





I-7

AM PRES BR1 .P58 v.1  
Biblical repertory.





**HENRICUS EHRENFRIED WARNEKROS,**

ON THE

**Fertility of Palestine,**

AND ITS PRINCIPAL ADVANTAGES, COMPARED WITH THOSE

OF

**EGYPT.**

---

§ I. *Moses calls Palestine fruitful.*

IN treating of the fertility of Palestine and its principal advantages, by the word Palestine I mean not only the region in the vicinity of Jerusalem, but Palestine properly so called, situated on this side of the Jordan. Moses, the leader of the Israelites, to whose posterity God was about to give this country for a habitation, describes it as being very fertile. And his testimony is corroborated by *Shaw*, *Maundrell*, and many other modern travellers, who have visited it. This description of Moses has, however, without any reason, been made a matter of ridicule. And why? The enemies of religion, instigated by a vain and impious audacity, have represented Moses as a man destitute of understanding and regardless of truth, whilst they have strenuously affirmed that Palestine was sterile and uninviting. These unprincipled men, who would wish, if they cannot overthrow the truth of Sacred Scripture, at least to invalidate it as much as possible, inveigh against no writer more vehemently, than against Moses, rejecting his

whole history, and all the miracles wrought by him, as false and absurd. We could blunt their opposing weapons, but to follow out all the windings of their fallacious arguments would be a useless labour ; for it is impossible, and not to be credited that Moses could have possessed such inconceivable assurance as to speak of actions and miracles, as performed by him before their eyes, if they were not true. Surely he would have exhibited all the symptoms of derangement, and the people having detected his deceit and misrepresentation, would have withdrawn their confidence from him, and would have committed his writings to the flames. If we consider the situation and condition of Moses, it will appear manifest, that a false description of Palestine, would have been most pernicious to him : for he delayed in the vicinity of that land with an immense multitude of men, and therefore it would have been the greatest imprudence, to have represented it in glowing colours, as surpassing other countries in fertility and abundance of all productions, if it had not been the fact ; especially considering that the people were rough and uncultivated, rebellious and inclined to seditions, and on every trivial occasion that offered itself, desirous of returning to Egypt. But the spies that were sent before them, brought back the same description, and exhibited as a proof the rich productions of the land. The number of the Israelites is minutely stated by Moses in different places :\* which places, if they be compared, will be found to contain the same amount ; whence I infer that the same census is alluded to in all those places, although others entertain a different opinion. Indeed it seems incredible, that the number of so great a people should neither be increased nor diminished within the space of a year ; but it is worthy of notice that the taking of the census of so large a multitude must have consumed much time as each name was written down. In the first year then the tables were made out by the rulers

\* Exod. xxx. 15, 16 ; xxxviii. 24. 31 ; et Num. I. 1.

of hundreds and of tens, which the priests reviewed in the second year, and made more complete by adding the age and lineage of each one. Then from the tables completed by this new survey a larger book was formed, in which each one was numbered as living, although he might have died during the preceding year. The number was 603,550, excluding the infants, the youth who had not reached their twentieth year, all the women, the servants, and the whole tribe of Levi. The number of the Levites was 22,300, which added to the former number will make the sum of 625,850; and if to this we add the infants and the females, and the servants, which would probably increase it four-fold, the whole amount will be 2,503,400. Therefore if the new habitation of the Israelites had been unfruitful, it could by no means have supported so large a multitude. Beside, Moses placed the foundation of his republick in agriculture which he could not by any means have done, had not the land been fertile. Each one of the Israelites received a portion of land as his private property, which was left to his posterity, and which it was wrong to sell; for all the support of the Israelites, as long as they dwelt in the land, was derived from pasturage and agriculture. God\* himself describes this region as “A good land and a large, a land flowing with milk and honey.” Moses† also gives the same description when the camp was in the neighbourhood of Jericho; the Lord, says he, will bring you into a good land, a land of rivers and of fountains, in whose plains and mountains, streams flow forth; a land of corn, barley, and vineyards, in which the fig-tree and pomegranate and olive-tree grow, a land of olives and honey. It is preferred to Egypt:‡ “For the land whither thou goest in to possess it, is not as the land of Egypt, from which ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed and wateredst it with thy foot as a garden of herbs; but the land whither

\* Exod. iii. 8.

† Deut. xi. 10.

‡ Deut. xi. 10.



ye go to possess it, is a land of hills and valleys and drinketh water of the rain of heaven." Finally, Moses celebrates the fertility of Palestine in a song to be sung by the Israelites in this land.\*

"The Lord," says he, "made him to ride on the high places of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields; and he made him to suck honey out of the rock and oil out of the flinty rock; butter of kine and milk of sheep, with fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of Bashan, and goats with the fat of kidneys of wheat; and thou didst drink of the pure blood of the grape."

---

## § II. *The advantages of Palestine when compared with Egypt.*

The testimony of Moses† has appeared incredible to many; whence, they say, they have been compelled to regard his representations as false, when he extols the land of Palestine in the highest praises, and describes it as abounding with superior privileges, because it is watered with rain from heaven and running streams, whilst Egypt is watered only by the overflowings of the Nile. But to this we may add that Palestine possesses the most delightful climate, having neither too great nor too small a quantity of rain. ABULFEDA divides the different countries into the *salubres*, that is, those which are irrigated by rain, and the *insalubres*, that is, those which are inundated by rivers. And no one will venture a denial, that in this respect Palestine enjoys advantages far surpassing those of Egypt. BARTHOLINUS on the properties of water says,‡ that rain water is in itself transparent, clear, subtile, light,

\* Deut. xxxii. 13. Conf. Exod. xiii. 5, xxiii. 1. Lev. xx. 24. Num. xiii. 27, xiv. 7, 8. Jos. xxiii. 14, xxiv. 13. Ps. cvi. 24. Neh. ix. 35. Jer. xi. 5. Ezech. xx. 6. Joel. ii. 3. *Basnage's* histoire des Juifs, lib. i. c. 14. § 9. p. 356.

† Deut. xi. 10.

‡ Lib. xiii. p. 555



and savoury; that its clearness indicates that there is no foreign admixture with it, and its lightness and sapidity show that it is a subtile substance. He, adds that of all kinds of water it is most productive of fertility, and especially when it falls with thunder, for the thunder by its motion scatters the vapour and makes the water thin and pure. In Palestine moreover the atmosphere is serene and salubrious, but in Egypt many diseases unavoidably arise from the quantity of mud and dirt which the Nile produces. For Egypt, especially the upper part, is watered by few or no showers.\* The lower part has rain, but only in the months of November, December, and January.† Hence, when in the time of *Psamenitus*, king of Egypt, a rain descended at *Thebes*, it was considered as a prodigy; for whilst a solitary rain at far distant intervals descends on those parts adjacent to the sea, and those parts which are above *Memphis* have no rain, at that time, the atmosphere presented a new appearance and a tempestuous storm rushed upon them. This novel and astonishing event‡ overwhelmed them with terror. Since then, Egypt is almost entirely deprived of showers, its fertility depends solely on the inundations of the Nile, whence the Egyptians§ feign the Nile to be a deity, and they esteem it the greatest of the deities, declaring it to be a rival of the heavens, because without clouds or rain, it waters the land and moistens the earth yearly instead of showers. These things the common people say. But those skilled in their mysteries affirm that the land is *Isis*, and the Nile *Osiris*.

\* Conf. *Ray's* Collection of Travels, Tom. ii. p. 92. *Greaves* Beschreibung der Pyramiden, p. 74, &c.

† *Vansleben's* Relation d'Egypte p. 37, 354. *Thevenot's* voyage au Levant lib ii. p. 789. *Vossii* Obsen. ad Melam desitu orbis. lib i. c. 9. *Dapper's* Beschr. von Afrika, p. 127.

‡ Conf. *Herodoti* hist. lib iii. cap. 10. *Philo Judæus* in vita Mosis, lib i. page 481. Edit. Genev.

§ Conf. Thesaurus numismatum antiquorum cum commentariis I. *Oiseli*, Tab, xxxiv. n. 9. et *Trestani* Numism. T. i. p. 307.

The Egyptians also worshiped\* the Nile under the name of *Serapis*.

§ III. *Of the origin of the Nile.*

Respecting the origin of the Nile which many derive from the mountains of the moon, the opinions of authors are various. Many kings and emperors have investigated it in vain, so that it has become a proverb, that to seek for the head of the Nile is to seek for a thing that is arduous and beyond the powers of man.† Alexander, indeed, when he saw crocodiles in the *Hydaspes* and Egyptian beans in *Acesines*, thought that he had discovered the source of the Nile, and prepared a fleet for Egypt, intending to sail down this river into the Nile, but he soon discovered that his hopes were not to be realised, for large rivers intervened, and the Ocean also into which all the rivers of India flow; and besides these Ariana and the Arabian and Persian gulfs; and Arabia and Troglodytica.‡ *Hieronymus Lobo*, according to TELLEZ, in his history of Aethiopia, says that the Nile rises in the kingdom of Gojam, a country under the Aethiopians or Abyssinians, in latitude twelve degrees from the Equator. SUDAS says, the *etesiaë*§ blow during the greater part of the summer; because the sun ascending higher and approaching nearer to the north, dissolves the moisture which exists in that part, which, mingling with the air and wind, forms the *etesiaë*: and this wind carried from the north into the south, when it meets the higher mountains of Aethiopia, is condensed and forms rain: by which the Nile, although coming from

\* Vid. *Sekmanni* diss. hist. de Serapide Egyptorum Deo maximo, Lipsiae 1666. *Bosseckii* diss. de fluminum cultu. Lipsiae 1740. Seldenus de Diis Syris. Synt. i. c. 4. *Kercheri* Oedipus Egypt. T. i. Synt. 3. c. 7. T. iii. Synt. 15. c. 1. *Vossii* Theologia Gentilium lib. ii. c. 74, 75.

† Strabo, lib. xv. p. 696.

‡ *Kercheri* Oedipus Egypt. T. i. Synt. 1. c. 7.

§ North East Winds which blow for forty days during the dog days.

a dry and tropical climate, is made to overflow. What *Sudas* here says of the increase of the Nile, *Pliny* declares, is believed by others also, where he gives the different opinions respecting the source of the Nile. He says\* that authors have advanced various causes of the increase of the Nile, the most probable of which are, the condensation of the *etesiae*, blowing at that time from contrary directions, the sea being driven beyond its shores; or the summer showers of Aethiopia, the *etesiae* carrying the clouds thither from the rest of the world. *Ammonius* testifies the same thing.† The most famous opinion is that the *Prodromi*‡ blowing, and continual blasts of the *Etsiae* meeting them for forty-five days, the velocity of the flowing of the river is retarded, so that its waves swell and overflow. In this manner the river continues to flow, still opposed by the winds, until it inundates the whole country. The opinions which *Pliny* and *Sudas* have expressed in their writings, they appear to have taken from *Callisthenes* and *Democritus*, who express the same sentiments. But the opinion that seems most probable to me is that the Nile arises not from fountains, but has its source in Aethiopia from the rains which fall there, and which, when the sun enters the sign of the cancer, are very great and abundant, and continue such for the space of forty days. In the month of June, on the seventeenth day the river begins to increase and inundates the whole of Egypt. This increase ends in the month of August and some times not until the middle of September; at which time it gradually diminishes, after the space of three months have intervened. The more abundant its increase has been, the slower is its fall, and the later the harvest. In this manner it supplies the wants of the husbandman§.

\* *Plinii hist. nat. lib. v. cap. 9.*

† *lib. xxii.*

‡ Winds which blow for eight days before the rising of the dog star.

§ *Homer* represents the Nile as descending from heaven. ΑΨ' δ' εις Αιγυπτου διήστει ποταμου *Odyss. Δ. V. 581.*



§ IV. *Of the effects of the inundation of the Nile and of the measures of the Nile.*

Pliny\* elegantly describes the effect of the overflowing of the Nile. When it is twelve cubits, famine is the consequence; when thirteen, hunger follows; fourteen cubits produce joy; fifteen, security; and sixteen, delight. Wherefore an image was erected in the temple of peace by *Vespasian Augustus*, with sixteen children, by which was signified the overflowing of the Nile to the depth of sixteen cubits.† The higher it rises beyond this number, the greater famine is expected, because the water delaying too long, the time of sowing is passed, and the crops cannot arrive at maturity, or produce fruit. It is the greatest calamity which can possibly happen to Egypt, when the Nile does not sufficiently water the earth, or when it exceeds sixteen cubits. The first curse upon Egypt is predicted in Isa. xix. 5. The words of the Hebrew text are וְנִשְׁתוּ־מִים מֵהַיָּם which are generally translated, *deficient seu arescent aquæ ex mari*; so the Syriac, Symmachus and the Vulgate. The root of this verb with the points and the dagesch forte, is נִשְׁתַּ which is said to occur three times in the Bible,‡ but it is to be found in no other Oriental language, and is therefore very doubtful. But if you reject the points and the dagesch forte, which were added by the Masorites about the seventh century after Christ, the places where this word is found become very clear. Therefore I think it ought to be read in this place וְנִשְׁתוּ without the dagesch

\* I. c.

† *Arcadius* the Emperor, forbade any water to be taken from the Nile by breaking the mounds when the increase was less than twelve cubits, under pain of burning—Anno Christi ccccix. leg. i., de Nile agerribus, lib. 9. Cod. Theod. tit. 32., in which year a great famine prevailed at Constantinople, teste *Marcellino* in Chron.

‡ Besides this place. Is. xli. 17; and Jer. li. 30.

forte, which is the Praeter. Conjug. Niph. from the root  $\text{בִּיבַע}$  *bibere*, and should be translated, *ebibentur aquæ ex mari*, and so the LXX and *Aquila* have translated it *και αναποδησεται υδατα απο θαλασσης*. By the word  $\text{ד'$  translators understand the Mediterranean sea. But what is that to Egypt? It would affect it but little, was it entirely dry. In my opinion  $\text{ד'$  in this place is the river Nile, which is very often called the sea: for the first name of this river was *Oceanus*, in Greek *Οκεανος*.\* But the sense of this place is by no means that the Nile should dry up entirely, but that it should not sufficiently water the land.

It has been made a matter of attention by some men, how they might discover by diligent observation, what number of cubits the river rises when it is the highest, and the instrument by which they made their observations was called *Νειλομετρον*: it was divided into cubits. *John Gravius*† has described this instrument. He says it is yet to be found in *Cairo*, and *Thevenot*, *Hasselquist* and others state the same thing.‡ The geographer of Nubia§ has elegantly described it as follows: *Dar Almechias*, that is, the place of measure is at the head of an island, which is broader on the eastern side, which is in sight of the city *Fosdad*. It is a large hall, surrounded within on all sides with arches, which a circle of columns support; and in the midst of the hall, is a large and deep cistern to which there is a descent on all sides by marble steps. From the centre of the cistern arises a straight marble column divided into cubits and digits. The water is car-

\* Conf. *Diod. Sic. Bibl. hist. lib. i. cap. 12. Maillet* in description de l'Egypte, lettre ii. p. 41. The Nile, they say, flows with such force, that it more resembles a sea, than a simple river.

† In libro de pede Romano.

‡ *Thevenot Voyage au Levante*, p. I. lib. 2. c. 32; et lib. 3. c. 44. *Hasselquist Reise nach Palestina*, pag. 76. Conf. *Diod. Sic. Bibl. hist. lib. 1. Strabo* in Georg. lib. xviii. *Plutarch* de Iside et Osir. *Plinii* hist. nat. lib. v. c. 9; xviii. 18; xxxvi. 7. *Herodot.* lib. ii. c. 13.

§ *Clim.* iii. p. 13.

ried to that cistern through a large canal, which passes from it to the water of the Nile. The water does not run into the cistern except when it has arrived to that elevation which takes place in the month of August. The waters ordinarily rise sixteen cubits, and then they irrigate equally the territory of the Emperor. When the Nile rises eighteen cubits it waters both the neighbouring countries. If it rises twenty cubits it causes injury. Twelve cubits is a very small rise—A cubit is twenty-four digits. As often as it exceeds eighteen cubits it brings destruction, because it tears up and kills the trees. Likewise when it is less than twelve cubits, it produces drought and famine. It may be proper to refer to the words of *Hasselquist* on the means of ascertaining the height of the Nile. “The place in which the height of the water is measured (the Nilometer) is the most remarkable thing in *Old Cairo*. It is a quadrangular house, built by the river, the roof terminating in a white pyramid. At certain distances from the ground there are openings to admit the water. In the middle of the building stands a marble pillar, upon which a gauge is marked, upon which the daily rise and fall of the water can be noted, until the whole land is overflowed. The government appoint the persons who are to make these remarks and during this period their superstition will not allow any but Mohammedans to enter the building. It was therefore impossible for us to obtain a view from the inside.”

---

§ V. *Of the drains and the lake of Moeris.*

The ancient Egyptians made use of various inventions, when the Nile did not overflow the more elevated lands, (for you will find no mountains in Egypt) or when it exceeded the desired bounds; among which inventions the drains and aqueducts hold a distinguished place. In the



middle of the drains there are steps on which the husbandman stands, as often as he wishes to water his land, and he is carried round by them. But to prevent falling, he seizes fast of a prop near him, with his hands, to which, clinging, he suspends his whole body and uses his hands in the place of his feet and his feet in the place of his hands; for he stands upon his hands whose business it is to act, and acts with his feet which are for standing.\* Hence we may understand what is intended by Deut. xi. 10. to water the garden with the feet. This instrument is called by the Arabians *Sakih* (سكّيح) *irrigatorium*.

*Archimedes*, indeed, is said to be the inventor of it, but this is incredible, since it occurs in the books of Moses. The Egyptians make use of their feet for treading, but the Persians make use of cattle.† Indeed the drains are excellent and most necessary inventions: but the aqueducts are still more important. Thus, according to *Pliny*,‡ between *Arsensis* and *Memphis*, there is a place in circumference CCLX paces, or according to *Mutianus* CCCCLX, and in depth fifty paces formed by nature, but improved and enlarged by the king of *Moeris*, whence also it is called the lake of *Moeris*, which is connected with the Nile by a canal. This place, both on account of its size and its depth, is sufficient to receive the overflowings of the Nile at the time of its increase, so that the water may not destroy the

\* Conf. *Phil. Jud. de confusione linguarum* p. 255. edit. Genev.

† You may see the figure in the *Travels and Observations* in several parts of Levant, by *Shaw*, T. II. p. 337. *Norden's Voyage d'Egypte et de Nubie*, T. I. fig. 53. ad pag. 61. *Niebuhr's Beschreibung Arabiens*, T. I. p. 148. &c. In the Koran, Sur. II. v. 66. *Muhamed* says, "the heifer which has not plowed the earth nor watered the land," that is, which has not moved in the wheel which draws the water, and by which it is poured into the canals that water the land.—From Babylon even to the Nile a certain hill descends, by which water is drawn from the river by means of wheels and pumps, captives working continually. Conf. *Strab. Geogr. lib. xvii.* p. 807. *Hannoverishes Magazin*, 1780. St. 57. p. 899.

‡ *Hist. Natur. lib. v. c. 9.*

crops and the habitations. Afterwards, the Nile decreasing, by the aid of a ditch it retains a sufficiency of water to supply the husbandmen. The ditch is eight stadia long, and three hundred feet broad. By this, the lake sometimes receiving the river water and sometimes not receiving it, retains a suitable supply of water, the mouth being opened at one time and closed at another, not without much labour and expense. For whoever would remove or replace the enclosures of this structure, had to expend not less than fifty talents. The lake has remained subserving the conveniences of the Egyptians even to our times, the name only being changed, for it is called *Lacus Charontis*.\* But this lake affords another advantage to the Egyptians; an immense number of fish grow in it. It is said to produce twenty two kinds of fish, and so great a number is caught, that although there is an immense number of men who follow the business of salting them, they can scarcely accomplish their work.

---

§ VI. *The fertility arising from the Nile.*

Among other nations, agriculture is carried on with great expense and labour; but among the Egyptians alone their fruits are collected with very little expense or trouble, whence also the common people, when the Nile overflows, freed from work, give themselves up to relaxation, feasting continually, and enjoying without interruption all things that conduce to pleasure†. Then when the slime is left, the fertility is so great, that they are often compelled to mix it with gravel, lest the seed being sown in this too rich and nitrous slime, should perish from its richness. Particularly the lower part of Egypt which is called the Delta is too rich. On the contrary, in the

\* Conf. *Strab. Geog.* lib. xvii. p. 811. *Diod. Sic. Bibl. hist.* lib. i. p. 34.

† Conf. *Diod. Sic. Bib. hist.* lib. i. *Irwin's Series of Adventures in the course of a voyage up the Red Sea, &c.* p. 229.

more elevated country which is not overflowed by the Nile, much smaller crops are to be expected. It adds very much to the fertility of Egypt, that it has a double summer every year ; the former of which is very uneven and inconstant, with excessive heat, which is very trying to the body, especially of a stranger not accustomed to this climate. It begins in the month of March and continues until May. The other summer, which is called the second part of the summer, succeeds the former, for it begins in the month of June and closes about the end of August. This summer is more uniform than the former and more constant, less hot and offensive to the body. The autumn comprises two months, September and October. The winter begins in the month of November and extends to January. The spring is observed in January and February : in these months the trees begin to bud, and the earth is rendered very beautiful with green herbs, plants, and flowers.\*

---

§ VII. *The water of the Nile is said to be very wholesome, and productive of fruitfulness in women.*

The water of the Nile is highly spoken of for drinking. But as it contains much dirt and mud, it is necessary first to strain it, and then to preserve it in earthen vessels, until the mud settles, and the water becomes clear. *Galen*† testifies that the Egyptians used it strained through earthen vessels, by which process it is preferable to all other waters ; for it is very pure, limpid, and of a sweet taste. Whence *Aeschylus*‡ also calls the water of the Nile, εὐποτοῦργεος, that is a flowing stream, sweet and suitable for drinking. For who will not believe that the wa-

\* Confer *Prosp. Alpinum de medicina Ægyptionum* lib. i. c. 7. *Dapper's Beschreibung von Afrika.* p. 126.

† *De Simpl. Medic. Facult.* lib. i. *Prosp. Alpin.* I. c. *Dapper* p. 131.

‡ *In Prometheo vincto.* p. 49.



ter of that very celebrated river is the best of all for the use of man ; seeing that by so long a course, it passes through so extensive a country, burnt by the sun, which the ancients thought not habitable on account of its excessive heat ; and seeing, moreover, that it is almost heated by the sun in its long journey, and by the motion and agitation which happen in so extended a progress, and by its descent from high mountains, the river being precipitated from lofty eminences, it becomes completely purified. And because that river has not a rocky channel, but one of very rich earth, it is evident that least of all waters it will injure by its coldness. For these reasons, *Avicenna* and *Prosper Alpinus* have spoken in the highest terms of this water. The Egyptians keep the water of the Nile in casks as wine is kept. For as it does not become putrid, according to *Aristides*, they preserve it three, or four, or even more years, at which time it comes in as great demand amongst them as wine with us. The Nile is said not only to fertilize the land, but also to produce fruitfulness in women. For *Pliny*\* states from Trogus that in Egypt it is very common for twins to be born, and that three, and four are often brought forth at one birth, and seven have been. *Strabo*† asserts that *Aristotlé* has said the same thing. But perhaps the text has been altered, and instead of *επταδυμα* it ought to be read *πενταδυμα*, since *Aristotlé* in various other places,‡ speaks of five at a birth, and *Gellius* affirms the same thing from him. Aristotle the philosopher, has related that a woman in Egypt brought forth five children at a birth, and this is the largest number ever heard of, and this number very seldom is found. But it often happens that the Egyptians bring forth twins,

\* *Hist. Natur.* lib. vii. cap. 3. *Aristotelis* de hist. animal. lib. viii. cap. 4. Conf. *Rittershusius* in *Oppiani Cynag.* lib. ii. c. 143. p. 57.

† *Geog.* lib. xv. p. 695.

‡ De *Generat. Animal.* lib. iv. c. 4. et 5 de hist. animal. lib. vii. cap. 5. p. 822. *Gellius* lib. x. c. 2. p. 504.

And ancient authors say that three and four are often born at a birth, and indeed in some lands that is common. It is said that a certain woman in four births, during the space of five years, brought forth twenty children, the most of whom grew up. Credible authors tell of a woman in Peloponnesus, who in five births brought forth four at a time.

It is certain that the three *Horatii* were of one birth, and likewise the three *Curatii*, as can be shown from the ancient coins which have this inscription, C. CVR. et TRIGE\*. *Laetius* also says, that he saw in the palace a freed woman who was brought from Alexandria, to be showed to *Adrian*, with five children, of which four were brought forth at a birth, and the fifth forty days after.†

---

### § VIII. *The evils which arise from the Nile.*

I have abundantly shown the benefits arising from the Nile and its advantages with respect to fertility; but it will bear no comparison with the fertility of the land of Palestine, which I shall now describe after having premised some of the evils that arise from the Nile. I have already mentioned that the Nile carries with it a great quantity of very rich clay. From this a great variety of insects arise, which putrefy when they die and poison the air. The bird called Ibis, is, on this account, of great utility, for it devours these pestiferous insects and removes the evil. Whence the Egyptians worshipped that benefactor with divine honours, and punished invariably with death every one that killed the Ibis, either willingly

\* *Patinus* in Famil. p. 97. n. 1. et 2. apud *Gorlæum* p. 30.

† Confer. *Paulus* Jurisconsultus in leg. iii. Digest. If the subject of heirship be sought, *Jukanus* leg. xxxvi. Dig. De solutionibus et liberationibus.

or unwillingly.\* The Ibis is a bird entirely white, tall, with black feet, rough legs, and a long and horny beak : its wings have no feathers but are bare, resembling those of the bat. Its size is about that of the hen or the crow.

But the greatest evil that arises from the Nile is occasioned by the evaporation, which produces a noxious atmosphere. So that I think it may be safely affirmed that Egypt is the only country producing the plague, from which it is carried into other regions. The Nile in the winter time flows very slowly, and the water has a very disagreeable smell ; and especially about the mouths of the Nile, where there are many marshes called *Bucolia*. Our geography of Egypt is by no means accurate or sufficiently minute ; it contains much mistake and deficiency : we barely know from *Heliodorus* and *Russel*,† that there are fenny places there. For there are low grounds receiving the overflowings of the Nile, and lakes of unfathomable depth in the middle, and terminating in marsh about their banks. For what the shores are to the seas, the marshes are to these lakes. There also the Egyptian robbers have their republic, for they make use of the water instead of a wall ; moreover there is a large quantity of reed in the marsh which answers them for a fortification. In Egypt also, the *lepra* and *Elephantiasis* (species of the leprosy) and other destructive diseases take their rise : *Maundrell*, *Thevenot* and *Prosper Alpinus*‡ affirm that

\* *Strabo*, in Geograph. lib. xvi. says, all the Egyptians worship certain animals, in common ; as, of quadrupeds, the cow, the dog, the cat ; of birds, the hawk and the ibis, of water animals, the lapidotus piscis and the oxyrychnus. See the form of the ibis in *Jac. de Wilde*, Sign. Antig. No. 13. *Dapper's* Besch. von Afrika, p. 120. *J. R. Forster's* Indische Zoologie, auf der Christen Kupfertafel. This bird is entirely unknown in our country, and has no name in Europe. Confer *Aldrovand's* Orrith lib. xx. cap. 3. pag. 312.

† *Heliodori* Aethopion lib. i. *Russel's* natural history of Aleppo, p: 49. 50. Conf. *Goquet* de l'origine des Loix, des Arts, et des Sciences et de leurs progres chez les anciens peuples. T. II. liv. 3. ch. 2.

‡ *Thevenot's* Voyage au Levant p. i. lib. ii. cap. 80. *Prosper Alpinus* de Medicina Ægyptiorum lib. i. p. 14. Conf. *Schillingii* commentationes de lepra. *Dapper's* Besch. von Afrika p. 127—129.



the leprosy has raged in Egypt in their own times, and that they have seen men labouring under it. *Pliny* affirms that it arises in Egypt alone and that it is common there. *Lucretius* says the same thing in the following lines from lib. VI.,

Est elephas morbus, qui propter flumina Nili,  
Nascitur Aegypto in media nec præterea usquam.

*Dioscorides* and *Avicenna*, indeed, contend that this disease arises from the Egyptian beer, but this appears to be a mistake, although *Scaliger* to excuse *Dioscorides* refers it to the acidity of the beer. The whole cause is rather to be referred to the varying atmosphere, as *Galen* also thinks.\* Indeed, in Alexandria many contract the disease from the united cause, of the manner of living and the heat of the climate. In *Germany* and other countries this disease is very uncommon, and among the *Scythians* who live principally on milk, it has scarcely ever appeared. But in *Alexandria* it is produced by the manner of living. For they eat boiled flour and lentils, shell fish and other salt food, and some of them, the flesh of the ass, and other things which produce gross and phlegmatick humours, whence, when the air is warm, the motion of the humours is directed towards the surface. Indeed, *Egypt* is generally represented as the native place of this disease, from which it afterward spread into other countries. The *Israelites* carried the leprosy into *Palestine*, whence Moses prescribed peculiar laws respecting it.† And nothing appears to me more evident, than that it was this disease with which *Job* was afflicted.‡

\* De curat. ad Glauc. lib. ii. cap. 10.

† Levit. xiii.

‡ Conf. *Michaelis* 36te Arabische Frage an die Reisenden und dessen Anmerkung zu Heob ii. 7. *Mead* on the most important diseases mentioned in the S.S. Chap. i.

§ IX. *Whether Egypt produces a greater quantity of corn than Palestine.*

Let no one infer, because Strabo\* affirms that Egypt abounds in corn, that on that account it is to be preferred to Palestine. For who will pronounce that region the most happy and desirable, which possesses no other advantages of nature than a supply of corn? But even in this respect Palestine surpasses, both in the productiveness and quality of its corn. In the Bible† we are informed that the *Tyrians* received their corn not from Egypt, which was more convenient for them, but from Palestine. Which however I freely concede might have been done for different reasons; and therefore I will not urge this argument. For the Egyptians in their early ages were very negligent in their commerce with foreigners, wanting a port, Alexandria being not yet built, and the navigation of the Nile being very dangerous on account of its cataracts, according to *Abulfeda*, *Homer*, and *Niebuhr*.‡ For there is a cataract extending twelve stadia, confined by craggy rocks into a narrow pass, very rough and turbulent. The water of the river being driven violently against these rocks, is turned by these obstacles into a contrary direction, where remarkable whirlpools are formed; and the resistance is so often repeated, that the whole surface is covered with foam: so that those that approach are overwhelmed with amazement. For the river is there precipitated in so violent and so accelerated a manner, that its rapidity seems to be equal to that of an arrow. At the overflowing of the Nile, when the rocks are covered and the roughness destroyed by the rise of the water, it sometimes happens that boatmen taking advantage of contrary winds, may descend the cataract,

\* Georg. lib. xvii. † Conf. Ezech. xxvii. 17. Ezr. iii. 7. Acts xii. 20.

‡ Conf. Wood's Essay on the original genius of Homer, page 125. Diodori Siculi Bibl. Hist. lib. i. page 20. Niebuhr's Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien, T. I. p. 56. etc.

but there is no possibility of ascending, for the force of the water baffles all the skill of the human mind. *Neibuhr*\* a classic author, on this subject, describes the harvests of Palestine as very large and profitable; for, says he, the crop that is overflowed by river water is of less value than that which is watered by the rain; whence according to exact computation you will find that twenty bushels of wheat, of the former kind, is equal to only fifteen of the latter, the flower of which is also much superior. The Hebrews were of the opinion, that it was very honourable to them to have a large increase, but that it was a great disgrace to have an unproductive harvest. Whence in Isa. lxi. 7, a large and abundant harvest is opposed to their former disgrace. No one will deny that the soil of Palestine is peculiarly suited to the production of eorn, when he is informed that it requires very little labour in its culture, and produces a very large increase. By the word *corn*, in this place, I mean principally *wheat* and *barley*, of which kinds of grain it produces the greatest abundance, although it is not deficient in the production of others. Consult Isa. xxviii. 25, where the principal kinds of corn are mentioned. Indeed this place appears to be misunderstood by most interpreters; permit me therefore to add a few words for the illustration of it. That it is not customary for the husbandman to sow the same kind of grain in the same place every year, but rather to vary it, is clearly understood from this place. We find in this text *יְשׁוּהַ פְּנֵיהָ* *he hath made plain the face thereof*, which seems difficult to interpreters, whence *Clericus* and *Vitringa* omit it in their commentaries. Others understand this as having reference to *harrowing*; which opinion *Paulsen* has adopted; † for he has said in explanation of this place, that the ground must first be harrowed, before the seed can be sown, for

\* Beschreibung von Arabien, p. 152. Ex quo, locus Deut. xi. 10. est explicandus.

† In Seiner Abhandl. v. dem Ackerbau der Morgenländ.



the rapid winds, which in our country, scatter the grain, are not found in the oriental regions. But in this thing, that very learned man greatly errs, for all who have visited those countries, affirm with one voice, that the winds are much more severe there, than they are with us. Therefore if I may be allowed to give my opinion, harrowing is not at all intended in this verse, mention of which is made in the former verse : for if the Prophet had intended to repeat what he had said before, I think he would certainly have employed the verb  $\text{ררש}$ , which signifies to harrow : whence nothing appears to me more plain than that the expression *to make plain the face thereof*, has another meaning. I think in this place *rollers* are referred to, with which the eastern people used to level their lands. Their use is unknown in our country, but they are found in England made of stone. The roller is a stone cylinder so constructed as to turn round, which writers on agriculture recommend for levelling threshing floors. *Cato*\* says, in this manner prepare the floor for threshing corn : let the ground be carefully dug up, let the lees of oil be sprinkled over it : and then let the clods be broken into small pieces by the roller or the pounding instrument : when it becomes hardened the ants will not be troublesome, nor will the rain produce mud. *Columella* advances the same in these words :—

Tum quoque procisso rigoque inspersa novali  
 Ocima comprimate, et gravibus densate cylindris,  
 Exurat sata ne resoluti pulveris æstus,  
 Parvulus aut pulex irrepens dente lacessat,  
 Neu fornica rapax populari semina possit.

From which words it appears that they were of great convenience and advantage. For the earth is hardened by them, the clods are broken, and the moles are destroyed.

\* Cap. 129. *Columella* in hortulo lib. x.

The seed, therefore, is committed to the earth after it has been levelled by the roller, and then it is harrowed. Which seems to me the most satisfactory explication of this place. **חטה שורה** is translated in different ways; some call it *measured wheat*, that is wheat not to be sown except according to the proportion of the land, in a certain measure: others call it *wheat in order*, that is placed in order; others, the *principal wheat*, that is the best, deriving the word from **שור** which means the principal: but this does not please me, I would rather translate it the *rich wheat*, from **שור** which in Arabic means *to be fat*: for the Sin of the Hebrew generally answers to Shin in Arabic, and vice versa. But since I find this word placed among the kinds of corn, it has struck me that **שורה** may denote something that grows in the field: but what it is, it is difficult to say, since the word is *απαξ λεγόμενον*, occurring only in this place, whence the *Seventy* and the *Syriac* omit it in their versions. The *Vulgate* translates it *by order*, taking it perhaps from **טורה**. Different kinds of grain are mentioned in this place: but in the East *rice* is a very excellent grain, from which the best bread is made, and in many places it is the daily food. If therefore I may venture a conjecture, I think that by the word **שורה** *rice* is intended, and that it is derived from an Arabic root which signifies *to be fat*; for there is no grain richer than rice. *Aristobulus* has said that the height of its stalk was four cubits, that it contained many ears and much fruit, that it was reaped about the setting of the *Pleiades* and was pounded like spelt. It luxuriates in the land of Palestine, especially in the wet and marshy places, and is found in great quantities near the Jordan: besides, it grows in the Bactrian, the Babylonian, and the Susean lands, and also in the lower part of Syria. Moreover the Italians, according to *Pliny*\* are very fond of

\* Hist. Natural, lib. xviii. *Bontius* in Dialogo III. lib. ii. de medicina Indorum.

rice, from which they make broth, which other people make from barley. Experience, however teaches us, says *Bontius*, that warm rice is injurious, not only to the stomach, but also to the brain, and the whole nervous system : hence it happens from the gross and dry vapours that ascend into the brain, the optic nerves are often so injured as to produce blindness ; on which subject and its cure *Bontius* has treated largely in his Indian method of treating it. Hence you will never see the inhabitants of Java or the Malays eating warm rice.

That *חטה* means *wheat*, is the opinion of all. It is the most common grain from which the Orientals make their bread. Nothing is more productive than wheat, which nature has kindly provided, since it constitutes the principal support of man : so that from a bushel, according to *Pliny*,\* if a the soil be good, such as the Byzician plain of Africa, a hundred and fifty bushels are produced. The Procurator of Augustus sent to him from one grain planted in that place, about forty sprouts, the letter concerning which is yet extant. There were sent to Nero from one grain three hundred and sixty straws. But the wheat of Palestine surpasses that of all other regions in price, whence it is highly praised by *Celsus*,† who, instituting a comparison between this and the Egyptian, says, fifteen bushels of the wheat of Palestine affords the same quantity of flour, as twenty bushels of Egyptian wheat, and moreover is superiour in quality and whiteness.

In 1 Kings v. 11., we read that Solomon gave yearly to the king of Tyre twenty thousand measures of wheat.

*שערה* signifies *barley*. Two kinds of barley are found in the East, according to *Niebuhr*,‡ one very like to our barley, but superior in sweetness of taste ; the other is black, and is a suitable food for beasts of burden, yielding

\* *Histor. Natur.*, lib. xviii. cap. 10.

† In *Heirobot.* Tom. II. p. 114. *Thomson's Reisebeschreibung*, p. 19.

‡ In seiner *Beschreibung von Arabien*, p. 157.



fifty fold. An hundred fold is promised to Jacob,\* and the Greek and Latin writers speak of crops still more productive. The region about Babylon, especially, is spoken of by *Herodotus*, as far the best for grain. For it is so fertile as to produce sometimes two hundred fold, and in the very best parts it has yielded even three hundred fold.

נִסְמָן is generally considered as an adjective belonging to שְׁעֵרָה, and is translated *appointed barley*, which ought to be translated *the best*. Then it is derived from סָמַן, which, among the Chaldees and Rabbins, signifies *he hath marked*; whence סִמָּן *a mark*, in the place of which the Bible employs אֹת. Which explication I think entirely false; for סָמַן appears plainly to arise from the Greek word σήμειον and to have been received by the Rabbins and inserted in their language, whence it is a new word. For Alexander making an expedition into the East, and reducing it under his dominion, many Greek words were adopted by the Orientals, of which number this is one. But these are by no means suitable words by which to explain the Scriptures. Other interpreters translate it *rich barley*, deriving the word from שָׂמַן, which in the Arabic signifies *to be rich*; but that this is contrary to the analogy of all those languages, every scholar who is moderately acquainted with them will see: for in the Hebrew, according to the rule already given, it ought to be *Shin*: moreover from this application a gross grammatical error arises, for שְׁעֵרָה is of this feminine gender, but נִסְמָן of the masculine, which none of these interpreters have observed. But that the word is a substantive, and that some plant is intended by it I have but little doubt, although no plant of this name can be found in *Celsius*. The *Seventy*, the *Vulgate*, *Aquila* and *Theodotion* translate it by the word *millet*. But then I think it should be read נִסְמָר, and this I take to be the true reading,

\* Gen. xxvi. 13. Conf. *Landii* Jüdische Heiligthümer iv. 35.

from the root סמר, which signifies *to be rough*: so it is explained by *Castell* in his *Lexicon*, and it has the same signification in the Armenian language. From the millet, according to *Columella* and *Pliny*, a very sweet bread is made, which, whilst warm, is very pleasant.\* The Indian millet introduced into Italy in the time of Nero, was of a black colour, the grain was large, and the stock resembling that of a reed. It grows seven feet high, and has a very large stock; its productiveness surpasses that of all other kinds of corn, a single grain producing four or five pints. At the present time it is cultivated every where amongst us in the gardens as a curiosity; its grain is black and of the size of a pea; its straw resembles a reed; it grows five feet high and is called *the Saracen corn*. There are four kinds of the Indian millet; one kind produces yellow grains, another purple, and some is of a whitish colour. There is also a diversity in the ears; some have white, some purple and some yellow flowers, according as the grains are coloured. With respect to their shape there is no difference. The Ethiopians have no other corn but millet and barley. The Campanians make great use of millet. The Salmatians live chiefly on food of which millet is an ingredient, together with raw flesh, and mare's milk or the blood taken from the veins of the leg. The use of the millet for food is very common amongst the Germans, and many of the poor live on it almost entirely, according to *Rivius*.† כסמת in this place, the *Vulgate* translates *Vetch*, which *Luther* follows, though improperly. But others, the *Seventy*, the *Chaldee* and the *Syriac* versions rightly render it—Gr. ζεα; Lat. *Spelta*; Germ. *Speltz* s. *Dinkel*. It is a kind of grain, very like to wheat, and superior to it in taste. It does not grow every-

\* Conf. *Galenum* de aliment. facultat., lib. i. cap. 15. p. 322.

† *Rivii* notae in *Dioscoridem* lib. cap. 89. On the Indian millet of great size vide *Philostratum* de vita Apollonii lib. iii. cap. 2. page 111.

where, and is found in our country, but it is peculiar to Egypt, Palestine, Cilicia, Asia and Greece. *Herodotus*\* says, many live on corn and barley, but in Egypt it is not esteemed respectable to live on them, they use a kind of food made of what they call *Zea*. *Zea* is of two kinds, according to *Dioscorides*,† one simple, the other bears two grains in a double shell, and on that account is called *dicocci*. It has more nourishment than barley: in making bread it is not so light as wheat. The *siligo*, (a kind of corn) and *oats* are not found in Palestine, although many are of a contrary opinion. As to the *siligo*, I think Palestine is by no means its natural soil: for I do not discover that it was in the eastern countries, and all travellers visiting that land are silent about it. In the *Talmud*, indeed, I have found some places which make mention of it, by which many translators have been led into an error, being evidently ignorant of the natural productions of Palestine, and thinking that all kinds of corn which our land produces, grow there also. The places of Sacred Scripture which the translators render *siligo*, are to be differently explained in my opinion, and the mention of it in the *Talmud*, results from the trifles and fables of the Rabbins. Neither can you find the *oats* in the East: in our country it is the common food of horses, but with them barley is used in its place. Consequently their beasts of burden are badly kept; for being without oats, and also without hay, at least at this day, they feed them on cut straw, mixed with a few grains of barley. When the year is particularly fruitful, they increase the quantity of barley, and also add vetches and beans to the cut straw.‡

\* *Histor. lib. ii. cap. 36.*

† *De medicinali materia, lib. ii. cap. 81. Conf. Celsii Hierobot. T. II. p. 48. Ursini Herbar. Bibl. lib. ii. cap. 3.*

‡ You can see more in *Shaw's Travels and Observations in several parts of the Levant*, page 123; and *Niebuhr's Beschreib. von Arabien*, p. 151. *Thevenot*, T. II. lib. i. c. 5. *Bocharti Hierozoicon. p. 1. lib. ii. c. 9. Maillet's description d'Egypte, Lettre ix. p. 8. 13.*



I have already said that *hay*. at least at the present day, is unknown in Palestine and also in the other Oriental countries, and I assert it from this ground, that all who have visited those regions at the present day, without an exception, have made no mention of hay. However I think hay was in use there in the early times, and this appears from reading Isa. xxxiii. 11, where I translate עֵשֶׂן *dry grass*, that is hay. The root is found in the Arabie where it signifies *to be dry*. Moreover in the same language עֵשֶׂן is opposed to עֵשֶׂן which signifies, *young grass growing*. That עֵשֶׂן in Isa. v. 24, signifies *dry grass*, appears evident, for green and fresh grass cannot take fire. I do not understand, that hay, which is generally kept by us in barns, and which is less exposed to fire, but rather the *hay lying in the field*, as is the custom in the East, which can easily take fire, both on account of the more ardent heat of the sun, and the imprudence of the inhabitants. Of which thing, there are not wanting examples. Therefore in this place, it is entirely an Oriental figure, and although none of the travellers make mention of hay, this by no means proves, as I think, that the ancient Hebrews were without the use of it. For the old Orientals far surpassed the modern in economy, and living more compactly than at this day, they were compelled to exert themselves more to find provision for their cattle.

---

§ X. *Not Egypt but Palestine, abounds in vines.*

If we compare the testimonies of ancient and modern authors, respecting the cultivation of the vine in Egypt, we will find that they differ: the former represent Egypt as abounding in vineyards, and the latter as having scarcely any. The representations of the Bible are between both. These contradictions, and the testimony of one part appear to be false: but they are not; each of them is most true,

if we only distinguish between the different ages of Egypt. In their early history, there appears to have been only a moderate cultivation of the vine in Egypt: but afterwards, under the successors of Alexander, very great attention was paid to it, which the Greek and Roman authors describe; finally under the Mohammedans, the vineyards were neglected and destroyed. However, vineyards are yet found in a very few places, and especially about Alexandria, and the region of *Fium*, where the *canal of Joseph* is, which makes the earth fertile. This canal is sometimes called the *river of Fium*, but generally the *canal of Joseph*: so it is called by *Paul Lucas*\* and *Sicardus*.† For every great and stupendous work in Egypt is attributed to Joseph,‡ who is said to have made this canal, and by it, to have rendered the region of Fium fertile;§ but this is incredible. The Mareotic wine is praised by Strabo.|| The lake Mareotis situated in Egypt, is about one hundred stadia broad, and three hundred long: it contains eight islands, and the places in the vicinity are very populous, and they make great quantities of wine. Horace¶ extols the Mareotic wine, as second only to that of Cæcubum,

\* In a voyage made 1714, through Turkey, &c. T. II. p. 205. T. III. p. 53. Examine the annexed table, where this canal is represented. Vid. Ps. lxxviii. 47. Gen. xl. 9. 10. Num. xx. 5.

† *Memoires des Missions*, Tom. II. page 261. The canal of Joseph made from Saon to Fium, cut through a mountain, communicates immediately with the Nile, by a bridge or cataract, and flows through the middle of Fium. Conf. *Abulfeda* in *descriptione Egypti* p. 10, where he says, the river of Fium commences (from the Nile,) at Daruth Darban, and flows northwardly towards Bahanesa, thence to a place called Sohon; afterwards it turns to the west, and enters Fium. The country of Fium has always been the most fertile part of Egypt. *Strabo* lib. xvii. *Plinii* Hist. Nat. lib. xviii. c. 15. *Maillet's* Description of Egypt, page 293, &c. *Wansleben's* voyage in Egypt, p. 245—255.

‡ *Maillet*, p. 211, 212.

§ *Golii* Not. in *Alfragan*, p. 175. *Kircheri* *Oedipus Ægypt.* T. I. p. 8.

|| *Geog.* lib. xvii. p. 799, Edit. Paris.

¶ *Lib. i. Od.* 37. There is a particular species of the wine of Marcotis, whence *Virgil*, *Georg.* lib. i, says, *Sunt Thasiae vites, sunt et Mareotides albæ.*

Mentemque lymphatam Marcotico  
Redigit in veros timores.

However, almost the whole of Egypt is very unfavourable for the cultivation of the vine, for it is destitute of hills, which the vine requires,\* for in a plain, grapes cannot come to maturity; especially as at the favourable season for them, the land is overflowed by the Nile. *Maillet*† says, that vines are sometimes seen on the walls of houses, which afford an excellent wine: but this by no means proves that Egypt abounds in wine. *Herodotus*‡ describing the scarcity of wine in Egypt, says, that wine is carried into Egypt twice a year, from different parts of Greece and Phenicia. In which thing many have attempted to refute him, but to these *Michaelis*§ answers, that the commerce which *Herodotus* mentions, the priests attempted to stop, as being very pernicious to Egypt, for they prohibited the use of wine, saying that Osiris had invented it: and they themselves abstained from it very strictly.

However they made use of wine at their feasts, and offered it, according to *Hecataeus* not as a thing in itself agreeable to the gods, but to expose the blood of those who had fought against the gods, and thence they thought to conciliate the deities to themselves; for the Egyptians thought that the vine had sprung from the blood of the giants poured on the earth, and hence fury and madness belonged to wine. But this prohibition, thought it was intended to be universal, yet was exercised with some limitation: for to gratify their kings and wealthy men, a dis-

\* —————Apertos  
Bacchus amat colles.

*Virgilia* Georg. lib. ii. 109.

† Description de l'Égypte, Tom. II. p. 17.

‡ Hist. lib. iii. cap. 6. Conf. *Expedition totius mundi*, vol. III. p. 5. Ep. Edit. *Hodsoni*, where it is said, Ascalon and Gaza send their best wine to Egypt and Syria. Vid. *Dapper's Besch. von Afrika*, p. 117.

§ Im Mosaischen Rechte, Tom. IV.



inction was made between wine, and the juice of the grape which they were allowed to drink; and which permission gave them no ordinary consolation and joy.\* From these things it will appear evident that Egypt is not to be called a vine bearing country: but that Palestine abounds in wine, we will now attempt to show. There are many vineyards in Palestine, and there would have been more, had not the use of wine been entirely prohibited by the law of *Mohamed*,† to the Saracens or Turks: for they holding that land under their subjection, tear up and destroy the vineyards wherever they find them. There are, however, some Saracens living near to the Christians, who cultivate vineyards and sell to them birds and wine. Moreover the Turks often violate their law and indulge themselves with the sweet gifts of Bacchus.‡ The wine of the Holy Land is very rich and sweet as all the travellers state, and particularly that of Bethlehem in the valley Rephaim, and as far as Nehel-Eschol, where the spies sent by Moses received the vine and grapes which they brought to the camp.§ About Sidon and Anterodus and Marhadus, and likewise Mount Lebanon, good wine is made.|| The trunks of the vines are there very thick and they send out their branches to a great distance, the inhabitants knowing well how to cultivate them: for they plant them so far a part that a carriage can easily pass be-

\* Conf. Gen. xl. The Indians have a law, that if a woman shall kill a king intoxicated, her reward shall be marriage to his successor; but his sons shall succeed.

† Which you may find in many places of the Koran, especially in Sura II and V. 92; XVI. 69.

‡ Conf. *d'Arvieux* Memoirs, which Labat edited 1735; Tom. I. p. 62. *Thevenot* T. I. lib. i. c. 24. *Smith* de moribus et institutis Turcarum, Epist. II. p. 28. *Busbeckii* Hist. Constantinopol. Epist. I. Conf. *Hasselquist's* Reise, p. 203. *Beausobre* says the same thing of the Manacheans in his history of them, Tom. II. pag. 774, &c. Conf. *Niebuhr's* Besch. von Arabien, p. 144.

§ Num. xiii. 23.

|| *Niebuhr's* Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien, T. II. p. 451. *Troilo's* Reisebeschreibung, p. 69. *Roger's* Terre Saint, p. 479.

tween them. It is not wonderful therefore that the grapes are so large and the wine so generous; nor is it to be wondered at, that in some countries the wine is so weak, seeing the inhabitants plant their vines so near to each other, that they scarcely admit the intervention of the foot of the cultivator. The manner of cultivating the vine in Antaradus is worthy of remark. For there the same wine produces grapes three times a year and they all mature in the ordinary time in this manner. The vine-dressers when they prune the vines leave as many branches of the preceding year as they deem necessary. Then after they begin to produce new branches and young clusters of grapes, they cut off the part of the branch that is above the clusters and cast it away. This is done in March. In April the branch that was cut above the clusters buds, and produces another branch with new clusters, which being seen, the part above the grapes is again cut off. In May the branch buds again and produces another, with new clusters, and thus there are three orders of grapes which ripen in the same manner. Those that appeared in March are gathered in August: those in April are gathered in September: those in May are gathered in October. But if the branches are not pruned in that order, it will not take place. Whence in Palestine, from the feast of Pentecost until St. Martin's day, ripe grapes are continually to be found in the market.\* Indeed, it is astonishing that, Palestine even in this day surpasses all the neighbouring regions in the best wines, after having suffered so much injury from the Turks, the enemies of wine. Its wines are said to be quite equal in flavour to those of Italy: and especially those of *Hebron* are extolled in the highest praises by *Hasselquist*,† comparing them with the gene-

\* Conf. *Shaw's Travels*, p. 142. *Joseph. de bello Jud.* lib. iii. cap. 10. sect. 8.

† Im. 12ten Briefe an den H. Ritter *Linne*, von Smirna, aus den 13 Septem. 1751. Conf. *Athenæi Dipnos.* lib. i. cap. 15, pag. 29. *Michaelis or. Bib. T.* IV. p. 118. &c.

rous wines of Germany, which grow about the Rhine. But it cannot be denied that some vines were brought from Palestine to Europe and planted near the Rhine. *Scheidt* found near *Emaus* an abundance of vines, and *Niebuhr*,\* found near mount *Sinai* remarkably fine ones. The Sacred Scripture† certifies that the country about Gaza produces wine: and at this day the wine of that place is spoken of by travellers.‡ *Shultz*§ declares that grapes are found in Palestine of ten or twelve pounds weight.

In the Sacred Scriptures the word תִּירוֹשׁ often occurs, and it is generally translated *new wine*, from which however it by no means follows, that the ancients drank new wine to a great extent: the Hebrew word can justly be translated *new wine*, but it also frequently means simply *wine*. For it is derived from the root יָרַשׁ, which signifies *to employ*, whence תִּירוֹשׁ, *drink, easily employing a man*. From many parts of the Bible|| it appears that this drink was in as great demand amongst the Orientals as amongst the Greeks and Romans. Mention is made of a *sweet wine*, which is called γλευκος, in the New Testament.¶ It is uncertain, and a doubt may arise whether this is to be referred to *new wine* or to *wine* simply. One thing is certain, that it cannot refer to those wines which we call sweet. *Pliny*\*\* mentions fourteen kinds of sweet wine: the middle one of these, he says, is what the Greeks call *Aigleuces*, that is new or sweet wine. That wine is

\* Beschreib. von Arab. p. 401.

† Num. xiii. 23, 24. Jud. xiv. 5.

‡ Conf. *Relandi* Palestina, pag. 589, et 792. Exposit. totius mundi, Vol. III. p. 5. ex edit. Hudsoni. *Sidon. Appollin.* Carm. XVII. ad Ommatium, *Cassiodor.* lib. xii. Epist. 12.

§ Leitungen des Höchsten nach seinem Rath auf den Reisen durch Europa, Asia und Afrika, T. V. pag. 135, 285. Conf. *Arvieux*, T. II. p. 203. *Pliniv* Hist. Nat. lib. xiv. c. 1. *Strabo*, lib. ii.

|| Gen. xxvii. 28. Jud. ix. 13. Jer. xxiv. 7. lxx. 8.

¶ Acts ii. 13.

\*\* Hist. Nat. lib. xiv. cap. 9.

made with care, since they prevent it from fermenting. For they immerse the casks in water immediately from the wine vat, until the cold is passed. From this, as I suppose, a certain kind of wine is produced, which they call *γλευκος* : although I hesitate somewhat between two explanations. For *γλευκος* can imply *must*; and that this is much sweeter than the wine made of it, none will deny. Whence also the Syrians use the word *must* for *sweetness*. But whether *must* is to be found at the feast of Pentecost, may seem doubtful to some. But *Pliny* destroys that difficulty, affirming that the *must* was preserved in casks. And *Columella*\* has described a method by which *must* may be kept as sweet as if it was fresh. Before the husks of the grapes are pressed, remove the *must* as soon as possible from the vat, and put it in a new cask ; then make the cask perfectly tight by daubing it with pitch, so that no water can enter, and immerse the cask in cold and fresh water, so that no part of it shall be left out of the water : then, after forty days remove it from the water, and the *must* will remain sweet for a whole year. It is in a manner somewhat similar that the noble wine of Campania is preserved and kept from fermenting. But the word *γλευκος* may mean the *flower* or *essence* of wine, that is, wine made by picking out only the best grapes. Which opinion has not been advanced by any of the interpreters, although *Welstein* has treated largely on this subject. This is the way in which the *essence of Tokay*, the best wine of Hungary is made, and it appears not improbable to me, that a wine of a similar kind is here intended.

\* De re rustica, lib. xii. cap. 29.



§ XI. *Egypt is destitute of oil, but Palestine abounds in it.*

According to *Strabo*\* the greatest part of Egypt has no olive yards, the province of Heraclea alone excepted, which as it surpasses the other parts in other respects, so also produces olives to perfection, and very fruitful trees; and if any one would make the oil carefully, it would be very superior, but as they are very negligent in the manner of making it, it has a very disagreeable smell. But the rest of Egypt has no olives, except the gardens in the vicinity of Alexandria. *Niebuhr*† has described the instrument for making oil, but has not stated the place where he found it. If he did not find it in Alexandria, perhaps more labour and attention is paid, at this day, to the cultivation of the olive than was the case in the time of *Strabo*. But Palestine surpasses other countries in the abundance of its olives: whence *Ezechiel*‡ the Prophet says, “Judah and the land of Israel were thy merchants: They traded in thy market (Tyre) wheat of Minnith and Pannag, and honey and oil and balm.” Solomon also is said, (1 Kings v. 11,) to have sent annually to the king of Tyre, twenty measures of pure oil. *Husselquist* has given us the best description of its excellence, affirming that in no region has the oil a sweeter taste than in Palestine, and that it is far preferable to that of the *Province*. *Bellonius* says that a few olives are found in Lemnos, and that they grow in gardens of Crete, but that those of Syria and the land of Jerusalem surpass in richness. In the sacred monu-

\* De rebus Geographicis, lib. xvii. p. 809. Edit. Paris. Conf. *Michaelis*’ Mosaisches Recht, T. IV. p. 90.

† Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien, T. I. p. 151.

‡ Cap. xxvii. 17. Conf. Deut. vii. 13; xxxiii. 13; xxxiii. 24; Ps. xlv. 9; Hos. ii. 22. Conf. Talmud. in cod. Menachot cap. viii. 3. *Bocharti* Hieroz. p. 2, lib. iv. cap. 12. *Bellonii* Observat. lib. ii. c. 87. *Sharo’s* Travels, p. 337, 339. *Roger’s* Terre Saint. lib. i. c. 9. *Relandi* Palestina, p. 360, 381.

ments of Hebrew antiquity oil was held as a sign of forgiveness and mercy. Fertility also is denoted by the symbol of the olive tree. That it was the sign of fatness and fertility you may see from Jud. ix.; for when it was invited by the barren trees to govern, it answered that it was unwilling to leave its fatness, “wherewith by me they honour God and man.” By *Horace*\* the olive is selected as the richest tree. Formerly the olive was the index and symbol of the sad and of those seeking pardon and peace: as those asking pardon carried the olive in their hands. According to *Demosthenes*, the Athenians used to supplicate against *Timocrates*, in sordid clothing and carrying the olive. When *Artaxerxes Ocho* was besieging *Sidon*, as *Diodorus Siculus* says in the life of Philip, five hundred of the nobles of the city went out to meet Artaxerxes, carrying olive branches and begging for peace. *Apuleus* says, that women who have become widows by murder, carry olive branches in order to excite the commiseration of the judges. When the Romans carried on a war with *Perseus* king of Macedonia, ambassadors with long hair and beards, and carrying olive branches, came to the Roman senate to beg for mercy: this *Livy* states. In marriage feasts and celebrations oil was used to anoint the bridegroom; according to the Oriental custom† he had some of his friends and companions with him, who were partakers of the unction, though not so largely as he. From the testimony of those who have visited the Eastern countries in our days, it appears that this custom has been abolished and perfuming introduced in its place. The Egyptian priests used to abstain from oil according to *Chaeremon* the stoic, in *Porphyry*.‡ Many of them did not use it at all, and those who did, used it very sparingly with their herbs. The olive, then, was not cultivated in

\* Lib. ii. Od. II. Conf. *Pierii Valeriani Hieroglyphica*, lib. 53.

† Confer. Jud. xiv. 11, 20. Ps. xlv. 9.

‡ De abstinentia, lib. iv. sect. 6.

Egypt and the land was not suitable for it, a very small part only, the tract of Heraclea excepted, and even this was but little used for that purpose. But Palestine abounds in olives. *Schulz*\* says, that he found many olive yards in the vicinity of Jericho; whence Moses gave different precepts to the Israelites that they should use oil in their food, and he prohibited the use of the fat of kidneys, so that being more and more accustomed to oil, they might cultivate it with more industry, and never have a desire to remove into a region that did not produce oil.† This was an excellent method, to keep the Israelites from emigrating.

---

§ XII. *They had butter in Egypt, but not in Palestine.*

Butter appears to have been much used in Egypt, but not at all in Palestine; it was also scarcely known to the Greeks and Romans; thus *Pliny*‡ says, of milk is made butter, an excellent food of the barbarous nations, and which distinguishes the rich from the common people. It is generally made from the milk of the cow (e bubulo) and thence the Latin name; but the richest is from the milk of the ewe. Of the Lusitanians *Strabo* says, they use butter instead of oil. My denial of the use of butter in Palestine will excite astonishment, since so many great men have strenuously affirmed it; and if we compare the old and recent interpreters of the Sacred Scriptures we find the word butter in their translations, although in the original text I contend there is no mention of the word. The Israelites had no need of it, possessing

\* Leitungen des Höchsten auf seinen Reisen, &c. T. V.

† Conf. *Ill. Michaelis* Comment. de legibus Moses Palestinam Israelitis earam futuris, sect. 5, 7. Mosaisches Recht. T. IV. p. 90.

‡ Hist. Nat. lib. xxviii. cap. 9. *Dioscorides* lib. xi. cap. 81.



as they did the most excellent oil, whence our Jews, butter being forbidden in the law of Moses, use goose's fat. The word **חֵמֶת** very often occurs in the Sacred Scriptures, which is generally translated *butter*. But on what foundation does this interpretation depend? What is the philological reason? I suppose they have been led by some prejudice to fix that signification to this word. If we make that the signification, the sense of some places in scripture will be rendered truly ridiculous and disgusting. It rather means in particular *curdled milk*, and in general *any milk*. Which signification suits well all the places where the word is found. The root in the Arabic is **حَمَت**, which signifies *milk was thick and hard*. In Jud. v. 25, it is said, that Joel gave to Sissera drink of **חֵמֶת**, not of *butter*, but of *milk*. In Job xx. 17, is an Oriental description of Palestine, in these words: he shall not see the rivers, the floods, the brooks of honey, **חֵמֶת** and *milk*. And so the Arabic and Syriac versions render it. In Job xxix. 6, there is mention of washing the feet **בְּחֵמֶת** with milk. In this place **חֵמֶת** is put for **חֵמֶת** as all the translators allow, although they err in the translation, rendering it, *with butter*: this is ridiculous; for who would wash his feet in butter? This word occurs in Isa. vii. 15, the sense of which place is, he shall eat milk and honey, until he shall know to refuse evil and choose good. So the Syriac translation: but the LXX and the Vulgate, and from that Luther and others translate it *butter*. For the LXX living in Egypt always had butter in their minds, as that region abounded in it. From these places it will appear manifest, that **חֵמֶת** means not *butter* but *milk*. Also milk appears to have been the usual drink amongst the ancients; whence many nations are called by the Greeks *γαλακτοποται* that is drinkers of milk, in the number of which were the Ethiopians especially: also *Cotumella* gives this name to the Nomades and the Getæ;



*Galen*\* to the Scythians; and *Strabo* and *Pomponius Mela* to the Germans. *Jerome*† says, the Arabs use camel's milk. At this day the Tartars are very fond of that drink.

---

§ XIII. *The testimonies of Greek and Latin writers respecting Palestine; to which are added those of Travellers.*

The enemies of religion inflamed with ardent desires to fix on the character of Moses the charge of the basest falsehood, because he has described Palestine as very fertile, bring forth Greek and Latin authors, and cite many places from them to prove its sterility; but almost all these places speak only of the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, which is called unfruitful, and to their testimony that of *Maunderell* and *Kort* are added. The latter calls Palestine an ill-fated region, that suffers for want of water; and why? He saw two rivers that were dried up within twenty feet of their origin. But in this thing *Kort* is by no means a competent judge, for he is a native of Holsatia; and moreover a general opinion is not to be formed from one observation, for a river may be dry one year and this may seldom or never occur again. Also, if the rivers of Palestine are easily and suddenly dried, that may not be owing to the land, but to the cultivation. But no one will deny that the condition of Palestine at this day is different from what it was in the time of Moses.

*Tacitus* and *Julius Cæsar* have written on Germany, and represented it as an unfruitful country, but no one in our age will think of using their testimony, and from it pronounce against the present productiveness of this country. But if we consider the condition and changes of Pa-

\* Lib. ii. ad Glauco. de curat. cap. 10.

† Lib. ii. in Ioyianum.

lestine, by how many eruptions of the Arabs and other nations it has been injured, who laboured to destroy everything in their way ; it will necessarily follow that, agriculture being neglected, the whole region must have suffered incalculable loss and calamity. If we take these things into the account, it will appear evident that Palestine has deteriorated ; but it is by no means so much changed as the adversaries of religion assert ; so that by the testimony of ancient and modern writers it is allowed to be favourable for cultivation. *Tacitus*\* says of Palestine, it has few showers, a rich soil, and produces sour fruits, and besides them balsam and dates. Thus that author speaks, from whom we find no mention of its barrenness, but rather praise of its fertility. I will allow that the neighbourhood of Jerusalem does not produce so great a supply of fruits as the rest of Palestine ; but I disagree with the opinions of those who pronounce it barren. *Maunderell* has asserted that the land about Sichem is unfruitful, but *Thomson* denies it, saying that the land about *Naplosa*, (so *Sichem*† is now called) is very fruitful ; its hills are finely cultivated, abounding with olive trees, citron trees, and other fruit trees, and watered with clear rivulets which descend from the mountains. *Strabo* is cited by all the adversaries as their favourite author, who is said to have described the whole of Palestine as barren. I will quote his words‡ : “Moses,” says he, “brought his people into those places where Jerusalem is now built : which country he easily obtained, as it was not an object of contention, not being worthy of it. For it is a stony place, abounding in water, but the country around is dry and barren, and

\* Lib. v. cap. 6.

† *Neapolis* in Samaria, Ptolem. lib. v. c. 16. *Sichem* it was called in the time of Christ according to *Benjamin* in Itiner. p. 38. By the inhabitants it was called *Mabortha* according to Josephus, lib. v. bell. Jud. cap. 4. Pliny calls it *Mamortha*. At this day it is called *Naplosa*.

‡ In rebus Geograph. lib. xvi. p. 761. edit. Paris.

for sixty stadia, it has a stony surface.” It will therefore strike every one that reads it, that the adversaries have been drawn into a great error : for he by no means speaks of the *whole of Palestine*, but of the *neighbourhood of Jerusalem* only : and in what part of the world is there a country that has not some barren spots, if we take even the most fertile parts ? It would be more to the purpose, says *John Toland*,\* if the commentators would cite the words of Strabo to the iii. chapter of Exodus, and not those fictitious writers *Aristeus*, *Hecateus*, and I know not what others who have exaggerated the fertility of Palestine. But what *Vitringa*† answered to *Phaletranus* who depended‡ on the authority of Strabo, that we also oppose to *Toland* : for what is brought from Strabo describing the region of Jerusalem as barren, rocky and dry, ought to be received with considerable allowance. For in the first place, if you should transfer it to the whole lot of the tribe of Judah, you would commit a gross blunder. Then if you should apply it to the whole region near Jerusalem on all sides, you would not have the truth. For although something may be wanting, yet it is not so as *Phaletranus* and others say from Strabo : but it is to be understood especially of the mountainous and sterile land, which above the Mount of Olives lies in a long tract eastwardly towards Jericho. Strabo applied that without sufficient cause, to the whole region, and that excellent author who excels in describing other parts of this land, has not used the greatest accuracy, as the learned have already discovered. It is moreover a very false argument to say, a country is stony and therefore it is unfruitful : I freely grant that land of that kind is little suited to agriculture, but it may be very good for vines. The Jebusites would

\* In libro de origine Jud. sect. ii. p. 139.

† Comment in Esaiam. Tom. I. p. 199.

‡ In dissertat. de oblatione sceptri Judaici, cap. 7.



have acted very foolishly in fixing their habitation there, if the testimony of Strabo was true. Allow me to bring forward the testimony of *Aristeus* about Judea. He says Jerusalem is well situated: the region is large and good, and some part of it consists of plain, as that towards Samaria, and also the parts contiguous to Idumea: but some parts are mountainous, where they need agriculture and perpetual care to produce fertility, and from this it happens that all parts are cultivated, and there is a great abundance throughout the whole country. A little farther on, he states, that there is there a great attention to agriculture; the region abounds in olives; it is fruitful in corn, pulse and vines, and it produces much honey. There are many fruit trees, but the palm trees especially are innumerable. There are also many flocks of various kinds, and plenty of provision for them. *Josephus*\* mentions some places from *Hecatæus*, in which the fertility of Palestine is praised. *Hecatæus Abderita*, a philosopher, and a man renowned for his exploits, who lived with king Alexander, and conversed with Ptolemy, son of Lagus, has made mention of the Jews, not merely by the way, but has written a book concerning them. This Hecatæus, says Josephus, has written an account of the extent of our country, and its excellence. They have, says Hecatæus three hundred thousand acres of land, generally of the very best and most fertile soil: for of so great extent is Judea.† *Shaw* also testifies that the greater part of Palestine is very fruitful.‡ Which fertility he makes to include fitness for cultivating the vine, and therefore, he says, the region of Je-

\* *Contra Apionem* lib. i. p. 596. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. xv. c. 5. *de bello Jud.* lib. iii. c. 2. et 12. *Ammianus Marcellinus* lib. xiv. c. 26. *Polybius* lib. v. c. 70. *Justinus* lib. xxxvi. c. 3.

† Many doubt whether Judea is of so great extent, but this is nothing to us; we want only his testimony respecting its fertility.

‡ *Travels and observations in several parts of the Levant*, p. 336. *Radziwiłł* *Peregrinat. Hierosol.* p. 47.



Jerusalem is by no means unfruitful. *Thomson*\* and *Maundrell* affirm that at this day there are to be found on the most barren rocks, marks by which it is evident that these rocks were formerly fruitful. There are on them the remains of walls, manifestly constructed to prevent the earth from washing away : from which it appears that these rocks formerly contained vines. The same custom still prevails in China and Switzerland. If the *Talmud* be examined, it will be found that the neighbourhood of Jerusalem was productive, and that one acre there was held in greater estimation than the same quantity in any other part of Palestine. Which thing is easily explained : the neighbourhood of Jerusalem was stony, and on this account not suitable for agriculture, but very favourable for olives and vines, from which greater profit was made. For *Cato*† says, of all kinds of lands, if you would buy an hundred acres to the best advantage, a vineyard is the most profitable ; in the second place, a moist garden ; in the third, a willow grove ; in the fourth, an olive yard ; in the fifth, a meadow ; in the sixth, a plain for corn ; in the seventh, a wood for cutting ; in the eighth, an orchard ; in the ninth, a wood for masts. Moreover, *Abulfeda*‡ living not far from Jerusalem and an eye witness, has given a minute description of Palestine and the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, which I consider as decisive on this subject. And ought not his testimony to have more weight than that of *Strabo* ? He did not see Palestine when it was in its most prosperous state, but long after, when wars had wasted it ; and yet he says, that Palestine is the most fertile region of all Syria, and that it has advantages of salubrity, because it is watered with rain, except only the

\* *Thomson's* Description of Palestine, p. 19. *Maundrell* p. 94. *Arriens* T. II. p. 204. *Bellonii* Observat. lib. ii. c. 81.

† De re rustica, cap. VI.

‡ In descriptione Syriæ, p. 10.

country of *Sichem*. He says, moreover, that Jerusalem has the richest soil of Palestine. So much for Abulfeda, who is the most credible witness, and by whom the testimony of Strabo and others is destroyed. The bountiful earth pours forth from its bosom its splendid gifts over Palestine, and that part that is mountainous is favourable for the cultivation of the vine, and is covered with trees and various fruits. It is naturally not very moist, but in most places rains descend in abundance. Its waters are sweet, and on account of the abundance of good grass, its flocks abound in milk more than elsewhere. *Josephus* says, since we possess a fertile country we attend to agriculture. But let us admit the objection of those who say, that the neighbourhood of Jerusalem is unfruitful; yet the proofs of the fertility of the other parts of Palestine are abundantly sufficient to vindicate the truth of the descriptions, contained in the Sacred Scriptures. As to the testimony of those who have travelled to this land, and affirm that it is barren and unfruitful, if we consider the doubts which arise from them, and their tendency to destroy our faith in the Sacred Scriptures, they appear to be fallacious: for Palestine, even in our days, is far from being sterile, according to *Thomson*.\* That the principal part of this land at the present lies uncultivated and desert, I freely grant, although that is by no means to be attributed to the poverty of the land, but rather to the fewness of the inhabitants and their neglect of agriculture. But if that region was well inhabited and the land cultivated, it would exhibit its former fertility, and would afford more luxuriant crops than the best parts of Syria: and even now, better wheat and other kinds of grain are nowhere found, than the land of Jerusalem produces: for *Saligniaco*† says, that he has not eaten any bread so sweet and delicate as in Jerusalem.

\* In itinerario suo, pag. 19.

† In itinerario terræ sanctæ, lib. ii. cap. 1.

*Bellonius*\* says, that the country of Jerusalem, and especially in the vicinity of the city is richly cultivated and contains very fine vineyards. Apples, almonds, figs and olives, producing much oil, grow there. We see every where from the travellers in Palestine,† that notwithstanding the desolation of that country, the fertility of the land of Bethlehem is still very great. *Pliny* says, that the land of Damascus, which drinks in the river Chrysorrhoea is very fertile, and *Strabo* and *Bellonius* testify the same thing.‡ From these arguments and testimonies, I think, it evidently appears, that Palestine has been fertile, and that in our own age the soil is productive.

\* *Observat. lib. ii. cap. 93. Sandy's Travels, Book III. p. 120. Thevenot, T. I. lib. ii. p. 245. Myricke's Reise nach Jerusalem p. 97.*

† *Conf. Cotovici Itinerar. lib. ii. cap. 8. Doubdan Voyage de la Terre S. cap. 16. Savari de Breves Voyages, p. 171. Groebenii Itin. Orient. cap. 27. Rauwolf's Morgenländische Reise, T. III. cap. 22. Breuningii Itiner. lib. iii. cap. 18. Reisebuch des heiligen Landes, pag. 718, 842. Bisselii Topothes. Palest. p. 49. Andrichomii Theatrum Terræ Sanctæ, pag. 41. Ockely's Geschichte der Sarazenen, p. 279.*

‡ *Plinii Hist. Nat. lib. v. cap. 18. Strabo de Rebus Geog. lib. xvi. Bellonii Observat. lib. ii. cap. 91.*

---

[To be concluded in the next Number.]

STAEUDLIN'S GESCHICHTE DER THEOLOGISCHEN WISSENSCHAFTEN is designed to exhibit the state and progress of theological knowledge, from the revival of literature to the present time.\* Its author, the Professor of theology at *Goettingen*, has divided the work into three periods—from the year 1450 to the Reformation; from the Reformation to the commencement of the 18th century; from the beginning of the 18th century to the present time. This history is given under different heads—as, Theological knowledge generally; Hermeneutics; Systematic theology; Church history; &c. &c.

The portion here translated, is from the first head, of the third period, in which the writer, before entering upon the details of his history, presents us with an exhibition of the causes which led to the great revolution in theological opinion, which occurred during the 18th century. To this succeeds an account of the most important works of this period, intended to prescribe the manner and course of theological education, &c. The reader will find the greater part of this interesting account in the following article. As there are few subjects on which information is more generally desired, than the state of theological opinion and learning on the continent, during the last fifty or hundred years, it is probable that the translation of *Staeudlin*, may be continued in some of the future numbers of the REPERTORY.

\* The Preface of the first Volume is dated, May 1810.



---

EXTRACT FROM

**STAEUDLIN'S GESCHICHTE**

DER

**Theologischen Wissenschaften.**

---



# History

OF

## THEOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE & LITERATURE,

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT TIME.

---

DURING this period a great revolution in all departments of theological learning was gradually effected. Like all other revolutions, it was long preparing and its seeds were scattered during the previous period, although that period exhibited so remarkable a contrast with the present. This change owed its origin to various causes, and is capable of being viewed in a variety of aspects. Its principal cause, was the deism which arose in the 17th century in England ; and its principal aspect, is that of a species of deism, which gradually pervaded all departments of theology. It is easy to find many other causes and aspects, of this great literary revolution. Some may even produce many appearances, seemingly inconsistent with the representation just given ; they may appeal to the fact, that deism was zealously and powerfully opposed, and that many theologians set themselves with all their strength against the design of making it prevalent, and of reducing Christianity to its level ; and yet it may have been the main tendency and principal effect of the literary labours of these theologians to render the deism they opposed still more prevalent.

Most of the English deists, attacked only the divine

origin, credibility, and the authenticity of the Sacred Scriptures; the contents of the Sacred Volume were but in part assailed, as the accounts of miracles and the system of ecclesiastical theology; but the character and the doctrines of Jesus himself, were spared. The latter they generally represented as a pure and popular system of deism, suited to the people of the age. Most theologians opposed themselves to these writers, endeavouring to save what the deists had rejected as unnecessary and unfounded, and to uphold Revelation and not reason, as the standard of religion. Yet many theologians soon appeared in England, who, in many points nearly agreed with the deists. It is true, they did not abandon the authority, genuineness and credibility of the Sacred Volume, and the preceptive and historical parts of Christianity; but they purged the ecclesiastical system from every thing, which appeared to them inconsistent with reason, and produced systems of Christian theology which were pervaded by this liberal spirit. The constantly increasing power and fame of the British nation, in the eighteenth century, spread its literature over all Europe. The writings of its deists and its theologians, who were termed latitudinarians, were read especially in Germany with zeal and attention, and have, in connection with other causes, produced that great revolution in theology and religious opinion, which has proved more thorough and general in this country, and has proceeded further than in Britain itself, and which has hence spread its effects into other lands. This great change first appeared in the German protestant churches, whence it was extended to the German catholics.

The reign of Frederick II. had great influence upon the state of theology and religion, and the greater on account of the splendour of his exploits; for the more he was admired as a king, hero and sage, the more were other monarchs disposed to imitate him. He gave the press, in his dominions, unrestrained freedom, and was rejoiced



when he saw Christianity, (which he had hated from his youth,) attacked. He entertained a decided contempt for Christianity, theology, the church and the clergy. He surrounded himself with French philosophers, who were acknowledged as the enemies of all positive religion, as sceptics, materialists, and atheists; he scarcely preserved himself from their extremes, though he would sometimes support simple deism in opposition to his courtiers. Since this period the freedom of the press has been extended to other states of Europe, and most of the enlightened theologians (so called) in and out of his states, declared themselves more or less openly in favour of deism, and exerted themselves in various ways, to represent Christianity as nothing more than a system of natural religion. They regarded this as the only way in which it could be saved or preserved in honour.

The propagation of deism, and its introduction into theology had still other causes. The various departments of natural philosophy, were more cultivated and enriched, they were held in higher esteem and applied more practically to the affairs of life. Miracles were referred to the laws and the powers of nature, and where these could not be discovered, they were still supposed to exist. Hence the desire arose, not to allow any miracles in the strict sense of the term, (no supernatural events,) even in religion; a desire either to explain the miracles of the Bible as natural occurrences, or reject them as fabulous narrations, and to give currency to a merely natural religion, and to represent Christianity as entirely independent of any thing supernatural.

The constantly extending and more accurate knowledge of the history of religions, had also a great influence in producing this change. The history and nature of ancient religions, mythology, and religious rites, were investigated with more critical skill, with more philological and historical learning, and with more of a philosophical spirit.

The many journeys, missions, voyages and wars, in distant parts of the world, brought men acquainted with the state of religion, and brought many new systems to light. Men compared these religions with each other, and with Judaism and Christianity. They found in other religions many representations, many ideas, facts, and customs, analogous to those in the Jewish and Christian systems, without being able to prove, nor even having ground to suppose, that they had been introduced from the latter into the former. They were hence led to suppose, that what had in other religions no immediately divine origin, could boast of no such origin in Christianity: and that what was found in so many other systems could give no distinctive character to the Christian. And to these points of resemblance belonged some of those very doctrines which had been regarded as the holiest and most characteristic in the Christian system. They were thus led to regard as of less importance the peculiarities of Christianity, and to endeavour to raise it to a pure system of natural religion; and whatever from this source was contained in Christianity, and had not found its way into other religions, they considered as its most important part, and in fact as the essence of the religion.

The influence of philosophy upon theology, deserves also particular attention. In the beginning of the 18th century, the philosophy of LOCKE had spread extensively both within and without Great Britain, and had gained complete ascendancy. It denied entirely all inborn knowledge and innate ideas; it taught that all our knowledge, without exception, was derived from sensation or reflection, and consequently that all our ideas were images of objects presented to us by our internal or external senses. It was in this way that *Locke* deduced our ideas of God and morality, and gave himself much trouble to shew that they were in no way born with us, nor unfolded themselves from the mind itself. This philosophy was more favoura-

ble to *Rationalism*, than to the opposite system. It represented all knowledge, faith and volition as arising from sensible things. It thus led to scepticism, by its dependence on the uncertainty, versatility and inconstancy of experience. Although its author adhered to the Christian faith, and was correct in his morals, yet his philosophy promoted infidelity and looseness of principle, both in religion and morality. Setting all this aside, it was not easy to find from *Locke's* system a passage to Christianity as a supernatural revelation, and containing mysteries above reason and nature. This system, founded so entirely upon sensation and experience, excluded from Christianity every thing which may be termed *spiritual*, as founded upon the mind itself, and which was the ground work of *supernatural* theories. *Locke* also, in another of his works, represented Christianity as so rational and simple, that we may without any impropriety assert that it had a manifest tendency to deism. His philosophy found many friends and defenders, especially in France, who applied the principles deducible from it to the injury of all positive religion, and even to the support of materialism and atheism. *BAYLE*, a cotemporary of *Locke* is not to be considered as belonging to this class; his literary character is that of a sceptic, who attacked and weakened all systems of philosophy and theology, and was constantly opposing the one to the other. France had produced little fruit of pure deism; it had either kept philosophy entirely distinct from religion and theology, or it had used it to undermine them both; but it influenced in this way many philosophers in England and Germany, to defend, purify, and more firmly to establish the deistical system.

*WILH. LEIBNITZ* appeared in opposition to the philosophy of *Locke* and the sceptical doubts and raillery of *Bayle*. He admitted, properly speaking, no impression from external objects, not even of our own bodies upon the mind, but supposed that all perceptions and ideas arose from the



inward principle of the soul itself. He shewed especially, that universal and essential first principles did not arise from experience, but were an a priori knowledge. The idea and the existence of God he deduced a priori. His whole system was a firmer foundation for religion than that of *Locke*. In opposition to *Bayle* he endeavoured to exhibit the consistency between the evil which is in the world and divine providence, between faith and reason. In this latter investigation he effected a union between his philosophy and Christian theology, and placed weapons in the hands of theologians against *Rationalism*. He started with the principle, that the two classes of truths, those revealed by God, and those taught by reason, could not contradict each other. He moreover divided the truths taught by reason into two classes, those which were necessarily true, and whose opposites were absolutely impossible; and those which are only hypothetically true or necessary, or whose necessity depends merely upon the order of nature which God has chosen, and which he may at any time alter. With respect to the first class, he maintained that no truth really revealed can contradict them; but with regard to the others, that they might be repealed, and were actually repealed by miracles, which removed the condition upon which they were truths. In this view he admitted an opposition between philosophical and revealed truth. It was not an opposition of reason considered absolutely, and revelation; but an opposition between what was only conditionally true and a revelation which removed the condition. Faith was here not opposed to reason, but was itself most reasonable; it was a faith in the exceptions and changes which God himself had made in the course of nature, and therefore a faith perfectly consistent with reason. *Leibnitz* thus taught that there was, properly speaking, no real opposition between reason and faith, between philosophy and revelation. He further maintained that it was true philosophy, and truly reasonable, to



believe what God had revealed, even when it stood opposed to our limited understandings and imperfect knowledge. The divinely revealed mysteries of the gospel, he regarded as truths which the human mind could not of itself discover, nor establish, and consequently could not comprehend; but yet could explain and defend, since they did not contradict reason, but were perfectly consistent with it. This he undertook to prove as it regarded the several Christian mysteries. Thus he opposed *Naturalism*, and his principles were soon embraced by many theologians to defend their theological systems, and to set them off in a philosophical attire. These principles received a more systematic finish, and a wider circulation through CHR. WOLF. He wrote a system of natural theology, in which he expressly opposed the errors of deism and naturalism, and presented a systematic theory of a supernatural revelation; wherein he endeavoured to exhibit and prove the possibility of such a revelation, its contents and criteria, and the condition upon which it could be intelligently believed. A party of Leibnitzian-Wolfian philosophers soon arose, principally in Germany, and among protestants, but not confined to them, as the influence of this philosophy was visible in other countries, and among the catholics, in the aspect and treatment of theological subjects. As *Wolf* himself became a martyr to his philosophy, and as the theologians of Halle, who were followers of *Spener*, and their numerous party, opposed themselves to the followers of *Wolf*, the zeal of the latter, as might be expected, was the more excited and carried to an extreme. They not only maintained the utility of their philosophy in theology, but they produced a complete system both of doctrines and of morals founded upon its principles. Its influence was even felt in pastoral theology, in sermons and catechetical exercises. Notwithstanding this philosophy had embraced the cause of revelation, it promoted in many a disposition for the opposite system. *Wolf* had laid more stress upon

reason, in the things of religion, than was favourable for its subsequent and durable defence; and he incurred the suspicion of being only in appearance its advocate, while some of the principles of his philosophy were in direct opposition to some of the essential principles of Christianity. He had not been able to prove, that in any case we can with perfect certainty satisfy ourselves of the supernatural origin of a revelation. Subsequently some of his best disciples and followers became open deists. It was through the influence of his philosophy that more systematic connexion, precision, perspicuity, and a more philosophical use of words, especially in German, were introduced into theology, and the Aristotelian scholastic philosophy discarded.

The most distinguished opposer of this system was CRUSSIUS, who opposed to it a system of philosophy, the perfect harmony of which, with the orthodox Lutheran theology, and Biblical morality, he endeavoured to exhibit. This system is unquestionably the production of a philosophical mind, but appears in itself little suited to answer the purpose of an orthodox faith, it was adopted by numerous and zealous advocates, especially among theologians; but as it maintained its standing only for a short time, as it produced no effect beyond the limits of Germany, and as the Wolfian philosophy still preserved the ascendancy, it does not require any further notice.

In France, in the meantime, philosophy continued decidedly inimical, not only to all systematic theology, but to Christianity and religion in general. In Great Britain, sceptics appeared, who, whilst elegant and distinguished writers, shook the foundation of religion, morals and Christianity. In Germany, respect for the Leibnitzian-Wolfian philosophy gradually declined. It was found little suited to purposes of improvement, and not sufficient to answer new objections; fault was found with its method, its proofs and repetitions; it was thus either neglected or

rejected ; men questioned its solidity, and found it more convenient, and more fashionable, to embrace the popular philosophy of the famous French and English writers. From these writers, from experience and observation, from histories and travels a new philosophical system was formed, and various works, some profound and some elementary, were composed. Men became more and more averse to research. This period of philosophy in Germany was by no means favourable to theology. It lost its principles, its leading points, its aim, and its commanding interest. It became a mixture of empirical, weak and unfledged opinions and doctrines. It lost the spirit of investigation, of pure religion and morality.

KANT at length produced a revolution in philosophy, which is the most remarkable of the eighteenth century, and which extended its influence beyond Germany and still continues its effects. He was excited to this effort by the scepticism of HUME, against whom he wished to defend the certainty of human knowledge, and especially religion and morality. It was at the same time his professed object to refute materialism, spinozism, atheism and even naturalism, so far as this last would derive theology merely from nature, and endeavoured to prove the absolute impossibility of a revelation. For all these purposes he found the previous systems inadequate. He therefore created a new philosophy, in which he commenced with an accurate and rigid examination and estimate of the powers of the human mind, thence to determine what man could know, and what he had to do, believe and hope. He presented a system not derived from experience, but from the mind itself. The ideas of religion and morality he evolved from unassisted reason, which he represented as the original principle in religion and the supreme judge in matters of faith. For the existence of God he admitted no decided proof, but a strong moral ground of faith. He taught simple moral deism. He did not speak



contemptuously of positive religion, but taught that it was to be judged critically and philosophically, and also that the positive and historical doctrines of Christianity could be viewed as the sensible and figurative covering of simple and universal religious and moral doctrines. This philosophy had great influence upon every department of theological knowledge, and introduced more of speculation, depth, research, life and interest into studies of this nature. By it the tendency of the eighteenth century to deism was made perfectly manifest.

From this species of deism, various others arose, which agreed in nothing, but in entirely rejecting miracles, properly so called, as the foundation or any essential part of religion. During this century almost every system of philosophical religion or natural theology which had formerly prevailed among the Greeks and Romans was waked up and found its advocates, who have disputed with as much warmth as the most zealous theologians could have done. All these systems were of course set in opposition to any supernatural revelation. Every attempt, however, to make *rational* or natural religion the public and acknowledged form of religion, failed. The Bible was retained as the public standard of religion and morals, the historical foundation of the church, and the ancient symbols were not rejected; but men endeavoured to derive as much of simple deism from the Bible as possible, and introduced it as far as they could into positive religion and church creeds. The later philosophical systems which have arisen in Germany, ascribe much more philosophical truth to Christianity, and even to church theology, than the previous systems had done, although in their definitions and explanations they differ much from each other. *Kant* explained the philosophical sense of Christianity differently from *Schelling*; both, however, wished to honour Christianity as the public religion, and to unite it with reason, with which, from its origin, it was congenial.



The French nation had great influence in a variety of ways upon European literature, and upon theology, during the eighteenth century. This has already been alluded to, but it deserves to be presented in a different light. Among the Hugonots, whom LEWIS XIV. expelled from France, and who settled in Holland, Germany, England and other parts of Europe were many learned men, who carried with them the refinement, to which the French language and literature had then attained ; and imparted much from this source to the literature of the several countries in which they settled. Among these were many learned theologians, who wrote upon the subjects of religion, with more taste, with greater knowledge of men, with more ease, grace and eloquence than were then usual, and which were united in most cases, with erudition and research. These men laboured and were imitated in foreign lands. *Bayle, Saurin, Beausobre, Lenfant*, and others, are illustrious names in the history of theological literature. From France the custom spread itself still further, of writing upon learned subjects in vernacular tongues. This especially in theological knowledge produced a great revolution. With the old Latin terminology, which the public generally could not understand, and which scarcely admitted of translation, many old doctrines and opinions passed away. In living languages much could be expressed, for which no proper term was to be found in those that are dead. By thus writing in vernacular tongues, religious and theological doctrines came before the public generally, which they could not only learn, but upon which they also could sit in judgment, and thus they could to a certain degree controul the learned theological order. Theology became more popular and practical, though less profound.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries a polemical spirit pervaded all departments of theology. As the different Christian parties persecuted and combated

each other, thus also the learned theologians acted in presenting and promoting their opinions. But as by degrees, toleration, justice, equity and forbearance towards those who held a different faith, and professed a different system of Christianity made greater progress, so a more peaceful spirit extended itself in all theological matters. Polemics themselves, fell into disuse, and what still remained of them, was very different from what they had previously been, they were a mere critique and comparison of different systems. Men sought in their theological opinions and principles, to understand and coincide with each other; whilst before almost every discussion of the kind was undertaken with the view to destroy the opposite party, to cover it with obloquy, and widen the existing breach. The zealous controversy became more and more assimilated, to the mild discussion; and even this refrained from less important subjects, and concerned itself more with things than with persons. Men attended to theology more for their own improvement, than for the injury of their adversaries. Deism which had gradually pervaded all branches of theology, was a kind of centre-point for the different parties. It promoted toleration, because it was itself benefited by its prevalence.

But with the increasing spirit of toleration, a coldness and indifference towards religion, christianity, church order, and unity, gradually extended itself; resulting from causes which it is not my present business to unfold. This disposition has by degrees mingled itself with theology. Upon the whole, the earnestness, the attention, the zeal, the diligence, the strong religious interest with which, formerly, this species of knowledge was cultivated, have declined. In both the previous centuries, the sources and treasures of theology were investigated with the greatest labour, and innumerable and generally very voluminous works were written; during the eighteenth, these materials, thus prepared, were used and ap-

plied to more general purposes, and employed with more judgment ; although really erudite theology became gradually less rich. The different subjects of theology were indeed more separated, and in general they were reduced to more regularity of form ; they were treated with more philosophy and taste ; they were presented in union with more learning, and enriched with the literary treasures of the foregoing centuries. The directions for theological study, works prescribing the course the student should pursue, and theological cyclopedias became more numerous and important. Works of greater or less dimensions were composed, in which were given a systematic view of theological literature, an account of the contents of important books, and notices of the lives of ecclesiastical writers. Periodical works on theology, in every department, Journals, Bibliothecæ, Reviews, &c., commenced with the eighteenth century, and are still continued.



*An account of Introductions to the study of Theology,  
of Theological Cyclopedias, &c.*

In the evangelical church, great changes have occurred during this period. The old Lutheran system, the centre of all theological knowledge and effort, lost by degrees its friends and defenders; as this was the result, in part, of the more extensive cultivation of other branches of theology, so it operated on the manner in which these branches were treated. The spirit of reform was constantly active in every department of theology, and gave rise to opinions in striking contrast with the symbolical books which men either would not or could not remove. All this happened first and principally in Germany, which was the most important evangelical country, as it regards theological science. Here, where the new evangelical system arose, it



was first undermined. Here have diligence, effort, research and erudition been devoted to this branch of knowledge, and more numerous aids been secured in its cultivation than in any other country. Here have appeared numerous works for prescribing the course of study, cyclopedias, and works which not only prescribe the course to be pursued, but the books the student ought to read.

Immediately after the commencement of this period, the important influence of the school of *Spener* upon the spirit and method of theological pursuits began to manifest itself. According to the principles of this school, more was to be expected in the formation of a genuine theologian, from true piety of heart and life, than from learning; that true theology was not merely a matter of speculative knowledge, but an inward light derived from God, through spiritual experience; that only those who have been regenerated could attain to this genuine theology; that this new birth itself depended upon faith in the divinely revealed doctrines of the Holy Scriptures; that although learning was not to be entirely neglected by the theologian, it possessed for him only a limited and subordinate importance; and that it should in him always receive a practical tendency; that between the formation of a learned theologian and a church' pastor a difference should be made; and that the course of public instruction should be accommodated to the latter class, as the most numerous; that to the former a moderate and discrete study of philosophy should be permitted, and a deeper knowledge of theology should be made necessary; yet the purely Biblical doctrines, as to faith and morals, were to be received and presented. They admitted a difference between theology and religion, but maintained that the former should be thoroughly pervaded by the latter. The most important means to be used in the education of a genuine theologian and teacher, should be practical, familiar and instructive lectures, joined with suitable instructions, exhortations, and warnings.



Upon these principles, the books prescribing the course of theological study and discipline were constructed. To this class belong the following works of FRANKE. *The method of theological studies, with the method of Biblical discipline, and the idea of a theological student.* These works are replete with excellent counsels and directions, and are written with uncommon power. They are adapted not merely to direct the theological student, but also to excite the liveliest interest for his pursuits, and arouse him to the strictest cultivation of piety. In the first of these books, *Franke* discourses not only on the nature and object; but also upon the helps, order, and difficulties of theological studies. *Prayer, meditation and self-examination* are represented as the most important aids, in the prosecution of this interesting study.

JOACH. LANGE considered more fully the several branches of theology, and the departments of literature, whose connection with it, was most intimate, yet without neglecting general principles. He lamented the error and the want of order, in the course generally pursued; which he supposed arose principally from having either a false object in view or from having no definite object whatever. The true object he represented to be, to restore the divine image in ourselves and others, and thus to promote the divine glory. In attaining this object, according to his opinion, consisted true erudition, compared with which all other learning is of little account; indeed that there can be no real learning, on this subject, without a principle of divine grace, regeneration and sanctification, and that theology deserves the appellation of *sacred*, not merely from its object, but also from the manner in which it ought to be treated and studied. He taught expressly that in these studies more depended upon the *will* than upon the *understanding*; and consequently that if any one did not prosecute them with prayer and spiritual exercises, his labour would be in vain. He wished that those branches which

depended merely upon memory, as languages, should be attended to before those which require judgment, as philosophy and mathematics ; but he opposed the opinions of those who would require the student to spend the first year or two of his academical course entirely in preparatory studies ; and only after this term, apply himself to theology. He rather desired that he should make theology, from the first, his principal object, and unite with it now one, now another branch. He consoled those who at the universities, through want of time, opportunity, or resources, could not attend to other branches of learning, but were obliged to confine themselves to theology, with the consideration, that these branches were frequently a hindrance rather than an advantage ; and that with a moderate knowledge of languages, and a judgment enlightened and sanctified by divine grace, they could deduce all parts of theology from the Sacred Scriptures. He therefore gives a number of rules to the theological student for the direction of his academical life and studies, in the general, and then respecting the method of studying particular branches, as exegesis and philology, didactic theology and morals, casuistry, polemics, sermonizing, and church history. Exegetical studies he called the foundation, the nerves, and the centre of all theology. He admitted the use of commentaries only after they had themselves exerted all their strength to discover the sense of the Sacred Writings. He discriminated between the external and the internal means of interpreting the Sacred Scriptures ; to the former he referred, sacred philology and archeology, exegetical lectures and writings ; to the latter the enlightening grace of God, a real taste and experience of divine things, and a sound, natural, yet sanctified understanding. In morals he warned them of the dangers of pelagianism and indifferentism. To polemics he devoted more attention, and ascribed to them greater importance than we should have expected from a follower of *Spener*. He showed

how controversies, with the Catholics, the Reformed, the Socinians, the Jews, Sceptics and Atheists should be conducted. As to sermonizing, he thought that the directions could be contained in a very few rules. Ecclesiastical history he regarded as essentially important, and directed that it should be studied from the original fountains. Besides these directions his book contained a compendious view of the literature of the various departments of theology.

The opposers of the followers of *Spener* controverted their principle respecting the theology of those who were regenerated, they regarded much as an essential part of Christianity which the former considered as Scholasticism, they held firmly to the literal doctrines of *Luther*, accused the pietists of hypocrisy and heresy, and represented their opposition to learning as arising from the fact that they could make no pretensions to it themselves. The last accusation was refuted by the character of the authors and disciples of this school, and especially by the writings of J. F. BUDDEUS, his *Historical and Theological Introduction to Theology and its several branches*. In this work the principles of *Spener* are plainly manifested, although it is a production of the most profound and extensive erudition; and it shows how many branches of learning are connected with theology, and to a greater or less degree important to the theologian. The introductory sections on *the object of theological studies*, on *the talents and mental qualifications of the theological student* and upon *the means of attaining the end proposed*, clearly evince the disciple of *Spener*. The investigation which follows, concerning *preparatory theological studies*, exhibits a man, who had cultivated the literature of his own age, who was familiar with every branch of knowledge, and who knew how to exhibit the advantage which theology could derive from each, and yet who was careful not to apply any branch to the detriment of his subject.



The ancient languages, philology generally, criticism, grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history in all its branches, the natural sciences, mathematics, and medicine are here all reviewed for this purpose. The several branches of theology to which introductions are given, are thus divided and arranged, doctrinal, symbolical, patristical, moral, with mystical and pastoral, theology, church government, ecclesiastical history, polemics, and exegesis. In this work the history of these branches occupies the greatest space, which not only in itself, but as facilitating the investigation of these subjects, is exceedingly instructing and interesting. This work greatly excelled all that preceded it, and forms an epoch in writings of this nature, it shows that some change had already taken place in theology, and contains grounds for anticipating a still more important revolution. If it be too learned and extensive for most beginners, it has a greater value to those who wish to enter more thoroughly into studies of this nature. Besides the richness and variety of its erudition, it is greatly recommended by its spirit of moderation, modesty and piety.

J. G. WALCH followed in his *Introduction to theological knowledge* the principles and writings of *Buddeus*. This work was properly an epitome from the Prolegomena or preparatory course, for the use of his lectures. With respect to each branch, he treated first of its nature, contents and object, its importance, sources, and method ; and then of the means with which it should be studied ; where we always find the reading of certain works, which are here quoted in great numbers, and meditation and prayer recommended. J. C. ROECHER had before this published a short introduction to the study of theology, in which he treated not only the preparatory subjects, but also of the several branches of theology itself. Among the latter we find, besides the common divisions, propethical, typical, paraetetical, irenical, comparative, mathematical and foederal theology.



The numerous and diversified changes which occurred during this period, in theological opinions and in the mode of presenting them, had naturally a great influence upon the class of writing, we are now considering. New principles were introduced, new questions arose, new demands were to be satisfied; attention was to be paid to new philosophical systems, new objections, new difficulties, and new helps. These books of directions, therefore, differed considerably from each other. The work of MOSHEIM belonging to this class, was a posthumous production; and would not have been published by him, in its present state; yet his spirit is clearly manifested in it; and the simplicity of its plan, its perspicuity, the comprehensive view which it takes of the whole compass of theology, and the characteristic remarks with which it abounds, leave no doubt of its having actually proceeded from him. He considered the proper object of such a work to be, to exhibit the means, whereby a student could obtain a facility and skill in discharging the duties which would devolve upon him as a teacher and pastor. He distinguished it from pastoral theology, which is the knowledge of the official duty of one who is already a preacher; but the work in question is designed to point out the means of preparing for the office, and is principally concerned with what belongs to clerical learning. He considered it impossible to form a work of this kind, which would be alike suitable to all times, and that it was necessary that its peculiar character should be adapted to the age in which its author lived. He found that it was only since the reformation, that such works were composed, or that men began to prescribe so particularly the course of theological education. He very properly introduced a short history of theological seminaries. *Luther's* aphorism: *oratio, meditatio, tentatio, faciunt theologum*, which has been so often regarded as a direction for the study of theology, and which has as frequently been made

the foundation of works intended to prescribe the course to be pursued in these studies, he shewed was only to be understood of those who were already in the sacred office, and that even with respect to them it did not include every thing. He remarked that most authors of works of this nature, recommended particularly the department with which they were themselves most familiar ; that they did not make a sufficient distinction between the theologian and the pastor ; and that they took for granted the time, ability, and opportunity of the student to attend to all their rules. In his own work he distinguished the preacher from the theologian, although he admitted that there were subjects to which they should attend in common. The studies and exercises which prepared the way for prosecuting theology, he represented as equally serviceable to the pastor and the theologian ; desiring the latter, however, to enter into them more thoroughly. He treats at length those departments, which it is requisite for the clergyman, particularly the pastor to cultivate. It may be worth while to quote some of his directions. It is in his opinion, better not to delay attention to didactic theology, but to gain a general view of it before entering very deeply into the study of the Bible ; it would be well to take a short course of theology, that some foundation may be laid, and the connexion, and aim of theology be preserved. Ecclesiastical history cannot be thoroughly studied, before we are acquainted with theology ; and it would be improper to commence with the study of morals, because, constant reference must be had to doctrines, whence these moral duties flow : to begin with deep and extensive study of the Sacred Scriptures, would be a very circuitous way, requiring many years. The study of didactic theology should be connected with the study of the Bible, and in theology, the philosophical and Biblical method should be united ; the system for beginners should be a philosophical catechism, so short as to be easily learned. To his directions for the edu-

cation of a learned theologian, *Mosheim* prefixes the title ; “ *Of the Theologian of our time.*” He distinguishes the theologian from the pastor, principally in this, that the former has no particular congregation, but has to labour for the whole church and train up proper teachers for it ; should the church of the Lord be disturbed by false doctrines and mischievous abuses, it is his business to stand in the breach and endeavour to repress every thing likely to prove injurious. He is, as it were, an eye over the whole church, which should have the perspicacity easily to discover any thing inimical to true religion : a theologian of our time, worthy of this name, is a very difficult character to sustain ; his influence depends upon no external support, but he must form himself, and have something about him, which will secure the respect, affection, and esteem of men.

Soon after the appearance of this work of *Mosheim*, **SEMLER** presented himself as an author in this department, at first in a work written in German, and afterwards in one written in Latin. In the former, he insisted so strongly upon the necessity of thorough and extensive erudition, that it was objected to him, that he attributed to it too much importance, that he made piety only a secondary concern, and that he wished to set his method in opposition to that of *Franke*. He was also accused of preferring the scholastic theology to that which was purely Biblical. *Semler* found it necessary to defend himself against these charges, and especially to show that a thorough theological education promoted the interests of religion, advanced pure piety, and preserved it from errors, superstition, and fanaticism. The second of these books was written while he had the duty to discharge, of lecturing upon the extent, the nature, and the aids of theological learning. It was generally the case with him, when he was about to write, that he did not take a general and systematic view of his subject, formed no plan suited to its nature, collected no sufficient quantity of materials, and wrote in a desultory manner, and under



the influence of a few favourite ideas, and thus he has done in the present instance. In this work, there is more that is extraneous than what is pertinent, much which is essential, is omitted, and the subject is not exhausted. In the first division of his work, he treated of the *efforts of Christians, in the interpretation of Sacred Scripture, and the formation of a system of doctrines, during the first five centuries*. He remarked that his chief object in this work was to show, that in the first stages, there was no uniform and constant system of doctrine, of church discipline and government existing, as has since been the case—that the churches and teachers were very erroneous—that many books were surreptitiously introduced—that the spirit of Christianity is now much better understood, than it was then—that in different times, the compass and apparatus of theology has been very different—but that the essential part of Christianity has always been the same, and that it depends much more upon a Christian life, than upon a constant uniformity of doctrinal opinions. In the second division, he treats of *the aids for theological learning*; that is, of Greek and Latin philology, of ancient chronology, geography, and antiquities, of history generally, and especially the history of philosophy; of the books of the Old and New Testaments, the necessity of the study of languages, of commentaries, and translations, of the difficulties in the way of a proper interpretation of Scripture, and finally of systematic theology. The work abounds with historical remarks and extracts, relating principally to the labours of *Melancthon* and *Zuingli*, the doctrinal writings of the Catholics, the progress of the Reformers, the occasion of the articles of agreement, and the Jesuits. *Semler* every where sought the traces of liberal doctrines, he every where urged free and independent views. He opposed the system of church doctrines, but did not wish these formularies to be removed; he placed them in opposition to inward personal religion, as if the received system could not cherish



and promote personal religion ; such is his *Introduction to a liberal theological Education*. The excuse which he offers that nothing is said on Ecclesiastical History, and respecting the Fathers, is that his work was written as a foundation for his own lectures ; as though this subject ought not to be treated in a different manner, and with a different object. As it regards Hermeneutics, he admitted that he was not sufficiently acquainted with its history, to treat on the subject. The whole work has a tendency to promote free or liberal theological learning, especially through the influence of history. It calls the attention to some rare books. It would lead us to seek the essentials of Christianity, in a general moral system of religion, and to judge of its external forms, (which are not to be despised) according to the circumstances of the times in which they were assumed. The work however is partial, and considering its object, contains both too little and too much.

For a considerable time after the publication of these works of *Semler*, no important work on the subject appeared. After a number of years *HERDER'S Letters on the study of Theology*, were published. In a mild and paternal manner, he communicated his elevated sentiments, his wise counsels and experience, his views and wishes for a reformation, especially as it regarded interpretation, articles of faith, and preaching. These letters were not only fitted to direct the student in theology, but to render his studies attractive, important and interesting. To afford him rules and examples how he might prosecute them with spirit and taste, and might unite with them more extensive learning and attention to the literature of his age. New views and hypotheses, versions of the poetical parts of the Bible, originality of style and fertility of imagination, impart to these letters new and diversified attractions. Yet they might have been continued further, and *Herder* had better devoted to the extension of his work and promoting the spirit of Hebrew poetry, the time

and power he bestowed on polemical writings against the critical philosophy.

About the time of the appearance of these letters, the German public heard and read much on the necessity of an entire change in the course of study and mode of education of young men intended for the ministry. It was said that most of the studies which they pursued at the universities, were rather injurious than otherwise, in reference to their future office; it was urged that every thing should be directed to the object of making them useful, popular teachers, and to furnish them with knowledge which would be of practical importance; such as natural history and philosophy, economy, medicine, the art of teaching, &c. This course was principally advocated in two works, the one by BAHRDT, the other by CAMPE. The former censures the whole course of theological study commonly pursued, and undertakes to shew that it ought to be rejected. He thinks that almost all the defects of clergymen, may be traced to the mode of their education. He considered that they entered on their studies too soon, pursued a course too short, having no reference to their future office; that they attended lectures merely because they had to be examined upon them, and exhibit testimonials of their attendance. Exegesis, oriental languages, polemics, church history contributed nothing, according to his opinion, to make them fit teachers of the people, these not being the subjects upon which they were afterwards to deliver instruction; the lectures they hear do not produce the facility of popularly delivering useful knowledge, nor contribute to form them for counsellors and examples to their future congregations in domestic economy and the common affairs of life; it was not the theology which they were taught that could make them suitable teachers of the people, but religion in which they received no instruction; the moral lectures of the university did not serve to form them for their office; since they were nothing more than a mixture of general and

positive truths, without unity, connexion with theoretical religion, or reference to active life, they were defective in their presentation of motives, and did not point out the way in which men were to be reformed. *Bahrdt* undertook to present proposals for the better direction of theological study at the universities. Under the head of really useful branches of knowledge, he enumerated philosophy, religion of the New Testament, natural history, natural philosophy, anatomy, arithmetic and geometry, history and literature, introduction to theology, medicine, &c. &c. &c. He reduced the whole of religion to mere morality, and the latter into a matter of expediency, or doctrine of happiness. During the last half year of their course he would allow students to gain some idea of learned theology, which ought to embrace the following subjects: a knowledge of what has been added to religion, or in other words of the popular doctrines, a historical view of their gradual rise, a skeleton of church history, a knowledge of the symbolical books, a historical introduction to the books of the New Testament, and theological literature. These proposals, in which truth and falsehood are artfully blended, by which the very existence of the clerical order is subverted, which debar them from theological learning, but impose the necessity of attending to a still greater number of subjects, and which represent the clergy as common teachers of the people, occasioned much opposition from the learned theologians.

It was in part the writings just referred to which induced NOESSELT to publish his *directions for the education of clergymen*. He, in this work, settled, with much accuracy and discrimination, the relation of learning to religion and the clerical order; and corrected the prejudices as to the studies which were advocated as exclusively useful. He shewed, not only what the theologian should study, but also what talents he ought to possess, how he should improve and direct them, and finally how he ought to use



the existing institutions, (the universities) for his education. To the preparatory and auxiliary studies; he devoted the whole of the first part of his work. As to the departments of theology itself, he explained their nature and importance, their difficulties, their relation to each other, the rules according to which they should be studied, the extent to which they should be cultivated, &c. This work is distinguished not so much by its novelty and spirit, as by an admirable adaptation to the wants of the age, by an intimate and accurate acquaintance with all parts of theology, by its practical usefulness, and the skill of a learned theological veteran.

A few years after the second edition of the preceding work appeared, PLANK'S *Introduction to theological knowledge*, was published. The main object of this work, was not to give a new book of directions to the young student; but to excite greater zeal and desire for this science. The study therefore, he thought should be made more easy and attractive. There should be communicated a clear idea of the nature, object, sources and method of the science, together with an account of its history and literature. This work cannot be considered an Introduction to a regular system of theology; yet certain essential parts of the Lutheran system, which many learned theologians had rejected, are skillfully defended.

TITTMANN published at Leipsig, under the title of an *Encyclopedia of theological knowledge*.—1. An inquiry into the nature, extent, and departments of theology.—2. An inquiry into the philological, philosophical, and historical aids in this science.—3. A theological directory, divided into three parts; the first consisting of instructions how to cultivate the requisite preparatory studies, in what order the subjects should be attended to, how the public lectures could be turned to most advantage, &c.; the second, shows how a system is to be formed, or how we should proceed to make a consistent representation of re-

ligious knowledge,—the third prescribes the manner in which the Sacred teacher can most usefully discharge the active duties of his office.

In the works already described, the literature of theology was partially attended to, other works were written expressly in reference to this subject. Before this period, there did not appear to be so much zeal to collect the whole stock of Theological Literature, in single books. These books were arranged either in the systematic, chronological or alphabetical order. They generally united, with the mention of the works to which they refer, the expression of the author's opinion on their merits, and other literary remarks. As these works facilitated the acquisition of the knowledge, of the progress made in the several departments of theology, they have contributed to its advancement. Yet it is true, that it frequently happened, that students, instead of recurring to the original sources of information, were contented with these secondary streams. Many of these works were nothing more than books of reference to what had been previously written, or at most united with a few remarks on the several subjects, of which they professed to treat. Such Literary Theological works, commonly bore the title of Theological Bibliothecæ, or Literary Histories of Theology. Under the latter title, PFAFF published an extensive work; which, however, only in a very limited sense, deserves the name of a history: the quotations of books are heaped upon each other without discrimination, without order, and without judgment. We meet with many mistakes, and many instances of negligence. It however, contains many new and interesting literary notices for that period, especially of English and other foreign works. It, upon the whole, extended the knowledge of theological books. Many documents and essays which he inserts entire, are indeed foreign to the object of the work, but they are generally such as under other circumstances would have been thankfully

received. He exhibits himself as a scholar acquainted with the learned world, and who had prosecuted the history of literature, in some of its most remote and least frequented regions. We meet here and there with proposals for improvements in literature, and suggestions of works which are still needed.

Soon after the appearance of this work, J. C. DORN published his *Critical Theological Bibliotheca*, which is a production of great diligence and judgment. But clearly evinces that he had not a proper apparatus of books, nor an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of theological literature, which is essential for such a work.

G. STOLLE gave in his *History of Theological Learning*, rather a register of theological books.

J. G. WALCH'S *Select Theological Library* greatly excelled every other work of this kind. We must not take the word *select* in the strictest sense. Many of his opinions are common-place and of little weight, yet this work will always remain a production, admirable for the diligence, and for the extensive reading and accuracy which it evinces: the sound judgment remarkable in other works of this Theologian, is conspicuous here. All possible aids for theological literature are here embraced. The whole is well arranged: with regard to many books their contents and value are stated, and also directions where more extensive information is to be obtained. Of many important works an extensive and accurate literary history is given. All departments of theology, have a rich collection of books pertaining to them, described, and abundant materials are furnished for the history of Religion. What related to the Fathers, *Walch* had treated in a separate work. Among the later shorter works of this kind, that of NOESELT is distinguished by its accuracy, correctness, discrimination, order, and short pithy opinions of the merits of books.



C. M. PFAFFII, *Introductio in historiam theologiæ literariam*, Tub. 1720. *Notis amplissimis quæ novum opus conficiunt, illustrata*, 1724.

J. C. DORNII, *Bibliotheca Theologica Critica*, Jen. p. i. 1721, ii. 1723.

G. STOLLE, *Anleitung zur Historie der theolögischen Gelertheit*, Jen. 1739.

J. G. WALCHII, *Bibliotheca Theologica Selecta litterariis annotationibus instructa*, Jen. i. 1757, ii. 1758, iii. 1762, iv. 1765.

J. A. NOESSELT, *Anweisung zur Kenntniss der besten allgemeinen Bücher in allen Theilen der Theologie*, Leip. 1779, 2te Ausg. 1800.

J. P. MILLER'S *Systematische Anleitung zur Kenntniss auserlesener Bücher in der Theologie und den damit verbundenen Wissenschaften*, Leip. 1781.

From the commencement of the 18th century, until the present time, there has been an unbroken succession of Theological Journals, published in Protestant Germany. The custom became prevalent, principally through the influence of the learned French emigrants. But besides the example of these emigrants, the increasing interest taken in Theology, and the constant agitation of important controversies in these publications, greatly promoted their success. At first, the criticism they contained, was superficial and unimportant. They were however enriched with interesting articles, essays, remarks, &c.; they contained notices of rare books, of inscriptions and coins, (which had any relation to theology,) anecdotes, unedited letters, historical records, &c. &c. They served as a medium of attack upon the followers of *Spener*, and the disciples of *Wolf*; they for a long time, with zeal and energy, opposed the numerous innovations in theology, and endeavoured to uphold the genuine Lutheran system, until at length, they themselves became infected with the prevalent spirit of infidelity. Their critical character became gradually more learned, profound, and instructing.

In the Reformed Church, theological learning pursued a course analogous to that through which it passed in the Evangelical Church. The fate of theology in different countries in which the Reformed Church was established, was various; but this diversity can be better exhibited,

when we treat of the particular branches of theology. Works of the kind we have been now considering, were not very numerous among the Reformed, nor of much repute. Before the expiration of the 17th century, STEPHEN GAUSSEN, Professor at *Saumur*, had written a *Treatise on the Course of Theological Study*, discussing the nature of Theology, the use of Philosophy, and the method of preaching, which was reprinted several times during the 18th. In this work we remark the faults of his age, but it contains many important observations and directions. J. HEINR. HEIDEGGER, of *Heidelberg*, wrote a *Model for Theological Students*, in which he collected much, which had been previously published in other works, and made many additions from his own resources. He wished that less attention should be paid to Polemics, and gave his work rather a moral than a doctrinal cast. In the *Netherlands*, the sciences, criticism, and the oriental languages, were zealously cultivated as aids in the study of Theology.

In many parts of the Catholic Church, great progress was made in every department of knowledge connected with Theology. They emulated the Protestants, and although no change or improvement was effected in their established system of doctrine, yet they were unwilling to be left behind in the prosecution of learning, and were not ashamed to avail themselves of the discoveries and improvements of the Protestants. Since *Rich. Simon*, the criticism which he directed to the whole compass of Roman Catholic Theology, obtained many liberal defenders and cultivators; although the number of those who opposed its progress, still continued the most considerable. The Oriental languages retained their chairs in the Catholic Universities. Theology and its cognate branches of knowledge, were more divided and more extensively prosecuted. Theological Seminaries were multiplied, and improved. The congregation of *St. Maurus* and the Fa-

thers of the Oratory were conspicuous for their diligence and zeal, and other learned Catholics have by their services in Ecclesiastical history, thrown light upon every part of theology. The suppression of the Jesuits produced greater liberty of the press, allowed the new principles of Interpretation greater influence, and lessened the constraint of pedantry and scholasticism. The strict ancient Catholic system was attacked with the weapons of learning, even in Italy. Many Catholic Princes and Bishops endeavoured, in various ways, to promote the interests of learning; and to improve the method of studying Theology. All this manifested itself principally in Germany, and indeed first in Salzburgh in Austria, in the States of the Electorates of Mentz and Bavaria, and in Wurzburg. Here the last struggles of the Jesuits were made for maintaining their influence. In Austria, in the year 1776, appeared under the Empress MARIA THERESA, *The Instruction for all the Theological Faculties in the Empire*. The author of this work was RAUTENSTRAUCH, a Benedictine, whom the Empress had made Director of the Theological Faculty of Vienna. The whole spirit and method of teaching, as regards Theology, would have been changed by this book, and would have received a completely practical tendency. The Sacred Scriptures were represented as the only proper original ground of theological knowledge. Scholasticism, and Jesuistical Casuistry were prescribed, and Polemics very much moderated. Great stress was laid upon the study of the Oriental Languages. Ecclesiastical History, it taught, should be prosecuted with moral and religious views. The cultivation of Biblical Hermeneutics was expressly enjoined. After attending to these subjects, Didactic and Casuistical Theology were to be studied. In Church Government, the Decretal was no longer to be followed, but some more liberal system. Not until the fifth and last year of the course, were the Ascetic Catechetical or Homelectic departments, nor Pastoral The-



ology and Polemics to be attended to. Under JOSEPH II, the freedom of opinion, and liberty of the press were still further increased. Theology was now from the pulpit and the press, treated in a much better spirit and purified from many of its errors. This liberal spirit had begun to diffuse itself, but political events have since, not only suppressed it in Austria and restored the direction of Theology to the Monks, but withdrawn the attention of Catholics from these subjects ; so that the encouragements of various kinds which had been held out to theological learning, have failed of producing any important results.

The 18th century produced works, which treated of Ecclesiastical writers, their lives, the contents, worth, and editions of their works, much more extensive and valuable than any which preceded them. These works refer so directly to all parts of Theology, (which they have contributed much to enlighten) and have so enriched the history of theological literature, that they deserve here a most honourable mention. We can however only notice those, which are the most comprehensive and important, passing by others, which relate either, only to one class of authors or to one particular age or nation. DUPIN's *Bibliotheca of Ecclesiastical Authors*, which he commenced publishing in 1686, and completed in 1714, is the most extensive work of this nature. As an Introduction he has given Prolegomena to the Bible. The work itself, contains a Biography of Ecclesiastical Authors, a catalogue of their works, their chronological order, and their various editions ; it presents also an epitome of their contents, and an examination of their style and opinions, with many other particulars connected with Church History and Chronology. It commences with the first century and continues to the 18th. What is properly Bibliographical in the work, is not always sufficiently accurate, the Epitomes are often incorrect and negligent, many articles are of no value, and with respect to authors, not of the Catholic communion,

there is much mistake and injustice. Yet the work possesses and must continue to possess a value which overbalances all these defects. The judgements given are discriminating and liberal, and the several authors are properly characterized. This work procured for *Dupin* two classes of opposers. The one found much that was too liberal and contrary to the true Catholic faith. The Archbishop of Paris condemned it, and forced its author to a public recantation of some of its parts. Bishop *Bossuet* also complained of his style of criticism, and pointed out many passages as erroneous, especially relating to doctrines and Church Government. The other class, on the contrary, complained that his criticisms were not liberal enough, nor sufficiently accurate. This was especially the case with *Richard Simon*, whom *Dupin* had provoked by a previous attack. *Simon* exhibited many mistakes committed by his antagonist, and showed himself his superior, in profoundness, originality, sagacity, and extent of learning, although he frequently did him injustice.

Whilst this work of *Dupin* was publishing, *A Literary History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, by WILL. CAVE, an English Professor made its appearance. This work does not treat of the *contents* of the writings of ecclesiastical Authors, but with much minuteness, details every thing which relates to their lives, to their genuine, doubtful or spurious works. and the various editions of them, and to those which have never been published, or which have perished. This work was published gradually under the direction of *Cave*; and with the assistance of another individual, was constantly enlarged, though it never exceeded the size originally designed. At first, it reached only to the 14th century, but he afterwards brought it as low as the Reformation. It contains notices of all the heathen writers who opposed Christianity. It is divided into centuries, to each of which is affixed a distinct title, as the *Apostolic*, the *Gnostic*, *Novatian*, *Arian*, *Nestorian*,

*Eutychian*, &c. &c. To each century is prefixed a historical view of its principal events, then follows an account of all the Ecclesiastical Writers, in chronological order; and finally a notice of all the ecclesiastical councils, whether general or provincial which occurred during the period.

CAS. OUDIN, Librarian of the University of Leyden, found that the authors who had written on the Ecclesiastical Writers, as *Possevin*, *Labbe*, *Cave*, and *Dupin* had passed over many authors, without notice, and had committed a great number of mistakes. He made it therefore his object, in his great work, which he brought down to the year 1460, to supply the deficiencies of these authors, and present a supplement to their works, without however confining himself strictly to this object. He treated of a great number of unedited, and hitherto unknown works, which he had found out in the Libraries. He upbraided *Cave* with not having read and studied the ancient authors himself, but gleaned his account of them from others, and with having regarded many works as genuine, which are really spurious. Of *Dupin* he expressed a more favourable opinion. He himself, intentionally abstained from any thing of a doctrinal character, that his work might not offend the Catholics; he did not even investigate what the Fathers taught or wrote upon any doctrine, nor did he give any analysis of their works. He therefore had the more leisure to devote himself to the investigation of their history, of the spuriousness or genuineness of their works and their number and editions of them.

LOUIS ELLIES DUPIN, *Nouvelle Bibliotheque des auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, Paris, 1686—1711, 47 voll.

*Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum historia litteraria*, a C. N., usque ad Sec. 14, a GULIEL. CAVE, Ox. 1740—1743.

CAS. OUDIN, *Commentarius de Scrip. Eccl. Antiquis illorumque scriptis, adhuc extantibus in Bibliothecis Europæ*, a Bellarmino, Cavco, Dupin, et aliis omissis, Lip. 3 vol. 1722.



---

**K N A P P U S**

DE

**SPIRITU SANCTO ET CHRISTO PARACLETIS.**

ITEM

**De varia Potestate Vocabulorum,**

ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙΝ, ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΙΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ.

---



# KNAPPIUS

DE

SPIRITU SANCTO ET CHRISTO PARACLETIS,

&c.

---

THE word Paraclete is used by no writer of the New Testament except John, by whom this name is once applied to Christ, Epis. I. Ch. ii. v. 1, and often to the Holy Spirit, Ch. xiv. 16, 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7. Nor does he ever use the verb παρακαλεῖν or the noun παρακλησις; which, with various significations, the other writers of the New Testament books frequently employ. This variety of significations accounts for the fact, that from the earliest times, the opinions of interpreters in determining the power του παρακλητου, especially in those places where it is applied to the Holy Spirit, have been different and opposite. These opinions appear to admit many arguments, wherefore, that those who desire to judge for themselves may see at one view all these opinions collected, we shall enumerate in order the definitions of παρακαλεῖν and παρακλησις.

And first, among the ancient Attics, παρακαλεῖν always means to summon—*advocare*; to send for—*arcessere*; to invite—*invitare*; as by *Xenophon*, Mem. Socr. 11. 10. 2. In this sense also it is found in Acts xxviii. 20.†

† Thus *Pliny*, Epp. vii. 17, 12: “Ego (when discoursing) non populum *advocare*, (that is to hear the oration) sed certos electosque soleo.”



This signification of the word is so very extensive, that it designates calling of every kind. And παρακλησις denotes invitation of every sort, and for any purpose. Hence ἀπαρακλητος means, one who comes uncalled, or uninvited, who offers himself willingly for giving assistance or safety; to whom is opposed he who comes παρακεκλημενος. In the same sense also the Gods are said to be *called* by men imploring their aid and seeking their presence; as by *Xenophon* Όταν τον Ένυαλιον παρακαλεσώμεν,\* and elsewhere ἐπικαλειν, κατακαλειν τον θεον. Those who are engaged in any controversy or difficulty, and are unable to consult for their own safety are said to *call—advocate* him whom they consult, and whose power or assistance they demand. Hence have arisen these common forms of speaking; παρακαλειν συμβουλον, βοηθον, παρακαλειν τινα εις σωτηριαν, εις συμβουλιον or εις συμβουλην. † But παρακλησις, in this sense, is chiefly used when any one is summoned to trial, or suspects that he will be summoned: at such a time, friends and those possessing legal knowledge, are consulted, who give counsel, and suggest whatever may aid the cause. There were those also who would give counsel for wages, and if they understood rhetoric, would write orations which were delivered by themselves, or by those who were on trial, or those who managed their cause. Such were many of the orations of *Demosthenes*, and almost all those of *Lysias*. But the most frequent and technical use of παρακλησις and παρακαλειν, in the forum, was concerning the *patrons of causes* or orators who were *called* to defend a cause. Thus παρα-

1. *Histor. Græc.* ii. 7, 10. The Latins have imitated this. Thus *Livy* (*Hist.* viii. 33, 21.) and *Varro* write *deos advocare*; and *Lactantius*; *precibus advocare*. See *Buenemannus*, ad *Lactant.* I. D. ii. Q. 2.

2. This *Seneca* (*Ep.* 109) and *Quintilian* (*de I. O.* iii. 8. 70) have literally translated thus, *advocari in consilium*, or *in consilia*. *Cicero* says, *in consilium adhiberi*. *Gellius* (*N. A.* xiv. 2, 9) *in consilium rogari* and *Phædrus* (*Fab.* iv. 4. 20.) “*Fidem advocavit, jure neglecto. parens.*” *Seneca* also says (*Ep.* xcix) “*adversus dolorem et incommoda virtutem advocare,*” and also (*Ep.* lxxviii.) “*vinum virium causa advocare, aut intermittere.*”

καλεῖν συνηγορον, is to demand a patron, or call to his aid any one in whom he puts confidence, that he may speak for him. See for example, Δημοσθένη παρακαλη; (let him call Demosthenes), παρακαλω Εὐβουλον συνηγορον, from *Æschines*, and many other similar passages. Hence, not only the patrons of causes or συνηγοροι, were named παρακλητοι as in the following passage from *Demosthenes*, (*Adv. Æsch. de παραπρ.*) Αἱ δὲ τῶν παρακλητῶν αὐταὶ δεήσεις καὶ σπουδαὶ τῶν ἰδίων πλεονεξίων ἐνεκα γιγνόνται,\* but also the pleading (προστασία,) or defence undertaken by the orator, was called παρακλησις, and συνηγορία thus *Æschines*, Τῆς σοφροσύνης παρακλησίν παρακεκληκα, and *Demosthenes*, Οἱ ἐκ παρακλησεως συγκαθημενοι†.

Generally among the Grecian orators, παρακαλεῖν τινα, is to ask any one to be with us at the trial, for a witness, patron, defender, (προστατῆς συνδικος) or partisan of our cause, and those in any manner defending the accused, are said to be with him παραγινεσθαι, συμπαραγινεσθαι. See 2 Tim. iv. 16. παρεῖναι, συμπαραεῖναι 3.

† For they were accustomed συνηγορεῖν ἐπι μισθῷ. Compare what *Gellius* relates (N. A. xi. 9) concerning the legates of the Millesians, who, when pleading, spoke for themselves, and also concerning Demosthenes, who, at the commencement, strenuously opposed the petition of these advocates, but afterwards, by a reward from the Millesians, was suddenly silenced. To the same must be referred τῆς ἰκεσίας παρακλητος of *Heraclitus*, Ἰλληγορ. εἰς τὰ τοῦ Ὀμηροῦ περὶ θεῶν εἰρημένα, 59. For παρακαλεῖν συνηγορον in the orations of Demosthenes, is substituted καλεῖν συνηγορον ἀγωνι τινι, (to demand a patron of the cause,) or παρασκευαζέσθαι ἑαυτῷ συνηγορουντα or συνερουντα, (to associate a patron with himself.)

† † Among the Latins, also, *postulare* or *petere advocacionem*, is to petition the prætor or president of the court, for time to invite friends and consult with them on the cause in trial. The assembly collected for this purpose was called *advocatio*, and because this caused a delay in the court, every delay or hindrance was called *advocatio*. This is exemplified by *J. F. Gronovius* ad *Cicero*. *Epp.* vii. 11, 1.

3. παρακλητος also means a messenger who is sent to speak in the place, name, and authority of another; thus *Diogenes Laertius* de *Bione*, says (iv 50) προς τον ἀδολεσχην, λιπαρουντα συλλαβεσθαι αὐτῷ, το ἱκανον σοι ποιησω, φησιν, ἐὰν παρακλητους πεμψῆς, καὶ αὐτος μὴ ἔλθῃς. but not many similar passages can be found.

Amongst the Attics, παρακαλεῖν also signified to exhort, to admonish, to persuade, to invite, and to impel. - Hence παρακλησις and προτροπή, and also παρακαλεῖν and προτροπεῖν, are by *Isocrates* often interchanged, as if signifying the same thing, and sometimes coupled together. *Philo* the Jew, also often uses it concerning exhortation, and admonition of every kind, and writes παρακλησιν and παρανεσις promiscuously.\* Nor is this use less frequent in the New Testament, as by *Luke* concerning Paul, Acts xx. 2. παρακαλεσας αὐτους λογισα πολλω, in place of which is used v. 31, Νουθετων ενα εκαστον. These are, for the most part, common amongst the Attics. But when the Macedonian dialect began to prevail in Greece, other significations gradually obtained, derived indeed from the preceding, but rarely or never used by the Attic writers. To this must be referred the interchange of παρακαλεω with δεωμαι, to ask, to pray, to beseech, which signification is unusual in the Attic books 5, although from exhorting, persuading, imploring, and supplicating (in which sense they use it,) the transition to this signification may appear easy†. Thus *Dion. Hal.* vii. 54, says λογων

4. See *Carpzovii* Exercitt. in Ep. ad Hebr. c Philone. p. 154. Hence, by *Greg. Naz. Orat.* 36. παρακλητος in 1 John, ii. 1. is explained by παρανετης, and with *Dion. Halicarnassus* παρακλητικος signifies that which has power to arouse or excite and is joined with a genitive, as ειρηνης, οργης, ομοιοιας and others. See also *Raphelii*, Aunot, in N. T. c Xenophonte, p. 275.

5. *Thomas Magister* in 'Εκλογ. ονοματων 'Αττικων, word παρακαλω writes thus: το προτροπεω, ως επι το πολυ και παρακλησις, η προτροπή άπαξ δε και το δεομαι. See the interpreters on this in the edition of *Bernard*, p. 684, and the notes of *Wetstein* on Matt. viii. 5. It was the custom among the later Greek scholiasts to explain the Attic verb αντιβολω, in the sense of asking or imploring, by παρακαλω, 8.9. Schol. ad *Aristophanis* Nubb. 110: το δε αντιβολω παρακαλω 'Αττικως.

† *H. Plankius* in *Commentat. de vera natura atque indole orationis Græcæ* N. T. (*Gotting.* 1810.) p. 62. "Antiquiores homines hortandi genus, quod hoc vocabulo exprimebatur, referebant nondum, ut serius factum est, ad ea quæ pro nobis nostrisque commodis ab aliis fieri volumus. Exstitit inde hortatio ad id faciendum, quod nostris precibus respondent, h. e. vera rogatio, quæ hoc sensu cogitata, facile παρακλησις vocari potuit."



παρακλησιν έχοντα νοθετησει μεμιγμενην, και δεησιν αναγκη. *Polybius* also (Leg. 25 et 93,) joins αξιωσιν with τη παρακλησει and αξιουν with the verb παρακαλειν, as does the author of II Macab. ix 26. *Plutarch* uses it thus most frequently. There is also the same use of the word, in the writings of the Jews, *Philo*, *Josephus*, and the New Testament; rarely in the Alexandrine version, but very often in the Greek apocraphy of the Old Testament. But it has happened, that this word, like many others, has been enriched by the Jews who spoke Greek, with meanings entirely unknown to the ancient Greeks. For with them παρακαλειν means to *console*, to *calm*, to *assuage*, to *refresh*, to *alleviate*, and to *exhilarate*; and παρακλησις, signifies *consolation*, *alleviation*, *joy*, and all that can in any manner *console* or *refresh*. In this they probably followed the analogy of the word παραμυθεομαι and παραμυθιας, whose form and primary signification is the same, and which were applied by the Greeks both to *exhortation* and *consolation*, and had some other similar significations. *Paul* joins them together, 1 ii. 11. 1 Cor. xiv. 3. Phil. ii. 1.; and what the Greeks call παραμυθησικα or παρηγορικα, (consolatory or assuaging,) the Jews call παρακλησικα; and απαραμυθητος, they call απαρακλητος. This use of the word passed from the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament, (in which it often answers to the Hebrew word, דַּבַּר and נַחֵם as in Ps. xxii. 6. xciii. 19. Job. ii. 11.) to the authors of the New Testament, and from them to the Greek and Latin Ecclesiastical writers. Thus *Tertullian* says *advocare languentes*, to *console* the weary, (adv. Macc. iv. 14,) and Luke vi. 14, he translates thus, *Recepistis advocacionem vestram*, and in other places unites words that signify exhortation and consolation; (advocatio.†)

† In a similar manner the ancient Latin writers, Varro, Horace, Catulus, Seneca and others rendered the Greek words παραμυθαισθαι, παρηγορειν, and also παρηγοριαν παραμυθιαν παραμυθαιον, which men used in discourses calculated to alleviate or console the sorrows of another, by the words alloqui, allocutio and alloquium. See examples in *Mureti*, Var. Lect. ii. 3.

There is still another meaning not to be omitted, which is also peculiar to the Jewish writers, and has arisen, perhaps from that which we have now illustrated. They attribute to it, and with some reason, the idea of strengthening and confirming, so that it corresponds to the Hebrew words  $\gamma\mu\lambda$  and  $\rho\iota\eta$  as in Deut. iii. 28, which the Alexandrines have in other places translated,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ ,  $\acute{\iota}\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$   $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$   $\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\nu$ ,  $\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\omicron\varsigma$   $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ . They have even ventured to say  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$   $\gamma\omicron\nu\alpha\tau\alpha$   $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$ , and  $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . Isa. xxxv. 3, 4. John iv. 3. (Comp. Heb. xii. 12.) This has been imitated by the New Testament writers, who have coupled  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$  with  $\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ , 1 Thess. iii. 2. 2 Thess. ii. 17. 1 Cor. xiv. 31, also with  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$  2 Cor. xiii. 2, and  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\nu$ , 1 Thess. v. 2. To this must be referred  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$   $\tau\eta\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\nu$ , Col. ii. 2. iv. 5. Eph. vi. 22.

It remains now, to treat of the idea of *teaching* and *instructing*, which this word sometimes bears, in the writings of Paul. Although Luke, the intimate friend and constant companion of Paul, appears to use the word sometimes in this sense, as in chap. iii. 18. Acts ii. 40. xv. 31. xx. 2. yet there is no cause why it may not even in these passages, refer to exhortation, admonition, consolation, or confirmation. Paul himself, in Rom. xii. 7, 8, clearly distinguishes instruction;  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha$  and  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ , from admonition  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  and  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ . But in other places, it is evident that instruction in Christian doctrine, is called  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . And  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$  means to *teach*, to *instruct*, as 1 Thess. ii. 3. Tit. i. 9. ii. 15. 1 Tim. vi. 2. In some passages the interpretation is doubtful, as Romans, xv. 5.

The origin of this signification must be deduced from the subject and manner of religious instruction among the Jews and Christians of that age, which was evidently  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ , or  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ . For in the Jewish synagogues, when the lesson from the Sacred Writings on each Sabbath was finished, some one capable of speaking, delivered a discourse  $\kappa\eta\rho\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$ , (See Luke iv. 16, 21, 44.) Not

indeed abstruse and learned, but popular and adapted to cherish pious thoughts in the minds of the audience. Being therefore of a practical nature, it was entirely employed in exhorting and admonishing. Thus Luke relates, Acts xiii. 15, that the rulers of the synagogue at Antioch, after the sacred lesson was recited, (μετα ἀγνωσιν του νομου και των προφητων) requested Paul and his companions, that if they had any exhortation for the people, (εἰ ἐστὶ λόγος ἐν ὑμῖν παρακλήσεως προς τον λαον) they would make it; see Heb. xiii. 22, and Acts ii. 40. This custom, with the same name, passed from the Jews to the Christians, for in their instructions the public sacred reading (ἀναγνωσιν) was followed by exhortation (παρακλήσις) 1 Tim. iv 13, where it is joined with διδασκαλία. I think, therefore, it is evident that *Christian instruction* and every discourse (κηρυγμα) adapted to instruct men was by the Apostle correctly and suitably, though perhaps in a new sense called παρακλήσις.

These considerations have been adduced in support of what follows in our dissertation, that the readers might have something to guide them in judging of the various interpretations given to this word in John. From the many and various uses of the verb παρακαλεῖν, among the ancient Greeks and the Jews who wrote Greek, may be learned the reason why the ancient interpreters so often differed in determining the meaning of παρακλητος. Even in those places where this name is distinctly applied to the Holy Spirit, as in John xiv. xv. and xvi., nothing can be discovered from the scope and order of the whole discourse which entirely removes all doubt. Christ, indeed, in these words, Ἐγὼ ἐρωτησῶ τον πατερα και ἌΛΛΟΝ παρακλητον δωσει ὑμῖν, John xiv. 16, declares that he also is the Paraclete, which Augustine has correctly observed (in Joann. Tract lxxiv.) But this passage sheds no light on the interpretation, for *many* of the significations given to this word unite in Christ, and the idea of *intercessor* attached to it in 1 John ii. 1, (where Christ is expressly called the Paraclete)



is too confined to be applied to the Holy Spirit, whose office is there described as far more extensive. But we shall endeavour to examine the different reasons of interpreters, why this name was given to the Holy Spirit, omitting those which are obsolete or unimportant, for in examining these opinions the truth will naturally be discovered.

There are many among the Greeks who, relying confidently on the authority of *Origen* (περι ἀρχ. ii. 7, and elsewhere) translate παρακλητον in this passage *comforter* (παραμυθητην) as *Chrysostom*, (Homil. LXXV. in John.) *Cyril* of Jerusalem, (Catech. φωτιζ., xvi.) *Theophylact*, (ad Jo. xiv.,) and some others. But among the Latins there were not so many. *Jerome* indeed, (Comm. in Isa. xi.) translates it *comforter*, but *Augustine* hesitates, sometimes rendering it, *comforter*, sometimes *advocate*, and sometimes both conjoined, which accords with some of the Greek writers, as appears from *Suicer*, who has carefully marked the passages, (Thesaur. Eccles. T. II. p. 585.) The opinion of those who translate this word *comforter*, has been followed after *Luther* and *Erasmus*, by many commentators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In this interpretation there is nothing inconsistent with the use of the verb παρακαλειν among the Jews, nor opposed to the scope of Christ's discourse, which was designed to comfort and console the disciples, who were troubled and saddened at the announcement of his departure. Among the Jews, as *Lightfoot* observes, (in Hor. Hebraicis, ad Jo. xiv.) the name *comforter*, [מְנַחֵם] was applied to the Messiah, who, in this passage openly professes that the office of the Paraclete pertains to himself, (Comp. Luke, ii. 25—38.)

It is of no consequence, that *Boisius* and *Suicer* have imagined this word to be in the passive form, (παθητικη) and deny that it can correctly be applied to a *comforter*, who ought rather to be called παρακλητωρ, in the active form, (ἐνεργητικη.) For the Greek Interpreters, *Aquila* and *The-*

odotion, translate **דַּמְנָה** in Job xvi. 2, παρακλητους; and in the same place, the Alexandrines have παρακλητορες,\* and Symmachus παραγοροντες. Except in this one place, παρακλητος is not used by the ancient Greek interpreters, and never once in the Alexandrine version.

Others understand by this term, *teacher* or *master*, which interpretation *Ernesti* following *Mede*,† has endeavoured to illustrate, and has so established by the authority of his name and a plausible sort of reasoning, that he has drawn many of the later writers into the same opinion. He appeals to the scope of the whole discourse, which describes the actions and attributes του παρακλητου, to show that this name may denote the office of *teaching*, and in his judgment, it is *most certain*, that when it is applied to the Holy Spirit, this word signifies nothing else than a *teacher*. And it is correct, and perfectly safe for any one to suppose that το πνευμα της αληθειας, the spirit of truth, should be called the most proper master of all. In confirmation of this, these similar passages may be adduced, Luke, xii. 12, and Matt. x. 19, 20.

But all this reasoning which is drawn from the context and tenour of the discourse, both here and elsewhere, labours under great difficulty. For it is of such a character as to admit *many* significations, which is evident from what has been shown above; nor does *Ernesti* deny it. It is evident, I grant, that in these passages the peculiar office of the Holy Spirit is described. But does it follow of course, that Christ intended to give an exposition of the word Paraclete? But this word embraces more than can

\* This gloss of Hesychius, παρακλητορες, παραμυθηται, belongs to the passage in Job, xvi. 2, and not as Stephen's (in Thesaurο Gr. Tom. II. p. 15.) suspects to a passage from some ancient Greek poet.

† In Fragmentis Sacris, recus, Tom X. Opusculor. philolog. p. 249. See Wolfii Cur. philolog. on John xiv. 16; and Ernesti Prolus. concerning the difficulties of interpreting the New Testament correctly, which is inserted in his Opuscul. philolog. Crit. Edit. 2. p. 214, &c.

pertain, solely to the province of a teacher. He who is styled Paraclete, may indeed often give instruction, but he would not necessarily derive the name Paraclete from *instructing*. Suppose you should read in some book a passage in which it was related, that by a certain Bishop, Apostle, or even the Holy Spirit, men had been furnished with a saving knowledge of divine things, recovered from their errors and vices, and things of a similar nature, you might doubtless gather from the context that the labour and care of a *teacher* was expressed. But does the context declare explicitly, what each of those words signifies? Could you, if ignorant of the primary and peculiar meaning of the words Bishop, Apostle, and Holy Spirit, explain and elucidate it from the context. *Ernesti* indeed professes to follow *Tertullian*, who although he sometimes renders it *advocate*, yet clearly and distinctly interprets it teacher in these words. Quæ est ergo Paracleti administratio, nisi hæc, quod disciplina dirigitur, quod Scripturæ revelantur, quod intellectus reformatur, quod ad meliora proficitur? But there is more belonging to this, although omitted by *Ernesti*, which is as follows. Hic (the Paraclete) erit solus a Christo magister et dicendus et verendus.—Hic solus antecessor, quia solus post Christum. But if I can judge, *Tertullian* in this passage, no more intended to explain the peculiar force of the term paraclete, than Christ does in John. He merely designates the chief parts of his work and office. For as often as he translates τον παρακλητον into Latin, so often, as far as I can discover, he uses the word *advocatus*; and not in that sense, as *Ernesti* supposes) in which the ancient Latins often used *advocatus*, but in the sense commonly used in the later ages.\* *Ernesti*, when he supposes that Christ used this

\* De Monogam. c. 3. extr. In hoc quoque *Paracletum* agnoscere debes *advocatum*, a tota continentia infirmitatem tuam excusat. Also, de jejuniis adv. Psychic, c. 13. Spiritus S.—qua Paracletus, id est *advocatus* ad exorandum judicem, hujusmodi officiorum remedia mandabat. Thus in translating John



very word, either in the Hebrew or Chaldee from פְּרָקְלִיט or פְּרָקְלִיטָא (which was formerly used by the Jews,) and that John translated it from the mouth of Christ, agrees, it is true, with *Lampe*, *Hammond*, and some others. This opinion, however, though not entirely destitute of probability, is yet of such a nature, as to afford scarcely any aid in determining the force of the word. For if the import of the word is to be learned from Jewish forms of speech, it must first be demonstrated either that Christ used the Greek word, or that John wrote a Hebrew or Chaldee word from Christ himself, and translated it with this Greek word.

If the use of παρακαλεω and παρακλησις be considered, it does appear that the signification of *teacher* is possible, although it is certain that Paul alone uses παρακαλεω in the sense of *to teach*; but however this may be, we must not be induced by a single ισodusιαμιας of the word, to suppose that the cause is entirely at rest. It is opportunely remarked by *Ernesti* and others, that the word פְּרָקְלִיט in the Chaldee paraphrase corresponds to the Hebrew word מְלִיץ (Job xvi. 20, and xxxiii. 23,) which he supposes may mean *teacher*. The Rabbins do indeed interchange the words פְּרָקְלִיט and מְלִיץ as if they were of similar import, and explain one by the other. It is probable, therefore, that if Christ did use a Hebrew noun, where John has written παρακλητος, he used מְלִיץ. But it is doubtful whether it can be demonstrated by suitable examples, that among Jewish writers, מְלִיץ and פְּרָקְלִיט or παρακλητος ever denoted a teacher. And first the word מְלִיץ neither in these passages of Job nor elsewhere in the Sacred Writings designates a *teacher*, though

xiv. 16, into Latin, he often uses *advocatum*. (as adv. Prax. c. 9.) Also 1 John ii. 1, de Pudicitia c. 19, when what he before called *advocatum* he afterwards calls *exoratore*.

such a signification might be kindred with it.† Secondly, which is the very point in question, the Rabbins, among those words which denote a *teacher*, and the office of a *teacher*, never mention מליץ or פְּרָקֵיט. After having carefully examined the Rabbinical passages (collected by *Drusius, Buxtorf, Schoettgen, Wettstein* and others) in which the Paraclete is mentioned, I confess I could not discover one which imperiously demanded the idea of *teacher*, and to declare the whole truth, not one was found which would bear it. Nor does *Philo*, who often uses this word, ever use it in this sense, but always evidently in the sense which obtains in the Rabbinical writings. The opinion of those, therefore, who translate it *comforter*, is much more defensible from the Jewish forms of speech: for although neither *Philo* nor the Rabbins translate Paraclete the *comforter*, yet, as was observed above, in one passage of the O. T., two Greek interpreters have translated the Hebrew word מנחם παρακλησον, but מליץ or any similar word no Greek interpreter has ever translated by this word. But in this interpretation, it has always perplexed me that different and generally opposite meanings should be given to the same word when applied to Christ

† Among the Rabbins, מליץ often signified an *orator*, whence the words הַלְצָה, מְלִיצָה, מְלִיצוֹת (chiefly in prose) are applied to an *oration* and to *eloquence*, and the verb הִלְצִיץ means to speak eloquently, (see *Buxtorfii Lexic. Chal. Talmudic et Rabbinic*, p. 113.) In the Old Test. this word means, 1. an *interpreter*, (of languages) as Gen. xlii. 23, where the Alexandrians use ἑρμηνευτης; 2. a legate, who speaks in the name of another, 2. Chron. xxxii. 21. as also by the Rabbins; 3. he who acts or speaks for another, as a legate or conciliator, (μεισιτος) or intercessor, or patron, or aid; and thus in Job xxxiii. 23, מלאך מליץ angelus tutor, intercessor, pleading man's cause before God, to whom is opposed שטן, [Comp. c. ii.] that is מלאך שטן; (ἀγγελος σαταν angelus adversarius; 2 Cor. xii. 7.) In Isa. xliii. 27, 28 it is applied to the priests, who are the intercessors of the people.

and to the Holy Spirit. And it appears forced and improbable, because Christ, when he promises the Holy Spirit to be a Paraclete, (Ch. xiv. 16) declares that he also is the Paraclete, (αλλου παρακλητον;) and the Apostle, in the epistles, while he often alludes to the words and sayings of Christ, related by himself in the Gospel, always uses them in a sense, if not precisely the same, at least not very dissimilar. If, therefore, the force of this word can be investigated, may we not adopt some meaning which shall be so extensive as to embrace both these places, and which shall be deservedly preferred to all others.

This meaning does not lie concealed, but is obviously displayed in the writings of the Greek Classics, and also of the Jews who spoke both Greek and Hebrew.

The most ancient writers of the Latin church, both in the *Gospel* and in the *first Epistle* of John, translate παρακαλεω, *advocare*;\* which signification, I suppose, appeared obscure and remote, although correct. But their good cause being badly defended, and some disliking the double use of the Latin word, this signification was gradually discarded by interpreters. All languages abound with vague and general terms, which embrace many things kindred in their nature; but to such terms, there is not in all languages the same definition. The translator therefore, often searches in vain for a word that will precisely correspond; even if he could succeed and translate with literal

\* We have before noted some passages from Tertullian. Novatian, Lucifer, Hilary, Pheopadius, the ancient codices of the Latin version, Colbertinus Vercellinensis, and others, also have in the Gospel *advocatum*. See Sabaterii Bibl. Lat. vers. antiq. John xiv. 16, et Blanchini Evangeliar. quadruplex, p. CDXIII.—Others of the Latins retain in the Gospel, the word *Paracletum*, agreeing with the Vulgate and some ancient interpreters, whose versions are exhibited in the Codex Veronensis, and Brixianus, according to Blanchinus. And in the Cantabrigiensis, whose text Semler has published at the end of his *Paraphras*, in *Evang. Johannis*. In 1 John lib. 1, the Vulgate has *advocatum*, when the ancient Latins have *Paracletum*, which is remarked by Sabaterius. The ancient Oriental Interpreters of the New Testament, the Syrians, Arabians, and Æthiopsians retain *Paracletum*.



and servile accuracy, he could not escape the censure of giving an unskilful and unfaithful translation. The ancient Biblical interpreters, who have translated literally into forced and barbarous Latin, expressing word for word and syllable for syllable, have fallen into this very error, so that although they speak the truth, they are yet destitute of credit. Those who condemned the ancient interpreters, may perhaps have been deceived by the modern use of the word *advocatus*, which differs widely from the ancient: but that we may avoid being deceived by it, we shall entirely reject it, in illustrating the import of paraclete, and shall proceed to show what guided the ancient interpreters in translating this Greek word, and what Latin words, according to the forms of speech of various ages, may in these places correspond to the Greek. Let us remember from the meanings of παρακαλεω, which we have collected, that it is applied to all those whose aid or assistance is in any manner called for or demanded. Hence the noun παρακλητος has a double import, the one general, the other particular. For παρακλητος, means both he who counsels, aids, advises, admonishes, watches for one's interest, or protects; an aider, counsellor, defender, or guardian; and also, he who conducts the cause of any one in trial, who defends or pleads for him, which the Latins call *patronum causæ*, (as Cicero pro. S Roscio, c. 2,) or *causidicum*. But it was thence transferred to defenders and intercessors of all sorts, who for another demanded pardon, and conciliated the favour of the great and powerful. Examples of both these meanings are found in the Hebrew and Greek writings of the Jews.

But this more extensive, and also more rare and accurate signification of the word, has been evidently neglected and omitted by those who have enumerated its various meanings. There is a remarkable passage of Philo, concerning God the Creator of the universe, (*de Opif. mundi*, p. 4, E. Ed. Mangei.) Οὐδενι παρακλητω (τις γαρ ἦν

ἑτερος) μονῶ δ' αὐτῷ χρησαμενος, ἐγνώθειν εὐεργετεῖν—την φύσιν, in which this term is bestowed upon a helper or assistant who persuades, admonishes and excites, referring to Isa xl 13, (τῆς χειρὸς συμβουλος ἐγενετο, ὡς συμβίβα αὐτόν,) comp. Rom. xi. 34. By the same writer, παρακαλεῖν also is used concerning those who give counsel, persuade or admonish, as when Moses, shortly before his death, exhorted Joshua to act courageously, (de Charit. p. 700, B. \*) In the Rabbinical books also, as *Drusius* has lately remarked, the Paracletes (פְּרַקְלִיטִין) of the Jews, Samaritans and Greeks are mentioned, that is, the partizans, friends and protectors, who were fathers in counsel, directors in government, and defenders or reconcilers in war. The Rabbins in other places give to these same persons, the Latin name Patroni, (פְּטְרוֹנִין) and in the same sense, which obtained among the Roman writers, when they mention the *patroni* of the people, of colonies, provinces, and also of freedmen; or when gods and goddesses are called *patroni* and *patronæ*. All these are correctly called paracletes (פְּרַקְלִיטִין, מְלִיצִין.) Nor can πλουσιῶν παρακλητοί, in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, Sec. 20, be differently understood. You see therefore, that the import of Paraclete is very extensive.

But the more limited signification of this word, is most frequently adopted in the Greek, Chaldee, and Hebrew books of the Jews; that is *patron*, defender or intercessor in a cause. The Rabbins have borrowed from the Greek,

\* In Seneca you often find *advocare* for *adjuvare*, *opem ferre*. as *Epist.* lxxii. 8, *Medicus*—sæpe ad eundem (ægrotum) quem *advocarat*, excitatur. (Nor is the conjecture of Gronovius of any weight, *avocaverat* or *adjuverat*.) *Advocatio*, *Ep.* xxii. 9, is used similarly. And *Ep.* xciv, he has this passage, “Nonne apparet, nobis esse opus aliquo *advocato* qui contra populi præcepta præcipiat?” for which almost in the end of the *Epistle* is put, *stet ad latus monitor*. In the same *Epistle* is this sentence, “*Monitoribus crebris opinionones, quæ nos circumsonant, compescant*, and a little after it is thus expressed: *Necessarium est admoneri et habere aliquem advocatum bonæ mentis, eque tanto fremitu tumultuque falsorum, unam denique audire vocem.*

the words παρακλητος, συνηγορος, (סְנִיגוֹר,) δικολογος, (דִּיקוֹלוֹגוֹס,) which they use promiscuously, and oppose to κατηγορος (קְטִיגוֹר,) thence the Chaldee Interpreter of Job xxxiii. 23, calls the angel (מִלִּיץ) who is said to intercede for men before God מְלֵאכָא פְּרַקְלִיטָא, and the Rabbins interpret the Paraclete, by patron, (מִלִּיץ טוֹב) and intercessor. In the same sense, they say that repentance, charity and good works, are the Paracletes of men at the tribunal of God. Philo too, in the same sense, often uses the noun παρακλητος, and the verb παρακλητευσειν, as concerning Macro the intercessor of Caius before the Emperor Tiberias; concerning Joseph who received his brethren into favour without any intercession, and the Jewish High Priest, who, when he supplicated God, used τη Λογω, as if παρακλητω τελειοστατω.

Therefore I think it is manifest, in what sense Christ and the Holy Spirit are called Paracletes by John, for this name is given to Christ, dwelling in Heaven, 1 John, ii. 1, only because αυτος ιλασμος, (ιλαστηριον, Rom. iii. 25,) εστι περι των αμαρτιων ημων, as John himself says in verse 2. This sense is illustrated by these two passages, Rom. viii. 34, (comp. Heb. vii. 25,) and Heb. ix. 24. In the latter, Christ being received into Heaven, and sitting at the right hand of God, is said εντυγχανειν υπερ ημων, i. e. to intercede for us, to plead our cause, and restore us to the favour of God. It is argued also, that Christ greatly excels the Jewish High Priest in dignity, because he entered not into a tem-

\* See the passages from Philo, in *Carpzov.*, Exercitt. in Ep. ad Heb. e Philone, p. 154. Also in *Lasnere Obs.* in N. T., Phil. p. 496. Those from the Rabbins in *Buxtorf's Lex. Talm.* p. 1843, and *Wetstein's* notes ad Jo. xiv. 16. See also that passage of Eusebius, H. E. V. 1, concerning a Christian Martyr, who, in the sentence of the judge was called παρακλητος χριστιανων, compare 1 John ii. 1, with Apoc. xii. 10, where an appellation opposite to παρακλητος is used, viz. ο κατηγορος or (which is the true reading) κατηγορ.

Read also *Midrasch Tillim*, fol. 55, a. from these words משל לקטוור to the end.



ple built with hands, but into heaven itself, 'εμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. For το ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ τινος, and εἰφανισθῆναι, is the province τοῦ Παρακλητοῦ, and this very thing by Philo is called παρακλητεύειν, (which word Eustathius also uses in this sense,) therefore ἐντυγχάνειν κατὰ τινος, is the same as ἐγκαλεῖν or κατηγορεῖν, Rom. xi. 7, comp. also, Apoc. xii. 10. Thus the most profound theologians have interpreted them, and they say that the death of Christ, ever since his return to heaven, continues to profit us; (αἰώνιαν λυτρωσιν εὐραμενος, Heb. ix. 12,) or that the efficacy of Christ's death, in procuring the favour of God, is everlasting. So that he, beholding the death of Jesus Christ, is continually propitious to the human race. Heb. xii. 24. Rom. viii. 26. For the Jewish priests were *intercessors* with God for the people, not with *words* only, but with *victims* and the *shedding of blood*. \*

But in the last discourses of Christ in John, when he promises the Holy Spirit, the import of this term is evidently more extensive. For although, according to Paul, (Rom. viii. 26,) it also belongs to the Holy Spirit to commend us to God, or intercede (ὑπερεντυγχάνει†) for us with him. Yet the scope of the discourse indicates that *Paraclete* here embraces much more. For βροθος or παραστάτης, an assistant, patron or guardian was promised, who should be to them, what Christ was while on earth; and the reason is manifest, why he bestowed that name both upon himself and upon the Holy Spirit; for he knew that the hour was at hand, when he should depart from the earth, and return to his Father, c. xiv. 4; xvi. 5, 10, 16. The propagation of the religion lately established, would then

\* Compare *C. Gu. F. Walchii* Dissert. de intercessione Christi sacerdotali, Gotting, 1774.

† John Damascenus appears to have understood it only in this sense, because (de orthodox. fid. i. 10,) he translates, παρακλητον John xiv. τὰς τῶν ὄλων παρακαλήσεις δεχομενον. The same is read in Glossis Hesychnianis. But παρακλησις here is not free from ambiguity.

devolve solely upon the Apostles ; who must so labour as to establish and extend what Christ had commenced, but they were disheartened, because they were ignorant, inexperienced, and without a guide, and foresaw contempt, hatred and persecution. Vid. c. xiv. 1, 12, 13 ; xv. 18 ; xvi. 20. As yet they had accomplished or attempted nothing, Christ had done all, he was their patron and teacher, whom they revered, and upon whose authority all things depended. Such being the state of things, what would naturally have been the tenor of his discourse to the disciples, shortly before his departure ? He knew that all power resided in himself, that by his strength he could confirm the doubting, calm the afflicted, and by his counsels guide the unwary in the hour of danger. Hence arose the discourse, (xiv. 1,) beginning “let not your hearts be troubled,” and ending (xvi. 33,) “Ye shall have tribulation but be of good cheer.” Therefore that he might comfort the afflicted, and excite them to their destined office, with courageous and ardent minds, he promised them success and the immediate and peculiar assistance of God, so that they would fearlessly dare to speak before magistrates and kings, and boldly and strenuously defend their cause, which is also the cause of God himself. Compare Matt. x. 20 ; Mark xii. 11 ; Luke xii 12, xxiv. 49. Christ was confident that after his departure, his apostles, having abandoned the errors of Judaism, and the traditions concerning the earthly empire of the Messiah, would by Divine assistance, understand the new doctrine and discipline, and be able to teach men, and to convince them *περι αμαρτιας, και περι δικαιοσυνης, και περι χριστου*. Nor did he doubt but that the seed which he had carefully sown in their minds, though a long time buried, would yet germinate and bear its rich and gladdening fruit, and that their labours being united, more would be done after his departure, than while he dwelt on earth, (Matt. xvi. 18 ; John iv. 35, 38 ; John xiv. 12, xvi. 7.) The change or conversion which would

take place in the apostles and other disciples of the new religion, after his departure is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete. He it is that warns, excites, teaches and confirms; who illustrates Divine truth, and brings to remembrance the words of Christ, and also directs the judgement, and prospers all their enterprises. John xiv. 26, xv. 26, 27, xvi. 8, 12, 13. Hence, he is said to be sent from God the Father, and from Christ,\* and to effect nothing, but according to the will of Christ and the Father, with whom there is an entire and perpetual oneness of purpose. Nor is this care and patronage of the Holy Spirit, according to Jesus and the apostles, confined solely to the apostles, but it extends itself to the whole church, and to individual Christians, accommodating itself to the variation of men, times and places. Jesus indeed denies that the world, (τον κοσμον) can receive this Spirit; John xiv. 17. (Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 14,) but he has promised him only to his friends. And this was the common and constant doctrine taught, from the time of John the Baptist, and often repeated and confirmed by Christ and all the Apostles. See Matt. iii. 11; John xi. 13, vii. 38, 39; Acts i. 5, ii. 38; 1 Cor. vi. 19; Tit. iii. 5; 1 Peter iv. 14. And

\* John xv. 26. Το πνευμα—ο παρα του πατρος εκπορευεται i. e. sent for chap. xiv. 16, it is ο πατηρ δωσει υμιν, and verse 28, ο πεμφει ο πατηρ εν τω ονοματι μου, also, ch. xv. 26. before these words, is read παρακλητος, ον εγω πεμψω υμιν παρα του πατρος. Whence πνευμα του θεου i. e. του πατρος is found, Matt. x. 20. And because the same spirit was in Christ, and came through him, it is called in Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6; Tit. iii. 5; Phil. i. 19; 1 John iv. 13; 1 Peter i. 11, πνευμα του χριστου i. e. του υιου. (Christ also speaking of himself, says εξηλθον εκ (απο, παρα) του θεου i. e. του πατρος John viii. 42, xvi. 27, 28, 30, xvii. 8. And generally in the Aramean dialect, which was used by the Jews of Palestine, persons were said to go *out* as *legates* from him who *sent* them.) By the Ecclesiastic writers, the Holy Spirit is said to be the *substitute* of Christ. *Tertullian*, de Virgg. veland, c. i. and de præscript. hæret, c. 13; says, Christum mississe vicariam vim Spiritus S. qui credentes agat.



those places in which ἐπαγγελία του Πατρος, i. e. πνευματος ἁγιου (Lev. xiv. 49,) is described as pertaining to *all* Christians who can receive it, as Gal. iii. 14; Eph. i. 13; Acts ii. 33, &c,

Hence we learn the cause why the prosperity of Christians, and the increase of the church, is by the apostles always ascribed to the Holy Spirit as the efficient agent. And this is that aid, and support of the Divine Spirit, (for according to Paul, Rom. viii. 26, συναντιλαμβανεται το Πνευμα under whose protection and guardianship we are placed,) by which Luke says the Christian Church was enlarged. This passage which has been generally neglected by the interpreters of John's Gospel, is thus; "Then had the Churches rest throughout all Judea, and Gallilee, and Samaria, and were edified: and walking in the fear of the Lord, and the comfort (παρακλησει) of the Holy Ghost were multiplied." In this passage, the interpreters have erred exceedingly, not only in connecting this word with the former, but also in explaining παρακλησις. Some with the Vulgate, render it *consolation*, others, *exhortation*, *admonition*, *confirmation*, and others, *joy*, and some *supplication*, which are all inconsistent with the scope of the discourse.

If this common name του Παρακλητου is regarded as it appears in the discourses of Christ, and doubtless in common use; and we understand by it the *aid*, or *guard*, or *protection* of the Holy Spirit, in which the Christians confided, and which they continually employed; the sense will be plain and perspicuous, for this very charge is referred to the care and patronage of the Holy Spirit promised by Christ, that the Christians might prosper and their number be increased.\*

\* Ἐπληθοντο were increased, or as the ancient Latin Interpreter in Laudian! codex according to Sabatier, they were multiplied (by the supplication of the Holy Spirit.) In the same sense, the word is sometimes used in Acts, as ch. vi. 7; ἐπληθυνετο ὁ ἀριθμος των μαθητων verse 1; πληθουνοντων των

But the declarations of Christ and his apostles, with many Jewish Doctors of that and the former age, concerning the Holy Spirit and his peculiar office, is the same as would have been drawn from the Sacred books of the Hebrews, (in which, as also in the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament,) the Holy Spirit is every where *endued with a person*. That the extent of the office of the Spirit, as the *Paraclete*, may be clearly understood, we shall draw forth from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, the description of his office and ministry. From this we shall at once discover that the number and variety of significations given to πνευμα by the modern Lexicographers of the New Testament, is far too great.

Among those spirits (מלאכים, רוחות, πνευμα ἁγγαι- λους) with which, though unseen, the universe is filled, and moved, and governed, by the will of God; one excels, who is in a peculiar sense called *divine, sacred, holy*, (קרושׁ) a pure intelligence, which excels all others in power and pervades, and rules, and upholds every thing. Even in the beginning, in the cradle of the world, when the earth was yet clothed with one wide ocean, this Divine Spirit, the source and principle of motion, was sent from God, and brooded over the water. (Gen. i. 2.) Nor was the creation of man accomplished without him. (Job xxxiii. 4.\*) He being most powerful, (Mic. ii. 7; Zach.

μαθητων elsewhere, προσετρεθησαν, as ch. ii. 41, 47, v. 14, xi. 24.—Falsely rendered in the Vulgate Ecclesia—consolatione Sancti Spiritus replebatur, which interpretation imposed on Augustine, Erasmus, and many others.

\* Philo de Gigant. p. 265, Ed. Mangei: “*Dei Spiritus dicitur primum aër fluens supra terram, tertium elementum, quod supra aquam vehitur: hence he says, in oppificio mundi, Spiritus Dei supra aquam ferebatur; (aër enim, cum sit levis attollitur et sursum fertur, ejusque basis est aqua;) deinde: immortalis illa scientia, cujus omnis sapiens fit particeps. Id ostenditur in artifice et opifice sacri operis, (Beselele, Ex. xxxi. 3.)* Compare his *Allegor. Lib. i. p. 50—52*. I dare not, indeed, positively deny that Moses, when he wrote this did not think of *air* or *wind*, but Philo and his followers deserve censure, because they have not only in *name* but in *fact*, disjoined that *immortal intelligence* from this Spirit. Thus the interpreters of Homer, measuring the learn-

iv. 6,) endues man with power and strength for deeds of greatness. For without his inspiration and impulse, the might and vigor of man is utterly powerless, Num. xxvii. 18; Judg. xi. 29, xiv. 6, 19; xv. 14. He knows all things,—nothing can escape his searching vision, Ps. cxxxix. 1; Is. xl. 3, (Wisdom ix. 17.) He is the source and the dispenser of wisdom, and every art and science in which men excel, so that he is correctly and appropriately styled the *spirit of wisdom*, of *understanding*, and of *knowledge*. Ex. xxviii. 3, xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31; Deut. xxxiv. 9; Is. xi. 2. The prophets receive his power, when they foretell future events, or exhibit prodigies and miracles, Gen. xli. 38; Num. xxiv. 2; Is. xlii. 1; Joel iii. 1.\* By the same spirit also God provides for men, and bestows *benefits* upon them. Wherefore, when they receive great and remarkable benefits, this spirit is said to be given them, and to be poured out upon them, Ps. cxliii. 10; Is. xxxii. 15, xlv. 3; Aag. ii. 6. Still further, every institution of religion, the moral discipline and improvement of the soul, piety towards God, and duty towards men, are derived from him; both in the ancient books of

ing of the ancient poet by their own, have reduced the simplicity of the pristine age, to a philosophical subtlety. In the infancy of a people, before philosophy is known, they supposed a spirit to have corporeal form, and yet *animal*. Every thing that has life and motion, is governed by a *Spirit*. Such is the nature which moves and animates the human body. It is derived from the Divine power, and when the body dies it will return to him who breathed it into the body. Gen. ii. 7; Eccl. xii. 7. See Comment. iii. p. 88, and *Koesleri* Dissert. de Philosoph. vet. Eccl. de Spiritu. Tubing. 1783. It must be confessed, that the opinions of remote ages, concerning such things, are very obscure and inexplicable. Hence the Theologians of the schools, who have attempted to explain them and adapt them to the precepts of modern philosophy, have fallen into so many difficulties.

\* Hence the prophets themselves were called קְדוּשִׁים ἀγιοι, θειοι, ἀνθρωποι θεου, θεοπροποι (Hom. It. xii. 228.) See what I have gathered from sacred and profane writers for illustrating the opinion of antiquity, in Comment. i. p. 29 and 36; to which add these passages of Homer, Odys. i. 200, 201, xv. 172.



the Bible, (as Gen. vi. 3 ; Isa. lix. 21,) and in those of a later age, (as Neh. ix. 20, 30 ; Ezek. xxxvi. 27, xxxvii. 14, xxxix. 29 ; Zach. xii. 10 ; Wisd. i. 5 ; Sirach i. 9.) On the other hand, he who is overwhelmed with fear, who distrusts himself and fortune, who feels unfit for great enterprises, who is borne down by calamity, who is afflicted with delirium or madness, who is an idiot, who is a notorious sinner, who indulges impious thoughts of God, and who teaches or prophecies falsehood, is said to be destitute of the Holy Spirit, and to be led by a *false Spirit*, either tempting him willingly, or sent from God, 1 Sam. xvi. 14—23, xviii. 10, xix. 9 ; Ps. li. 13, lxxxviii. 49, (comp. Luke xiii. 11 ; 2 Cor. xii. 9.) 1 Kings xxii. 22, 23. Thus the Holy Spirit is said to be grieved and offended with disobedience and immorality, Is. lxiii. 10 ; (comp. Ex. xxiii. 21.) But this same Spirit after his influences had ceased among the Jews, (John xiv. 17 ; Gal. iii. 2.) passed immediately to that new society, whose author and framer was Christ. From him was now derived all the divine benefits bestowed upon the worshippers of Christ, and all the virtue which distinguished them from other men ; while the opposite was attributed to an *evil spirit*, the author of all evil and misery, comp. Luke xi. 13 ; Mark iii. 29, 30 ; Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12 ; 1 John iv. 4 ; 1 Cor. ii. 12. By this Holy Spirit Christ himself was led, employing him as an aid in acting and speaking, John iii. 24 ; Matt. iii. 16, xii. 28 ; John i. 32, 33 ; Luke iv. i.

He was also the author of the Christian doctrine (which is sometimes called πνευμα,) for He knows all things παντα ερουνα, και τα βαθη του θεου, 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11, and therefore he is called Πνευμα σοφιας, αποκαλυψεις, γνωσεως, (Eph. i. 17,) by whom all μυστηρια are revealed and illustrated, Eph. iii. 5. Therefore the instruction of the Apostles and other teachers, who were inspired by that Spirit, obtained from God through Christ, was true and free from error, because ευηγγελισαντο εν Πνευματι αγιω αποσταλεντι απ ουρανου, 1 Pet. i.

12. Therefore, what they decreed, are called the decrees of the Holy Spirit, Acts xv. 28 ; Matt. xviii. 18. Whoever contemned and despised them, despised and rejected God and the Holy Spirit, Matt. xii. 31 ; Acts v. 39. The teachers and rulers of Christian Churches, also are said to be constituted by the Holy Spirit, Acts xx. 28. Whatever was, by the Pagans, as by Socrates, ascribed to το δαιμονιον, whose power is upon us ; was by the Christians, referred not to some *unknown God*,\* but to the Holy Spirit. For those internal emotions of the soul, which impelled them to action, and that boldness and eagerness in teaching and defending the doctrine of Christ, and the power of working miracles, they did not attribute to themselves, nor to external causes, but to the indwelling Spirit of holiness, Matt. x. 18—20 ; 2 Tim. i. 7 ; 1 Thess. i. 5. ; 1 Cor. xii. xiii. Likewise, if any one was destitute of that bravery of soul, and did not feel himself inwardly impelled to speak and act, he was said to be forbidden or hindered by the Holy Spirit, Acts xvi. 6, 7. But these things were peculiar and unusual among Christians, for it was not expedient that all should teach, prophecy and work miracles, (1 Cor. xii. 4, xiii ; Heb. ii 4,) while other things, derived from the same Spirit, were common to all, διαγεσεις χαρισματαων εις, το δε αυτο Πνευμα. Those gifts which did not belong to all, but were peculiar, were according to Paul temporary ; (1 Cor. xiii. 8—13, compared with xiv. 20 ; Eph. iv. 11—14.) for gifts of this kind could not be abiding and perpetual. Those *common* gifts, which were no less *divine* than the others, were perpetual, and never ceased from the church ; for if any so honoured Christ as to direct their life by his precepts and instructions, they were continually led by the Spirit of God, and no longer followed, τω Πνευματι and Ἀρχοντι του κοσμου (1 John iv. 4 ; 1

\* Seneca, Ep. xli., In unicoque virorum bonorum (quis deus incertum est) habitat deus.

Cor. ii. 12.) or τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ νυν ἐνεργουσι ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας, Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12. Therefore as all error, baseness, depravity and great wickedness, was ascribed to an *evil spirit*; so morality, piety, and the Christian virtues were ascribed to the *Holy Spirit*; by his influence, our lives are reformed and we are induced to cherish and practice virtue, Rom. vii. 6, viii. 1—4; Gal. v. 16—18, 22; 1 Cor. vi. 10, 11, 19; 1 Pet. i. 22; Eph. v. 18. To him is owing every Christian enterprize, and all the increase of the Christian Church, κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἀνθρώπον, Eph. iii. 16; from him is derived all the joy and peace of the soul, and the saving efficacy of the Christian doctrines (1 Thess. i. 6.)

All who obey this spirit, he aids in affliction, (συναντιλαμβάνεται,) conducts their affairs, and intercedes for them before God, ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, Rom. viii. 26, 27; but those who are vicious and corrupt, grieve him, and cause him to depart, Eph. iv. 30. Those who surrender entirely to the demands of Christ, and obey the precepts and instructions of God, know that they are approved of God, and indulge a hope of eternal life, the strength of this conviction, and the consciousness of every pious man is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, Rom. v. 5, viii. 16; Gal. iv. 6; Eph. i. 13, 14, iv. 30; 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5.

For this Spirit, therefore, whose offices are described by Christians as so many and so various, could there be any name discovered which would embrace at once all its offices and duties more naturally than *Paraclete*.

It remains now to illustrate the Latin words which may correspond to the Greek. I have before stated that the ancient Latin interpreters had incurred a causeless censure, because they translated παρακλητον, *advocatus*; for among the Latins this word was differently used in different ages. According to the common forms of speech which obtained in the Roman forum, while the republic flourished, the Greek word may be translated *advocatus*, when applied to the



Holy Spirit, but it must be rendered patron, (*patronum causæ*) when applied to Christ. Asconius remarks ad Ciceronis Divinitat. in Q. Cæcil. c. 4, Qui defendit alterum in judicio, aut *patronus* dicitur, si orator est; aut *advocatus* si aut jus suggerit, aut præsentiam suam commodat amico.\* For when a cause was pending, the friends of the parties were *invited* (*advocari*) to deliberate concerning it, to give counsel, to be present at the trial, and to sit in the same seat with the accused, that they might honour him, and show that they were ready to defend him, even though they might say or do nothing. And not only the accused but the accusers also, invited friends to the cause, whose office and attendance were called *advocatio*. Such *advocates* are often mentioned in the Writings of Plautus, Terence, Varro, Cicero and Livy, and are different from the *patrons of causes*.† But after the liberty of the republic was gone, the signification of the Latin word began to extend, in correspondence with the Greek, whose import was the same. For the next age not only called him, *advocate*, who admonished, persuaded and supported his friend, but also him who in the former age was called *patron of the cause*. The legal form it is true remained the same, but the name *advocate* gradually changed from him who aided a friend by his presence and counsel to a mere barrister. In this sense Quintillian, Pliny, Tacitus and Suetonius frequently use the words *advocari*, *advoca-*

\* Compare also, Laurent Valla, de ling Lat. elegantia, lib. 4, c. xii.

† This was the common use of the word *advocatus*, among writers of the golden age. See I. F. Gronovius ad Senecæ Librum de Clement. c. 19. I will not deny that *Patronos causarum*, according to the custom of the Greeks, were by these writers sometimes called, *advocatos*. Certainly by Cicero, de Or. ii. 47, and by Livy iii. 44—46, those are called *advocati* who defended in the forum, the cause of any one; (compare Dion. Hal. xi. p. 717, Ed. Sylburg, where παρακλητοι is found.) But as παρακαλεῖν among the Greek orators, meant to *bring a witness*, so by Plautus, a *witness* is called *advocatus*, Poen. iii. 5, 22, and 6, 11.

*lio* and *advocatum*.\* Therefore if we adopt the signification of the later age, which, to use the words of Ulpian, (Dig. de. var. et extraord. cognit.) *advocatus* accepit omnes omnino, qui causis agendis quoque studio operantur, there is no cause why παρακλητον may not, with the Vulgate and other Latin interpreters, be rendered *advocatum*. Nor must it be supposed that παρακλητος is one of those words which, to preserve the ancient Roman mode of expression, cannot be expressed by one Latin word. Cicero relates that Σωτηρ was of this kind in his time, (Verr. ii. 63.) We may according to the use of the ancient Latins, render it *patronum*, with its general import when applied to the Holy Spirit, and in its peculiar sense when applied to Christ, for the word *patron* may be so extended as to embrace all those who successfully perform any duty† for others. Thus according to the institute of Romulus, the common people adopted *patrons* from among the powerful, who embraced their *clients* with *paternal* care, defended their rights and avenged their injuries. Freedmen also called their Lords who had freed them, *patrons*. We are told also of patrons of the city, of the Senate and the legions; (who are elsewhere called guards, preservers, and presidents;) and among the Gods, those are called *patrons*, who in the next age were called *tutelary*. (See Macrobian Saturn, iii. 9.) Those, likewise, who made a treaty with conquered cities or nations,‡ were, according to the custom of the ancients called *patrons*. Such were the *patrons*

\* See Quinetillian de I. O. iv. 1, xii, 1, 25, (other passages from the same writer may be found in Indice Gesneriano h. vv.) also Tacitus Ann xi. 5; Pliny, Ep. i. 22, v. 4 and 8, and Suetonius, Claud. 15, and de ill. Gramm. c. 22. But the most remarkable passage is from the author's Dialogus de causis corrupt. eloqu. cap. i, "Horum temporum disertis *causidici*, et *advocati*, et *patroni*, et quidvis potius, quam oratores vocantur."

† " *Patronus* aut temporale nomen est defensoris, aut certe appellatio, per quam ostenditur, quid illi cultus, aut obsequii debeat."

‡ Cicero de Off. i. 11. Compare Plinii Epp. iv. 1, 4, and Suetonii Aug. c. 17, also Tiber. c. 6.

of Antium, Sicily, Bononia, the Sabine fields, Cyprus and other provinces, (comp. Livy. ix. 20, and others.) But since it pertained to the office of a patron, that he should be present at the trial of his *clients* and defend their cause, the name was gradually transferred to those who defended the accused and plead their cause in trial. Therefore, when barristers are called *patrons* or *patrons of causes*, and those whom they defend, *clients*, the word is used in its most confined signification.

We should learn from this discussion, what is continually urged by Christ and his Apostles, that we should own the Spirit by whose will all things are governed, who overrules the affairs of Christians, not only in general but in particular. For they admonish us continually to consider that this Divine Power is always present and beholding us, that he dwells in our souls, and that a good conscience, the promotion of virtue, every benefit, and the security of a happy and tranquil life, must be referred solely to him. Those, who remember these things will never so act as to defile, by baseness and depravity, that temple which the Holy Spirit has consecrated to God, (1 Cor. iii. 16.) The Spirit of God is not grieved with impunity, but he is grieved with all sin, nor will he suffer vicious intercourse. The following is a remarkable sentiment, and worthy the religion of Christ, though spoken by a Stoic philosopher :\* *Prope est a te deus, tecum est intus est. Ita dico, sacer intra nos spiritus sedet, malorum bonorum que nostrorum observator et custos : hic prout a nobis tractatus est, ita nos ipse tractat. Bonus vir sine deo nemo est. An potest aliquis supra fortunam, nisi ab illo adjutus exsurgere ? Ille dat consilia magnifica, et erecta. In unoquoque virorum bonorum habitat deus.—Vis istuc divina descendit.—Non potest res tanta sine admiciculo numinis stare.*

\* Seneca, Epist. xli. 1, 4, 5.



---

**WARBURTON**

ON

**Types and Secondary Senses,**

FROM HIS

**DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES,**

BOOK VI., SEC. VI.

---

\* It being of the highest importance to revelation in general, and not a little conducive to the support of arguments for the divine legation of Moses in particular, to show the logical truth and propriety of types in action, and secondary senses in speech, I shall take this opportunity to examine the matter to the bottom. For having occasionally shewn, in several parts of the preceding discourse, that the references in the old law to the Christian dispensation (of which we hold it to be the foundation and preparative) are in typical representations, and secondary senses; and the truth of Christianity depending on the real relations (which are to be discovered by such references) between the two dispensations, it will be incumbent on me to prove the logical truth and propriety of types in action, and secondary senses in speech.

And I enter on the subject with the greater pleasure, as one of the most plausible books ever wrote against Christianity is entirely levelled at them. In this enquiry I shall pursue the same method I have hitherto taken with infidel writers; examine only the grounds and principles on which they go, and having removed and overthrown them, in as few words as I am able, leave the superstructure to support itself as it may.

\* Concluding paragraph of the 5th Section of the 6th Book of the Divine Legation.

# WARBURTON

ON

## Types and Secondary Senses.

---

THE book I speak of, is entitled, a discourse of the grounds and reasons of the Christian religion, written, as is generally supposed, by Mr. Collins; a writer, whose dexterity in the arts of controversy was so remarkably contrasted by his abilities in reasoning and literature, as to be ever putting one in mind of what travellers tell us of the genius of the proper Indians, who, although the veriest bunglers in the fine arts of manual operation, yet excell all mankind in every slight and trick of Legerdemain.

The purpose of his book is to prove Jesus an impostor; and his grand argument stands thus—Jesus (as he shews) claims under the promised Messiah of the Jews, and so proposes himself as the deliverer prophesied of in their sacred books; yet (as he attempts to shew) none of those prophecies can be understood of Jesus but in a secondary sense only; now a secondary sense (as he pretends) is fanatical, chimerical, and contrary to all scholastic rules of interpretation; consequently Jesus not being prophesied of in the Jewish writings, his pretensions are false and groundless. His conclusion, the reader sees, stands on the joint support of these two propositions, that there is no Jewish prophecy which relates to Jesus in a primary sense; and that a secondary sense is enthusiastical and un-



scholastic. If either fail, his phantom of a conclusion sinks again into its original nothing.

Though I shall not omit occasionally to confute the first, yet it is the falsehood of the second I am principally concerned to expose. That there are Jewish prophecies which relate to Jesus in their direct and primary sense, has been proved by an excellent prelate with great force of reason and learning ; but, that secondary prophecies are not enthusiastical and unscholastic, has not been shewn and insisted on by the writers on this question with the same advantage. The truth is, the nature of a double sense in prophecies has been so little seen or enquired into, that even some divines who agree in nothing else, have agreed to second this assertion of Mr. Collins, and with the same frankness and confidence to pronounce that a double sense is enthusiastical and unscholastic. To put a stop therefore to this growing evil, so fatal to revelation, is not amongst the last purposes of the following discourse.

I. It hath been shewn, that one of the most ancient and simple modes of human converse was communicating the conceptions by an expressive action. As this was of familiar use in civil matters, it was natural to carry it into religious. Hence it is we see God delivering his instructions to the prophet, and the prophet God's commands to the people in this very manner. Thus far the nature of the action, both in civil and religious matters, is exactly the same.

But in religion it sometimes happens that a standing information is necessary, and there the action must be continually repeated. This is done by holding out the truth (thus to be preserved) in a religious rite. Here then the action begins to change its nature ; and, from a mere significative mark, of only arbitrary import, like words or letters, becomes an action of moral import, and so acquires the new specific name of Type. Thus God, intending to record the future sacrifice of Christ in action,

did it by the periodic sacrifice of a lamb without blemish. This was not merely significative of Christ, which any other expressive action might have been, but was likewise a type of him ; because that sacrifice being a religious rite, it had a moral import, under the Jewish dispensation.

Again it hath been shewn how, in the gradual cultivation of speech, the expression by action was improved and refined into an allegory or parable ; in which the words carry a double meaning ; having, besides their obvious sense that serves only for the envelope, a more material and secret one. With this figure of speech all the moral writings of antiquity abound. But when it is transferred, from civil use into religious, and employed in the writings of inspired men, to convey information of particular circumstances, in two distinct dispensations, to a people who had an equal concern in both, it is then what we call a double sense ; and undergoes the very same change of nature with an expressive action converted into a type ; that is, both the meanings in the double sense are of moral import ; whereas in the Allegory one only is so : and this, which arises out of the very nature of their conversion, from civil to religious matters, is the only difference between expressive actions and types, and between allegories and double senses.

From hence it evidently appears, that as types are only religious expressive actions, and double senses are only religious allegories, and receive no change but what the very manner of bringing those civil figures into Religion necessarily induces, they must needs have, in this their translative state, the same logical fitness they had in their native. Therefore, as expressive actions and allegories, in civil discourses are esteemed proper and reasonable modes of information, so must types and double senses in religious ; for the end of both is the same, namely, communication of knowledge. The consequence of this is, that our Author's proposition,—a secondary or double sense is en-

thusiastical and unscholastic, the necessary support of his grand argument, is entirely overthrown.

This is the true and simple origin of types and double senses, which our adversaries, through ignorance of the rise and progress of speech, and for want of knowing ancient manners, have insolently treated as the mere issue of the distempered brain of visionaries and enthusiasts.

II. Having thus shown their logical propriety, or that they are rational modes of information, I come now to vindicate their religious use, and to show that they are well suited to that religion in which we find them employed. An objection, which I conceive, may be made to this use, will lead us naturally into our argument. The objection is this : I have shown that these oblique modes of converse, though at first invented out of necessity, for general information, were employed at length, to a mysterious secretion of knowledge ; which, though it might be expedient, useful, and even necessary both in civil matters and in false religion, could never be so in the true ; for true religion having nothing to hide from any of its followers, types and double senses (the same mysterious conveyance of knowledge in Sacred matters, which allegorical words or actions are in civil,) were altogether unfit to be employed in it.

To this I answer, the Jewish Religion, in which these types and secondary senses, we say, are found, was given to one single people only, as the Christian is offered to all mankind : now the Christian, as our adversary\* himself,

\* " Christianity is founded on Judaism, and the New Testament on the Old ; and Jesus is the person said in the New Testament to be promised in the Old, under the character of the Messiah of the Jews, who, as such only, claims the obedience and submission of the world. Accordingly it is the design of the authors of the New, to prove all the parts of Christianity from the Old Testament, which is said to contain the words of eternal life, and to represent Jesus and his apostles as fulfilling by their mission, doctrines, and works, the predictions of the Prophets, the historical parts of the Old Testament, and the Jewish law ; which last is expressly said to prophesy of, or testify Christianity." *Grounds and Reasons, &c.* p. 4, 6.



labours to prove, professes to be grounded on the Jewish. If therefore Christianity was not only professedly, but really grounded on Judaism (and the supposition is strictly logical in a defence of types and double senses, whose reality depends on the reality of that relation,) then Judaism was preparatory to Christianity, and Christianity the ultimate end of Judaism. But it is not to be supposed that there should be an entire silence concerning this ultimate religion during the preparatory, when the notice of it was not only highly natural but expedient. 1. First, to draw those under the preparatory religion, by just degrees to the ultimate; a provision the more necessary, as the nature and genius of the two religions were different, the one carnal, the other spiritual. 2. Secondly, to afford convincing evidence to future ages, of the truth of that ultimate religion; which evidence, a circumstantial prediction of its appearance and nature so long beforehand effectually does afford. The ultimate religion then must have been noticed in the preparatory.

Our next inquiry will be, in what manner this notice must needs be given. Now the nature of the thing informs us it could not be directly and openly; so as to be understood by the people at the time of giving. Because this would have defeated God's intermediate purpose, which was to train them, by a long discipline, under his preparatory dispensation. But that being a religion founded only on temporal sanctions, and burdened with a minute and tiresome ritual, had the people known it to be only preparatory to another, founded on better promises and easier observances, they would never have borne the yoke of the law, but have shaken off their subjection to Moses before the fulness of time had brought their spiritual deliverer among them, as, without this knowledge, they were but too apt to do, on every imaginary prospect of advantage. This information, therefore, was to be delivered with caution, and conveyed under the cover of their present economy.

Hence arose the fit and necessary use of types and secondary senses. For the only two safe and lasting means of conveyance were, their public Ritual, and the Writings of the Prophets. And a speaking action, and an allegory, when thus stationed, had all the secrecy that the occasion required. We have observed, that in the simpler use of speaking by action, the action itself hath no moral import, and so, having but one meaning, the information it conveys is clear and intelligible. But where a rite of Religion is used for this speaking action, there the action hath a moral import, and so, having two meanings, its information is more obscure and mysterious. Hence it appears, that this mode of speaking action, called a type, is exactly fitted for the information in question. Just so it is again with the secondary sense. In the mere allegory, the representing image has no moral import: in the secondary sense (for a contrary reason, which the very term imports) it has. And so hath the same fitting obscurity with information by types. For the typical ritual, and the double prophecy, had each its obvious sense in the present nature and future fortune of the Jewish Religion and republic.

Such, we shall prove, was the wonderful economy of Divine Wisdom, in connecting together two dependent religions, the parts of one grand dispensation; by this means making one preparatory to the other, and each mutually to reflect light upon the other. Hence we see the desperate humour of that learned man, but very sincere Christian,\* who, because most of the prophecies relating to Jesus, in the Old Testament, are of the nature described above, took it into his head that the Bible was corrupted by the enemies of Jesus. Whereas, on the very supposition of a mediate and ultimate religion, which this good man holds, the main body of prophecies in the Old Testa-

\* Mr. Whiston.

ment relating to the New, must, according to all our ideas of fitness and expediency, needs be prophecies of a secondary sense. But it is the usual refuge of folly to throw its distresses upon knavery. And thus, as we observed, the Mahometans, likewise, who pretend to claim under the Jewish law, not finding there the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, are positive that the Jews have corrupted their own Scriptures in pure spite to their great Prophet.

III. Having thus shown the reasonable use and great expediency of these modes of Sacred information, under the Jewish economy; the next question is, whether they be indeed there. This we shall endeavour to show. And that none of the common prejudices may lie against our reasoning, the example we give, shall be of types and double prophecies, employed even in subjects relating to the Jewish dispensation only.

1. The whole ordinance of the passover was a type of the redemption from Egypt. The striking the blood on the side-posts, the eating flesh with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, and in a posture of departure and expedition, were all significative of their bondage and deliverance. This will admit of no doubt, because the institutor himself has thus explained the type.—And thou shalt show thy son, (says he) in that day, saying, this is done because of that which the Lord did unto me, when I came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes; that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth. For with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt. Thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance in his season from year to year.\* As therefore it was of the genius of these holy rites to be typical or significative of God's past, present, and future dispensations to his people, we cannot in the

\* Exod. xiii. 8. and seq.



least doubt, but that Moses, had he not been restrained by those important considerations explained above, would have told them that the sacrifice of the lamb without blemish was a type, a sign or memorial of the death of Christ.

2. With regard to double senses, take this instance from Joel: who, in his prediction of an approaching ravage by Locusts, foretells likewise, in the same words, a succeeding desolation by the Assyrian army. For we are to observe that this was God's method both in warning and in punishing a sinful people. Thus, when the seven nations for their exceeding wickedness were to be exterminated, God promises his chosen people to send hornets before them, which should drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before them. Now Joel, under one and the same prophecy, contained in the first and second Chapters of his book, foretells, as we say, both these plagues; the locusts in the primary sense, and the Assyrian army in the secondary—"Awake, ye drunkards, and weep and howl, all ye drinkers of wine, because of the new wine, for it is cut off from your mouth. For a nation is come up upon my land, strong and without number; whose teeth are the teeth of a lion, and he hath the cheek teeth of a great lion. He hath laid my vine

\* Exod. xxiii. 23. This, the author of the book called the "Wisdom of Solomon" admirably paraphrases:—"For it was thy will to destroy by the hands of our fathers both those old inhabitants of thy holy land; whom thou hatedst for doing most odious works of witchcrafts, and wicked sacrifices; and also those merciless murderers of children, and devourers of man's flesh, and the feasts of blood, with their priests out of the midst of their idolatrous crew, and the parents that killed, with their own hands, souls destitute of help: That the land which thou esteemedst above all other might receive a worthy colony of God's children. Nevertheless even those thou sparedst as men, and didst send wasps, forerunners of thine host, to destroy them by little and little. Not that thou wast unable to bring the ungodly under the hand of the righteous in battle, or to destroy them at once with cruel beasts, or with one rough word; but executing thy judgments upon them by little and little, thou gavest them place of repentance, not being ignorant that they were a naughty generation, and that their malice was bred in them, and that their cogitation would never be changed." Chap. xii. ver. 5. and seq.

waste, and barked my fig-tree; he hath made it clean bare, and cast it away, the branches thereof are made white—The field is wasted, the land mourneth; for the corn is wasted: The new wine is dried up, the oil languisheth. Be ye ashamed, O ye husband-men: Howl, O ye vine-dressers, for the wheat and for the barley; because the harvest of the field is perished.\* Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain. Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble; for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand. A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: a great people and a strong, there hath not been ever the like—A fire devour-eth before them, and behind them a flame burneth: The land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness, yea, and nothing shall escape them. The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses, and as horse-men so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble, as a strong people set in battle array. Before their face the people shall be much pained; all faces shall gather blackness. They shall run like mighty men, they shall climb the wall like men of war, and they shall march every one on his ways, and they shall not break their ranks; neither shall one thrust another, they shall walk every one in his path: and when they fall upon the sword, they shall not be wounded. They shall run to and fro in the city; they shall run upon the wall, they shall climb up upon the houses; they shall enter in at the windows like a thief. The earth shall quake before them, the heavens shall tremble, the sun and moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining.”\*

\* Chap. ii. v. 1—11.

The fine conversion of the subjects is remarkable. The prophecy is delivered in the first chapter—awake, ye drunkards, &c., and repeated in the second—Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, &c. In the first chapter, the locusts are described as a people; for a nation is come up upon my land, strong and without number. But, that we may not be mistaken in the primary sense, namely the plague of locusts, the ravages described are the ravages of insects: They lay waste the vine, they bark the fig-tree, make the branches clean bare, and wither the fruit-trees. In the second chapter, the hostile people are described as locusts: As the morning spread upon the mountains. The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses, and as horsemen so shall they run, as a strong people set in battle array. They shall run like mighty men, they shall climb the wall like men of war. But that we may not mistake the secondary sense, namely the invasion of a foreign enemy, they are compared, we see, to a mighty army. This art, in the contexture of the prophecy, is truly divine; and renders all chicane to evade a double sense ineffectual. For in some places of this prophecy, dearth by insects must needs be understood; in others, desolation by war. So that both senses are of necessity to be admitted. And here let me observe, that had the commentators on this prophecy but attended to the nature of the double sense, they would not have suffered themselves to be so embarrassed; nor have spent so much time in freeing the prophet from an imaginary embarrassment (though at the expense of the context) on account of the same prophecy having in one part that signification primary, which, in another, is secondary. A circumstance so far from making an inaccuracy, that it gives the highest elegance to the discourse, and joins the two senses so closely as to obviate all pretence for a division, to the injury of the Holy Spirit. Here then we have a double sense, not aris-



ing from the interpretation of a single verse, and so obnoxious to mistake, but of a whole and very large descriptive prophecy.

But by strange ill fortune even some believers, as we have observed, are come at length to deny the very existence of double senses and secondary prophecies. A late\* writer hath employed some pages to proclaim his utter disbelief of all such fancies. I shall take the liberty to examine this bold rectifier of prejudices, not for any thing he hath opposed to the principles here laid down ; for I dare say these were no more in his thoughts when he wrote, than what he has wrote were in mine when I laid them down ; but only to show that all he has written is far wide of the purpose, though, to confess the truth, no wider than the notions of those he argues against ; men, who contend for types and secondary senses in as extravagant a way as he opposes them ; that is, such as take a handle from the doctrine of double senses to give a loose to the extravagances of a fanatical imagination. Consequently his arguments which are aimed against their very use and being, hold only against their abuse. And that abuse, which others indeed have urged as an argument against the use, he sets himself to confute (a mighty undertaking !) and then mistakes his reasoning for a confutation of the use. His materials and his project being thus ill sorted, it is no wonder his argument should look asquint. One can hardly indeed tell what they look at ; so that if we should chance to attack them on their blind side, it is not with design to take them at advantage, but merely from being deceived by their odd looks.

His reasoning against double senses of prophecies, as far as I understand it, may be divided into two parts ;

1. Replies to the arguments of others for double senses.

\* The principles and connection of Natural and Revealed Religion, distinctly considered, p. 221, by Dr. Sykes.

2. His own arguments against them. With his replies I have nothing to do, (except where something of argument against the reality of double senses is contained) because they are replies to no arguments of mine, nor to any I make use of. I have only therefore to consider what he has to say against the thing itself.

1. His first argument against more senses than one, is as follows—“Supposing that the opinion or judgement of the Prophet or Apostle is not to be considered in matters of prophecy, more than the judgement of a mere Amanuensis is ; and that the point is not what the opinion of the Amanuensis was, but what the Inditer intended to express ; yet it must be granted, that if God had any views to some remoter events, at the same time that the words which were used, were equally applicable to, and designed to express nearer events ; those remoter events as well as the nearer, were in the intention of God, and if both the nearer and remoter events were equally intended by God in any proposition, then the literal sense of them, is not the one nor the other singly and apart, but both together must be the full meaning of such passages.”

—Then the literal sense of them is not the one nor the other singly and apart, but both of them together, &c. ; i. e. if both together make up but one literal sense, then there is neither a secondary nor a double sense : And so there is an end of the controversy. A formidable adversary truly ! He threatens to overthrow the thing, and gives us an argument against the propriety of the term. Let him but allow his adversaries that a nearer and a remoter event are both the subjects of one and the same prediction, and, I suppose, it will be indifferent to them whether he calls it, with them, a prophecy of a double and secondary sense, or they call it, with him, a prophecy of a single literal sense ; and he ought to be thankful for so much complaisance, for it is plain, they have the better of him even in the propriety of the term. It is allowed that God in these

predictions, might have views to nearer and remoter events; now these nearer and remoter events were events under two different dispensations, the Jewish and the Christian. The prediction is addressed to the Jews, who had not only a more immediate concern with the first, but, at the time of giving the prophecy, were not to be let into the secrets of the other. Hence the prediction of the nearer event was properly the literal or primary sense, as given for the present information of God's servants; and the more remote event for their future information, and so was as properly the secondary sense, called with great propriety figurative, because conveyed under the terms which predicted the nearer event. But I hope a first and a second, a literal and a figurative, may make up a double sense.

2. His second argument runs thus: "Words are the signs of our thoughts, and therefore stand for the ideas in the mind of him that uses them. If then words are made use of to signify two or more things at the same time, their significancy is really lost, and it is impossible to understand the real certain intention of him that uses them. Were God to discover any thing to mankind by a written Revelation, and were he to make use of such terms as stand for ideas in men's minds, he must speak to them so as to be understood by them. They must have in their minds the ideas which God intended to excite in them, or else it would be in vain to attempt to make discoveries of his will; and the terms made use of must be such as were wont to raise such certain ideas, or else there could be no written Revelation. The true sense, therefore, of any passage of Scripture can be but one; or if it be said to contain more senses than one, if such multiplicity be not revealed, the revelation becomes useless, because unintelligible."

Men may talk what they please of unintelligibleness in writers who have two senses, but it has been my fortune to meet with it much oftener in those who have none.



Our reasoner has here mistaken the very question, which is, whether a Scripture *proposition* (for all the prophecies are reducible to propositions) be capable of two senses ; and, to support the negative, he labours to prove that *words* or terms can have but one. If then words are made use of, to signify two or more things at the same time, their significancy is really lost—such terms as stand for ideas in men’s minds—Terms made use of must be such as are wont to raise such certain ideas. Now all this is readily allowed, but how utterly wide of the purpose, may be seen by this instance : Jacob says, I will go down into Sheol unto my son mourning. Now if Sheol signify in the ancient Hebrew only the grave, it would be an abusive interpretation to make it signify likewise, with the vulgar Latin, in infernum, because there the interpreters were giving not the sense of a proposition, but the sense of a word : and if words (as he says) be made to signify two or more things at the same time, their significancy is lost. But where the Psalmist says, Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (Sheol) neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption ; it is very different as well as reasonable, to interpret this, where the sense of the whole proposition, not of a single word, is the subject of enquiry, in a spiritual sense of the resurrection of the body of Christ from the grave, and the reduction of his soul from the region or receptacle of departed spirits ; though at the same time there be a literal sense allowed, in which the words translated soul and hell, are left in the meaning they bear, in the Hebrew tongue, of body and grave.

But let us suppose our reasoner to mean that a PROPOSITION is not capable of two senses, as perhaps he did ; for notwithstanding his express words to the contrary, yet, before he comes to the end of his argument, he talks of the true sense of any *passage* being but one ; and then his assertion must be, that if one *proposition* have two senses, its significancy is really lost ; and that it is impossible to

understand the real, certain intention of him that uses them; consequently Revelation will become useless, because unintelligible.

Now this I will take the liberty to deny. In the following instances a single proposition was intended by the writers and speakers to have a double sense, as he himself shall own. The Poet Virgil says,

—“*Talia, per clypeum Volcani, dona parentis  
Miratur : rerumque ignarus, imagine gaudet,  
ATTOLENS HUMERO FAMAMQUE ET FATA NEPOTUM.*”\*

The last line has these two senses : First, that Æneas bore upon his shoulders a shield, on which was engraved an historical picture of the Fame and Fortunes of his posterity ; Secondly, that under the protection of that piece of armour he established their Fame and Fortunes, and was enabled to make a settlement in Latium, which proved the foundation of the Roman Empire.

Here then is a double sense, which, I believe, none who have any taste of Virgil will deny. The preceding verse introduces it with great art,

“*Miratur, rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet :*”

as preparing us for something a little mysterious, and hid behind the Letter.

The Holy Spirit, in Sacred Scripture, says to Peter, on his refusing to eat promiscuously, in the famous vision, of clean and unclean meats, What God hath cleansed that call not thou common.† The proposition is, that which God hath cleansed is not common ; but no one that reads this story can doubt of its having this double sense ; 1. That the distinction between clean and unclean meats was to be abolished. 2. And That the Gentiles were to be called into the Church of Christ. Here then the true sense of these passages is not one, but two ; and yet the inten-

\* Æneid, lib. viii. in fin.

† Acts x. 15.

tion or meaning is not on this account the least obscured or lost, or rendered doubtful and unintelligible.

He will say, perhaps, that the very nature of the subject, in both cases, determines the two senses here explained.—And does he think we will not say the same of double senses in the prophecies? It is true he seems to take it for granted that Judaism and Christianity have no manner of relation to one another: why else would he bring in discredit of a double sense, these two verses of Virgil,

“*Hi motus animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta  
Pulveris exigui jactu composita quiescunt.*”

On which he thus descants;—The words are determinate and clear.—Suppose now a man having occasion to speak of intermitting fevers, and the ruffle of a man’s spirits, and the easy cure of the disorder by pulverized bark, &c. To make this pertinent, we must suppose no more relation between the fortunes of the Jewish Church and the Christian, than between a battle of bees, and the tumult of the animal spirits: if this were not his meaning it will be hard to know what was, unless to show his happy talent at a Parody.

3. His next argument runs thus—“If God is disposed to reveal to mankind any truths, he must convey them in such a manner that they may be understood. If he speaks to men, he must condescend to their infirmities and capacities. Now if he were to contrive a proposition in such a manner, that the same proposition should relate to several events; the consequence would be, that as often as events happened which agreed to any proposition, so often would the revelation be accomplished. But this would only serve to increase the confusion of men’s minds, and never to clear up any prophecy: no man could say what was intended by the Spirit of God. And if many events were intended, it would be the same thing as if no event was intended at all.”



I all along suspected he was talking against what he did not understand. He proposed to prove the absurdity of a double or secondary sense of prophecies ; and now he tells us of many senses ; and endeavours to show how this would make prophecy useless. But sure he should have known, what the very phrase itself intimates, that no prophetic proposition is pretended to have more than two senses : and further, that the subject of each is supposed to relate to two connected and successive dispensations, which is so far from creating any confusion in men's minds, or making a prophecy useless. that it cannot but strengthen and confirm our belief of, and give double evidence to, the divinity of the prediction. On the contrary, he appears to think that what Orthodox Divines mean by a second sense, is the same with what the Scotch Prophets mean by a second sight ; the seeing one thing after another as long as the imagination will hold out.

4. His last argument is : “ Nor is it any ground for such a supposition, that the prophets being full of the ideas of the Messiah, and his glorious kingdom, made use of images taken from thence, to express the points upon which they had occasion to speak. From whencesoever they took their ideas, yet when they spoke of present facts, it was present facts only, that were to be understood. Common language, and the figures of it, and the manner of expression ; the metaphors, the hyperboles, and all the usual forms of speech, are to be considered : and if the occasions of the expression are taken from a future state, yet still the proposition is to be interpreted of that one thing to which it is particularly applied.”

Orthodox Divines have supported the reasonableness and probability of double senses by this material observation, that the inspired Writers were full of the ideas of the Christian dispensation. That is, there being a close relation between the Christian and the Jewish, of which the Christian was the completion, whenever the Prophets

spoke of any of the remarkable fortunes of the one, they interwove with it those of the other. A truth which no man could be so hardy to deny, who believes, 1. That there is that relation between the two religions : and 2. That these inspired men were let into the nature and future fortunes of both. See now in what manner our author represents this observation. It is no ground, says he, for a double sense, that the Prophets were full of the ideas of a Messiah and his glorious kingdom, and made use of images taken from thence ; (that is, that they ennobled their style by their habitual contemplation of magnificent ideas.) For, (continues he) whencesoever they took their ideas, when they spoke of present facts, present facts alone were to be understood. Common language and the figures of it, &c. Without doubt, from such a fulness of ideas, as only raised and ennobled their style, it could be no more concluded that they meant future facts when they speak of present, than that Virgil, because he was full of the magnificent ideas of the Roman grandeur, where he says, Priami Imperium—Divum Domus, Ilium, and Ingens gloria Teucrorum, meant Rome as well as Troy. But what is all this to the purpose ? Orthodox Divines talk of a fulness of ideas arising from the Holy Spirit's revealing the mutual dependency and future fortunes of the two dispensations ; and revealing them for the information, solace, and support of the Christian Church : and Dr. Sykes talks of a fulness of ideas, got, nobody knows how, and used, nobody knows why, to raise (I think he says) their style and ennoble their images. Let him give some good account of this representation, and then we may be able to determine, if it be worth the trouble, whether he here put the change upon himself or his reader.

From hence, to the end of the chapter, he goes on to examine particular texts urged against his opinion ; with which I have at present nothing to do ; first, because the proper subject of this section is the general nature only

of types and double senses : and secondly, because what room I have to spare, on this head, is for a much welcomer guest, whom I am now returning to, the original author of these profound reasonings, Mr. COLLINS himself.

To proceed. We have shown that types and secondary senses are rational, logical, and scholastic modes of information ; that they were expedient and highly useful under the Jewish economy ; and that they were indeed there.

But now it will be objected, that, as far as relates to the Jewish economy, a double sense may be allowed ; because the affairs of that dispensation may be well supposed to be in the thoughts of the Prophet ; but it is unreasonable to make one of the senses relate to a different and remote dispensation never in his thoughts. For the books of the Old Testament (Mr. Collins assures us) seem the most plain of all ancient writings, and wherein there appears not the least trace of a typical or allegorical intention in the authors or in any other Jews of their time.

I reply, that was it even as our adversaries suggest, that all the prophecies, which, we say, relate to Jesus, relate to him only in a secondary sense ; and that there were no other intimations of the new dispensation but what such prophecies convey ; it would not follow that such sense was false or groundless. And this I have clearly shown in the account of their nature, origin, and use. Thus much I confess, that without miracles, in confirmation of such sense, some of them would with difficulty be proved to have it ; because, as we have shown, a commodious and designed obscurity attends both their nature and their use.

But then this let me add, and these pretenders to reason would do well to consider it, that the authority of superior wisdom as rationally determines the assent to the meaning of a doubtful proposition, as any other kind of logical evidence whatsoever.

But this is by no means the case. We say further,  
1. That some of the prophecies relate to Jesus in a prima-



ry sense. 2. That besides these, there are in the Prophetic Writings, the most clear and certain intimations of the Gospel economy.

I. That some prophecies relate to the Messiah in a primary sense, has been invincibly proved by a very learned prelate.\* I shall mention therefore but one, and that only because our adversary has made some remarks upon it, which will afford an occasion for further illustration of the subject. Jesus says of John the Baptist—*This is the Elias that was to come.* “Wherein (says the author of the Grounds, &c.) he is supposed to refer to these words of Malachi, behold, I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord; which, according to their literal sense, are a prophecy, that Elijah or Elias was to come in person, and therefore not literally but mystically fulfilled in John the Baptist.” And again, in his *Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered*, speaking of this passage of Malachi, he says, “But to cut off all pretence for a literal prophecy, I observe, first, that the literal interpretation of this place is, that Elias, the real Elias was to come. And is it not a most pleasant literal interpretation to make Elias, not signify Elias, but somebody who resembled him in qualities?—Secondly, I observe, that the Septuagint Translators render it, Elias the Tishbite—and that the Jews, since Christ’s time, have generally understood, from the passage before us, that Elias is to come in person. But John the Baptist himself, who must be supposed to know who he was himself, when the question was asked him, whether he was Elias, denied himself to be Elias; and when asked who he was, said, he was the voice of one crying in the wilderness, &c.; which is a passage taken from Isaiah.”

1. The first thing observable in these curious remarks is, that this great Philosopher and Divine did not so much

\* The present Bishop of Durham:

as understand the terms of the question. The words, says he, according to their literal sense, are a prophecy, that Elijah was to come in person, and therefore not literally but mystically fulfilled in John the Baptist. He did not so much as know the meaning of a primary and secondary sense, about which he makes all this bustle. A secondary sense indeed implies a figurative interpretation; a primary implies a literal: but yet this primary sense does not exclude figurative terms. The primary or literal sense of the prophecy in question is, that before the great and terrible day of the Lord, a messenger should be sent, resembling in character the Prophet Elijah; this messenger by a figure, is called the prophet Elijah. A figure of the most easy and natural import; and of especial use amongst the Hebrews, who were accustomed to denote any character or action by that of the kind which was become most known or celebrated. Thus the Prophet Isaiah: "And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea, and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams."\*—Here a second passage through the Red sea is promised in literal terms; but who therefore will say that this is the literal meaning? The literal meaning, though the prophecy be in figurative terms, is simply redemption from bondage. For Egypt, in the Hebrew phrase, signified a place of bondage. Would not he be thought an admirable interpreter of Virgil who should criticise the Roman Poet in the same manner?—Virgil seems the most plain of all ancient writings: and he says,

"Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna."

which, according to its literal meaning, is, that the Virgin returns, and old Saturn reigns again, in person: and therefore not literally but mystically fulfilled in the justice and

\* Chap. xi. 15.

felicity of Augustus' reign. And it is a most pleasant literal interpretation, to make the Virgin and Saturn not signify the Virgin and Saturn, but somebody who resembled them in qualities. Such prate, in a classical critic, would be called nonsense in every language. But freethinking sanctifies all sorts of impertinence.—This was a kind of compound blunder; literal, in common speech, being opposed both to figurative and to spiritual; and mystical signifying both figurative and spiritual; he confounded the distinct and different meanings both of literal and mystical.

He goes on—"I observe, that the Septuagint translators render it Elias the Tishbite—and that the Jews, since Christ's time, have generally understood from this passage, that Elias is to come in person. And John the Baptist himself, who must be supposed to know who he was himself, when the question was asked him, denied himself to be Elias." Why does he say, since Christ's time, and not before, when it appears to be before as well as since, from his own account of the translation of the Septuagint? for a good reason. We should then have seen why John the Baptist, when asked, denied himself to be Elias; which it was not Mr. Collins's design we should see; if indeed we do not ascribe too much to his knowledge in this matter. The case stood thus: at the time of the Septuagint translation, and from thence to the time of Christ, the doctrine of a transmigration, and of a resurrection of the body, to repossess the land of Judea, were national opinions; which occasioned the Jews by degrees to understand all these sorts of figurative expressions literally. Hence, amongst their many visions, this was one, that Elias should come again in person. Which shows what it was the Jews asked John the Baptist; and what it was he answered, when he denied himself to be Elias: Not that he was not the messenger prophesied of by Malachi (for his pretending to be



that messenger evidently occasioned the question) but that he was not, nor did the prophecy imply that the messenger should be, Elias in person.

2. But we will suppose all that an ingenuous adversary can ask—“That most of the prophecies in question relate to Jesus in a secondary sense only; the rest in a primary, but expressed in figurative terms; which, till their completion, threw a shade over their meaning, and kept them in a certain degree of obscurity.” Now, to show how all this came about, will add still further light to this very perplexed question.

We have seen, from the nature and long duration of the Jewish economy, that the prophecies which relate to Jesus, must needs be darkly and enigmatically delivered. We have seen how the allegoric mode of speech, then much in use, furnished the means, by what we call a double sense in prophecies, of doing this with all the requisite obscurity. But as some of these prophecies by their proper light alone, without the confirmation of miracles, could hardly have their sublimer sense so well ascertained; to render all opposers of the Gospel without excuse, it pleased the Holy Spirit, under the last race of the prophets, to give credentials to the mission of Jesus by predictions of him in a primary and literal sense. Yet the Jewish economy being to continue long, there still remained the same necessity of a covert and mysterious conveyance. That figurative expression therefore, which was before employed in the proposition, was now used in the terms. Hence, the prophecies of a single sense come to be in highly figurative words: as before, the earlier prophecies of a double sense (which had a primary meaning in the affairs of the Jewish state, and, for the present information of that people) were delivered in a much more simple phrase.

The Jewish doctors, whose obstinate adherence, not to the letter of the law, as this writer ignorantly or frau-

dulently suggests, but to the mystical interpretations of the Cabala, prevents their seeing the true cause of this difference in the language, between the earlier and latter prophets ; the Jewish doctors, I say, are extremely perplexed to give a tolerable account of this matter. What they best agree in is, that the figurative enigmatic style of the later prophets (which however they make infinitely more obscure by cabalistic meanings, than it really is, in order to evade the relation which the predictions have to Jesus) is owing to the declining state of prophecy. Every prophet, says the famous Rabbi, Joseph Albo, that is of a strong, sagacious, and piercing understanding, will apprehend the thing nakedly without any similitude ; whence it comes to pass that all his sayings are distinct and clear, and free from all obscurity, having a literal truth in them : But a prophet of an inferior rank or degree, his words are obscure, enwrapped in riddles and parables ; and therefore have not a literal but allegorical truth contained in them.\* And indeed our fictitious Rabbi seems to have had as little knowledge of this matter as the other ; for in answer to what Mr. Whiston, who, extravagant as he was in rejecting all double senses, yet knew the difference between a secondary and enigmatic prophecy, which, we shall see, Mr. Collins did not, in answer, I say, to Mr. Whiston, who observed “that the prophecies (meaning the primary) which relate to Christianity are covered, mystical and enigmatical,” replies, “this is exactly equal mysticism with, and just as remote from the real literal sense as the mysticism of the allegorists (i. e. the contenders for a double sense) and is altogether as obscure to the understanding.†” His argument against secondary senses is, that they are unscholastic and enthusiastical. Mr. Whiston, to humour him, presents him with direct and primary

\* *Smith's Select Discourses*, p. 180.

† *Grounds and Reasons*, &c., p. 242.

prophecies, but tells him, at the same time, they are expressed in covered, mystical, and enigmatic terms. This will not satisfy him; it is no better than the mysticism of the allegorists. How so? We may think perhaps, that he would pretend to prove, because his argument requires he should prove, that enigmatical expressions are as unscholastic and enthusiastical as secondary senses. No such matter. All he says is, that they are as obscure to the understanding. But obscurity is not his quarrel with secondary senses. He objects to them as unscholastic and enthusiastical. But here lay the difficulty; no man, who pretended to any language, could affirm this, of figurative, enigmatical expressions; he was forced therefore to have recourse to his usual refuge, obscurity.

It is true, he says, these mystical enigmatic prophecies (as Mr. Whiston calls them) are equally remote from the real literal sense, as the mysticism of the Allegorists. But this is only a repetition of the blunder exposed above, where he could not distinguish between the literal sense of a term, and the literal sense of a proposition. And how gross that ignorance is we may see by the following instance. Isaiah says, "the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them."\* Now I will take it for granted that his followers understand this, as Grotius does, of the profound peace which was to follow after the times of Senacherib, under Hezekiah: but though the terms be mystical, yet sure they call this the literal sense of the prophecy: for Grotius makes the mystical sense to refer to the Gospel. Mr. Whiston, I suppose, denies that this has any thing to do with the times of Hezekiah, but that it refers to those of Christ only. Is not his interpretation therefore literal as well as that of Grotius? unless it immediately

\* Chap. xi. ver. 6.



becomes oddly typical, unscholastic, and enthusiastical, as soon as ever Jesus comes into the question.

II. But now, besides the literal primary prophecies concerning the person of Jesus, we say, in the second place, that there are others, which give a primary and direct intimation of the CHANGE OF THE DISPENSATION. Isaiah foretels great mercies to the Jewish people, in a future age; which, though represented by such metaphors as bore analogy to the blessings peculiar to the Jewish economy, yet, to show that they were indeed different from what the figurative terms alludes to, the prophet at the same time adds, “my thoughts are not as your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord.” This surely implies a different DISPENSATION. That the change was from carnal to spiritual, is elegantly intimated in the subjoining words,—“for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than thy ways, and my thoughts than thy thoughts.” But this higher and more excellent dispensation is more plainly revealed in the following figure; instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier shall come the myrtle-tree; i. e. the new religion shall as far excel the old, as the fir-tree does the thorn, or the myrtle tree the brier. In a following prophecy he shows the extent of this new religion as here he had shewn its nature; that it was to spread beyond Judea, and to take in the whole race of mankind,—the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising, &c. Which idea the prophet Zephaniah expresses in so strong a manner, as to leave no room for evasion: “The Lord will be terrible unto them, for he will famish all the gods of the earth; and men shall worship him every one from his place, even all the isles of the Gentiles.” The expression is noble, and alludes to the popular superstitions of Paganism, which conceived that their gods were nourished by the steam of sacrifices. But when were the Pagan gods thus famished, but in the first

ages of Christianity?—Every one from his place ; that is, they were not to go up to Jerusalem to worship—Even all the isles of the Gentiles : but when did these worship the God of Israel, every one from his place, before the preaching of the apostles ? Then indeed their speedy and general conversion distinguished them from the rest of the nations.

But Isaiah, as he goes on, is still more explicit, and declares, in direct terms, that the dispensation should be changed: “Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind.” This in the prophetic style, means a new religion and a new law ; the Metaphors, as we have shown elsewhere, being taken from hieroglyphical expression. To make it still more clear, I observe further, the prophet goes on in declaring the change of the sanction ; a necessary consequence of the change of the dispensation—“ there shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days : For the child shall die an hundred years old, but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed ;” i. e. the Jewish sanction of temporal rewards and punishments shall be no longer administered in an extraordinary manner : For we must remember, that long life for obedience, and sudden and immature death for transgressions, bore an eminent part in their rewards and punishments : now these are expressly said to be abrogated in the dispensation promised, it being declared that the virtuous, though dying untimely, should be as if they had lived an hundred years ; and sinners, though living to an hundred years, as if they had died untimely.

The very same prophecy in Jeremiah, delivered in less figurative terms, ascertains this interpretation beyond all possible cavil : “ Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, not according to the coven-

ant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts."

What Isaiah figuratively calls a new heaven and a new earth, Jeremiah simply and literally names a new covenant. And what kind of covenant? not such an one as was made with their fathers. This was declarative enough of its nature; yet to prevent mistakes, he gives as well a positive as negative description of it: this shall be the covenant, I will put my law in their inward parts, &c.; i. e. this law shall be spiritual, as the other, given to their fathers, was carnal: for the Jewish law did not scrutinize the heart, but rested in external obedience and observances.

Lastly, to crown the whole, I observe that Jeremiah too, like Isaiah, ascertains the argument by declaring, at the same time, the change of the sanction: "In those days they shall say no more, the fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity, every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge." For we know it to have been part of the sanction of the Jewish law, that children should bear the iniquity of their fathers, &c.; a mode of punishing, which has been already explained and justified.

Notwithstanding all this, if you will believe our adversary, the books of the Old Testament seem the most plain of all ancient writings, and wherein there appears not the least trace of a typical or allegorical intention in the authors, or in any other Jews of their times. He that answers a free-thinker has a fine time of it. Not the least trace of a typical or allegorical intention! he might as well have said, there is no trace of poetry in Virgil, or



of eloquence in Cicero. But there is none, he says, either in the authors, or in any other Jews of their times. To both which assertions this single text of Ezekiel will serve for a confutation—"Ah Lord! they say of me, doth he not speak parables?" The prophet complains that the fruitlessness of his mission proceeded from the people's regarding him as speaking of mysterious things, not understood by them. The author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, who is reasonably supposed to have been contemporary with Antiochus Epiphanes, speaks of the Holy Scriptures as fully fraught with typical and allegoric wisdom: "He that giveth his mind to the law of the Most High, and is occupied in the meditation thereof, will seek out the wisdom of the ancients, and be occupied in prophecies. He will keep the sayings of the renowned men, and where subtile parables are, he will be there also. He will seek out the secrets of grave sentences, and be conversant in dark parables." Hence it appears, that prophecies were not so plain as our author represents them, and that their obscurity arose from their having typical or allegorical intentions; which figures too related not to the present, but to a future dispensation, as is further seen from what Ezekiel says in another Place:—"Son of Man, behold! they of the house of Israel say, the vision that he seeth is for many days to come, and he prophesieth of the times that are far off." So that those people to whom the prophecies were so plain, and who understood them to respect their own times only, without any typical or allegorical meaning, complain of obscurities, and consider them as referring to very remote times. But I am ashamed to dwell so long on so evident a truth. The English Bible lies open to every free-thinker of Great Britain, where they may read it that will, and understand it that can.

As for such writers, as the author of the *Grounds and Reasons*, to say the truth, one would never wish to see them otherwise employed; but when so great and good a

man as Grotius has unwarily contributed to the dotages of infidelity, this is such a misadventure as one cannot regard but with the utmost pity and concern.

This excellent person, for it is not to be disguised, has made it his constant endeavour, throughout his whole comment on the Prophets, to find a double sense even in these direct prophecies which relate to Jesus; and to turn the primary sense upon the affairs of the Jewish dispensation, allowing them to relate to Jesus only in a secondary; and by that affected strain of criticism, has done almost as much harm to Revelation as his other writings have done it service: not for any strength there is in his interpretations; for this and his Comment on the Apocalypse, are the opprobrium of his great learning, but only for the name they carry with them. I am the freer in my censure, because I can prove what I say.

The principle which Grotius went upon, in commenting on the Bible, was, that it should be interpreted on the same rules of criticism that men use in the study of all other ancient writings. Nothing could be more reasonable than his principle: but unluckily he deceived himself in the application of it. These rules teach us, the genius, purpose, and authority of the writer should be carefully studied. Under the head of his authority it is to be considered, whether he be a mere human or an inspired writer. Thus far Grotius went right: he examined that authority; and pronounced the writers to be inspired, and the prophecies divine: But when he came to apply these premises, he utterly forgot his conclusion; and interpreted the prophecies by rules very different from what the confession of their divine original required: for seeing them pronounced by Jewish prophets, occupied in Jewish affairs, he concluded their sole object was Jewish; and consequently that the proper sense of the prophecies referred to these only. But this was falling back from one of the grounds he went upon, that the writers were inspired: for

his interpretation was only reasonable on the supposition that these writers prophesied in the very manner which the Pagans understood their prophets sometimes to have done, by a natural sagacity: for, on the allowance of a real inspiration, it was God, and not the writer, who was the proper author of the prophecy; and to understand his purpose, which the rules of interpretation requires us to seek, we must examine the nature, reason, and end of that religion which he gave to the Jews: for on these, common sense assures us, the meaning of the prophecies must be entirely regulated. Now if, on enquiry, it should be found, that this, which Grotius admitted for a divine dispensation, was only preparatory of another more perfect, it would then appear not to be improbable that some of these prophecies might relate, in their literal, primary, and immediate sense, to that more perfect dispensation. And whether they did so or not was to be determined by the joint evidence of the context, and of the nature of God's whole dispensation to mankind, so far forth as it is discoverable to us. But Grotius, instead of making the matter thus reasonably problematical, and to be determined by evidence, determined first, and laid it down as a kind of principle, that the prophecies related directly and properly to Jewish affairs: and into this system he withdrew all his explanations. This, as we say, was falsely applying a true rule of interpretation. He went on this reasonable ground, that the prophecies should be interpreted like all other ancient writings: and on examining their authority, he found them to be truly divine. When he had gone thus far, he then preposterously went back again, and commented as if they were confessed to be merely human: the consequence was, that several of his criticisms, to speak of them only as the performance of a man of learning, are so forced, unnatural, and absurd, so opposed to the rational canons of interpretation, that



I will venture to affirm they are, in all respects, the worst that ever came from the hand of an acute and able critic.

Having now proved that the principles Mr. Collins went upon, were in themselves false and extravagant, we have little reason to regard how he used them. But as this extraordinary writer was as great a free-thinker in logic as in divinity, it may not be improper to show the fashionable world what sort of men they have chosen for their guides, to lead them from their religion, when they would no longer have any to direct them to it.

His argument against what he calls typical, allegorical, but properly secondary senses, stands thus:—Christianity pretends to derive itself from Judaism. Jesus appeals to the religious books of the Jews as prophesying of his mission. None of these prophecies can be understood of him but in a typical, allegoric sense. Now that sense is absurd, and contrary to all scholastic rules of interpretation. Christianity, therefore, not being really predicted of in the Jewish writings, is consequently false. The contestible proposition, on which the whole argument rests, is, that a typical or allegoric sense is absurd, and contrary to all scholastic rules of interpretation.

Would the reader now believe that Mr. Collins himself has in this very book given a thorough confutation of his own proposition? Yet this he has done, and, contrary too, to his usual way of reasoning, in a very convincing manner; by showing, from the universal practice of antiquity, that a typical or allegorical sense is agreeable to the logical, scholastic rules of Interpretation. For he says,—“Allegory was much in use amongst the Pagans, being cultivated by many of the philosophers themselves, as well as theologians. By some as the method of delivering doctrines; but by most as the method of explaining away what, according to the letter, appeared absurd in the ancient fables or histories of their gods. Religion itself was

deemed a mysterious thing amongst the Pagans, and not to be publicly and plainly declared. Wherefore it was never simply represented to the people, but was most obscurely delivered, and veiled under allegories, or parables, or hieroglyphics; and especially among the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and the Oriental nations.—They allegorized many things of nature, and particularly the heavenly bodies.—They allegorized all their ancient fables and stories, and pretended to discover in them the secrets of natural philosophy, medicine, politics, and in a word all arts and sciences. The works of Homer in particular have furnished infinite materials for all sorts of allegorical commentators to work upon.—The ancient Greek poets were reputed to involve divine, and natural, and historical notions of their gods under mystical and parabolical expressions—The Pythagorean philosophy was wholly delivered in mystical language, the signification whereof was entirely unknown to the world abroad—The Stoic philosophers are particularly famous for allegorizing the whole heathen Theology—We have several treatises of heathen philosophers on the subject of allegorical interpretation.”

If now this kind of allegorizing, which involved the proposition in a double sense, was in use amongst the Pagan oracles, divines, philosophers and poets, is not the understanding ancient writings allegorically, or in a double sense, agreeable to all rational, scholastic rules of interpretation? Surely, as much so as the understanding mere metaphorical expressions in a tropical signification; whose propriety no one ever yet called in question. For the sense of propositions is imposed as arbitrarily as the sense of words. And if men, in the communication of their thoughts, agree to give, on some occasions, a double sense to propositions, as well as on others, a single, the interpreting the first in two meanings is as agreeable to all scholastic rules, as interpreting the other in one: and propositions, with a double and single sense, are as easily

distinguishable from each other, by the help of the context, as words with a literal and figurative meaning. But this great philosopher seems to have imagined, that the single sense of a proposition was imposed by nature ; and that therefore, giving them a double meaning was the same offence against reason as the deviating from the unity of pure Theism into Polytheism : and, consequently, that the universal lapse into allegory and idolatry rendered neither the one nor the other of them the less absurd.

I say, he seems to think so. More one cannot say of such a writer. Besides, he seems to think otherwise, where, in another place, as if aware that use would rescue a double sense from his irrational and unscholastic censure, he endeavours to prove, that the Jews, during the prophetic period, did not use this allegoric way of expression. Now if we be right in this last conjecture about his meaning, he abuses the terms he employs, under a miserable quibble ; and, by scholastic and unscholastic rules, only means interpreting in a single or a double sense.

The reader perhaps will be curious to know how it happened, that this great reasoner should, all at once, overthrow what he had been so long labouring to build. This fatal issue of his two books of the Grounds, &c. and Scheme, &c. had these causes :

1. He had a pressing and immediate objection to remove. And, as he had no great stock of argument, and but small forecast, any thing, at a plunge, would be received, which came to his relief.

The objection was this, "That the allegorical interpretations of the Apostles were not designed for absolute proofs of Christianity, but for arguments *ad homines* only to the Jews, who were accustomed to that way of reasoning." Thus, he himself tells us, some divines are accustomed to talk. He gives them indeed a solid answer; but he dreams not of the consequence. He says, this allegoric reasoning,



was common to all mankind. Was it so? then the grand proposition on which his whole work supports itself is entirely overthrown. For if all mankind used it, the method must needs be rational and scholastic. But this he was not aware of. What kept him in the dark, was his never being able to distinguish between the USE and the ABUSE of this mode of information. These two things he perpetually confounds; the Pagan Oracles delivered themselves in allegories—this was the use: their later divines turned all their religion into allegory—this was the abuse. The elder Pythagoreans gave their precepts in allegory—this was the use: the later Stoics allegorized every thing—this was the abuse. Homer had some allegories—this was the use: his commentators turned all to allegory—and this again was the abuse. But though he has talked so much of these things, yet he knew no more of them than old John Bunyan; whose honester ignorance, joined to a good meaning, disposed him to admire that which the malignity of our author's folly inclined him to deery: and each in the like ridiculous extreme.

2. But the other cause of this subversion of his own system was the delight he took to blacken the splendour of religion. He supposed, we may be sure, it would prove an effectual discredit to Revelation, to have it seen, that there was this conformity between the Pagan and Jewish method of delivering religion and morality. His attempt hath been already exposed as it deserves. But in this instance it labours under much additional folly. For the different reasons which induced the propagators of Paganism, and the Author of Judaism, to employ the same method of information, are obvious to the meanest capacity, if advanced but so far in the knowledge of nature to know, that different ends are very commonly prosecuted by the same means. The Pagans allegorized in order to hide the weakness and absurdities of their national religions; the author of Judaism allegorized in order to pre-

pare his followers for the reception of a more perfect dispensation, founded on Judaism, which was preparatory of it; and at the same time, to prevent their premature rejection of Judaism, under which they were still to be long exercised.

Thus we see how this formidable enemy of our faith has himself overturned his whole argument by an unwary answer to an occasional objection. But this is but one, of a work full of contradictions. I have no occasion to be particular, after removing his main principles; yet, for the reader's diversion, I shall give him a taste of them. In his 81st. page, he says; "And there has been for a long time, and is at this time as little use of allegory in those respects amongst them (the Jews) as there seems to have been during the time the books of the Old Testament were written, which seem the most plain of all ancient writings, and wherein there appears not the least trace of a typical or allegorical intention in the authors, or in any other Jews of their times." Yet it is but at the 85th page that we find him saying; "And in this (viz. in delivering his philosophy in mystical language) Pythagoras came up to Solomon's character of wise men, who dealt in dark sayings, and acted not much unlike the most divine teacher that ever was. Our Saviour spake with many parables," &c. Now it seems, it was Solomon's character of wise men that they dealt in dark sayings. But these wise men were the authors of the Jewish Scriptures. And yet he had but just before assured us, that the books of the Old Testament seems the most plain of all ancient writings, and wherein there appears not the least trace of a typical or allegorical intention in the authors, or in any Jews of their times.

Again, in his pages 85, 86, he says, "the Pythagorean philosophy was wholly delivered in mystical language; the signification whereof was entirely unknown to the world abroad, and but gradually explained to those

of the sect, as they grew into years, or were proper to be informed—the Stoic philosophers were particularly famous for allegorizing—we have several treatises of heathen philosophers on the subject of allegorical interpretation—and from philosophers, Platonists and Stoics, the famous Origen is said to have derived a great deal of his skill in allegorizing the books of the Old Testament.” This he says, and yet at the 94th page he tells us, “That the Apostles, and particularly St. Paul, wholly discarded all other methods of reasoning used by philosophers, except the allegorical: and set that up as the true and only reasoning proper to bring all men to the faith of Christ: and the Gentiles were to be wholly beat out of the literal way of arguing, and to argue as became Jews. And the event of preaching the Gospel has been suited to matters considered in this view and light. For we know that the wise did not receive the Gospel at first, and that they were the latest converts: Which plainly arose from their using maxims of reasoning and disputing wholly opposite to those of Christians.” By these *wise*, can be meant none but the Pagan philosophers: and these, according to our author, were altogether given up to mystery and allegory. Yet St. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles, who, he says, were likewise given up to the same method, could make no converts amongst these wise men. Why? It would now methinks have suited his talents as well as temper, to have told us, it was because two of a trade could not agree: No, says this incomparable logician, it was because the philosophers used maxims of reasoning and disputing wholly opposite to the Christians.

What now but the name and authority of freethinking could hinder such a writer from becoming the contempt of all who know either how to make, or to understand an argument? These men profane the light they receive from Revelation in employing it to rob the treasures of the sane-



tuary. But religion arrests them in the manner, and pronounces one common doom upon the whole race.

“—Ne IGNIS NOSTER facinori præluceat,  
Per quem colendos censuit Pietas Deos,  
VETO ESSE TALE LUMINIS COMMERCIIUM.”\*

Hence the fate that attends them all, in the inseparable connection between impiety and blundering; which always follow one another as the crime and the punishment.

If it be asked then, what it is that hath so strangely prejudiced our modern reasoners against this ancient mode of information by typical and secondary senses? I answer, the folly of fanatics, who have abused it in support of the most abominable nonsense. But how unreasonable is this prejudice! Was there ever any thing rational or excellent amongst men that hath not been thus abused? Is it any disparagement to the method of geometers, that some conceited writers on morality and religion have of late taken it up, to give an air of weight and demonstration to the whimsies of pedantic importance? Is there no truth of nature, or reasonableness of art, in grammatical construction, because cabalistic dunces have in every age abused it to pervert all human meaning? We might as well say that the ancient Egyptians did not write in hieroglyphics, because Kircher, who endeavoured to explain them, hath given us nothing but his own visions, as that the ancient Jews had not types and secondary senses, because modern enthusiasts have allegorized their whole story.

\* Phæd. l. iv. Fab. 10.





**For use in Library only**



**For use in Library only**

