της ταιαυτης αποσασιας πατηρ γεγονεν (*ibid.* p. 277). The zeal of this worthy man, this glorious champion of orthodoxy, and this “*vir prope divinus*,”

Thus begun and thus supported, the belief of the Trinity passed over into this island, with the general system of the Gospel. We know not much indeed of our church, at that period. But we know enough, to see this fact very clearly. And from one of the *two* British histories that we have of the times, and from the only one that touches upon theology at all; we learn not only the original faith of the island in the Divinity of our Saviour, but also the first introduction of Arianism into it. The truth is thus shown in a stronger luster of light, by its opposition to the darkness of error. “ This pleasing agreement of Christ the head and of the members,” says Gildas, “ continued here; till THE ARIAN PERFIDY, like a fierce serpent, vomiting forth its *transmarine* poisons upon us, destructively caused brethren who were united together, to be separated.” In that great earth-

as Bull calls him (p. 291), is here remarkable. To *modern* ears he must sound as blunt in his manner, as he is right in his matter. And, on an occasion so grand as this, zeal must often speak what charity would fain withhold. Charity indeed, looking upon things with the common eye of vision, would withhold every thing that is grating and severe to the moment. But Charity, furnished with a telescope by Faith, and ranging forward in vision to the Great Future, sees things in a new state, and finds herself to be Zeal in reality.

° Hist. c. ix. p. 12. Gale's Scriptores, vol. i. “ *Manfit—hæc Christi, capitum, membrorumque consonantia suavis; donec Ariana Perfidia, atrox ceu anguis, transmarina nobis evomens venena, fratres in unum habitantes exitiabilè faceret seungi.*”

quake, as it were, which was made within the body of the church, by the force of Arianism struggling for vent, and working in darkness below; Britain shared in the general convulsion. But the church soon settled again, upon its old and natural center. The island soon recovered its original habits of thinking, and adopted the Nicene Faith of the church at large. The æra of introduced Arianism, was marked with the disdain and abhorrence of our British ancestors. And the current of belief ran clear and untainted, in this particular; through all the succeeding periods of our history, to the present<sup>d</sup>.

Nor let the perpetual self-sufficiency of Arianism<sup>e</sup>,  
presume

<sup>d</sup> Hist. of Manchester, ii. Quarto, p. 455—456, &c.

<sup>e</sup> Of this self-sufficiency we *feel* too much at present, not to be sensible of its existence among the present Arians. But let history exhibit it to us, as the original and co-eval spirit of Arianism, as infused into it at its second birth in Arius, and as therefore showing itself so lively since. “Those who have set themselves in array “against the Divinity of the Son of God,” says Alexander Bishop of Alexandria concerning Arius and his *followers* in heresy, “— *deign* “not to compare any of the antients with themselves; and suffer not “those whom we have used as Masters from our childhood,” the Fathers preceding them, “to be put on an equal footing with themselves; “and consider not any one of our present colleagues throughout the whole “church, to have even a moderate share of wisdom; declaring them- “selves to be the only wise, and the only persons to whom has been re- “vealed, what never happened to enter into the mind of any other man “under the sun. O impious arrogance and immeasurable madness!” Οἱ γὰρ κατὰ τῆς Θεότητος τῆ Τιῆ τῆ Θεῶ παραταξάμενοι, — ἔδε τῶν ἀρχαίων τινὰς συγκρίνειν ἑαυτοῖς ἀξίωσιν, ἔδε οἱς ἡμεῖς ἐκ παιδῶν ὠμλήσαμεν διδασκαλοῖς, ἐξίστασθαι ἀνεχόνται· ἀλλ’ ἔδε τῶν νῦν πανταχῶ συλλειψυγῶν

presume to attribute this unvaried style of orthodoxy in our church, to the contracted state of the human mind in those ages, and to its incapacity of expansion and exertion. This would be only to expose its folly the more, by its self-sufficiency. The Deist might, with equal arrogance, pronounce our belief of the *whole* Gospel; to be only narrowness of intellect, and bigotry of spirit. And the unhappy maniac in Bedlam, with equal justice might assert himself, to have been the only man in his senses amid a world of madmen; to have been therefore overpowered by the multitude, and locked up in his solitary cell. There were some undoubtedly in this long period of time, who were too proud to adopt the trite faith of the vulgar, or too weak to grasp the vast evidence for it. There will be such, in every age. It was with a view to such, we may

γων τινὰ εἰς μάτρον σοφίας κηένται\* μονοι σοφοί—λεγοντες εἶναι, καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀποκεκαλυφθαι μονοις, ἀπερ εἶδεν τῶν ὑπο τὸν ἥλιον ἑτέρῳ πεφυκεν εἰθεῖν εἰς ἐνοικαν. Ω ἀνοσιβ τεφθ και ἀμετρη μανας (Theodorit's Eccl. Hist. i. 4. p. 17. Reading, 3d volume). The good bishop, in his zeal, has overlooked the earlier history of the church in general, and the Ebionite and Cerinthian Arianism of the Apostolick church in particular. He was not ignorant of them, because in p. 15 he actually refers to them. But, in his zeal, he momentarily speaks more than he means. And what he speaks, even in the lowest line to which we can reduce it, shows us very plainly the universal sentiments of the church in his time, to have been for the Divinity of the Son of God; and Arianism to have been long buried in the grave of its own infamy, when it was recalled from death by the act of Arius, took its new appellation from his, and so has transmitted *his* name with all *its* infamy, through the succeeding ages of the church.

be sure, that the doctrine of the Trinity is so repeatedly and so strenuously vindicated as it is, in the canons of our Saxon fathers. Those of the Norman are strikingly distinguished from them; the doctrine being there enforced, only just enough to show the abiding belief of the nation, and with a frequency so much less, as proves the disputes concerning it to have been much rarer. And, in both the Norman and the Saxon periods of our church, the Arians were so insignificant in themselves; as to be only like the dust of a library upon the literature of it, repeatedly swept away with an easy hand, and sometimes lying sequestered perhaps in a dark corner of the room.

In this state of the national theology, the Reformation happily took place among us. No corruptions however having been made in this point, by that grand author of all corruptions in the middle ages, the church of Rome; there was no scope for a reformation in it. Our Reformers accordingly took up the doctrine of the Trinity, as they found it; as the faith of the universal church in all ages, and as the faith of the church of England from the beginning. Nor did even those unreasonable seceders from our reformed church, who thought we did not carry our reformations far enough; ever pitch upon this doctrine, as an object of their animadversions. No! They were as zealous for the doctrine, as ourselves. And they and we went on  
hand



hand in hand, concurring cordially in the assertion of this Prime Principle, receiving and reflecting mutually the fire of zeal for it.

— V. —

But after a sleep of many ages, the evil genius of Arianism started occasionally from his slumbers, in the course of the last century; and suddenly came forth all awake among us, at the commencement of the present. From that period to this he has gone on, taking his round through the island; seducing the ignorant, the unwary, and the fantastical; and making peculiar havoc, among the Dissenters from our church. These unhappy brethren, as they have dropt their original enthusiasm, seem to have lost their only guard of orthodoxy with it. And in the new light, which is now breaking in upon their opened eyes, by a very extraordinary fatality they see not the folly of their dissension, to terminate it; or even the absurdity of their extemporaneous prayers, to correct it; but see forsooth! the weakness of the church of Christ in all ages, embrace the tenets of a Cerinthus, and reject the doctrines of a St. John.

We have also too much reason, to lament the growth of Arianism in the very pale of the church itself. Two of our church, two even of our Clerical Order, have particularly distinguished themselves in

propagating this heresy among us. These are Dr. CLARKE and Mr. WHISTON; men eminent for their learning, exemplary in their lives, and as much an honour to Arianism as Arianism is a disgrace to them. And to these we may principally attribute that spirit and vigour, with which a doctrine so reprobated by an apostle, so proscribed by the Fathers, and so crushed in our own island for ages, is *now* appearing among us.

The character of Dr. Clarke, has lent considerable encouragement to it. The good-sense, the judiciousness, and the precision of such a scholar, might well do so. These still throw a strong and bright ray of intellect, over the gloom of this Jewish heresy. But one thing is little known, which turns all these qualities of his understanding, *against* the very heresy which they have supported. NEAR THE CLOSE OF LIFE, HE GREATLY REPENTED OF WHAT HE HAD DONE.

Nor let any one think, that I speak this upon incompetent authority. I speak it upon the best. I speak it upon that of a man, who in early life had been even an infidel himself, was converted by the celebrated Fenelon, and reports only what he received from Dr. Clarke's own lips. In a letter, which the celebrated Chevalier De Ramsay wrote to the younger Racine in April 1742, about twelve or thirteen years only after the death of Dr. Clarke; and which has been published by the younger, in  
the

the works of the elder; he has these remarkable words, as translated literally from the French. “ Sir Ifaac Newton,” he fays, “ who was a great “ geometrician and no metaphysician, was persuaded of the truth of Chriftianity; but was “ willing to refine upon the antient errors of the East, “ and revived Arianifm by the instrumentality of his “ famous difciple and interpreter [in natural philofophy], Dr. CLARKE; who owned to me fome time “ before his death, after feveral conferences that I “ had held with him, HOW MUCH HE REPENTED HE “ HAD PUBLISHED HIS WORK [his Scripture doctrine of the Trinity, published in 1712, and republished in 1719]. It is about a dozen years “ fince, that at London I was witnefs to the laft sentiments of this modeft and virtuous doctör.” And as Mr. Ramfay here opens to us the private hiftory of Sir Ifaac Newton a little, for THE GRAND REVIVER among us of that antient error of the East, Arianifm; fo does he difclofe one of the awful fecrets of the grave, concerning the laft and concluding sentiments of his inftrument, Dr. Clarke<sup>e</sup>.

This

<sup>e</sup> Oeuvres de Mr. L. Racine, iii. 199—200. fexieme edition. Amsterdam. 1750. “ M. le Chevalier Newton, grand geometre et “ nullement metaphysicien, etoit persuade de la verité de la religion, “ mais il voulut rafiner fur d’anciennes erreurs orientales, et re- “ nouveilla l’Arianifme par l’organe de fon fameux difciple et in- “ terprete M. Clarke; qui m’avoua quelque tems avant que de “ mourir, apres plufieurs conferences que j’avois eues avec lui, “ combien

This letter of Mr. Ramfay's was first brought before the publick in our own island, by that lively  
man

“ combien il se repentoit d'avoir fait imprimer son ouvrage. Je fus  
“ temoin, il y a douze ans a Londres, des derniers sentimens de ce  
“ modeste et vertueux Docteur.” This letter is dated “ a Pontoise  
“ le 28. Avril 1742 ;” Dr. Clarke died May 17, 1729 ; and “ about  
“ a dozen years back” from the former, will bring us up to the  
latter. In 1697, Dr. Clarke published a new edition of Rohault's  
Physicks, in a Latin translation, and with notes drawn chiefly from  
the lately published *Principia* of Newton. In 1706 he published a  
Latin translation of Newton's *Opticks*, and received 500*l.* as a gene-  
rous acknowledgment from the author for it. And in 1728, after  
the death of Newton, he vindicated, in the Philosophical Transac-  
tions, Newton's doctrine of the velocity and force in moving bodies,  
against some recent objections.

Concerning Sir Isaac Newton himself let me observe, that he has  
been represented by some writers on the alledged authority of Mr.  
Whiston, to have been angry at Mr. Whiston *for declaring him to  
be an Arian*, and to have *therefore* kept him out of the Royal Society.  
I wish this was true. But unhappily it is not. And Mr. Whiston  
tells us so himself. “ Now if the reader desire to know,” he says,  
“ the reason of Sir Isaac Newton's unwillingness to have me a mem-  
“ ber ; he must take notice, that—I did enjoy a large portion of  
“ his favour for twenty years together : but he then perceiving,  
“ that I could not do as his other darling friends did, that is, learn  
“ of him without contradicting him ; when I differed in opinion  
“ from him, he could not in his old age bear such contradiction ;  
“ and so he was afraid of me, the last thirteen years of his life.—He  
“ was of the most fearful, cautious, and suspicious temper, that I  
“ ever knew” (Whiston's Memoirs of himself, p. 293—294).  
Whatever weight there may be in the *general* testimony of Mr.  
Whiston, against the character of Sir Isaac ; yet it forms a decisive  
evidence, that Mr. Whiston attributes Sir Isaac's opposition to him  
in the Royal Society, to a principle very different from aversion to  
the name of an Arian. “ Nay, I afterwards found,” adds Mr.  
Whiston

man of taste and elegance, that critick and poet in one, Dr. Joseph Warton; in his agreeably miscellaneous Essay, on the Writings and Genius of Mr. Pope. It then spoke to the conviction of every thinking reader. That notorious but honest Arian Mr. Lindsay, therefore, has been very naturally endeavouring since, to annihilate its authority by opposing its testimony. And the Arian arguments are drawn up in full force, by the respectable but Arian editor of the new Biographia Britannica, in his additions to the original life of Dr. Clarke. The latter speaks out against the account at once, and in these terms. "We have no hesitation," cries Dr. Kippis, "in declaring we believe it to be an absolute falsehood<sup>f</sup>." Such a sweeping declaration as this at the outset, leaves us little chance for fair criticism. And we accordingly find the arguments produced by him, uncritical and unfair, the mere result of Arian prejudice. "We have nothing—to conclude," says first Mr. Lindsay here cited by him, "but that "this tale of Dr. Clarke's reconversion,—is nothing but an anecdote of Mr. Ramsay's own invention<sup>g</sup>." This is one of those dashing strokes of vigour, which always mark the headlong genius of

Whiston in another place, "that Sir Isaac Newton was so hearty for "the *Baptists*, as well as for the—*Arians*; that he sometimes suspected, *these two were the two witnesses in the Revelation*" (p. 206). Such a wild Arian was he!

<sup>f</sup> iii. p. 606.

<sup>g</sup> P. 607.

bigotry. The violence of the effort, oversets the maker of it. Every candid mind, that knows the character of Mr. Ramsay, must revolt at the affrontive imputation. The editor therefore, though he himself has shown so similar a spirit above, is startled at the sight of his own and Mr. Lindsay's bigotry, when it appears in so strange a shape before him. He has "always considered" Mr. Ramsay, he says, "as not only a man of ingenuity, but of a respectable moral character." And he sets aside with as easy a hand as he can, an imputation that every man of liberality must reject with disdain. "We are willing to suppose," he adds, "that he [Mr. Ramsay] mistook some expression in his conversation with Dr. Clarke; and that this mistake, operating on a sanguine disposition and a warm imagination, ripened in a course of years into the assertion he has made, without his absolutely intending to deliver a falsehood <sup>b</sup>." We have thus the features of bigotry again, but in a softer form. Positive evidence is again to be overborne, by a mere supposition. The editor, like Mr. Lindsay, apparently feels himself *interested* in the cause; and so retires, like him, before the force of evidence into the subterfuge of supposition. Substance is thus encountered by shadows; and all the principles of evidence are set aside, to save the Arian reputation of this instrumental reviver of Arianism in Britain,

<sup>b</sup> P. 607.

But the supposition *now*, is *against* the very *terms* of the evidence. Mr. Ramfay's account could not possibly have resulted, from "some expression" mistaken by him. It was actually *preceded*, by several conferences that he "held with the Doctor." And it declares at the *close* of all, "how much" the Doctor "repented" of what he had done. Let us come, therefore, to something like an argument. Let us leave the airy region of suppositions, and settle on the solid ground of facts. Mr. Emlyn, say the editor and Mr. Lindsay together, heard Dr. Clarke, "the March before he died," and only about two months previous to his death, speak "with approbation" of his own Arian corrections of his Common-Prayer Book; Bishop Hoadly declares, that the doctor, "to the day of his death, found no reason to alter" his Arian opinions, and that "all the Doctor's friends knew" this; and the Doctor's son attested in 1771, that his father, "a little before his death, revised his work" against the Trinity, "designedly for a third edition." These *are* arguments. Yet they cannot overpower the evidence of Mr. Ramfay. They would, if they absolutely contradicted it. They are the united testimony of three against one. But they do not so contradict it. They *are reconcilable to it*. And the whole truth must be deduced, from it and from them together. Dr. Clarke, like Buchanan, occasionally

<sup>1</sup> P. 606 and 607.

avowed his repentance, and yet continued his practices. He avowed it fully to Mr. Ramsay, a *foreigner* in situation, and an *orthodox* man in belief. He avowed it to him, “after several conferences;” while he was professing his former sentiments, to his *friends* and *associates* in heresy; and even while he was preparing to republish the very work, which he avowedly repented to have published at all. And thus Buchanan wrote his history, even published it only a month before his death, and so repeated all his enormities again; *amidst* the very confessions of sorrow for them, which he was occasionally making to King James, and which were sadly consummated to his soul, at the hour of death<sup>k</sup>. On the whole then, the evidence of Mr. Ramsay stands too strong, to be blown away by surmises; too reconcilable with the other evidences, to be either annihilated or even counteracted by them; and too decisive in itself, to be doubted. Mr. Ramsay had “several “conferences” with the doctor. These were “some “time before his death;” though so near it, as to witness to Mr. Ramsay what they must witness to every man, who knows the laws of historical credibility, “the last sentiments” of the Doctor. At the close of these, the Doctor avowed to Mr. Ramsay what he was too timid to avow to his son, to a Hoadly, or to an Emlyn; and what he even took

<sup>k</sup> Mary Queen of Scots Vindicated, iii. p. 441—450. edit. 2d.



pains to conceal from them, in a seeming continuance of opinions, and in an actual perseverance of conduct; "*how much* he repented he had published " his work." The behaviour of Buchanan, so parallel to the doctor's, serves at once to ascertain and illustrate it; only not running parallel, I fear, in the concluding repentance of the death-bed, and so leaving us with a hope less lively than we would wish to have, for the doctor. And all shows the *reason* of those notions, which have been floating in air so long, concerning some final change of sentiments in this EBION of Britain; draws them down from their airy situation, to earth; and substantiates them for ever.

Having however noticed the dissimulation in Dr. Clarke's character, let me here corroborate the charge by reference to another fact. The shuffling of the Arians in the fourth century, when they first rose into consequence, has been pointed out by the evidence of history. Athanasius remarks expressly the "cunning," the "dishonest practices," and the "artifices of impiety," with which they acted towards the church. In the dexterity of dissimulation, they leaped over every bar, which the church set up against their heresy. They accepted any formulary of faith, that was proposed to them; but fraudulently accepted it in a sense, which annihilated its import and use. "Being questioned," says Dr. Bull, "whether they acknowledged the Son to be  
" generated

“ generated from the Father himself; they affirmed,  
 “ understanding forsooth the Son to be *so* from God,  
 “ as *all creatures* are from God, that is, have their  
 “ beginning of existence from him. When the  
 “ Catholicks enquired of them, whether they con-  
 “ fessed the Son of God to be God; they instantly  
 “ answered, Yes. They even made an addition,  
 “ and declared the Son of God to be *very God*. But  
 “ in what sense? Forsooth *he is very God*, who *was*  
 “ *verily made God*. Finally, when they were cen-  
 “ sured by the Catholicks for affirming the Son of  
 “ God to be a creature, they denied the charge  
 “ with some indignation; in this sense forsooth  
 “ which they reserved to themselves, that the Son  
 “ of God is not a creature *as other creatures are*,  
 “ which were formed mediately by God through  
 “ the Logos, and not immediately as the Logos  
 “ himself.” Such was the duplicity of the Arians  
 then!

I P. 33. “ Addit Athanasius—Arianorum penè incredibilem,  
 “ et bonis omnibus planè detestandam, *την πανουργιαν*, sive (ut alibi  
 “ loquitur idem Athanasius) *την καυρηγιαν και την της ασεβειας κακο-*  
 “ *τεχνιαν*.—Rogati, an agnoscerent Filium ex ipso Patre genitum  
 “ esse; annuebant, intelligentes nimirum Filium ita ex Deo esse,  
 “ quomodo omnes creaturæ ex Deo sunt, hoc est, ab ipso existendi  
 “ initium habent. An Deum faterentur Dei Filium, cùm ab ipsis  
 “ Catholici sciscitarentur; illico respondebant, Omnino. Quin et  
 “ Filium Dei *αληθινον θεον*, *verum Deum*, ultrà prædicabant. Quo  
 “ demum sensu? Scilicet *γενομενος αληθινος*, *αληθινος εστιν*, i. e. *Verus*  
 “ *est Deus, qui vere factus est Deus*. Denique cùm a Catholicis de  
 “ eo arguerentur, quòd Filium Dei creaturam dicerent, accusati-

then! And Dr. Clarke was an Arian in this respect, as well as in others. Being called upon by the Convocation in 1714, to answer for the Arianism of his late publication, “the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity;” he showed himself as dexterous a dissembler, as any of the Arians of antiquity. He presented a paper on July the 2d. to the Upper House, in which he formally and solemnly, under his own hand, declared “his opinion” to be; “that the *Son* of God was ETERNALLY begotten, by the ETERNAL incomprehensible power and will of the Father; and that the *Holy Spirit* was likewise ETERNALLY derived from the Father, *by* and *through* the *Son*, according to the ETERNAL incomprehensible power and will of the Father<sup>m</sup>.” He thus asserted the DIVINITY of the Son and Holy Ghost, in the clearest and most conclusive manner; by affirming the CO-ETERNITY of the Son with the Father, and the CO-ETERNITY of the Holy Ghost with both. There cannot possibly, in all the compass of theology, be found any stronger and preciser symbol of DIVINITY; than a continuity of ex-

“onem non sine indignatione aliquâ respuebant; hęc nimirum sensu sibi ipsis reservato, creaturam non esse Dei Filium sicut cęterę creaturę, quę mediatę a Deo δια τε Λογος, non immediatę sicut ipse Λογος, conditę fuerunt.—Vide omnino, quę hęc de re scripsit Athanasius in Epistolâ ad Africanos episcopos, recitatâ a Theodorito Eccl. Hist. lib. i. c. 8.”

<sup>m</sup> Biographia Britannica, iii. p. 602.

istence, running parallel with the existence of God the Father himself, and extending backwards with it up to the commencing point, of a never-commencing eternity. It is peculiarly levelled too in the Son of God, against the grand axiom of Arianism, which was formed by Arius, and became the *tessera* of his party; that “there was a time in which “the Son was not<sup>n</sup>.” Accordingly, as we are told by the very friends of Dr. Clarke, “Bishop Smalridge, whose opinion was chiefly regarded” in the Upper House, “had dropped some words beforehand intimating; that, “as to other of Doctor “Clarke’s metaphysical notions about the Trinity, “he did not think it necessary to proceed to their “condemnation, *provided* he would but declare he “believed the ETERNITY of the *Son* of God<sup>o</sup>.” And Dr. Clarke even added to his declaration of belief in this ETERNITY, that he was “sorry,— “what he sincerely intended for the honour and “glory of God; and so to explain this great “mystery, as to *avoid* the *heresies* in *both* extremes; “should have given any offence to this Synod<sup>p</sup>.” But Dr. Clarke *confirmed* what he had declared concerning this ETERNITY, in a paper which he called an *explanation*, and which he presented to the Upper House three days afterwards. On July 5th he de-

<sup>n</sup> ΗΥ ΠΟΤΕ ΟΤΕ ΕΚ ΗΥ (Theodorit i. 4 and 8. p. 11 and 29).

<sup>o</sup> Biog. Brit. p. 602.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. *ibid.*

livered a declaration, and equally under his own hand, “that, whereas the paper laid before their Lordships the Friday before, was through *haste* and *want of time* not drawn up *with sufficient exactness*,” &c. “he thought himself *indispensably obliged in conscience* to acquaint their Lordships, that he did not mean thereby *to retract any thing he had written*, but to declare that *the opinion set forth at large in his Scripture Doctrine*,” &c. “is, that the Son was ETERNALLY begotten by the ETERNAL incomprehensible power and will,” &c.<sup>9</sup> Thus did he, when he was in no “haste,” when he had had full “time,” and when therefore he must have drawn up his paper “with sufficient exactness,” repeat his former assertion in his former terms; and not only affirm his belief to be at present, but to have previously been, and to have been *actually set forth by his late publication*, a belief in the ETERNITY of the Son of God. He consequently pledged himself to the convocation, to the church, and to the world, if he had any credit among men, and any hope in God; to be, and to have been, a firm believer in the CO-ETERNITY of the Son with the Father. And though he did not in either of these papers, as the Lower House justly observed, make “any recantation of the heretical assertions and offensive passages” in his work; and indeed *could* not formally

<sup>9</sup> Biog. Brit. p. 602.

do so, as he declared he *meant* to set forth the ETERNITY of the Son by them, and by this “to avoid “the heresies in both extremes,” those of Arianism and of Sabellianism; yet he vitally and substantially did it, by solemnly declaring his *meaning* to be just the reverse of what it was, by disclaiming his Arianism in the most pointed manner, and by confessing his belief for the present and for the past, in the positive ETERNITY of the Son of God. This was “such satisfaction for the great scandal occasioned “thereby,” to speak the language of the Lower House; as this House should have accepted, but would not. The Upper, however, more justly conceived the satisfaction already given, in a total disavowal of all intended Arianism, and in a solemn acknowledgment of a grand principle diametrically opposite to Arianism; to be such, “as ought to “put a stop to any farther examination and censure” of the work”. And in this way did Dr. Clarke escape from the hands of the Convocation, by an act of knavery that must for ever stain his memory, by a violent infringement upon all honesty and honour, by a written, a repeated, a grand falsehood.

Accordingly some even of his Arian friends blamed him, for his dishonest conduct; and called his declaration of present and *previous* belief, in the ETERNITY of the Son and Spirit, “a new declara-

’ Biog. Brit. p. 602.

“tion of his belief, of a SORT of Eternity<sup>s</sup>.” The Arians in general, I believe, have applauded his prudence; so have made his dishonesty their own; and have shown themselves as ready to palter with mankind as he was, in all the original ingenuity of Arian imposition<sup>t</sup>. He himself had once the conviction and the shame of falsehood, so strong upon him; as to denominate the delivery of his declaration, “a foolish thing.” Yet he consummated the whole system of prevarication, by “constantly and “vigorously maintaining” a “metaphysick opinion” of “his own;” that “*any creature whatsoever might “possibly have been CO-ETERNAL with its Creator<sup>u</sup>.”* He thus took “occasion,” as his very friend and historian thinks<sup>x</sup>, from this mere *possibility* in *his own* opinion, to assert an *actual* and *existing* Eternity in the Son; in the most formal and solemn manner to assert that ETERNITY in the Son, which, in the language of all mankind, peculiarly discriminated the Son from a creature, merely because he thought it *possible* a creature *might* be eternal; and so to ground a *positive* assertion, to the deception of all the world, on a reserved *surmise* of his own, and a merely metaphysical *possibility*. And he finally showed himself willing, to throw all the elements of common sense into disorder, and to reduce the whole

\* Biog. Brit. p. 602.

<sup>t</sup> So does Maclaine in Mosheim, v.

101. edit. 2d.

<sup>u</sup> Biog. Brit. p. 602.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. *ibid.*

world of intellect into a chaos, in his supposed possibility of a *creature* being *co-eternal* with his *Creator*; that he might plunge into the deep from detection, and escape with his Arianism in the confusion <sup>y</sup>.

From all this dissimulation and dishonesty while he lived, and from all that privately acknowledged, but publickly disclaimed, repentance before he died; two remarkable incidents in the history of the Doctor, which are similar in themselves, and lend a lustre to each other; Arianism, I think, has derived a greater portion of spirit; and the cold statue has been animated, with more of Promethean fire; from Mr. Whiston than from him. By no means equal to the Doctor in solidity of understanding, he was superior in dignity of soul. The Doctor refused to take any more preferment, because he would no longer subscribe what he did not believe. But Mr. Whiston did more. He resigned up all which he held, because he held it by subscribing that doc-

<sup>y</sup> Such conduct was never exceeded even among the Arians, unless it was by Arius himself. Arius subscribed before the Emperor, to his belief in the *consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father; just as Dr. Clarke did to his belief, in the *co-eternity* of the Son. Arius was then *sworn* by the Emperor, to the sincerity of his belief in what he had subscribed. And Arius was *reported* in the days of Socrates, to have falved his oath in some measure as Dr. Clarke falved his attestation; the modern Arius, by a reserved supposition of what is impossible in itself; and the antient, by a subscribed confession of Arianism, which he had previously placed under his arm, and to which he secretly referred his oath. See Socrates's *Ecl. Hist.* i. 38. p. 74. in Reading vol. 2d.



trine as true, which he now considered as false. This was honourable and exalted conduct. This carried the spirit of a confessor in it. And Arianism, we may observe, can then only become formidable in our church; when it has a spring of elasticity within it, sufficient to produce such confessors, as we have seen *some* in our own days, and as our fathers saw *one* for the first time in Mr. Whiston. With the obvious prevalence of selfishness in the human bosom, the multitude very naturally suspect it, to be the predominating principle of the human conduct. With the acuteness, that this active spirit gives to the most sluggish intellect, the generality have discernment enough to see, when all is sacrificed to probity. And, from that very acuteness and this very selfishness together, they cannot but admire, what they consider as so very singular; and cannot but reverence, what they see raised so greatly above the ordinary level of life.

With this grand advantage on his side, Mr. Whiston came forward to promote Arianism. He continued his efforts and he kept up his zeal, through the period of a long life. Nor does he appear to have faltered at all in his sentiments, at the solemn appeal of sickness or of death to his soul. His spirit was too honest and too headlong, for such work. But let us mark the progress of his Arian life, to show the gradual advances of heresy, in this weak and worthy man. And the memoirs of his

life, as written by *himself*, will prove the most powerful antidote that we can apply, to the venom of his Arian opinions.

In June 1708 he first began to be heard of, in that grand center of all national intelligence, London; as a reputed Arian <sup>z</sup>. In the August following, he offered a small Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions, to the licencer of the prefs at Cambridge; and was refused the licence <sup>a</sup>. In 1709 he actually published a Sermon, against the eternity of Hell-torments <sup>b</sup>. So variously was the spirit of error already at work, in his mind! In 1710 he boldly asserted the Apostolical Constitutions, to be “of *equal* authority with the four Gospels themselves <sup>c</sup>;” and a tract included in them, and called the Doctrine of the Apostles, to be “the *most* sacred of the Canonical Books <sup>d</sup>.” So rapidly was he running his career of wildness! But, in 1712, he published in favour of the Anabaptists; the next year, printed a Book of Common Prayer, that had been reformed the backward way into Anabaptism and Arianism; and, two years afterward, set up a meeting-house for the use of it: having strangely drawn up his liturgy, before he had provided his church <sup>e</sup>. All this was surely sufficient for *one* heretick. But the stone of Sisyphus could never stand still. In 1723 he pub-

<sup>z</sup> Memoirs, p. 139.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. *ibid.*

<sup>b</sup> P. 144—145.

<sup>c</sup> P. 179.

<sup>d</sup> P. 372 and 639.

<sup>e</sup> P. 204, 224, and 236.

lished a dissertation, to prove the Canticles *not* a canonical Book of Scripture<sup>f</sup>, in 1727 another, to prove the Apocryphal Book of Baruch, to which I have referred so much before, canonical<sup>g</sup>; in the *same* year another, to prove the Epistle of Baruch to the nine tribes and a half, equally canonical<sup>h</sup>; in the *same* year another, to prove the second Book of Esdras, to which I have equally referred before, equally canonical<sup>i</sup>; in the *same* year another, to prove Eighteen Psalms of a second Solomon, equally canonical<sup>k</sup>; in the *same* year another, to prove the Book of Enoch equally canonical<sup>l</sup>; in the *same* year another, to prove those Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs, of which I have made so much use before, equally canonical<sup>m</sup>; and another in the very *same* year, to prove an Epistle of the Corinthians to St. Paul, with St. Paul's Answer to it, equally canonical<sup>n</sup>. With so much labour of spirit, and so much debility of mind, was this respectable heretick rolling the stone up the hill.

<sup>f</sup> P. 309.

<sup>g</sup> P. 329.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. *ibid.*

<sup>i</sup> P. 195, 196, and 329. Mr. Whiston, in p. 196, calls it "the second, or rather the fourth, Book of Esdras." So, in the 6th of the 39 articles, the first and second Books of Esdras are called the third and fourth. And "tertius Esdræ Latinorum, est primus Græcis" (Cofin, p. 114). Ezra and Nehemiah, as I have observed in a note iii. 2 before, are in this mode of enumeration reckoned for the first and second of Esdras.

<sup>k</sup> P. 329.

<sup>l</sup> P. 330.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid.

<sup>n</sup> P. 330—331 and 386—387.

With many a weary step and many a groan,  
 Up the high hill he heaves the huge round stone ;  
 The huge round stone, resulting with a bound,  
 Thunders impetuous down, and smokes along the ground,  
 Again the restless orb his toil renews,  
 Dust mounts in clouds, and sweat descends in dews.

In 1745, he published his “ *Primitive New Testament in English, in four parts;*” and added a page at the end, “ exhibiting the *titles of the rest of the Books of the New Testament, not yet known by the body of Christians.*” Among *these* were specified, *besides* the works above recited, “ the Epistles of Timothy to *Diognetus*, and *the Homily*,” the “ two Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians,” “ Josephus’s Homily concerning Hades,” the “ Epistles of Barnabas, Ignatius, and Polycarp,” the “ Shepherd of Hermas,” and what I have cited with applause before, “ the Martyrdom of Polycarp<sup>o</sup>.” He thus, according to *his own* enumeration, enlarged the number of the canonical books in the New Testament, from twenty-seven to —fifty-six<sup>p</sup>. And he seems to me from all, with every degree of candor that can be shown him, to have done as some Eastern Saints are said to do; to have run round in a circle, till he found his brains begin to whirl; and then to have mistaken the giddiness, for inspiration.

• P. 386—387.

p P. 399.

I take no pleasure in exposing the strange eccentricities, of this very amiable and very learned man. My good-nature recoils at it. But it becomes requisite, for the sake of the truth. In a state of probation like the present, the milder virtues must often be sacrificed to the sterner, and man give way to God. I therefore proceed to observe additionally, that in 1749, he *gradually* reached the highest point of *heretical* perfection.

He gravely asserted first, that “neither a Bishop, a Presbyter, nor a Deacon, ought to be more than—once married;” that “Primitive Christianity also forbid, either Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons, *to marry at all after their ordination;*” and that, “in the days of the Apostles, a *fourth* marriage was entirely *rejected*, even in the *laity*.” He also ventured upon the bold presumption, of ascertaining the very year “according to the Scripture prophecies,” for certain events of the highest consequence to the world; and, such was the ingenuous simplicity of the man, was confident enough to name a year *at no great distance*. “Mr. Whif-

¶ P. 467 and 468. See also p. 540.

† P. 608. He once (in 1712) acted a more cunning part, referred a *past* event to the Revelations, saw there the victory which Prince Eugene had *already* got over the Turks, and presented a dissertation to Prince Eugene himself upon the subject; who is said with great propriety to have replied, that he was not aware before, he had the honour to be known to St. John. But at other times his views were as here stated, all prophetick.

“ton,” he says himself, “from the same prophecies still foretells,—the JEWS are to be RESTORED TO THEIR OWN COUNTRY,”—in or before what year, does the reader think?—even before one, which *has long passed over our heads*. This throws an air of infinite absurdity, over all that he says. They are to “rebuild their Temple, and the Millennium is to commence, before—A. D. 1766 .” In “A. D. 1764,” he adds, “—Ezekiel’s temple is to be cleansed.” And “I verily believe,” he assures us in another place, “Providence is—NOW—BEGINNING TO SET UP THE MILLENNIUM.” We thus hear the Prophet, most unfortunately foretelling magnificent events, and assigning specific periods to them; when the periods have been already come, and the events are still behind.

But such a spirit as Mr. Whiston’s could not stop here. He had nearly run the whole round of theological absurdity. One line only was left untried. This he passed, and completed the circle. In the very *same* year he rose to the audacious licence, of asserting the FALSHOOD of some things in St. Paul’s Epistles. His words are these. I cite them, that I may not injure him. “What St. Paul says to the Jewish converts, in his Epistle to the Romans, about Original Sin;—seem to have been no part

• P. 608.

† Ibid.

▪ P. 626.

“ of CHRIST’S REVELATION to him.” What are they then, in the name of Christianity and of Commonfense? They are, Mr. Whifton tells us, “ rather certain reasonings of HIS OWN, accommodated “ to the WEAK Roman Jews at that time only<sup>x</sup>.” He then calls them, “ thefe STRANGE and WEAK “ reasonings<sup>y</sup>.” St. Paul, he adds, “ might do this “ the rather, becaufe he never appears to have de- “ signed fuch occasional Epiftles, as this to the Ro- “ mans, for fystems or ftandards of Christianity to “ the churches; which indeed had been LONG BE- “ FORE fettled upon SURER foundations and FULLER “ inftructions, as they ftand in the ONLY AUTHEN- “ TICK fyftem of Christianity, the Apoftolical Con- “ ftitutions<sup>z</sup>.” And he finally fubjoins, that, “ if, “ after all, any think that this my opinion *takes away* “ the *ftriict* *infpiration* of Paul’s Epiftles, which they “ *fuppofe* of dangerous confequence to Christianity; “ I CONFESS it *does* imply, that under what degree of “ Divine conduct or wifdom foever Paul wrote his “ Epiftles,—yet is THAT degree to be eftemed IN- “ FERIOR to what OUGHT to be PROPERLY CALLED “ INSPIRATION, fuch as the Prophets were under in “ the reception of their prophecies; which PROPER “ INSPIRATION I take to be here GROUNDLESS, and “ NEVER PRETENDED TO by ANY writers of the New “ Teftament, *excepting* the *prophetick parts* of Her-

<sup>x</sup> P. 638.<sup>y</sup> P. 639.<sup>z</sup> Ibid.

“mas, in his admirable visions, and the *prophetick* “*parts* of *St. John*, in his *no less* admirable Revelation<sup>a</sup>.” We here see the wilderness of error, by its own luxuriance of growth, entangling itself more and more, and shooting more and more savage before us at every advance. With a temerity that is the result of insensibility, and the attendant upon unthinkingness; Mr. Whiston asserted the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, to have some things in it, “which *seem* to have been no part of Christ’s Revelation to him.” Here, surely, even the foot of injudiciousness and presumption will stop. But Mr. Whiston does not. He goes forward to *defend* this wild dictate of heretical pravity. He distinguishes between the inspiration of the prophet, and the inspiration of the teacher. That alone he will allow to be proper inspiration. The other therefore is not a proper one, and only such as admits of “strange and weak reasonings.” He thus defends his absurd position, by—doubling and redoubling it. He defends it, by—adding tenfold more to it. He involves ALL the Epistles of St. Paul, in the same extravagance of censure. He even goes on in the presumption of blindness, and without seeming to know what his hand is executing at the moment; to involve ALL THE OTHER Epistles, to involve the very ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, and to involve the very GOSPELS themselves, in his ample vortex of

<sup>a</sup> P. 642.



reprobation. And what understanding is there among my readers, but must spurn with contempt at such a violent precipitation of folly; and what heart is there, but must sigh with compassion over such an evident sweep of madness<sup>b</sup>?

Mr. Whiston came at last, we see, to that grand consummation of the lunacies of heresy, to which we have seen the present Heresiarch of the Dissension, Dr. PRIESTLEY, since come. “The Apostle PAUL,” says the Doctor, “especially if he be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, has STRAINED VERY MUCH BY THE FORCE OF IMAGINATION, to reconcile the Jews to the Christian religion; by pointing out the analogies, which he IMAGINED the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish religion bore, to something in Christianity.” Dr. Priestley thus *insinuates* his disbelief in the inspiration of St. Paul, at the beginning of his work. But he *speaks out*, near the conclusion of it. “I

<sup>b</sup> It appears accordingly from Bishop Hare’s character of him, even as surprisingly recited by himself; that his cotemporaries considered him in this light. “They,” says the Bishop, “who speak most favourably of him, look upon him as crazed and little better than a madman” (Memoirs, p. 118). Something of this perhaps may be attributed, to the temperament of his body. “I have been a valetudinarian,” he says himself, “and greatly subject to the Flatus Hypochondriaci in various shapes, all my life long—. A lesser degree of melancholy always has, and I suppose always will, continue with me all the days of my life” (Memoirs, p. 18—19). But, whatever be the cause, the effect is too apparent, and was so to those who knew him personally.

“ think

“ think I have *shown*,” he then adds in a reference to some other work of his, “ that the Apostle Paul “ OFTEN REASONS INCONCLUSIVELY ; and *therefore* “ that he wrote AS ANY OTHER PERSON, of his turn “ of mind and thinking, and in his situation, WOULD “ HAVE WRITTEN, without ANY PARTICULAR IN- “ SPIRATION <sup>c</sup>.” In this manner did Dr. Priestley, like Mr. Whifton, *begin* with denying the inspiration of St. *Paul* only. And, like him too, he soon stepped forward to deny equally the inspiration of *all* the writers in the New Testament. “ I have “ frequently declared myself,” he says in a passage as comprehensive as it is confident, “ NOT TO BE A “ BELIEVER in the INSPIRATION, of the EVANGE- “ LISTS and APOSTLES as WRITERS <sup>d</sup>.” And the *progression* of the audaciousness unites with the termination of it, to show in whose trammels this daring son of liberty is fervently pacing all the while. The Doctor and Mr. Whifton, indeed, have many features of similitude in their characters. Eminent in some branches of literature, they had been both bred up in the very bosom of religiousness. They had been both educated, in that great and elementary principle of the Gospel, the doctrine of the Trinity. They both recoiled from the faith of

<sup>c</sup> Hist. of the Corruptions of Christianity, i. p. 24, and ii. p. 370.

<sup>d</sup> Letters to Dr. Horsley, Part i. p. 132, Dr. Horsley's Tracts, p. 314.

their education, threw off the elementary principle, and deserted over to the army of the Arians. They then had the wild assurance, to pretend to press the Fathers, those strongest and most strenuous champions for orthodoxy, into the very cause of heresy. Each too has been very like to the other, in confusedness of thinking, and in distrustfulness of reasoning, upon the subject. They have gone on, equal in the love of writing, and in the lust of publishing, upon it; still persisting, however confused; still muffing themselves up from conviction, in their own cloudiness of discernment; and still screening themselves from shame, in their own effrontery of writing about it. And they have dreadfully united at last, in this high note upon the scale of absurdity, at which Heresy is mounting up into Deism; that St. Paul, that all the Apostles, that all the Evangelists, reasoned at times as weakly and as wildly as themselves<sup>e</sup>.

## VI.—Mr.

<sup>e</sup> Of the Heresiarch it is remarkable, that his power of doing mischief, however strong his will may be, is greatly circumscribed. Men may write, but persons must buy to give vent to their writings. Dr. Priestley's false theology, from its equal flimsiness and heaviness and length, has few buyers. He stands therefore like Charles the Second in armour, not to be much hurt perhaps, and certainly not able to do much hurt. And his writings are only waiting for his death, I understand, to be sent by his publisher in cartloads, to the shop of the trunkmaker adjoining. Well may we then, with an allusion at once complimentary, satirical, and just, consider Dr. Priestley as an antient Giant, warring with *Heaven*, and staggering

## — VI. —

Mr. Whiston indeed might have read an useful lesson of warning, in the unhappy fate of Mr. CHILLINGWORTH, and in the more unhappy one of two of his own associates in sentiment; all recorded by himself. But warnings are held out in vain, to the unthinking. That ray of wisdom, which is reflected back from the incidents of life, or the events of history, before us; shines in vain upon the eye of the unwary. And Mr. Whiston saw, lamented, and related the facts; without once starting at the thoughts of that precipice, down which he saw *them* falling, and towards which he was hastening himself.

“ In August 1746,” he tells us, “ I—was—  
 “ showed a singular passage, taken out of a printed  
 “ original letter, written about A. D. 1642, which

under the load of *his uplifted mountain*. In this situation, blasted a little by the lightening, our *Enceladus* of heresy “ *mole ruit suâ;*” and has been *buried beneath the mass, of his own unwieldy weapon*. There, however, he is perpetually *shifting from side to side*. And thence he is continually venting his uneasiness, in *murmurs of menace* against his chastisers; and breathing out his resentment, in *volumes of smoke* against the sky.

Fama est, Enceladi semiustum fulmine corpus  
 Urgeri mole hâc ; ingentemque insuper Ætnam  
 Impositam, ruptis flammam expirare caminis ;  
 Et, fessum quoties mutat latus, intremere omnem  
 Marmure Trinacriam, et cœlum subtexere fumo.

“ directly

“ directly imports; that the great Mr. Chilling-  
 “ worth, how sagacious and honest soever, *at last*  
 “ defended SOCINIANISM, and was therein utterly  
 “ and immediately confuted, by that excellent per-  
 “ son the Lord Falkland:—so that this Mr. Chil-  
 “ lingworth had a strange diffidence and mutability  
 “ of temper; which had made him, when first a  
 “ Protestant, to turn Papist; and, when a Papist,  
 “ to turn Protestant again; then to favour ARIAN-  
 “ ISM,—and on that account in part, by refusing to  
 “ sign the thirty-nine articles, to lose some expected  
 “ preferment; and, after all, to defend SOCINIAN-  
 “ ISM itself: which is such a round of contrarieties,  
 “ as is hard to be paralleled in any other learned  
 “ man whomsoever. To be sure he at first wanted  
 “ my darling motto, *consider well and act steadily*:  
 “ nor had he afterwards the Apostolical Constitu-  
 “ tions and Canons, for his immoveable guide and  
 “ standard; as I have now had near forty years.”  
 Such a man is Mr. Chillingworth delineated here,  
 by the free pencil of Mr. Whiston himself! But  
 Mr. Whiston annexes this kind of cautioning note,  
 to the bottom of his picture. “ I mean this only,”  
 he says concerning the Socinian cast of his counte-  
 nance, “ in case the writer of the letter well under-  
 “ stood, the difference between Arianism and Soci-  
 “ nianism; which are often confounded one with  
 “ another<sup>f</sup>.”

<sup>f</sup> Whiston's Memoirs, p. 388—389.

The letter itself is in the Sidney Papers, and was written, not "about A. D. 1642," but on August 25, 1643, and "from before Gloucester." It was written by "*Robert* Lord Spencer," says the editor very erroneously; as it was actually written by *Henry* Lord Spencer, made Earl of Sunderland June 8, 1643, son to Lord William, and *father* to Earl *Robert* †; and written by him "to his lady, Dorothy "daughter of Robert Earl of Leicester." And "this country," it says, is "very full of little private cottages, in one of which I am quartered; "where my Lord Falkland did me the honour, last "night to sup: *Mr. Chillingworth* is now here with "me —; *our little engineer* comes not hether, so "much out of kindness to me, as for his own conveniency, my quarter being three or four miles "nearer the leager, than my Lord of Devonshire's, "with whom he stayed, till he was commanded to "make ready his engines with all possible speed. It "is not to be imagined, with what diligence and "satisfaction (I mean to himself) he executes this "command; for my part, I think it not unwisely "done of him to *change* *his* *profession*; and I think "you would have been of my mind, if you had heard "him dispute last night with Lord Falkland, in favour "of SOCINIANISM, wherein he was by his Lordship

† Sidney Papers, ii. p. 67, and Collins's Peerage, i. 370 and 375. edit. 4th.

“*so often* confounded, that really it appears he has “*much more reason for his engine, than for his opinion*.” This is the passage referred to by Mr. Whiston. A very remarkable one it is. It speaks in express terms, to the Socinianism of Mr. Chillingworth. Yet Mr. Whiston is naturally desirous, to save a brother Arian from the shocking imputation. He therefore *insinuates* a doubt, whether the author of the letter might not mistake Socinianism for Arianism. Another doubt may equally and as reasonably be *insinuated*, whether he did not mean to *write* Arianism, and his pen, unfaithful to his ideas, erroneously formed Socinianism. Of such doubts there is no end. And to such can no attention be paid. They only show the unwillingness of those who *insinuate* them, to admit an evidence that grates hard upon their brotherly feelings. Yet the doubt has been lately revived by another Arian; and, in the progress of affection, is no longer insinuated, but produced as an argument of weight and force. “It is *highly probable*,” says Dr. Kippis in the new Biographia Britannica, “that the writer of the letter “did *not* understand the difference, between Arianism and Socinianism; *for*, with regard to the latter charge, he hath decisively cleared himself of “it, in the preface to his “Religion of Protestants “the True Way to Salvation.” The reason af-

‡ Sidney Papers, ii. p. 669.

‡ iii. p. 517—518.

signed for the doubt, is just as valid as the doubt itself. Neither of them are of the slightest moment. The reason is particularly loose and vague. That Mr. Chillingworth disputed with Lord Falkland "in favour of Socinianism," on the 24th of August 1643; we know from the written testimony of a nobleman, who was an actual hearer of the dispute, and who set down his testimony the very day following. Against such an evidence, so present at the moment, so precise in his language, and speaking so close to the fact; what can possibly be alledged? This is; that Mr. Chillingworth could not *then* speak as a Socinian, because *five years before*<sup>k</sup> he declared himself no Socinian. A pillar of adamant is thus to be beaten down, by the wooden sword of a Harlequin. In that state of our nation indeed, when the whole island was agitated with religious, as well as political, controversies; and when Socinianism was so much one of the subjects of contention, that it was particularly obnoxious to the generality; the Earl of Sunderland must have been weak indeed, not to know the general import of the term. Yet he is the noble, whom Clarendon praises as "a Lord of great fortune, tender years, — and an *early judgment*;" and whom Lloyd celebrates, as having had a regular "education" under a "tutor crooked with age," at Magdalen college in Oxford, and as having there been "inured to good

<sup>k</sup> See p. 511.



“discourse and company<sup>1</sup>.” This is the peer, whom Arian credulity believes, not to have known the difference between Arianism and Socinianism; when he had just heard Mr. Chillingworth and Lord Falkland, disputing on the subject before him; when Mr. Chillingworth had five years before vindicated himself in print, from the imputation of Socinianism; and when Mr. Chillingworth had so vindicated himself, because all the nation considered the imputation as infamy. The term Socinianism too, in all probability, had been used by the very disputants themselves. In all probability Lord Falkland had attacked, and Mr. Chillingworth had defended, the point in debate; expressly as Socinianism. The ignorance therefore, if there was any, concerning the difference between Socinianism and Arianism; would mount up to the disputants themselves, and Mr. Chillingworth and Lord Falkland would be chargeable with it. And the whole serves to show us those tricks and frauds of sophistry, which the affection puts upon the judgment; when the plainest declarations of Scripture concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, shall be merely declarations of an angelical nature in him, because the reader is an Arian; and when even the term Socinianism itself shall mean only Arianism, merely because the reader is no Socinian. Supposition shall be heaped on sup-

<sup>1</sup> Collins's Peerage, i. 370, 371, &c.

position, and hill *with all its waving woods*<sup>m</sup> piled upon hill, to hide the Heaven of truth from the eye.

We have already seen the infinite absurdities, that accompanied Arianism at its origin among Christians. The seed instantly vegetated in part, into its direct production of Socinianism; and luxuriated into an abundant foliage, of collateral heresies besides. Gildas too observes in this very significant, though vitiated, style of language; concerning the first entry of Arianism into the island: “a passage being made across the ocean” by Arianism, “all sorts of wild beasts, tossing from their horrid mouths the mortal venom of every heresy, fixed their deadly fangs upon a country, that is always ready to hear something new, and indeed holds no truth steadily.” So nearly does the *introduction* of Arianism into Britain, and the *commencement* of Arianism in the church at large, resemble each the other in their trains of consequence! So nearly do both resemble what we have too sadly felt in this country, during the century that is nearly gone, and that is so dreadfully pointed out to posterity in the annals of our church, by the revival of Arianism and a thousand heresies among us!

<sup>m</sup> Εὐσεβίου Ἰστορίαι. Homer.

<sup>n</sup> Hist. ix. “Vixisset trans oceanum, omnes omnino bestię ferę, mortiferam cuiuscumque hæresios virus hærido ore vibrantes, lethælia dentium vulnera patrię, semper aliquid audire volenti, et nihil certe [certi] stabiliter obtinenti, insigebant.”

Mr. Chillingworth, in fact, had a strong spirit of Socinianism within him. The famous Jesuit Mr. Knot, with whom he held the conference that terminated in his celebrated Vindication of Protestantism, charged him with being a Socinian, so early as the year 1636. Socinianism, says the original biographer of Mr. Chillingworth very truly, was then “the most odious imputation he could find” for him, “and the fittest for his purpose” of prejudicing the publick against him°. Nor was it less just than invidious. For the charge was renewed against him a few years afterwards, and from a quarter directly opposite to the former. The Papists begun with the imputation, and the Presbyterians ended with it. At his death in 1644, Mr. Cheynell at the head of the Presbyterians branded him for a Socinian, as the Jesuit at the head of the Papists had done before. Such was the singular fate of Mr. Chillingworth! The Presbyterians were so fully convinced of the Socinianism, in this grand champion of Protestantism; that they overlooked all his merit in *that*, which seemingly constituted the main spring in their religion, their aversion to Popery; forgot it all in *this*, which they very properly abhorred still more than Popery, his believed Socinianism; and for a time refused him even Christian

° P. 511.

burial<sup>r</sup>. So violent were their prejudices against Socinianism, and so assured were their minds of his being a Socinian! And, what centres the whole of their conduct in this one mark, Mr. Cheynell afterwards published some points of divinity, which he apprehended to be in the creed and writings of Mr. Chillingworth; and which, as he says himself, he had “framed into a kind of *atheistical* catechism, fit “for *Racovia or Cracovia*<sup>q</sup>,” Cracow in Poland being the dunghill hot-bed of Socinianism, to the Christians of Europe. Thus taxed with Socinianism, by Presbyterians and by Papists in conjunction; and the two most hostile parties in the kingdom, forgetting their hostility in an union to tax him with it; whither shall the persecuted Chillingworth fly for protection? He has only his own church, the Church of England, remaining to receive him. Yet even she rejects him. The Earl of Sunderland comes forward, with Cheynell upon one side and Knot on the other, to proscribe him equally for a Socinian. In the year 1643, between the two periods of the Jesuit’s rough attack and the Presbyterian’s rougher assault, he vouches Mr. Chillingworth before *him* and in *his* quarters, to have disputed with Lord Falkland “in favour of Socinian-  
“ism.” We have thus the concurrence of all the three divisions of men that then filled the island, for

<sup>r</sup> P. 514.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid.

the *general* prevalence of Socinianism in his mind, during the last eight years of his life; though at one *particular* part of the time, he had, or thought he had, purged his mind from it. Nor, with such a collected weight of evidence for the Socinianism of Mr. Chillingworth, can we hesitate a moment about it. Perhaps no man in the world was ever more plainly convicted of an opinion, that had it not recorded by himself in print. And his Socinianism would never have been endeavoured to be disguised, in the face of such revealing testimony; if the Arians had not thought their cause, *honoured* by him as an Arian, and *disgraced* by him as a Socinian.

It is painful, however, to urge an accusation of this nature, against so respectable a character. But truth must be adhered to, though a Chillingworth suffers. I shall therefore subjoin to all a passage from Lord Clarendon, which Dr. Kippis himself unwarily presents to my notice\*. I shall only enlarge the quotation a little, at the beginning; in order to show the *early* germination of Socinianism, in the mind of this confessed Arian. Mr. Chillingworth at Lord Falkland's house, says the historical friend of both, "wrote, and formed, and modelled  
 " his excellent book against the learned Jesuit, Mr.  
 " Knott, after frequent debates upon the most im-  
 " portant particulars; in many of which he suffered

\* P. 518.

" himself

“ himself to be overruled by the judgment of his  
 “ friends, though *in others he still adhered to his own*  
 “ *fancy*, which was SCEPTICAL enough, even in the  
 “ HIGHEST points.—He had spent all his younger  
 “ time in disputation; and had arrived to so great a  
 “ mastery, as he was inferior to no man in those  
 “ skirmishes: but he had, with his notable perfection  
 “ in this exercise, *contrasted such an ir-resolution and*  
 “ *habit of doubting*, that *by degrees* he grew confi-  
 “ dent of NOTHING, and a SCEPTICK at *least* in the  
 “ GREATEST MYSTERIES OF FAITH.” This testi-  
 mony, from a member of the Church of England  
 like Earl Sunderland, from one who knew him for  
 years, and from a friend; carries an overbearing  
 authority with it, and forms all the three evidences  
 before into one invincible band of witnesses. It  
 particularly coincides with Mr. Cheynell’s intima-  
 tions. It therefore precludes all possible vindication  
 of Mr. Chillingworth, from the charge of Socinian-  
 ism. And it fixes this or a worse charge upon him,  
 for ever.

In the self-confounding ratiocination of his mind,  
 and in what was consequent to it, the fluttering im-  
 becility of his spirit; Mr. Chillingworth slid down  
 the precipice of Arianism, into Socinianism below.  
 We have accordingly seen a majority of those, who  
*first* dishonoured the church of Christ with Arian-

\* Life of Lord Clarendon, part I. p. 22 and 28, 29.

ism, soon sinking into Socinians, in denying the generation of our Saviour, from a Virgin and the Holy Ghost; and so forming that division of Ebionites, which is noticed at first as the principal by Eusebius, and is even considered as the whole by Epiphanius. Cerinthus too, that other father of Arianism in the church, *at once* improved the Arian folly of Ebion and of himself, into the congenial absurdity of Socinianism, in this point; raising himself into the disgraceful pre-eminence, of being the second founder of Arianism and the first founder of Socinianism, among Christians; and exhibiting Socinianism in its just relation to us, as the natural child of Arianism at its outset. But Socinianism was very modest yet. It only showed itself at present, in denying the supernatural and divine origin of our Saviour's humanity. It had not yet dared to sink him into a mere man. It allowed him to be an angel and a man united. The substance of the piece was Arian, but the fringe was Socinian. Nor did the substance become Socinian, till many centuries afterwards. Full-grown Socinianism, that ugliest monster which is possible to be formed, by the speculative impiety of a Christian; made not its frightful appearance in the world, till the latter end of the 16th century. Arianism was the highest effort of rebelling absurdity, before. But Socinianism has now reared its front among us, as Sadduceism showed

showed itself among the Jews, to mark the *last* ages of declension in the church of God. And the "Arian opinions" in our own country, says an author who is a professed Arian, and who, as such, has a peculiar claim to our confidence on *this* point;—"are at present upon the decline, MANY "Unitarian Christians TENDING FAST TO THE DOCTRINE OF SOCINUS'." So far did Mr. Chillingworth unite with modern and with antient Arians, in his movements of defection from Christianity! He moved like them, through Arianism into Socinianism. In deserting the plain language of scripture, and reducing our Saviour from his scriptural elevation of Divinity; the foot of human confidence can with difficulty stop, before it comes down to the common level of human nature. It first begun, as we have just seen, with rejecting the Godhead of our Saviour; because (we may be sure) it could not conceive the possibility, of more than one Person in one Deity. It thus stationed our Saviour at the foot of that throne, on which he had sat with the Deity before. So far it is only Arianism. But then what shall it do, with the miraculous conception of our Saviour as a man? It cannot allow the Holy Ghost to be any Person in the Deity, for the same reason that it could not allow our Saviour before. It therefore tore off this other article from

† Dr. Kippis in *New Biographia Britannica*, iii. p. 623.



its creed, denied the miraculous conception, and entered upon the very borders of Socinianism. Our Saviour thus becomes a mere man in his birth, and continues so to his baptism; till the angel is superinduced upon the man, and Jesus is joined by Christ. This Christ however departs from Jesus, when he begins to suffer. Our Saviour then sinks into a mere man again. And he ends just as he began. The Arians therefore allowed him a supernatural nature, for the short interval merely of three years. To take it away for those three years; to make our Saviour the same at his sufferings as he was before them, the same for the first thirty years as he was for the last three, and as he apparently was for all; to suppress a superinduction, which is not avowed by scripture, and to preclude a deduction, which is not even hinted at in scripture; was not to do much after what had been done before, and was what “Faustus Socinus, and his Polonian association,” united to do. In this easy and imperceptible manner, may the bad colour of Arianism fade away into the worse of Socinianism. By these insensible degrees, does human nature degradingly suffer itself to be drawn, from the heights of orthodoxy to the deep and dark vale of Socinianism! If the express declarations of scripture could stop it, they had prevented it from commencing its downward course; and averted Arianism would have saved it, from the precipitation

precipitation of Socinianism. Our own Arians, we see, are *falling endlong* into Socinians<sup>u</sup>. Even that original and mildest tribe of them, who allow our Saviour to have been the visible Jehovah of the Old Testament, and elevate him into an actual God by investiture; have almost all sunk away from these principles, with which they began in Sir Isaac Newton, and have settled at present into a denial of his virtual, as well as of his absolute, Divinity. And even those who remain of them, carry a strong taint of Socinianism in their very essence; all of them except Bishop Clayton, I apprehend, *annihilating* the Holy Ghost, by reducing him into a mere *impersonality*. Arianism is thus that shallow temple of heresy, which only serves to form the portal to Socinianism<sup>v</sup>.

Even

<sup>u</sup> . . . . fell endlong into svine. POPE.

<sup>x</sup> Genuine and original Arianism asserted the Holy Ghost, to be a creature as well as the Son; but a creature made by the Son, as the Son made the angels; and an Angel ministering to the Son. The Arians, says Epiphanius, “confess the angels to have been made by the Son; and even dare to say blasphemously of the very Spirit, that he was created by the Son:” *ομολογουσι τες αγγελους υπο του Υιου γεγοτασαι, και γαρ και περι του Πνευματος βλασφημουν, και τολμωσι λεγειν κειτισθαι υπο του Υιου*. “As even Arius determined concerning the Son,” says Photius, “so he determined also concerning the Ever-holy Spirit; and reduced the lordly and supreme Sovereignty of God, into two servants and ministers:” *ως και Αρειου κατα του Υιου, ετω και αυτος κατα παναγιου παρατακτομενου Πνευματου, εις δευτερας υπηρετας την δεσποτικην και υπερχειμενην αυτε συνετατι κυριωτητα*. And St. Basil calls the Arians, those “who rank  
“ the

Even at Socinianism did Mr. Chillingworth stop in all probability, only because his life was suddenly terminated by accident. Had it been continued to its natural length, he would have gone probably to the very point at the bottom, to which Mr. Whiston shows us two of his own acquaintance actually going. We have already seen Mr. Chillingworth “by degrees grown confident of NOTHING, and a SCEPTICK at *least* in the GREATEST MYSTERIES OF FAITH.” All Arianism originates from Infidelity. The Jewish, as we have already seen, resulted from their Sadduceism. The same spirit, which makes a man question the language of his God, reject its obvious meaning, and wrest it into one, that common sense proclaims could never be intended, by such language from such a Being; in a single effort more tortures the language into Socinianism, and in another rejects the revelation that needed all this. Infidelity thus easily becomes, at once the womb and the grave of Arianism. “From *dust* thou art,” is written by the hand of God upon the brow of Arianism, “and unto *dust* thou shalt return.” There are only three stages of declension, from Christianity into Deism. Mr. Whiston showed himself very ready for the second, when, with all the anticipated

“the Spirit with the serving spirits that are sent out to minister;” *οι μετα των λειτουργικων πνευματων, των προς διακονικην αποσελλομενων, το Πνευμα τιθεντες.* See Pearson, p. 315—316 and 318.

blasphemy of the most savage Socinian, he dared to charge the scriptures of God with weakness and with absurdity. Mr. Chillingworth had finished two of them, when he died; and was ready, I fear, for the third. CHUBB too, whose name was formerly of some notoriety in the lists of infidel fame, but is nearly lost and forgotten in the crouds upon the rolls at present; was *first* an Arian, *then* a Socinian, and *finally* a Deist<sup>1</sup>. MORGAN also, another phantom of unbelief, that once stalked about formidable in its nothingness, was a Presbyterian minister, who *commenced* an Arian, and *concluded* an Infidel<sup>2</sup>. And Dr. PRIESTLEY, as we may fairly conjecture from the past to the future, in the history of *his own* mind; and as we may reasonably infer, from these dreadful examples of *others*; having not stopped, as *his obvious original* Mr. Whiston stopped, but having gone, as Mr. Chillingworth went before, from orthodoxy down through Arianism into Socinianism; is even now rolling on with Morgan and with Chubb, and will at last be engulfed with them, in “that Serbonian bog” of Deism<sup>3</sup>. The Doctor is *already* come—I tremble while I repeat it—is come *already* to intimate—What?—the very FALLIBILITY even of OUR BLESSED REDEEMER Himself.

<sup>1</sup> Whiston's Memoirs, p. 276—278.      <sup>2</sup> P. 318.

<sup>3</sup> . . . . . That Serbonian bog  
Betwixt Damiatra and Mount Casius old,  
Where armies whole have sunk.

“ Some are now unreasonably apprehensive,” he cries in one of his later pamphlets, “ that those who “ *disbelieve* the miraculous conception, or *the plenary* “ *inspiration* of CHRIST and the *apostles*, in cases “ with respect to which the object of their mission “ did not require inspiration; are in danger of re- “ jecting Christianity<sup>b</sup>.” Dr. Priestley thus takes away from our Saviour, as he had antecedently taken from his apostles, that plenitude of inspiration in preaching or writing about Christianity; which alone can preclude the intrusion of error, and ensure the presence of truth. He reduces HIM “ in whom were hid all the treasures of wisdom “ and knowledge,” to the same level of lowness in illumination, to which he had reduced his apostles and evangelists before. He consequently ranks “ the Lord from heaven,” in that line of *inconclusive* *reasoners*; in which he had previously ranked the principal of his human agents. And the only excuse which can be made, for such a Deistical flight of impiety, is what I have pleaded in favour of Mr. Whiston; what is seemingly suggested to us here,

<sup>b</sup> Importance and Extent of free Enquiry in Matters of religion, 1785, p. 35. In the Theological Repository, Vol. IV. are also some papers, I understand, which the late Mr. Badcock put into the hands of a friend of mine, and averred to be written by Dr. Priestley; and in which is a paradox still more impious, drawn out with all the solemnity of dullness, and dreadfully enlivened only with the wish to prove, that our *Blessed Saviour* was not only not *infallible*, but also not—IMPECCABLE.

by the Doctor's overleaping all the intermediate operations of his own mind, coming at a bound to the conclusion, and even speaking of this as known to be adopted and avowed before, when no adoption appears, and no avowal is noticed<sup>c</sup>; and what, I would fain hope, will prove a valid excuse in that day, when the Insulted Saviour shall become an Avenging Judge, and an eternity of fortune shall be suspended on his tongue. At least the Doctor has, with a melancholy usefulness to the whole world of Christianity, shown us the regular progress of Arian infidelity *consummated* in his own history; and appears before us at this moment a striking and solemn evidence himself, that to deny the Divinity of our Saviour, does, by the necessary impulse of endeavouring to vindicate the denial, by the judicial curse of God upon the redoubled impiety, and by a precipitate gradation of absurdity from both, draw the mind at last; to deny the very inspiration of all our scriptural writers, to deny even the very inspiration of our grand and oral Teacher Himself, and consequently to charge BOTH, with FOLLY and with FALSHOOD in their instructions; so to shelter finally from refutation, in the blasphemies of Judaism, of Heathenism, and of Hell.

<sup>c</sup> This very pamphlet stands a memorable monument, of the Doctor's wild indiscretion in betraying to the world, his own *gunpowder-plot* for blowing up the church and state; p. 40—41.

“ Keep us, oh ! keep us, thou Guardian God of  
 “ our religion, from this natural extremity of Arian-  
 “ ism. Keep all the children of thy Gospel from it.  
 “ But keep peculiarly us of the Church of England,  
 “ that glorious head of the Reformed Churches, that  
 “ grand antagonist of Popery, and that bright dis-  
 “ penser of the pure rays of thy Gospel.

“ Thou *wast* the Great Substitute of God the  
 “ Father, in the original creation of angels and of  
 “ men. Thou *art* the great Substitute of God the  
 “ Father still, in the government of this human  
 “ world. “ By thee were all things created,  
 “ that are in heaven and that are in earth; visible  
 “ or invisible; whether they be thrones, or domi-  
 “ nions, or principalities, or powers: all things  
 “ were created *by* thee, and *for* thee, and *by*  
 “ *thee all things consist* <sup>d</sup>.” And Thou hast been  
 “ in all ages the visible Representative of the invi-  
 “ sible Father, to the race of man. “ No man  
 “ hath seen God at any time; Thou, the Only-  
 “ begotten Son, who art in the bosom of the Fa-  
 “ ther, Thou hast declared him <sup>e</sup>.”

“ For this reason, through all the generations  
 “ from Adam down to Abraham; and from the  
 “ selection of the Jews in their glorious founder, to  
 “ thy human appearance among his descendants;  
 “ didst Thou come forward to man, in the assumed  
 “ Majesty of God. Moses “ esteemed thy re-

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. x. 4.

<sup>e</sup> John, i. 18.

“ reproach,

“ reproach, O Christ, greater riches than the  
 “ treasures in Egypt<sup>f</sup>.” “ Thou art the Angel,  
 “ which spake to Moses in the Mount Sinai<sup>g</sup>.”  
 “ Thou art that Spiritual Rock which followed  
 “ the Israelites,” for “ that Rock was Christ<sup>h</sup>.”  
 “ When “ some of them also tempted” God,  
 “ they did actually “ tempt thee, O Christ<sup>i</sup>.”  
 “ Thus, “ being in the form of God” himself,  
 “ didst Thou show them practically, Thou  
 “ thoughtest it no robbery to be equal with  
 “ God<sup>k</sup>.” And, in all the nations of the earth,  
 “ thy “ form, O Son of God,” has been the  
 “ very form of God; because Thou hast been  
 “ the Image of the invisible God” to them, and  
 “ the express Image of his Person,” as being the  
 “ very “ Brightness of his Glory<sup>l</sup>.”

“ Yet, O Thou Divine Friend to man, when  
 “ Thou didst amazingly stoop from thy high dig-  
 “ nity, bow thy heavens, and come down upon  
 “ earth; what was thy reception here? “ Thou  
 “ wast in the world, and the world was made by  
 “ thee, and the world knew thee not. Thou  
 “ didst come unto thy own [proper domains], and  
 “ thy own [proper domesticks] received thee  
 “ not<sup>m</sup>.” The Jews, who were so peculiarly thy  
 “ own, who had been so long the favoured mem-

<sup>f</sup> Heb. xi. 25.

<sup>g</sup> Acts, vii. 38.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. x. 4.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. x. 9.

<sup>k</sup> Phil. ii. 6.

<sup>l</sup> Daniel, iii. 25,

Col. i. 15, and Heb. i. 2.

<sup>m</sup> John, i. 10, 11.



“ bers of thy household, and the honoured children  
“ of thy care; revolted from thy paternal autho-  
“ rity, spurned at thy paternal kindness, and be-  
“ came as the Gentiles had become before. But,  
“ what completed the enormity of their rebel-  
“ lion against thee, and pushed them on to the last  
“ line of human effrontery and human frenzy; they  
“ denied that Divinity of thine, which they had been  
“ perpetually adoring before; and they acknow-  
“ ledged only that humanity, which they knew to  
“ be merely the masking garment of thy Godhead,  
“ and which they exalted only a little above com-  
“ mon humanity, by attaching an angel to it for a  
“ season. And they have undefignedly taken a still  
“ ampler range of mischief; in not confining their  
“ blasphemous folly to themselves, in communicat-  
“ ing it very early to some of thy Christians, in com-  
“ municating it to the Pagan Mahometans after-  
“ wards, and so propagating a race among both, as  
“ perverse and as rebellious as themselves.

“ But oh! keep *us* particularly, of the clerical  
“ order; *us*, who are appointed to take the chair of  
“ authority, in thy congregations of the Church of  
“ England, and to deliver the words of thy revealed  
“ wisdom, to our countrymen of Britain; in a firm  
“ and steady superiority, to this alienated spirit of  
“ Judaism. Whatever the deranged mind of the  
“ Jews may dictate; whatever some of thy Chris-  
“ tians, with a wild credulity, may have derived from  
“ them;

“ them; let *us* “ ever hold fast the profession of  
 “ our faith” in thee, our Lord and our God,  
 “ without wavering<sup>n</sup>.” Let *us* “ earnestly con-  
 “ tend for this faith, which was once,” at the be-  
 “ ginning of the world, “ delivered unto thy  
 “ faints<sup>o</sup>,” which has since been guarded, as the  
 “ Vestal flame of thy religion, by thy faints of every  
 “ age; which is therefore more cordially entertained  
 “ and more devoutly preserved, in itself and in its  
 “ two appendages, the Incarnation and the Satisfac-  
 “ tion, by all the parts of thy church at present,  
 “ than any other doctrine of thy Gospel; and which  
 “ has been happily transmitted, in its full force of  
 “ light and warmth, to ourselves.

“ Thus acting, O Lord our Saviour, we shall be  
 “ fighting that good fight of faith<sup>r</sup>,” which one  
 “ of thy apostles, the favourite of them all, and the  
 “ very apostle of Love himself, has been fighting  
 “ before us. We shall be contending, like him,  
 “ against the CERINTHUSES of the present day.  
 “ Nor shall the poor and cold spirit of our meanly  
 “ philosophical times, damp the ardours and check  
 “ the exertions of our zeal; in this Christian, this  
 “ Apostolick contest. No! With thee for our  
 “ Patron, our Benefactor, and our God; and with  
 “ thy majestically amiable St. John, for our exam-  
 “ ple and pattern; we will rise above the puny effe-

▪ Heb. x. 23.

• Jude, 3.

P 1 Tim. vi. 12.

“ minacy

“ minacy of modern faith, and mount up into the  
“ bold and manly tone of primitive decisiveness.  
“ We will disdain alike the Pharisaick contumacy,  
“ and the Sadducean Arianism, of the Jews; their  
“ rejection of thee for their Messiah, and their  
“ denial of thee for their God. We will also disdain  
“ the borrowed Arianism, of the simple and Judai-  
“ cal Mahometan, and of some Judaical and Ma-  
“ hometan Christians among ourselves. And we  
“ shall thus unite with thy Church existing in all  
“ ages upon earth, and with thy Church hereafter  
“ to exist through all eternity in heaven; saying,  
“ UNTO THEE THAT DIDST LOVE US, AND WASH  
“ US FROM OUR SINS IN THY OWN BLOOD, AND  
“ HAST MADE US KINGS AND PRIESTS UNTO GOD  
“ AND THY FATHER, TO THEE BE GLORY AND  
“ DOMINION FOR EVER AND EVER. AMEN.”

¶ Rev. i. 5—6.

F I N I S.



## E R R A T A.

- Page 56, note, line 3. *for οζηλον, read οζαλον.*
- 96, ——— 2. *for υιν, read υιον.*
- 102, ——— 3. *for τροπον. επι, read τροπον, επι.*
- 203, ——— last but one, *for ανθρωπεσον, read ανθρωπειον.*
- 253, ——— last but one, *for Διλος, read Αιλος.*
- 284, ——— 7. *for τανυσεν, read ειλανυσεν.*
- 291, ——— 4. *for αναποδελος, read ανυποδελος.*
- 296, ——— 18. *for And though that, read That.*
- 23. *for it; yet. read it. Yet.*
- 305, ——— last but two, *for τον περ, read τον υπερ.*
- 314, ——— 5. *for σθενυεσι, read σθενυεσι.*
- 368, ——— 1. *for expect. And such, read expect. Such*
- 381, line 7. *for imposture being, read imposture; being.*
- 429, line 5. *for made, fays, read made," fays.*

*Speedily will be published,*

IN ONE VOLUME OCTAVO,

T H E

P R I V A T E   L I F E

O F

M A R Y   Q U E E N   O F   S C O T S.

*By JOHN WHITAKER, B.D.*

RECTOR OF RUAN LANYHORNE, CORNWALL.













