

# **A Biblical and Theological Dictionary**

Richard Watson



## PREFACE BY THE AUTHOR.

In the following Dictionary, compiled from the best sources ancient and modern, with the addition of many original articles, the selections have been made with reference to what was thought most useful; and thus many things of minor importance, usually found in similar works, have been excluded. Every article too, taken from preceding Dictionaries, has been carefully weighed, and in a great number of instances modified, corrected, or enlarged; and numerous other writings variously illustrative of the Holy Scriptures have been made to contribute a portion of their information under different heads. This general acknowledgment renders a particular reference to the works made use of unnecessary. The fact is, that many of the most valuable of them are compilations from preceding compilations, and so have no title to be referred to as original authorities; while in other instances the articles in this Dictionary have been collected from several sources, and so altered, or combined with original corrections or enlargements, that it would be difficult to assign each portion to its proper original. Where, however, any particulars of fact or history required confirmation, the authority has been given.

It will be observed that all the places and persons mentioned in the Bible have not been noticed, for this would only have made the same unprofitable display of proper names which is seen in several other Dictionaries; but those have been selected on which any thing important for the right understanding of the Scriptures seemed, more or less, to depend. The same rule has been observed as to the natural history of the Bible, on which department great light has been thrown by Dr. Harris, whose learned work has been rather freely used. The leading sects and heresies, ancient and modern, have also been introduced; but with no design to embody a complete account of religious opinions: those only, therefore, have been inserted with which it is most necessary that the theological student should have a general acquaintance.

All that is important in those useful modern works which have been published upon the manners and customs of the east will be found embodied under different heads so far as it tends to elucidate the sacred volume; and many interesting extracts are given from the most intelligent of our modern travellers in Palestine, and neighbouring countries, pointing out the present condition of places celebrated in sacred geography, and especially when the account illustrates and renders remarkable the fulfilment of prophecy.

At the close of the whole, a complete alphabetical list of proper names occurring in the Bible, with their significations and right pronunciation, is appended.

London, August 20, 1831.

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

No other improvements have been attempted in this edition of Mr. Watson's Biblical and Theological Dictionary, than adding a few notes in relation to some matters existing in this country, which had escaped the attention of the author, and rendering those passages and phrases into English which had been left untranslated. Such translations are included in brackets. It may be proper to remark, that only that part of the work from the eight hundred and forty second page has been printed under the superintendence of the present editor; the former part having passed through the press previous to the last general conference.

It is not necessary to say any thing in commendation of this work. Whatever merit, however, may be attached to others of a similar character which have preceded it, we think it will be conceded by all, that Mr. Watson, by furnishing this Dictionary, has supplied a desideratum, in the department of Biblical and Theological literature, which had long been felt, and for doing which the religious community will not be backward in acknowledging its obligations.

N. Bangs.

New-York, Sept. 25, 1832.

The  
WORLD,  
as Peopled by  
THE DESCENDANTS OF  
NOAH  
Shewing the Countries possessed by  
SHEM, HAM & JAPHET  
and their posterity

A  
BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY.

1AARON, the son of Amram and Jochebed, of the tribe of Levi. Aaron was three years older than his brother Moses; and when God appeared in the burning bush, Moses having excused himself from the undertaking committed to him, by urging that he was slow of speech, Aaron, who was an eloquent man, was made his interpreter and spokesman; and in effecting the deliverance of the Hebrews we therefore find them constantly associated. During the march of the children of Israel through the

wilderness, Aaron and his sons were appointed by God to exercise for ever the office of priests in the tabernacle.

Moses having ascended the mountain to receive the law from God, Aaron, his sons, and seventy elders, followed him, Exod. xxiv, 1, 2, 9–11; not indeed to the summit, but “afar off,” “and they saw the God of Israel,” that is, the glory in which he appeared, “as it were the paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven for clearness;”--a clear and dazzling azure, a pure, unmingled splendour like that of the heavens. “And upon the nobles of Israel,” Aaron, his sons, and the seventy elders, “he laid not his hand,”--they were not destroyed by a sight which must have overwhelmed the weakness of mortal men had they not been strengthened to bear it; “and they did eat and drink,”--they joyfully and devoutly feasted before the Lord, as a religious act, upon the sacrifices they offered. After this they departed, and Moses remained with God on the very summit of the mount forty days.

During this period, the people, grown impatient at the long absence of Moses, addressed themselves to Aaron in a tumultuous manner, saying, “Make us gods which shall go before us: for, as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.” Aaron sinfully yielded to the importunities of the people; and having ordered them to bring the pendants and the ear-rings of their wives and children, he melted them down, and then made a golden calf, probably in imitation of the Egyptian Apis, an ox or calf dedicated to Osiris. In this instance the image was dedicated to Jehovah the true God; but the guilt consisted in an attempt to establish image worship, which, when even ultimately referring to God, he has forbidden. Neither are images to be worshipped, nor the true God by images;--this is the standing unrepealed law of Heaven. The calf was called a golden calf, as being highly ornamented with gold. Having finished the idol, the people placed it on a pedestal, and danced around it, saying, “These be thy gods, O Israel;” or, as it is expressed in Nehemiah, “This is thy God,” the image or symbol of thy God, “which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.” Moses, having hastened from the mount by the command of God, testified to the people, by breaking the tables of the law in their presence, that the covenant between God and them was now rendered of none effect through their offence. He also indignantly reprov'd Aaron, whose sin indeed had kindled against him the anger of the Lord, so that he would “have destroyed him but that Moses prayed for him.”

After the tabernacle was built, Moses consecrated Aaron to the high priesthood with the holy oil, and invested him with his priestly robes,--his garments “of glory and beauty;” but Aaron’s weakness was again

manifested in concurring with Miriam, his sister, to censure and oppose Moses, through envy. Aaron, as being the elder brother, could not perhaps brook his superiority. What the motive of Miriam might be does not appear; but she being struck with leprosy, this punishment, as being immediately from God, opened Aaron's eyes; he acknowledged his fault, and asked forgiveness of Moses both for himself and his sister.

Aaron himself became also the object of jealousy; but two miraculous interpositions confirmed him in his office of high priest, as of Divine appointment. The first was the destruction of Korah, who sought that office for himself, and of the two hundred and fifty Levites who supported his pretensions, Num. xvi. The second was the blossoming of Aaron's rod, which was designed "to cause the murmurings of the Israelites against him to cease," by showing that he was chosen of God. Moses having, at the command of God, taken twelve rods of an almond tree from the princes of the twelve tribes, and Aaron's separately, he placed them in the tabernacle before the sanctuary, after having written upon each the name of the tribe which it represented, and upon the rod of Aaron the name of Aaron. The day following, when the rods were taken out, that of Aaron "was budded, and brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds." This rod therefore was laid up by the ark, to perpetuate the remembrance of the miracle, and to be a token of Aaron's right to his office.

Aaron married Elisheba, the daughter of Amminadab, of the tribe of Judah, by whom he had four sons, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, Exodus vi, 23. The two first were killed by fire from heaven, as a punishment for presuming to offer incense with strange fire in their censers, Lev. x, 1, 2. From the two others the succession of high priests was continued in Israel.

The account of the death of Aaron is peculiarly solemn and affecting. As he and Moses, in striking the rock at Meribah, Num. xvi, had not honoured God by a perfect obedience and faith, he in his wrath declared unto them that they should not enter into the promised land. Soon after, the Lord commanded Moses, "Take Aaron, and Eleazar his son, and bring them up to mount Hor; and strip Aaron of his garments,"--his splendid pontifical vestments,--"and put them upon Eleazar, his son; and Aaron shall be gathered unto his people, and shall die there." This command was carried into effect in the presence of all Israel, who were encamped at the foot of the mountain; and his son being invested with the father's priestly dress, Aaron died, and all the people mourned for him thirty days. His sepulchre was left unmarked and unknown, perhaps to prevent the superstitious reverence of future ages. In Deuteronomy it is said that Aaron died at Mosera; because that was the name of the district in which mount Hor was situated.

2. The PRIESTHOOD being established in Aaron and his family, the nature of this office among the Israelites, and the distinction between the high priest and the other priests, require here to be pointed out.

Before the promulgation of the law by Moses, the fathers of every family, and the princes of every tribe, were priests. This was the case both before and after the flood; for Cain and Abel, Noah, Abraham, Job, Abimelech, Laban, Isaac, and Jacob, themselves offered their own sacrifices. But after the Lord had chosen the family of Aaron, and annexed the priesthood to that line, then the right of sacrificing to God was reserved to that family only. The high priesthood was confined to the first-born in succession; and the rest of his posterity were priests simply so called, or priests of the second order. Both in the high priest and the second or inferior priests, two things deserve notice,--their consecration and their office. In some things they differed, and in others agreed. In their consecration they differed thus: the high priest had the chrism, or sacred ointment, poured upon his head, so as to run down to his beard, and the skirts of his garment, Exod. xxx, 23; Lev. viii, 12; Psa. cxxxiii, 2. But the second priests were only sprinkled with this oil, mixed with the blood of the sacrifice, Lev. viii, 30. They differed also in their robes, which were a necessary adjunct to consecration. The high priest wore at the ordinary times of his ministration in the temple, eight garments;--linen drawers--a coat of fine linen close to his skin--an embroidered girdle of fine linen, blue and scarlet, to surround the coat--a robe all of blue with seventy-two bells, and as many embroidered pomegranates upon the skirts of it; this was put over the coat and girdle--an ephod of gold, and of blue, purple, scarlet, and fine linen, curiously wrought, on the shoulders of which were two stones engraved with the names of the twelve tribes; this was put over the robe, and girt with a curious girdle of the same--a breastplate, about a span square, wrought with gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine linen, and fastened upon the ephod by golden chains and rings; in this breastplate were placed the urim and thummim, also twelve several stones, containing the names of the twelve tribes--a mitre of fine linen, sixteen cubits long, to wrap round his head--and lastly, a plate of gold, or holy crown, two fingers broad, whereon was engraved, "Holiness to the Lord;" this was tied with blue lace upon the front of the mitre. Beside these garments, which he wore in his ordinary ministration, there were four others, which he wore only upon extraordinary occasions, viz. on the day of expiation, when he went into the holy of holies, which was once a year. These were: linen drawers--a linen coat--a linen girdle--a linen mitre, all white, Exod. xxviii; Lev. xvi, 4. But the inferior priests had only four garments: linen drawers--a linen coat--a linen girdle--a linen bonnet. The priest and high priest differed also in their marriage restrictions; for the high priest might not marry a widow,

nor a divorced woman, nor a harlot, but a virgin only; whereas the other priests might lawfully marry a widow, Lev. xxi, 7.

In the following particulars the high priest and inferior priests agreed in their consecration: both were to be void of bodily blemish--both were to be presented to the Lord at the door of the tabernacle--both were to be washed with water--both were to be consecrated by offering up certain sacrifices--both were to have the blood of a ram put upon the tip of the right ear, the thumb of the right hand, and the great toe of the right foot, Exod. xxix, 20. In the time of consecration, certain pieces of the sacrifice were put into the priest's hand, which was called "filling his hand;" hence the Hebrew phrase, "to fill the hand," signifies consecration.

In the discharge of their offices, the high priest differed from the other priests in these particulars: the high priest only, and that but once a year, might enter into the holy of holies--the high priest might not mourn for his nearest relations by uncovering his head, or tearing any part of his garments, except the skirt; whereas the priest was allowed to mourn for these six,--father, mother, son, daughter, brother, and sister if she had no husband, Lev. xxi, 2, 10, 11; but they agreed in these respects: they both burnt incense and offered sacrifices--they both sounded the trumpet, either as an alarm in war, or to assemble the people and their rulers--they both slew the sacrifices--both instructed the people--and both judged of leprosy.

For the more orderly performance of these offices, the high priest had his sagan, who, in case of the high priest's pollution, performed his duty. The high priest and his sagan resembled our bishop and his suffragan.

3. Aaron was a TYPE of Christ, not personally, but as the high priest of the Jewish church. All the priests, as offering gifts and sacrifices, were in their office types of Christ; but Aaron especially, 1. As the high priest. 2. In entering into the holy place on the great day of atonement, and reconciling the people to God; in making intercession for them, and pronouncing upon them the blessing of Jehovah, at the termination of solemn services. 3. In being anointed with the holy oil by effusion, which was prefigurative of the Holy Spirit with which our Lord was endowed. 4. In bearing the names of all the tribes of Israel upon his breast and upon his shoulders, thus presenting them always before God, and representing them to him. 5. In being the medium of their inquiring of God by urim and thummim; and of the communication of his will to them. But though the offices of Aaron were typical, the priesthood of Christ is of a different and higher ORDER than his, namely, that of Melchizedeck. See Calf, Priest, Type, Ephod, Breastplate, Urim.



AB, in the Hebrew chronology, the eleventh month of the civil year, and the fifth of the ecclesiastical year, which began with Nisan. This month answered to the moon of July, comprehending part of July and of August, and contained thirty days.

The first day of this month is observed as a fast by the Jews, in memory of Aaron's death; and the ninth, in commemoration of the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar, in the year before Christ 587. Josephus observes, that the burning of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar happened on the same day of the year on which it was afterward burned by Titus. The same day was remarkable for Adrian's edict, which prohibited the Jews to continue in Judea, or to look toward Jerusalem and lament its desolation. The eighteenth day is also kept as a fast, because the sacred lamp was extinguished on that night, in the reign of Ahaz. On the twenty-first, or, according to Scaliger, the twenty-second day, was a feast called Xylophoria, from their laying up the necessary wood in the temple: and on the twenty-fourth, a feast in commemoration of the abolishing of a law by the Asmoneans, or Maccabees, which had been introduced by the Sadducees, and which enacted, that both sons and daughters should alike inherit the estate of their parents.

ABADDON, Heb. corresponding to Apollyon, Gr. that is, Destroyer, is represented, Rev. ix, 11, as king of the locusts, and the angel of the bottomless pit. Le Clerc and Dr. Hammond understand by the locusts in this passage, the zealots and robbers who infested and desolated Judea before Jerusalem was taken by the Romans; and by Abaddon, John of Gischala, who having treacherously left that town before it was surrendered to Titus, came to Jerusalem and headed those of the zealots who acknowledged him as their king, and involved the Jews in many grievous calamities. The learned Grotius concurs in opinion, that the locusts are designed to represent the sect of the zealots, who appeared among the Jews during the siege, and at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. But Mr. Mede remarks, that the title Abaddon alludes to Obodas, the common name of the ancient monarchs of that part of Arabia from which Mohammed came; and considers the passage as descriptive of the inundation of the Saracens. Mr. Lowman adopts and confirms this interpretation. He shows that the rise and progress of the Mohammedan religion and empire exhibit a signal accomplishment of this prophecy. All the circumstances here recited correspond to the character of the Arabians, and the history of the period that extended from A. D. 568 to A. D. 675. In conformity to this opinion, Abaddon may be understood to denote either Mohammed, who issued from the abyss, or the cave of Hera, to propagate his pretended revelations, or, more generally, the Saracen power. Mr.

Bryant supposes Abaddon to have been the name of the Ophite deity, the worship of whom prevailed very anciently and very generally.

ABANA. Naaman, the leper, on being directed to wash in the river Jordan, says, 2 Kings v, 12, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?" Probably the Abana is a branch of the Barrady, or Chrysorrhoeas, which derives its source from the foot of mount Libanus, eastward; runs round and through Damascus, and continues its course till lost in the wilderness, four or five leagues south of the city. Benjamin of Tudela will have that part of Barrady which runs through Damascus to be the Abana, and the streams which water the gardens without the city, to be Pharpar; but perhaps the Pharpar is the same with Orontes, the most noted river of Syria, which, taking its rise a little to the north or north-east of Damascus, glides through a delightful plain, till, after passing Antioch, and running about two hundred miles to the north-west, it loses itself in the Mediterranean sea, 2 Kings v, 12.

ABBA, a Syriac word, which signifies father. The learned Mr. Selden, from the Babylonian Gemara, has proved that slaves were not allowed to use the title abba in addressing the master of the family to which they belonged. This may serve to illustrate Rom. viii, 15, and Gal. iv, 6, as it shows that through faith in Christ all true Christians pass into the relation of sons; are permitted to address God with filial confidence in prayer; and to regard themselves as heirs of the heavenly inheritance. This adoption into the family of God, inseparably follows our justification; and the power to call God our Father, in this special and appropriative sense, results from the inward testimony given to our forgiveness by the Holy Spirit. St. Paul and St. Mark use the Syriac word abba, a term which was understood in the synagogues and primitive assemblies of Christians; but added to it when writing to foreigners the explanation, father. Figuratively, abba means also a superior, in respect of age, dignity, or affection. It is more particularly used in the Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic churches as a title given to their bishops. The bishops themselves bestow the title abba more eminently upon the bishop of Alexandria, which occasioned the people to give him the title of baba, or papa, that is, grandfather; a title which he bore before the bishop of Rome.

ABEDNEGO, the Chaldee name given by 4th king of Babylon's officer to Azariah, one of Daniel's companions, Dan. i, 7. This name imports the servant of Nago, or Nego, which is supposed to signify the sun, or morning star, so called from its brightness. Abednego was thrown into a fiery furnace, at Babylon, with his two companions Shadrach and Meshach, for refusing to adore the statue erected by the command of Nebuchadnezzar. God suffered them not to be injured by the flames; but made the whole to

redound to his own glory, and the shame of the idols of Babylon. One like unto the Son of God, or a Divine person, probably the Angel of the Divine presence himself, appeared in the midst of them; and they came out of the furnace, which had been heated seven times hotter than usual, so completely preserved from the power of the flames, that not even “the smell of fire had passed upon them.” This was an illustrious instance of the courageous and hallowed spirit of martyrdom; and the interposition was no doubt designed to encourage the Jews while in captivity, living among idolaters, to hold fast their religion. It is an instance also of those gracious visitations to the old Heathen world, by which it was loudly called from its idolatries, and aroused to the acknowledgment of the true and only Jehovah, who, in various ways, “left not himself without witness” among them. A great temporary effect was produced by this and other miracles related in the book of Daniel; but the people relapsed again into idolatry, and justly brought upon themselves all those wasting judgments which in succession swept over the mightiest and most ancient states.

ABEL. He was the second son of Adam and Eve, and born probably in the second or third year of the world; though some will have it that he and Cain were twins. His name signifies vapour, vanity, and might be given either because our first parents now began so to feel the emptiness and vanity of all earthly things, that the birth of another son reminded them painfully of it, although in itself a matter of joy; or it was imposed under prophetic impulse, and obscurely referred to his premature death. His employment was that of a shepherd; Cain followed the occupation of his father, and was a tiller of the ground. Whether they remained in their father’s family at the time when they brought their offerings to the Lord, or had establishments separate from that of Adam, does not clearly appear. Abel was probably unmarried, or had no children; but Cain’s wife is mentioned. “At the end of the days,”--which is a more literal rendering than “in process of time,” as in our translation, that is, on the Sabbath,--both brothers brought an offering to the Lord. Cain “brought of the fruit of the ground;” Abel “the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof.” “And the Lord had respect to Abel and to his offering; but unto Cain and his offering he had not respect.” As Cain afterward complains that “he should be hid from the face or presence of the Lord,” it is probable that the worship of the first family was performed before some visible manifestation of the glory of God, which thus consecrated a particular place for their services. Some have thought that this was at the east gate of Eden, where “Cherubim and a flaming sword were placed;” but this was a vengeful manifestation, and could only have inspired a dread of God inconsistent with the confidence and hope with which men through the promise of redemption were now encouraged to draw nigh to him. The respect which God was pleased to show to Abel’s offering, appears from the account to have been sensibly declared; for Cain

must have known by some token that the sacrifice of Abel was accepted, the absence of which sign, as to his own offering, showed that it was rejected. Whether this was by fire going forth from “the presence of the Lord,” to consume the sacrifice, as in later instances recorded in the Old Testament, or in some other way, it is in vain to inquire;--that the token of acceptance was a sensible one is however an almost certain inference. The effect of this upon Cain was not to humble him before God, but to excite anger against his brother; and, being in the field with him, or, as the old versions have it, having said to him, “Let us go out into the field,” “he rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him;” and for that crime, by which the first blood of man was shed by man upon the earth,--a murder aggravated by the relationship and the “righteous” character of the sufferer, and having in it also the nature of religious persecution,--he was pronounced by the Lord “cursed from the earth.”

2. As the sacrifice of Abel is the first on record, and has given rise to some controversy, it demands particular attention. It was offered, says St. Paul, “in faith,” and it was “a more excellent sacrifice” than that of Cain. Both these expressions intimate that it was EXPIATORY and PREFIGURATIVE.

As to the matter of the sacrifice, it was an animal offering. “Cain brought of the fruit of the ground; and Abel also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof;” or, more literally, “the fat of them,” that is, according to the Hebrew idiom, the fattest or best of his flock; and in this circumstance consisted its specific character as an act of faith. This is supported by the import of the phrase, *πλεϊονα θυσιαν*, used by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, when speaking of the sacrifice of Abel. Our translators have rendered it, “a more excellent sacrifice.” Wickliffe translates it, as Archbishop Magee observes, uncouthly, but in the full sense of the original, “a much more sacrifice;” and the controversy which has arisen on this point is, whether this epithet of “much more,” or “fuller,” refers to quantity or quality; whether it is to be understood in the sense of a more abundant, or of a better, a more excellent sacrifice. Dr. Kennicott takes it in the sense of measure and quantity, as well as quality; and supposes that Abel brought a double offering of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fruit of the ground also. His criticism has been very satisfactorily refuted by Archbishop Magee. The sacrifice of Abel was that of animal victims, and it was indicative not of gratitude but of “faith:” a quality not to be made manifest by the quantity of an offering, for the one has no relation to the other.

3. This will more fully appear if we consider the import of the words of the Apostle,--“By FAITH Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice

than Cain, by which he obtained WITNESS that he was RIGHTEOUS, God testifying of his gifts; and by it, he, being dead, yet speaketh." Now what is the meaning of the Apostle, when he says that it was witnessed or testified to Abel that he was righteous? His doctrine is, that men are sinners; that all, consequently, need pardon; and to be declared, witnessed, and accounted righteous, are, according to his style of writing, the same as "to be justified, pardoned, and dealt with as righteous." Thus he argues that Abraham believed God, "and it was accounted to him for righteousness,"--"that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness,"--"that he received the sign of circumcision, a seal," a visible confirmatory, declaratory, and witnessing mark "of the righteousness which he had by faith." In these cases we have a similarity so striking, that they can scarcely fail to explain each other. In both, sinful men are placed in the condition of righteous men; the instrument, in both cases, is faith; and the transaction is, in both cases also, publicly and sensibly witnessed,--as to Abraham, by the sign of circumcision; as to Abel, by a visible acceptance of his sacrifice, and the rejection of that of Cain.

Abel had faith, and he expressed that faith by the kind of sacrifice he offered. It was in this way that his faith "pleased God;" it pleased him as a principle, and by the act to which it led, which act was the offering of a sacrifice to God different from that of Cain. Cain had not this faith, whatever might be its object; and Cain, accordingly, did not bring an offering to which God had "respect." That which vitiated the offering of Cain was the want of this faith; for his offering was not significant of faith: that which "pleased God," in the case of Abel, was his faith; and he had "respect" to his offering, because it was the expression of that faith; and upon his faith so expressing itself, God witnessed to him "that he was righteous." So forcibly do the words of St. Paul, when commenting upon this transaction, show, that Abel's sacrifice was accepted, because of its immediate connection with his faith, for by faith he is said to have offered it; and whatever it might be, which made Abel's offering differ from that of Cain, whether abundance, or kind, or both, this was the result of his faith. So evident also is it from the Apostle, that Abel was witnessed to be "righteous," not with reference to any previous "habit of a religious life," as some say, but with reference to his faith; and to this faith as expressing itself by his offering "a more excellent sacrifice."

4. If, then, the faith of Abel had an immediate connection with his sacrifice, and both with his being accepted as "righteous,"--that is, justified, in St. Paul's use of the term,--to what had his faith respect? The particular object of the faith of the elders, celebrated in Hebrews xi, is to be deduced from the circumstances mentioned as illustrative of the existence and operation of this great principle, and by which it manifested itself in them. Let us

explain this, and then ascertain the object of Abel's faith also from the manner of its manifestation,--from the acts in which it embodied and rendered itself conspicuous.

Faith, in this chapter, is taken in the sense of affiance in God, and, as such, it can only be exercised toward God, as to all its particular acts, in those respects in which we have some warrant to confide in him. This supposes revelation, and, in particular, promises or declarations on his part, as the ground of every act of affiance. When, therefore, it is said that "by faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death," it must be supposed that he had some promise or intimation to this effect, on which, improbable as the event was, he nobly relied; and in the result God honoured his faith in the sight of all men. The faith of Noah had immediate respect to the threatened flood, and to the promise of God to preserve him in the ark which he was commanded to prepare. The chapter is filled with other instances, expressed or implied; and from the whole, as well as from the nature of things, it will appear, that, when the Apostle speaks of the faith of the elders in its particular acts, he represents it as having respect to some promise, declaration, or revelation of God.

This revelation was necessarily antecedent to the faith; but it is also to be observed, that the acts by which the faith was represented, whenever it was represented by particular acts, and when the case admitted it, had a natural and striking conformity and correspondence to the previous revelation. So Noah built the ark, which indicated that he had heard the threat of the world's destruction by water, and had received the promise of his own preservation, and that of his family, as well as that of a part of the beasts of the earth. When Abraham went into Canaan at the command of God, and upon the promise that that country should become the inheritance of his descendants, he showed his faith by taking possession of it for them in anticipation, and his residence there indicated the kind of promise which he had received. Thus these instances show, that when the faith which the Apostle commends exhibited itself in some particular act, that act had a correspondency to the previous promise or revelation which was the ground of faith. We must therefore interpret the acts of Abel's faith so as to make them also correspond with an antecedent revelation. His faith had respect to some previous revelation, and the nature of the revelation is to be collected from the significant manner in which he declared his faith in it.

Now that which Abel did "by faith," was, generally, to perform an act of solemn worship, in the confidence that it would be acceptable to God. This supposes a revelation, immediate or by tradition, that such acts of worship were acceptable to God, or his faith could have had no warrant, and would

not have been faith, but fancy. But the case must be considered more particularly. His faith led him to offer "a more excellent sacrifice" than that of Cain; but this necessarily implies, that there was some antecedent revelation to which his faith, as thus expressed, had respect, and on which that peculiarity of his offering, which distinguished it from the offering of Cain, was founded; a revelation which indicated that the way in which God would be approached acceptably, in solemn worship, was by animal sacrifices. Without this, the faith to which his offering, which was an offering of the firstlings of his flock, had a special fitness and adaptation, could have had no warrant in Divine authority. But this revelation must have included, in order to its being the ground of faith, as "the substance of things hoped for," a promise of a benefit to be conferred, in which promise Abel might confide. But if so, then this promise must have been connected, not with the worship of God in general, or performed in any way whatever indifferently, but with his worship by animal oblations; for it was in this way that the faith of Abel specially and distinctively indicated itself. The antecedent revelation was, therefore, a promise of a benefit to be conferred, by means of animal sacrifice; and we are taught what this benefit was, by that which was actually received by the offerer,—"He obtained witness that he was righteous;" which must be interpreted in the sense of a declaration of his personal justification, and acceptance as righteous, by the forgiveness of his sins. The reason of Abel's acceptance and of Cain's rejection is hereby made manifest; the one, in seeking the Divine favour, conformed to his established and appointed method of being approached by guilty men, and the other not only neglected this, but profanely and presumptuously substituted his own inventions.

5. It is impossible, then, to allow the sacrifice of Abel, in this instance, to have been an act of FAITH, without supposing that it had respect to a previous revelation, which agreed with all the parts of that sacrificial action by which he expressed his faith in it. Had Abel's sacrifice been eucharistic merely, it would have expressed gratitude, but not faith; or if faith in the general sense of confidence in God that he would receive an act of grateful worship, and reward the worshippers, it did not more express faith than the offering of Cain, who surely believed these two points, or he would not have brought an offering of any kind. The offering of Abel expressed a faith which Cain had not; and the doctrinal principles which Abel's faith respected were such as his sacrifice visibly embodied. If it was not an eucharistic sacrifice, it was an expiatory one; and, in fact, it is only in a sacrifice of this kind, that it is possible to see that faith exhibited which Abel had, and Cain had not. If then we refer to the subsequent sacrifices of expiation appointed by Divine authority, and their explanation in the New Testament, it will be obvious to what doctrines and principles of an antecedent revelation the faith of Abel had respect, and which his sacrifice,

the exhibition of his faith, proclaimed: confession of the fact of being a sinner,--acknowledgment that the demerit and penalty of sin is death,--submission to an appointed mode of expiation,--animal sacrifice offered vicariously, but in itself a mere type of a better sacrifice, "the Seed of the woman," appointed to be offered at some future period,--and the efficacy of this appointed method of expiation to obtain forgiveness, and to admit the guilty into the Divine favour.

"Abel," Dr. Magee justly says, "in firm reliance on the promise of God, and in obedience to his command, offered that sacrifice which had been enjoined as the religious expression of his faith; whilst Cain, disregarding the gracious assurances that had been vouchsafed, or at least disdaining to adopt the prescribed mode of manifesting his belief, possibly as not appearing to his reason to possess any efficacy or natural fitness, thought he had sufficiently acquitted himself of his duty in acknowledging the general superintendence of God, and expressing his gratitude to the Supreme Benefactor, by presenting some of those good things which he thereby confessed to have been derived from his bounty. In short, Cain, the first-born of the fall, exhibits the first fruits of his parents' disobedience, in the arrogance and self-sufficiency of reason rejecting the aids of revelation, because they fell not within its apprehension of right. He takes the first place in the annals of Deism, and displays, in his proud rejection of the ordinance of sacrifice, the same spirit which, in later days, has actuated his enlightened followers, in rejecting the sacrifice of Christ."

Abel was killed about the year of the world, 130.

ABEL-MISRAIM, the floor of Atad, beyond the river Jordan, where Joseph, his brethren, and the Egyptians mourned for the death of Jacob, Gen. 1, 11. On this occasion the funeral procession was, at the command of Joseph, attended by "all the elders of Egypt, and all the servants of Pharaoh, and all his house, and the house of his brethren, chariots and horsemen, a very great company;" an affecting proof, as it has been remarked, of Joseph's simplicity and singleness of heart, which allowed him to give to the great men of Egypt, over whom he bore absolute rule, an opportunity of observing his own comparatively humble origin, by leading them in attendance upon his father's corpse to the valleys of Canaan, the modest cradle of his race, and to their simple burial places.

ABEL-SHITTIM, a city situate in the plains of Moab, beyond Jordan, opposite to Jericho, Num. xxv, 1, &c; xxiii, 49; Joshua xi, 1. Eusebius says it stood in the neighbourhood of mount Peor. Moses encamped at Abel-Shittim some time before the Hebrew army passed the Jordan. Here the Israelites fell into idolatry, and worshipped Baal-peor, for which God



punished them by the destruction of twenty-four thousand persons in one day.

ABIAH, the second son of the prophet Samuel, and brother of Joel. Samuel having entrusted to his sons the administration of public justice, and admitted them to a share in the government, they behaved so ill, that the people demanded a king, 1 Sam. viii, 2. A. M. 2909.

ABIATHAR, the son of Ahimelech, and the tenth high priest among the Jews, and fourth in descent from Eli, 2 Sam. viii, 17; 1 Chron. xviii, 16. When Saul sent to Nob to murder all the priests, Abiathar escaped the massacre, and fled to David in the wilderness. There he continued in the quality of high priest; but Saul, out of aversion to Ahimelech, whom he imagined to have betrayed his interests, transferred the dignity of the high priesthood from Ithamar's family into that of Eleazar, by conferring this office upon Zadok. Thus there were, at the same time, two high priests in Israel, Abiathar with David, and Zadok with Saul. In this state things continued, until the reign of Solomon, when Abiathar, being attached to the party of Adonijah, was, by Solomon, divested of his priesthood, A. M. 2989; and the race of Zadok alone performed the functions of that office during the reign of Solomon, to the exclusion of the family of Ithamar, according to the word of the Lord to Eli, 1 Sam. ii, 30, &c.

ABIB, the name of the first Hebrew sacred month, Exod. xiii, 4. This month was afterward called Nisan; it contained thirty days, and answered to part of our March and April. Abib signifies green ears of corn, or fresh fruits, according to Jerom's translation, Exod. xiii, 4, and to the LXX. It was so named because corn, particularly barley, was in ear at that time. It was an early custom to give names to months, from the appearances of nature; and the custom is still in force among many nations. The year among the Jews commenced in September, and consequently their jubilees and other civil matters were regulated in this way, Lev. xxv, 8–10; but their sacred year began in Abib. This change took place at the redemption of Israel from Egypt, Exod. xii, 2, "This shall be to you the beginning of months." Ravanelli observes, that as this deliverance from Egypt was a figure of the redemption of the church of Jesus Christ, who died and rose again in this month, it was made the "beginning of months," to lead the church to expect the acceptable year of the Lord. On the tenth day of this month the paschal lamb was taken; and on the fourteenth they ate the passover. On the seven succeeding days they celebrated the feast of unleavened bread, on the last of which days they held a solemn convocation, Exod. xii, xiii. On the fifteenth they gathered the sheaf of the barley first fruits, and on the following day presented an offering of it to the Lord, which having done they might begin their harvest, Lev. xxiii.

ABIHU, the son of Aaron, the high priest, was consumed, together with his brother Nadab, by fire sent from God, because he had offered incense with strange fire, instead of taking it from the altar, Lev. x, 1, 2. This calamity happened A. M. 2514; within eight days after the consecration of Aaron and his sons. Some commentators believe that this fire proceeded from the altar of burnt offerings; others, that it came from the altar of incense. Several interpreters, as the Rabbins, Lyra, Cajetan, and others, are of opinion, that Nadab and Abihu were overtaken with wine, and so forgot to take the sacred fire in their censers. This conjecture is founded on the command of God delivered immediately afterward to the priests, forbidding them the use of wine during the time they should be employed in the service of the temple. Another class allege, that there was nothing so heinous in their transgression, but it was awfully punished, to teach ministers fidelity and exactness in discharging their office. It had a vastly more important meaning,--this instance of vengeance is a standing example of that divine wrath which shall consume all who pretend to serve God, except with incense kindled from the one altar and offering by which he for ever perfects them that are sanctified.

ABIJAH, the son of Jeroboam, the first king of the ten tribes, who died very young, 1 Kings xiv, 1, &c, A. M. 3046.--2. The son of Rehoboam, king of Judah, and of Maachah, the daughter of Uriel, who succeeded his father, A. M. 3046, 2 Chron. xi, 20; xiii, 2, &c. The Rabbins reproach this monarch with neglecting to destroy the profane altar which Jeroboam had erected at Bethel; and with not suppressing the worship of the golden calves there after his victory over that prince.

ABILENE, a small province in Cœlo Syria, between Lebanon and Antilibanus. Of this place Lysanias was governor in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, Luke iii, 1. Abela, or Abila, the capital, was north of Damascus, and south of Heliopolis.

ABIMELECH. This seems to have been the title of the kings of Philistia, as Cæsar was of the Roman emperors, and Pharaoh of the sovereigns of Egypt. It was the name also of one of the sons of Gideon, who became a judge of Israel, Judges ix; and of the Jewish high priest, who gave Goliath's sword, which had been deposited in the tabernacle, and part of the shew bread, to David, at the time this prince was flying from Saul, 1 Sam. xxi, 1.

ABIRAM, the eldest son of Hiel, the Bethelite. Joshua having destroyed the city of Jericho, pronounced this curse: "Cursed be the man, before the Lord, that riseth up and buildeth this city, Jericho: he shall lay the

foundation thereof in his first-born, and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it," Joshua vi, 26. Hiel of Bethel, about five hundred and thirty-seven years after this imprecation, having undertaken to rebuild Jericho, whilst he was laying the foundation of it, lost his eldest son, Abiram, 1 Kings xvi, 34; and Segub, the youngest, when they set up the gates of it: a remarkable instance of a prophetic denunciation fulfilled, perhaps on a person who would not credit the tradition, or the truth of the prediction. So true is the word of the Lord; so minutely are the most distant contingencies foreseen by him; and so exact is the accomplishment of Divine prophecy!

2. Abiram, the son of Eliab, of the tribe of Reuben, was one of those who conspired with Korah and Dathan against Moses in the wilderness, and was swallowed up alive, with his companions, by the earth, which opened to receive them, Num. xvi.

ABISHAG, a young woman, a native of Shunam, in the tribe of Issachar. David, at the age of seventy, finding no warmth in his bed, was advised by his physicians to procure some young person, who might communicate the heat required. To this end Abishag was presented to him, who was one of the most beautiful women in Israel, 1 Kings i, 3; and the king made her his wife. After his death, Adonijah requested her in marriage, for which he lost his life; Solomon perceiving in this a design upon the crown also. Adonijah was his elder brother, an intriguing man, and had aspired to be king before the death of David, and had had his life spared only upon the condition of his peaceable conduct. By this request he convinced Solomon, that he was still actuated by political views, and this brought upon him the punishment of treason.

ABISHAI, the son of Zeruah, David's sister, who was one of the most valiant men of his time, and one of the principal generals in David's armies.

ABLUTION, purification by washing the body, either in whole or part. Ablutions appear to be almost as ancient as external worship itself. Moses enjoined them; the Heathens adopted them; and Mohammed and his followers have continued them: thus they have been introduced among most nations, and make a considerable part of all superstitious religions. The Egyptian priests had their diurnal and nocturnal ablutions; the Grecians, their sprinklings; the Romans, their lustrations and lavations; the Jews, their washings of hands and feet, beside their baptisms; the ancient Christians used ablution before communion, which the Romish church still retains before the mass, sometimes after; the Syrians, Copts, &c, have their solemn washings on Good Friday; the Turks their greater and less ablutions, &c.

Lustration, among the Romans, was a solemn ceremony by which they purified their cities, fields, armies, or people, after any crime or impurity. Lustrations might be performed by fire, by sulphur, by water, and by air; the last was applied by ventilation, or fanning the thing to be purified. All sorts of people, slaves excepted, might perform some kind of lustration. When a person died the house was to be swept in a particular manner; new married persons were sprinkled by the priest with water. People sometimes, by way of purification, ran several times naked through the streets. There was scarcely any action performed, at the beginning and end of which some ceremony was not required to purify themselves and appease the gods.

ABNER was the uncle of king Saul, and the general of his army. After Saul's death, he made Ishbosheth king; and for seven years supported the family of Saul, in opposition to David; but in most of his skirmishes came off with loss. While Ishbosheth's and David's troops lay near each other, hard by Gibeon, Abner challenged Joab to select twelve of David's warriors to fight with an equal number of his. Joab consented: the twenty-four engaged; and fell together on the spot. A fierce battle ensued, in which Abner and his troops were routed. Abner himself was hotly pursued by Asahel, whom he killed by a back stroke of his spear. Still he was followed by Joab and Abishai, till he, who in the morning sported with murder, was obliged at even to entreat that Joab would stay his troops from the effusion of blood, 2 Sam. ii.

Not long after, Abner, taking it highly amiss for Ishbosheth to charge him with lewd behaviour toward Rizpah, Saul's concubine, vowed that he would quickly transfer the whole kingdom into the hands of David. He therefore commenced a correspondence with David, and had an interview with him at Hebron. Abner had just left the feast at which David had entertained him, when Joab, informed of the matter, warmly remonstrated, asserting, that Abner had come as a spy. On his own authority he sent a messenger to invite him back, to have some farther communication with the king; and when Abner was come into Joab's presence, the latter, partly from jealousy lest Abner might become his superior, and partly to revenge his brother Asahel's death, mortally stabbed him in the act of salutation. David, to show how heartily he detested the act, honoured Abner with a splendid funeral, and composed an elegy on his death, 2 Sam. iii.

ABOMINATION. This term was used with regard to the Hebrews, who, being shepherds, are said to have been an abomination to the Egyptians; because they sacrificed the animals held sacred by that people, as oxen, goats, sheep, &c, which the Egyptians esteemed unlawful. This word is also applied in the sacred writings to idolatry and idols, not only because the worship of idols is in itself an abominable thing, but likewise because

the ceremonies of idolaters were almost always of an infamous and licentious nature. For this reason, Chrysostom affirms, that every idol, and every image of a man, was called an abomination among the Jews. The “abomination of desolation” foretold by the Prophet Daniel, x, 27, xi, 31, is supposed by some interpreters to denote the statue of Jupiter Olympius, which Antiochus Epiphanes caused to be erected in the temple of Jerusalem. The second of the passages above cited may probably refer to this circumstance, as the statue of Jupiter did, in fact, “make desolate,” by banishing the true worship of God, and those who performed it, from the temple. But the former passage, considered in its whole connection, bears more immediate reference to that which the evangelists have denominated the “abomination of desolation,” Matt. xxiv, 15, 16; Mark xiii, 14. This, without doubt, signifies the ensigns of the Roman armies under the command of Titus, during the last siege of Jerusalem. The images of their gods and emperors were delineated on these ensigns; and the ensigns themselves, especially the eagles, which were carried at the heads of the legions, were objects of worship; and, according to the usual style of Scripture, they were therefore an abomination. Those ensigns were placed upon the ruins of the temple after it was taken and demolished; and, as Josephus informs us, the Romans sacrificed 9to them there. The horror with which the Jews regarded them, sufficiently appears from the account which Josephus gives of Pilate’s introducing them into the city, when he sent his army from Cæsarea into winter quarters at Jerusalem, and of Vitellius’s proposing to march through Judea, after he had received orders from Tiberius to attack Aretas, king of Petra. The people supplicated and remonstrated, and induced Pilate to remove the army, and Vitellius to march his troops another way. The Jews applied the above passage of Daniel to the Romans, as we are informed by Jerome. The learned Mr. Mede concurs in the same opinion. Sir Isaac Newton, *Obs. on Daniel ix, xii*, observes, that in the sixteenth year of the emperor Adrian, B. C. 132, the Romans accomplished the prediction of Daniel by building a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus, where the temple of God in Jerusalem had stood. Upon this occasion the Jews, under the conduct of Barchochab, rose up in arms against the Romans, and in the war had fifty cities demolished, nine hundred and eighty-five of their best towns destroyed, and five hundred and eighty thousand men slain by the sword; and in the end of the war, B. C. 136, they were banished from Judea upon pain of death; and thenceforth the land remained desolate of its old inhabitants. Others again have applied the prediction of Daniel to the invasion and desolation of Christendom by the Mohammedans, and to their conversion of the churches into mosques. From this interpretation they infer, that the religion of Mohammed will prevail in the east one thousand two hundred and sixty years, and be succeeded by the restoration of the Jews, the destruction of antichrist, the

full conversion of the Gentiles to the church of Christ, and the commencement of the millennium.

In general, whatever is morally or ceremonially impure, or leads to sin, is designated an abomination to God. Thus lying lips are said to be an abomination to the Lord. Every thing in doctrine or practice which tended to corrupt the simplicity of the Gospel is also in Scripture called abominable; hence Babylon is represented, Rev. xvii, 4, as holding in her hand a cup “full of abominations.” In this view, to “work abomination,” is to introduce idolatry, or any other great corruption, into the church and worship of God, 1 Kings xi, 7.

ABRAM, אַבְרָם, a high father; and ABRAHAM, אַבְרָהָם, father of a great multitude, the son of Terah, born at Ur, a city of Chaldea, A. M. 2008. The account of this eminent patriarch occupies so large a part of the book of Genesis, and stands so intimately connected with both the Jewish and Christian dispensations,--with the one by a political and religious, and with the other by a mystical, relation,--that his history demands particular notice. Our account may be divided into his personal history, and his typical, and mystic character.

#### I. Abraham's PERSONAL history.

1. Chaldea, the native country of Abraham, was inhabited by a pastoral people, who were almost irresistibly invited to the study of the motions of the heavenly bodies, by the peculiar serenity of the heavens in that climate, and their habit of spending their nights in the open air in tending their flocks. The first rudiments of astronomy, as a science, is traced to this region; and here, too, one of the earliest forms of idolatry, the worship of the host of heaven, usually called Tsabaism, first began to prevail. During the three hundred and fifty years which elapsed between the deluge and the birth of Abraham, this and other idolatrous superstitions had greatly corrupted the human race, perverted the simple forms of the patriarchal religion, and beclouded the import of its typical rites. The family of Abraham was idolatrous, for his “fathers served other gods beyond the flood,” that is, the great river Euphrates; but whether he himself was in the early period of his life an idolater, we are not informed by Moses. The Arabian and Jewish legends speak of his early idolatry, his conversion from it, and of his zeal in breaking the images in his father's house; but these are little to be depended upon. Before his call he was certainly a worshipper of the true God; and that not in form only, but “in spirit and in truth.” Whilst Abraham was still sojourning in Ur, “the God of glory” appeared to him, and said unto him, “Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred, and go into the land which I shall show thee;” and so firm was his faith in the

providence and care of God, that although the place of his future abode was not indicated, nor any information given of the nature of the country, or the character of its inhabitants, he nevertheless promptly obeyed, and “went out, not knowing whither he went.” Terah his father, Nahor his brother, and Lot his nephew, the son of Haran his deceased brother, accompanied him; a circumstance which indicates that if the family had formerly been idolatrous it had now received the faith of Abraham. They first migrated to Haran, or Charran, in Mesopotamia, a flat, barren region westward of Ur; and after a residence there of a few years, during which Terah had died, Abraham left Haran to go into Palestine, taking with him Sarah his wife, who had no child, and Lot, with his paternal property. Nahor appears to have been left in Haran. To this second migration he was incited also by a Divine command, accompanied by the promises of a numerous issue, that his seed should become a great nation, and, above all, that “in him all the families of the earth should be blessed;” in other words, that the Messiah, known among the patriarchs as the promised “seed of the woman,” should be born in his line. Palestine was then inhabited by the Canaanites, from whom it was called Canaan. Abraham, leading his tribe, first settled at Sechem, a valley between the mountains Ebal and Gerizim, where God appeared to him and promised to give him the land of Canaan, and where, as in other places in which he remained any time, he built an altar to the Lord. He then removed to a hilly region on the north of Jericho; and as the pastures were exhausted, migrated southward, till a famine drove him into Egypt, probably the earliest, certainly the most productive, corn country of the ancient world.

102. Here it may be observed, that the migrations of Abraham and his sons show the manner in which the earth was gradually covered with people. In those ages some cities had been built, and the country to some extent about them cultivated; but wide spaces of unoccupied land lay between them. A part of society following therefore the pastoral life, led forth their flocks, and, in large family tribes, of which the parent was the head, uniting both the sovereign power and the priesthood in himself, and with a train of servants attached to the tribe by hereditary ties, pitched their camps wherever a fertile and unappropriated district offered them pasture. A few of these nomadic tribes appear to have made the circuit of the same region, seldom going far from their native seats; which would probably have been the case with Abraham, had he not received the call of God to depart to a distant country. Others, more bold, followed the track of rivers, and the sweep of fertile valleys, and at length some built cities and formed settlements in those distant regions; whilst others, either from attachment to their former mode of life, or from necessity, continued in their pastoral occupations, and followed the supplies afforded for their flocks by the still expanding regions of the fertile earth. Wars and violences, droughts,

famines, and the constant increase of population, continued to impel these innumerable, but at first, small streams of men into parts still more remote. Those who settled on the sea coast began to use that element, both for supplying themselves with a new species of food, and as a medium of communication by vessels with other countries for the interchange of such commodities as their own lands afforded with those offered by maritime states, more or less distant. Thus were laid the foundations of commerce, and thus the maritime cities were gradually rendered opulent and powerful. Colonies were in time transported from them by means of their ships, and settled on the coasts of still more distant and fertile countries. Thus the migrations of the three primitive families proceeded from the central regions of Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria; and in succession they established numerous communities,--the Phenicians, Arabians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, and Lybians southward;--the Persians, Indians, and Chinese eastward;--the Scythians, Celts, and Tartars northward;--and the Goths, Greeks, and Latins westward, even as far as the Peruvians and Mexicans of South America, and the Indians of North America.

3. Abraham, knowing the dissolute character of the Egyptians, directed Sarah to call herself his sister, which she was, although by another mother; fearing that if they knew her to be his wife, they would not only seize her, but kill him. This circumstance indicates the vicious state of morals and government in Egypt at this early period. In this affair Abraham has been blamed for want of faith in God; but it was perhaps no more than an act of common prudence, as the seraglio of the Egyptian monarch was supplied by any means, however violent and lawless. Sarah, upon the report of her beauty, was seized and taken into his harem; and God sent great plagues upon his house, which, from their extraordinary character, he concluded to be divine judgments. This led to inquiry, and on discovering that he was detaining another man's wife by violence, he sent her back, and dismissed Abraham laden with presents.

4. After the famine Abraham returned to Canaan, and pitched his tents between Bethel and Hai, where he had previously raised an altar. Here, as his flocks and herds, and those of Lot, had greatly increased, and strifes had arisen between their herdsmen as to pasturage and water, they peaceably separated. Lot returning to the plain of the Jordan, which before the destruction of Sodom was as "the garden of God," and Abraham to Mamre, near Hebron, after receiving a renewal of the promise, that God would give him the whole land for a possession. The separation of Abraham and Lot still farther secured the unmingled descent of the Abrahamitic family. The territories of the kings of the cities of the plain were a few years afterward invaded by a confederacy of the petty kings of the Euphrates and the neighbouring countries, and Lot and his family were



taken prisoners. This intelligence being brought to Abraham, he collected the men of his tribe, three hundred and eighteen, and falling upon the kings by night, near the fountains of Jericho, he defeated them, retook the spoil, and recovered Lot. On his return, passing near Salem, supposed to be the city afterward called Jerusalem, he was blessed by its king Melchizedec, who was priest of the most high God; so that the knowledge and worship of Jehovah had not quite departed at that time from the Canaanitish nations. To him Abraham gave a tithe of the spoil. The rest he generously restored to the king of Sodom, refusing, in a noble spirit of independence, to retain so much as a "shoe lachet," except the portion which, by usage of war, fell to the young native sheiks, Aner, Eschal, and Mamre, who had joined him in the expedition.

5. After this he had another encouraging vision of God, Gen. xv, 1; and to his complaint that he was still childless, and that his name and property would descend to the stranger Eliezer, who held the next rank in his tribe, the promise was given, that he himself should have a son, and that his seed should be countless as the stars of heaven. And it is emphatically added, "He believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness." He was then fully assured, that he stood before God, a pardoned and accepted man, "whose iniquities were forgiven," and to whom "the Lord did not impute sin." Still the fulfilment of the promise of a son was delayed; and Sarah, perhaps despairing that it would be accomplished in her person, and the revelation which had been made merely stating that this son should be the fruit of Abraham's body, without any reference to her, she gave to him, according to the custom of those times, one of her handmaids, an Egyptian, to be his secondary wife, who brought forth Ishmael. Children born in this manner had the privileges of legitimacy; but fourteen years afterward, when Abraham was a hundred years old, and Sarah ninety, the Lord appeared to him again, established his covenant with him and with his seed, changed his name to Abraham, "the father of many nations," promised that Sarah herself should bring forth the son to whom the preceding promises had referred; instituted circumcision as the sign of the covenant; and changed the name of his wife from Sarai, my princess, to Sarah, the princess, that is, of many people to descend from her.

6. At this time Abraham occupied his former encampment near Hebron. Here, as he sat in the door of his tent, three mysterious strangers appeared. Abraham, with true Arabian hospitality, received and entertained them. The chief of the three renewed the promise of a son to be born from Sarah, a promise which she received with a laugh of incredulity, for which she was mildly reproved. As Abraham accompanied them toward the valley of the Jordan, the same divine person, for so he manifestly appears, announced the dreadful ruin impending over the licentious cities among

which Lot had taken up his abode. No passage, even in the sacred writings, exhibits a more exalted view of the divine condescension than that in which Abraham is seen expostulating on the apparent injustice of involving the innocent in the ruin of the guilty: "Shall the city perish, if fifty, if forty-five, if forty, if thirty, if twenty, if ten righteous men be found within its walls?" "Ten righteous men shall avert its doom." Such was the promise of the celestial visitant; but the guilt was universal, the ruin inevitable; and the violation of the sacred laws of hospitality and nature, which Lot in his horror attempted to avert by the most revolting expedient, confirmed the justice of the divine sentence.

7. Sarah having conceived, according to the divine promise, Abraham left the plain of Mamre, and went south to Gerar, where Abimelech reigned; and again fearing lest Sarah should be forced from him, and himself be put to death, her beauty having been, it would appear, preternaturally continued, notwithstanding her age, he here called her, as he had done in Egypt, his sister. Abimelech took her to his house, designing to marry her; but God having, in a dream, informed him that she was Abraham's wife, he returned her to him with great presents. This year Sarah was delivered of Isaac; and Abraham circumcised him, according to the covenant stipulation; and when he was weaned, made a great entertainment. Sarah, having observed Ishmael, son of Hagar, mocking her son Isaac, said to Abraham, "Cast out this bondwoman and her son, for Ishmael shall not be heir with Isaac." After great reluctance, Abraham complied; God having informed him that this was according to the appointments of his providence, with respect to future ages. About the same time, Abimelech came with Phicol, his general, to conclude an alliance with Abraham, who made that prince a present of seven ewe lambs out of his flock, in confirmation that a well he had opened should be his own property; and they called the place Beer-sheba, or "the well of swearing," because of the covenant there ratified with oaths. Here Abraham planted a grove, built an altar, and for some time resided, Gen. xx, xxi.

8. More than twenty years after this, (A. M. 2133,) God, for the final trial and illustration of Abraham's faith, directed him to offer up his son Isaac. Abraham took his son, and two servants, and went toward mount Moriah. When within sight of the mountain, Abraham left his servants, and ascended it with his son only; and there having bound him, he prepared for the affecting sacrifice; but when he was about to give the blow, an angel from heaven cried out to him, "Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing to him. Now I know that thou fearest God, since thou hast not withheld thine only son from me." Abraham, turning, saw a ram entangled in the bush by his horns; and he offered this animal as a burnt offering, instead of his son Isaac. This memorable place he called by the

prophetic name, Jehovah-jireh, or the Lord will see--or provide, Gen. xxii, 1-14, having respect, no doubt, to the true sacrifice which, in the fulness of time, was to be offered for the whole world upon the same mountain.

9. Twelve years afterward, Sarah, wife of Abraham, died in Hebron. Abraham came to mourn and to perform the funeral offices for her. He addressed the people at the city gate, entreating them to allow him to bury his wife among them; for, being a stranger, and having no land of his own, he could claim no right of interment in any sepulchre of that country. He, therefore, bought of Ephron, one of the inhabitants, the field of Machpelah, with the cave and sepulchre in it, at the price of four hundred shekels of silver, about forty-five pounds sterling. And here Abraham buried Sarah, with due solemnities, according to the custom of the country, Gen. xxiii. This whole transaction impressively illustrates the dignity, courtesy, and honour of these ancient chiefs; and wholly disproves the notion that theirs was a rude and unpolished age.

10. Abraham, having grown old, sent Eliezer, his steward, into Mesopotamia, with directions to obtain a young woman of his own family, as a wife for his son Isaac. Eliezer executed his commission with fidelity, and brought back Rebecca, daughter of Bethuel, grand-daughter of Nahor, and, consequently, Abraham's niece, whom Isaac married. Abraham afterward married Keturah; by whom he had six sons, Zimran, Jokshan, Medan, Midian, Ishbak, and Shuah; who became heads of different people, which dwelt in Arabia, and around it. He died, aged a hundred and seventy-five years, and was buried, with Sarah his wife, in the cave of Machpelah, which he had purchased of Ephron, Gen. xxiv, xxv, A. M. 2183, before Christ 1821.

II. From the personal history of Abraham we may now proceed to the consideration of the TYPICAL circumstances which were connected with it.

121. Abraham himself with his family may be regarded as a type of the church of God in future ages. They indeed constituted God's ancient church. Not that many scattered patriarchal and family churches did not remain: such was that of Melchizedec; and such probably was that of Nahor, whom Abraham left behind in Mesopotamia. But a visible church relation was established between Abraham's family and the Most High, signified by the visible and distinguishing sacrament of circumcision, and followed by new and enlarged revelations of truth. Two purposes were to be answered by this,--the preservation of the true doctrine of salvation in the world, which is the great and solemn duty of every branch of the church of God,--and the manifestation of that truth to others. Both were done by

Abraham. Wherever he sojourned he built his altars to the true God, and publicly celebrated his worship; and, as we learn from St. Paul, he lived in tents in preference to settling in the land of Canaan, though it had been given to him for a possession, in order that he might thus proclaim his faith in the eternal inheritance of which Canaan was a type; and in bearing this testimony, his example was followed by Isaac and Jacob, the “heirs with him of the same promise,” who also thus “confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims,” and that “they looked” for a continuing and eternal city in heaven. So also now is the same doctrine of immortality committed to the church of Christ; and by deadness to the world ought its members to declare the reality of their own faith in it.

2. The numerous natural posterity promised to Abraham was also a type of the spiritual seed, the true members of the church of Christ, springing from the Messiah, of whom Isaac was the symbol. Thus St. Paul expressly distinguishes between the fleshly and the spiritual seed of Abraham; to the latter of which, in their ultimate and highest sense, the promises of increase as the stars of heaven, and the sands of the sea shore, are to be referred, as also the promise of the heavenly Canaan.

3. The intentional offering up Isaac, with its result, was probably that transaction in which Abraham, more clearly than in any other, “saw the day of Christ, and was glad.” He received Isaac from the dead, says St. Paul, “in a figure.” This could be a figure of nothing but the resurrection of our Lord; and, if so, Isaac’s being laid upon the altar was a figure of his sacrificial death, scenically and most impressively represented to Abraham. The place, the same ridge of hills on which our Lord was crucified; the person, an only son, to die for no offence of his own; the sacrificer, a father; the receiving back, as it were, from death to life; the name impressed upon the place, importing, “the Lord will provide,” in allusion to Abraham’s own words to Isaac, “the Lord will provide a lamb for a burnt offering;” all indicate a mystery which lay deep beneath this transaction, and which Abraham, as the reward of his obedience, was permitted to behold. “The day” of Christ’s humiliation and exaltation was thus opened to him; and served to keep the great truth in mind, that the true burnt offering and sacrifice for sin was to be something higher than the immolation of lambs and bulls and goats,--nay, something more than what was merely human.

4. The transaction of the expulsion of Hagar was also a type. It was an allegory in action, by which St. Paul teaches us to understand that the son of the bondwoman represented those who are under the law; and the child of the freewoman those who by faith in Christ are supernaturally begotten into the family of God. The bondwoman and her son being cast out,

represented also the expulsion of the unbelieving Jews from the church of God, which was to be composed of true believers of all nations, all of whom, whether Jews or Gentiles, were to become “fellow heirs.”

III. But Abraham appears before us invested with a MYSTIC character, which it is of great importance rightly to understand.

1. He is to be regarded as standing in a federal or covenant relation, not only to his natural seed, but specially and eminently to all believers. “The Gospel,” we are told by St. Paul, “was preached to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.” “Abraham believed in God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness;” in other words, he was justified. A covenant of gratuitous justification through faith was made with him and his believing descendants; and the rite of circumcision, which was not confined to his posterity by Sarah, but appointed in every branch of his family, was the sign or sacrament of this covenant of grace, and so remained till it was displaced by the sacraments appointed by Christ. Wherever that sign was it declared the doctrine, and offered the grace, of this covenant--free justification by faith, and its glorious results--to all the tribes that proceeded from Abraham. This same grace is offered to us by the Gospel, who become “Abraham’s seed,” his spiritual children with whom the covenant is established, through the same faith, and are thus made “the heirs with him of the same promise.”

2. Abraham is also exhibited to us as the representative of true believers; and in this especially, that the true nature of faith was exhibited in him. This great principle was marked in Abraham with the following characters:--An entire unhesitating belief in the word of God;--an unflinching trust in all his promises;--a steady regard to his almighty power, leading him to overlook all apparent difficulties and impossibilities in every case where God had explicitly promised;--and habitual and cheerful and entire obedience. The Apostle has described faith in Heb. xi, 1; and that faith is seen living and acting in all its energy in Abraham.

A few miscellaneous remarks are suggested by some of the circumstances of Abraham’s history:--

1. The ancient method of ratifying a covenant by sacrifice is illustrated in the account given in Gen. xv, 9, 10. The beasts were slain and divided in the midst, and the persons covenanting passed between the parts. Hence, after Abraham had performed this part of the ceremony, the symbol of the Almighty’s presence, “a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp, passed between the pieces,” verse 18, and so both parties ratified the covenant.

2. As the beauty of Sarah, which she retained so long as quite to conceal her real age from observers, attracted so much notice as to lead to her forcible seizure, once by Pharaoh in Egypt, and again by Abimelech in Palestine, it may appear strange, that, as in the east women are generally kept in seclusion, and seldom appear without veils, she exposed herself to observation. But to this day the Arab women do not wear veils at home in their tents; and Sarah's countenance might have been seen in the tent by some of the officers of Pharaoh and Abimelech, who reported her beauty to their masters.

3. The intentional offering up of Isaac is not to be supposed as viewed by Abraham as an act sanctioned by the Pagan practice of human sacrifice. The immolation of human victims, particularly of that which was most precious, the favourite, the first-born child, appears to have been a common usage among many early nations, more especially the tribes by which Abraham was surrounded. It was the distinguishing rite among the worshippers of Moloch; at a later period of the Jewish history, it was practised by a king of Moab; and it was undoubtedly derived by the Carthaginians from their Phenecian ancestors on the shores of Syria. Where it was an ordinary usage, as in the worship of Moloch, it was in unison with the character of the religion, and of its deity. It was the last act of a dark and sanguinary superstition, which rose by regular gradation to this complete triumph over human nature. The god, who was propitiated by these offerings, had been satiated with more cheap and vulgar victims; he had been glutted to the full with human suffering and with human blood. In general it was the final mark of the subjugation of the national mind to an inhuman and domineering priesthood. But the Mosaic religion held human sacrifices in abhorrence; and the God of the Abrahamitic family, uniformly beneficent, had imposed no duties which entailed human suffering, had demanded no offerings which were repugnant to the better feelings of our nature. The command to offer Isaac as "a burnt offering," was for these reasons a trial the more severe to Abraham's faith. He must therefore have been fully assured of the divine command; and he left the mystery to be explained by God himself. His was a simple act of unhesitating obedience to the command of God; the last proof of perfect reliance on the certain accomplishment of the divine promises. Isaac, so miraculously bestowed, could be as miraculously restored; Abraham, such is the comment of the Christian Apostle, "believed that God could even raise him up from the dead."

4. The wide and deep impression made by the character of Abraham upon the ancient world is proved by the reverence which people of almost all nations and countries have paid to him, and the manner in which the events of his life have been interwoven in their mythology, and their religious

traditions. Jews, Magians, Sabians, Indians, and Mohammedans have claimed him as the great patriarch and founder of their several sects; and his history has been embellished with a variety of fictions. One of the most pleasing of these is the following, but it proceeds upon the supposition that he was educated in idolatry: "As Abraham was walking by night from the grotto where he was born, to the city of Babylon, he gazed on the stars of heaven, and among them on the beautiful planet Venus. 'Behold,' said he within himself, 'the God and Lord of the universe!' but the star set and disappeared, and Abraham felt that the Lord of the universe could not thus be liable to change. Shortly after, he beheld the moon at the full: 'Lo,' he cried, 'the Divine Creator, the manifest Deity!' but the moon sank below the horizon, and Abraham made the same reflection as at the setting of the evening star. All the rest of the night he passed in profound rumination; at sunrise he stood before the gates of Babylon, and saw the whole people prostrate in adoration. 'Wondrous orb,' he exclaimed, 'thou surely art the Creator and Ruler of all nature! but thou, too, hastest like the rest to thy setting!--neither then art thou my Creator, my Lord, or my God!'"

ABRAHAMITES, reported heretical sects of the eighth and ninth centuries, charged with the Paulician errors, and some of them with idolatry. For these charges we have, however, only the word of their persecutors. Also the name of a sect in Bohemia, as late as 1782, who professed the religion of Abraham before his circumcision, and admitted no scriptures but the decalogue and the Lord's prayer. As these were persecuted, they too were probably misrepresented, and especially as their conduct is allowed to have been good, even by their enemies.

ABSALOM, the son of David by Maachah, daughter of the king of Geshur; distinguished for his fine person, his vices, and his unnatural rebellion. Of his open revolt, his conduct in Jerusalem, his pursuit of the king his father, his defeat and death, see 2 Sam. xvi-xviii, at large.

ABSOLUTION, in the church of Rome, is a sacrament, in which the priests assume the power of forgiving sins. The rite of absolution in the church of England is acknowledged to be declarative only--"Almighty God hath given power and commandment to his ministers to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins: He pardoneth," &c. In this view it is innocent; and although any private Christian has a right to declare and pronounce the same doctrine to his neighbour, the official publication of the grace of the Gospel is the public duty of its ministers in the congregation, since they are Christ's "ambassadors."

ABSTINENCE, forbearance of any thing <sup>14</sup>It is generally used with reference to forbearance from food under a religious motive. The Jewish law ordained that the priests should abstain from the use of wine during the whole time of their being employed in the service of the temple, Lev. x, 9. The same abstinence was enjoined upon the Nazarites, during the time of their Nazariteship, or separation, Num. vi, 3. The Jews were commanded to abstain from several sorts of animals. See Animal.

The fat of all sorts of animals that were sacrificed was forbidden to be eaten, Lev. iii, 17; vii, 23; and the blood of every animal, in general, was prohibited under pain of death. Indeed blood was forbidden by the Creator, from the time of the grant of the flesh of beasts to man for food; this prohibition was continued under the Jewish economy, and transmitted to the Christian church by Apostolic authority, Acts xv, 28, 29. (See Blood.) The Jews also abstained from the sinew which is upon the hollow of the thigh, Gen. xxxii, 25; because of the shrinking of the sinew of Jacob's thigh when touched by the angel, as though by that the part had been made sacred.

Among the primitive Christians, some denied themselves the use of such meats as were prohibited by the law; others treated this abstinence with contempt. St. Paul has given his decision on these questions in his epistles, 1 Cor. viii, 7–10; Rom. xiv, 1–3. The council of Jerusalem, which was held by the Apostles, enjoined the Christian converts to abstain from meats strangled, from blood, from fornication, and from idolatry, Acts xv, 20.

The spiritual monarchy of the western world introduced another sort of abstinence which may be termed ritual, and which consists in abstaining from particular meats at certain times and seasons, the rules of which are called rogations. The ancient Lent was observed only a few days before Easter. In the course of the third century, it extended at Rome to three weeks; and before the middle of the succeeding age, it was prolonged to six weeks, and began to be called quadragesima, or the forty days' fast.

ABYSS, or DEEP, ἄβυσσος, without bottom. The chaos; the deepest parts of the sea; and, in the New Testament, the place of the dead, Rom. x, 7; a deep place of punishment. The devils besought Jesus that he would not send them into the abyss, a place they evidently dreaded, Luke viii, 31; where it seems to mean that part of Hades in which wicked spirits are in torment. See Hell.

In the opinion of the ancient Hebrews, and of the generality of eastern people at this day, the abyss, the sea, or waters, encompassed the whole earth. This was supposed to float upon the abyss, of which it covered a



small part. According to the same notion, the earth was founded on the waters, or at least its foundations were on the abyss beneath, Psalm xxiv, 2; cxxxvi, 6. Under these waters, and at the bottom of this abyss, they represented the wicked as groaning, and suffering the punishment of their sin. The Rephaim were confined there, those old giants, who, whilst living, caused surrounding nations to tremble, Prov. ix, 18; xxi, 16, &c. Lastly, in these dark dungeons the kings of Tyre, Babylon, and Egypt are described by the Prophets as suffering the punishment of their pride and cruelty, Isaiah xxvi, 14; Ezek. xxviii, 10, &c.

These depths are figuratively represented as the abodes of evil spirits, and powers opposed to God: "I saw," says St. John, "a star fall from heaven unto the earth, and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit. And he opened the bottomless pit; and there arose a smoke out of it, as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit. And there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth. And they had a king over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit," Rev. ix, 1, 2, 11. In another place, the beast is represented as ascending out of the bottomless pit, and waging war against the two witnesses of God, Rev. xi, 7. Lastly, St. John says, "I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season," Rev. xx, 1–3.

ABYSSINIAN CHURCH, a branch of the Coptic church, in Upper Ethiopia. The Abyssinians, by the most authentic accounts, were converted to the Christian faith about the year 330; when Frumentius, being providentially raised to a high office, under the patronage of the queen of Ethiopia, and ordained bishop of that country by Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria, established Christianity, built churches, and ordained a regular clergy to officiate in them. The Abyssinian Christians themselves, indeed, claim a much higher antiquity, having a tradition, that the doctrine of Christ was first introduced among them by Queen Candace, Acts viii, 27; or even preached there by the Apostles Matthew and Bartholomew; but the former is supported by no collateral evidence, and the latter is in opposition to high authority. Some of them claim relation to the Israelites, through the queen of Sheba, so far back as the reign of Solomon.

The Abyssinian Christians have always received their abuna, or patriarch, from Alexandria, whence they sprang, and consequently their creed is Monophysite, or Eutychian; maintaining one nature only in the person of

Christ, namely, the divine, in which they considered all the properties of the humanity to be absorbed; in opposition to the Nestorians.

On the power of the Saracens prevailing in the east, all communication being nearly cut off between the eastern and western churches, the Abyssinian church remained unknown in Europe till nearly the close of the fifteenth century, when John II, of Portugal, accidentally hearing of the existence of such a church, sent to make inquiry. This led to a correspondence between the Abyssinians and the church of Rome; and Bermudes, a Portuguese, was consecrated by the pope patriarch of Ethiopia, and the Abyssinians were required to receive the Roman Catholic faith, in return for some military assistance afforded to the emperor. Instead of this, however, the emperor sent for a new patriarch from Alexandria, imprisoned Bermudes, and declared the pope a heretic.

About the middle of the sixteenth century, the Jesuits attempted a mission to Abyssinia, in the hope of reducing it to the pope's authority; but without success. In 1588 a second mission was attempted, and so far succeeded as to introduce a system of persecution, which cost many lives, and caused many troubles to the empire. In the following century, however, the Jesuits were all expelled, Abyssinia returned to its ancient faith, and nothing more was heard of the church of Abyssinia, till the latter part of the last century.

After the expulsion of the Jesuits, all Europeans were interdicted; nor does it appear that any one dared to attempt an entrance until the celebrated Mr. Bruce, by the report of his medical skill, contrived to introduce himself to the court, where he even obtained military promotion; and was in such repute, that it was with great difficulty he obtained leave to return to England.

Encouraged, perhaps, by this circumstance, the Moravian brethren attempted a mission to this country, but in vain. They were compelled to retreat to Grand Cairo, from whence, by leave of the patriarch, they visited the Copts at Behruser, and formed a small society; but in 1783, they were driven thence, and compelled to return to Europe. More recently, however, the late king of Abyssinia (Itsa Takley Gorges) addressed a letter to Mr. Salt, the British consul in Egypt, and requested copies of some parts of both the Old and New Testaments. Copies of the Psalms, in Ethiopic, as printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society, were also sent to him.

ACADEMICS, a name given to such philosophers as adopted the doctrines of Plato. They were so called from the Academia, a grove near Athens, where they frequently indulged their contemplations. Academia is said to

derive its name from one Academus, a god or hero so called. Thus Horace,-

*Atque inter sylvas Academi quærere verum.*

[And in the groves of Academus to search for truth.]

The academics are divided into those of the first academy, who taught the doctrines of Plato in their original purity; those of the second or middle academy, who differed materially from the first, and inclined to skepticism; and those of the new academy. The middle school laid it down as a principle, that neither our senses, nor our reason, are to be trusted; but that in common affairs we are to conform to received opinions. The new academy maintained that we have no means of distinguishing truth, and that the most evident appearances may lead us into error; they granted the wise man opinion, but denied him certainty. They held, however, that it was best to follow the greatest probability, which was sufficient for all the useful purposes of life, and laid down rules for the attainment of felicity. The difference betwixt the middle academy and the new seems to have been this, that though they agreed in the imbecility of human nature, yet the first denied that probabilities were of any use in the pursuit of happiness; and the latter held them to be of service in such a design: the former recommended a conformity with received opinions, and the latter allowed men an opinion of their own. In the first academy, Speusippus filled the chair; in the second, Arcesilaus; and in the new or third academy, Carneades.

ACCAD, one of the four cities built by Nimrod, the founder of the Assyrian empire. (See Nimrod.) “And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar,” Gen. x, 10. Thus it appears that Accad was contemporary with Babylon, and was one of the first four great cities of the world.

It would scarcely be expected that any thing should now remain to guide us in our search for this ancient city, seeing that Babylon itself, with which it was coeval, is reduced to heaps; and that it is not mentioned under its ancient name by any profane author. But the discoveries of modern travellers may be brought to aid us in our inquiry. At the distance of about six miles from the modern town of Bagdad, is found a mound, surmounted by a tower-shaped ruin, called by the Arabs Tell Nimrood, and by the Turks Nemrood Tepasse; both terms implying the Hill of Nimrod. This gigantic mass rises in an irregularly pyramidal or turreted shape, according to the view in which it is taken, one hundred and twenty-five or one hundred and thirty feet above the gently inclined elevation on which it stands. Its circumference, at the bottom, is three hundred feet. The mound which constitutes its foundation is composed of a collection of rubbish, formed

from the decay of the superstructure; and consists of sandy earth, fragments of burnt brick, pottery, and hard clay, partially vitrified. In the remains of the tower, the different layers of sun-dried brick, of which it is composed, may be traced with great precision. These bricks, cemented together by slime, and divided into courses varying from twelve to twenty feet in height, are separated from one another by a stratum of reeds, similar to those now growing in the marshy parts of the plain, and in a wonderful state of preservation. The resemblance of this mode of building to that in some of the structures at Babylon, cannot escape observation; and we may reasonably conclude it to be the workmanship of the same architects. The solidity and the loftiness of this pile, unfashioned to any other purpose, bespeak it to be one of those enormous pyramidal towers which were consecrated to the Sabian worship; which, as essential to their religious rites, were probably erected in all the early cities of the Cuthites; and, like their prototype at Babylon, answered the double purpose of altars and observatories. 16Here then was the site of one of these early cities. It was not Babylon; it was not Erech; it was not Calneh. It might be too much to say that therefore it must be Accad; but the inference is at least warrantable; which is farther strengthened by the name of the place, Akarkouff; which bears a greater affinity to that of Accad than many others which are forced into the support of geographical speculations, especially when it is recollected that the Syrian name of the city was Achar.

ACCESS, free admission, open entrance. Our access to God is by Jesus Christ, the way, the truth, and the life, Rom. v, 2; Eph. ii, 18. Under the law, the high priest alone had access into the holiest of all; but when the veil of the temple was rent in twain, at the death of Christ, it was declared that a new and living way of access was laid open through the veil, that is to say, his flesh. By his death, also, the middle wall of partition was broken down, and Jew and Gentile had both free access to God; whereas, before, the Gentiles had no nearer access in the temple worship than to the gate of the court of Israel. Thus the saving grace and lofty privileges of the Gospel are equally bestowed upon true believers of all nations.

ACCHO, afterward called Ptolemais, and now Akka by the Arabs, and Acre by the Turks. It was given to the tribe of Asher, Judges i, 31. Christianity was planted here at an early period, and here St. Paul visited the saints in his way to Jerusalem, Acts xxi, 7. It is a seaport of Palestine, thirty miles south of Tyre, and, in the first partition of the holy land, belonged to the tribe of Asher; but this was one of the places out of which the Israelites could not drive the primitive inhabitants. In succeeding times it was enlarged by the first Ptolemy, to whose lot it fell, and who named it after himself, Ptolemais.

This city, now called Acre, which, from the convenience of its port, is one of the most considerable on the Syrian coast, was, during almost two centuries, the principal theatre of the holy wars, and the frequent scene of the perfidies and treacheries of the crusaders.

Among its antiquities, Dr. E. D. Clarke describes the remains of a very considerable edifice, exhibiting a conspicuous appearance among the buildings on the north side of the city. "In this structure the style of the architecture is of the kind we call Gothic. Perhaps it has on that account borne among our countrymen the appellation of 'King Richard's Palace,' although, in the period to which the tradition refers, the English were hardly capable of erecting palaces, or any other buildings of equal magnificence. Two lofty arches, and part of the cornice, are all that now remain to attest the former greatness of the superstructure. The cornice, ornamented with enormous stone busts, exhibiting a series of hideous distorted countenances, whose features are in no instances alike, may either have served as allusions to the decapitation of St. John, or were intended for a representation of the heads of Saracens suspended as trophies upon the walls." Maundrell and Pococke consider this building to have been the church of St. Andrew; but Dr. E. D. Clarke thinks it was that of St. John, erected by the Knights of Jerusalem, whence the city changed its name of Ptolemais for that of St. John d'Acre. He also considers the style of architecture to be in some degree the original of our ornamented Gothic, before its translation from the holy land to Italy, France, and England.

Mr. Buckingham, who visited Acre in 1816, says, "Of the Canaanitish Accho it would be thought idle perhaps to seek for remains; yet some presented themselves to my observation so peculiar in form and materials, and of such high antiquity, as to leave no doubt in my own mind of their being the fragments of buildings constructed in the earliest ages.

"Of the splendour of Ptolemais, no perfect monument remains; but throughout the town are seen shafts of red and grey granite, and marble pillars. The Saracenic remains are only to be partially traced in the inner walls of the town; which have themselves been so broken down and repaired, as to leave little visible of the original work; and all the mosques, fountains, bazaars, and other public buildings, are in a style rather Turkish than Arabic, excepting only an old, but regular and well-built khan or caravanserai, which might perhaps be attributed to the Saracen age. The Christian ruins are altogether gone, scarcely leaving a trace of the spot on which they stood."

Acre has been rendered famous in our own times by the successful resistance made by our countryman Sir Sydney Smith, aided by the

celebrated Djezzar Pasha, to the progress of the French under Buonaparte. Since this period, the fortifications have been considerably increased; and although to the eye of an engineer they may still be very defective, Acre may be considered as the strongest place in Palestine.

Mr. Conner says, on the authority of the English consul, that there are about ten thousand inhabitants in Acre, of whom three thousand are Turks, and the remainder Christians, chiefly Catholics.

ACCUBATION, the posture used at table by the ancients. The old Romans sat at meat as we do, till the Grecian luxury and softness had corrupted them. The same custom, of lying upon couches at their entertainments, prevailed among the Jews also in our Saviour's time; for having been lately conquered by Pompey, they conformed in this, and in many other respects, to the example of their masters. The manner of lying at meat among the Romans, Greeks, and more modern Jews, was the same in all respects. The table was placed in the middle of the room, around which stood three couches covered with cloth or tapestry, according to the quality of the master of the house; upon these they lay, inclining the superior part of their bodies upon their left arms, the lower part being stretched out at full length, or a little bent. Their heads were supported and raised with pillows. The first man lay at the head of the couch; the next man lay with his head toward the feet of the other, from which he was defended by the bolster that supported his own back, commonly reaching over to the middle of the first man; and the rest after the same manner. The most honourable place was the middle couch--and the middle of that. Favourites commonly lay in the bosom of their friends; that is, they were placed next below them: see John xiii, 23, where St. John is said to have lain in our Saviour's bosom. The ancient Greeks sat at the table; for Homer observes that when Ulysses arrived at the palace of Alcinous, the king dispatched his son Laodamas to seat Ulysses in a magnificent chair. The Egyptians sat at table anciently, as well as the Romans, till toward the end of the Punic war, when they began to recline at table.

ACCURSED, in the Scriptures, signifies that which is separated or devoted. With regard to persons, it denotes the cutting off or separating any one from the communion of the church, the number of the living, or the privileges of society; and also the devoting an animal, city, or other thing to destruction. Anathema was a species of excommunication among the Jews, and was often practised after they had lost the power of life and death, against those persons who, according to the Mosaic law, ought to have been executed. A criminal, after the sentence of excommunication was pronounced, became anathema: and they had a full persuasion that the sentence would not be in vain; but that God would interfere to punish the

offender in a manner similar to the penalty of the law of Moses: a man, for instance, whom the law condemned to be stoned, would, they believed, be killed by the falling of a stone upon him; a man to be hanged, would be choked; and one whom the law sentenced to the flames, would be burnt in his house, &c. Maranatha, a Syriac word, signifying the Lord cometh, was added to the sentence, to express their persuasion that the Lord God would come to take vengeance upon that guilt which they, circumstanced as they were, had not the power to punish, 1 Cor. xvi, 22.

According to the idiom of the Hebrew language, accursed and crucified were synonymous terms. By the Jews every one who died upon a tree was reckoned accursed, Deut. xxi, 23.

Excommunication is a kind of anathema also among some Christians; and by it the offender is deprived, not only of communicating in prayers and other holy offices, but of admittance to the church, and of conversation with the faithful. The spirit of Judaism, rather than that of the Gospel, has in this been imitated; for among the Hebrews, they who were excommunicated could not perform any public duty of their employments; could be neither judges nor witnesses; neither be present at funerals, nor circumcise their own sons, nor sit down in the company of other men, nearer than within the distance of four cubits. If they died under excommunication, they were denied the rites of burial; and a large stone was left on their graves, or a heap of stones was thrown over them, as over Achan, Joshua vii, 26. The Apostolical excommunication was simply to deny to the offender, after admonition, the right of partaking of the Lord's Supper, which was excision from the church of Christ.

ACELDAMA, a piece of ground without the south wall of Jerusalem, on the other side of the brook Siloam. It was called the Potter's Field, because an earth or clay was dug in it, of which pottery was made. It was likewise called the Fuller's Field, because cloth was dried in it. But it having been afterward bought with the money by which the high priest and rulers of the Jews purchased the blood of Jesus, it was called Aceldama, or the Field of Blood.

ACHAIA. This name is used to denote the whole of Greece, as it existed as a Roman province; or Achaia Proper, a district in the northern part of the Peloponnesus, on the bay of Corinth, and in which the city of that name stood. It appears to have been used in the former sense in 2 Cor. xi, 10; and in the latter, in Acts xix, 21.

ACHAN, the son of Carmi, of the tribe of Judah, who having taken a part of the spoils of Jericho, against the injunction of God, who had accursed

or devoted the whole city, was, upon being taken by lot, doomed to be stoned to death. The whole history is recorded, Joshua vii. It would appear that Achan's family were also stoned; for they were led out with him, and all his property, "And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them with stones." Some of the critics have made efforts to confine the stoning to Achan, and the burning to his goods; but not without violence to the text. It is probable, therefore, that his family were privy to the theft, seeing he hid the accursed things which he had stolen in the earth, in his tent. By concealment they therefore became partakers of his crime, and so the sentence was justified.

ACHMETHA. See Ecbatana.

ACHOR, Valley of, between Jericho and Ai. So called from the trouble brought upon the Israelites by the sin of Achan; Achor in the Hebrew denoting trouble.

ACHZIB, a city on the coast of the Mediterranean, in the tribe of Asher, and one of the cities out of which that tribe did not expel the inhabitants, Judges i, 31. It was called Ecdippa by the Greeks, and is at present termed Zib. It is situated about ten miles north of Accho, or Ptolemais. Mr. Buckingham, who passed by this place, says that it is small, and situated on a hill near the sea; having a few palm trees rearing themselves above its dwellings.

ACRA, Ἄκρα. This Greek word signifies, in general, a citadel. The Syrians and Chaldeans use אקרה, in the same sense. King Antiochus gave orders for building a citadel at Jerusalem, north of the temple, on an eminence, which commanded the holy place; and for that reason was called Acra. Josephus says, that this eminence was semicircular, and that Simon Maccabæus, having expelled the Syrians, who had seized Acra, demolished it, and spent three years in levelling the mountain on which it stood; that no situation in future should command the temple. On mount Acra were afterward built, the palace of Helena; Agrippa's palace, the place where the public records were lodged; and that where the magistrates of Jerusalem assembled.

ACRABATENE, a district of Judæa, extending between Shechem (now Napolose) and Jericho, inclining east. It was about twelve miles in length. The Acrabatene had its name from a place called Akrabbim, about nine miles from Shechem, eastward. This was also the name of another district of Judea on the frontier of Idumea, toward the northern extremity of the Dead Sea.



ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. This book, in the very beginning, professes itself to be a continuation of the Gospel of St. Luke; and its style bespeaks it to be written by the same person. The external evidence is also very satisfactory; for besides allusions in earlier authors, and particularly in Clement of Rome, Polycarp, and Justin Martyr, the Acts of the Apostles are not only quoted by Irenæus, as written by Luke the evangelist, but there are few things recorded in this book which are not mentioned by that ancient father. This strong testimony in favour of the genuineness of the Acts of the Apostles is supported by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Jerome, Eusebius, Theodoret, and most of the later fathers. It may be added, that the name of St. Luke is prefixed to this book in several ancient Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, and also in the old Syriac version.

2. This is the only inspired work which gives us any historical account of the progress of Christianity after our Saviour's ascension. It comprehends a period of about thirty years, but it by no means contains a general history of the church during that time. The principal facts recorded in it are, the choice of Matthias to be an Apostle in the room of the traitor Judas; the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of pentecost; the preaching, miracles, and sufferings of the Apostles at Jerusalem; the death of Stephen, the first martyr; the persecution and dispersion of the Christians; the preaching of the Gospel in different parts of Palestine, especially in Samaria; the conversion of St. Paul; the call of Cornelius, the first Gentile convert; the persecution of the Christians by Herod Agrippa; the preaching of Paul and Barnabas to the Gentiles, by the express command of the Holy Ghost; the decree made at Jerusalem, declaring that circumcision, and a conformity to other Jewish rites and ceremonies, were not necessary in Gentile converts; and the latter part of the book is confined to the history of St. Paul, of whom St. Luke was the constant companion for several years.

3. As this account of St. Paul is not continued beyond his two years' imprisonment at Rome, it is probable that this book was written soon after his release, which happened in the year 63; we may therefore consider the Acts of the Apostles as written about the year 64.

4. The place of its publication is more doubtful. The probability appears to be in favour of Greece, though some contend for Alexandria in Egypt. This latter opinion rests upon the subscriptions at the end of some Greek manuscripts, and of the copies of the Syriac version; but the best critics think, that these subscriptions, which are also affixed to other books of the New Testament, deserve but little weight; and in this case they are not supported by any ancient authority.

5. It must have been of the utmost importance in the early times of the Gospel, and certainly not of less importance to every subsequent age, to have an authentic account of the promised descent of the Holy Ghost, and of the success which attended the first preachers of the Gospel both among the Jews and Gentiles. These great events completed the evidence of the divine mission of Christ, established the truth of the religion which he taught, and pointed out in the clearest manner the comprehensive nature of the redemption which he purchased by his death.

Œcumenius calls the Acts, the “Gospel of the Holy Ghost;” and St. Chrysostom, the “Gospel of our Saviour’s resurrection,” or the Gospel of Jesus Christ risen from the dead. Here, in the lives and preaching of the Apostles, we have the most miraculous instances of the power of the Holy Ghost; and in the account of those who were the first believers, we have received the most excellent pattern of the true Christian life.

ADAM, the name given to man in general, both male and female in the Hebrew Scriptures, Gen. i, 26, 27; v, 1, 2; xi, 5; Josh. xiv, 15; 2 Sam. vii, 19; Eccl. iii, 21; Jer. xxxii, 20; Hosea vi, 7; Zech. xiii, 7: in all which places mankind is understood; but particularly it is the name of the first man and father of the human race, created by God himself out of the dust of the earth. Josephus thinks that he was called Adam by reason of the reddish colour of the earth out of which he was formed, for Adam in Hebrew signifies red. God having made man out of the dust of the earth, breathed into him the breath of life, and gave him dominion over all the creatures of this world, Gen. i, 26, 27; ii, 7. He created him after his own image and resemblance; and having blessed him, he placed him in a delicious garden, in Eden, that he might cultivate it, and feed upon its fruits, Gen. ii, 8; but under the following injunction: “Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.” The first thing that Adam did after his introduction into paradise, was to give names to all the beasts and birds which presented themselves before him, Gen. ii, 19, 20.

But man was without a fellow creature of his own species; wherefore God said, “It is not good for man to be alone; I will make him a help meet for him.” And the Lord caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and while he slept, he took one of his ribs, “and closed up the flesh instead thereof;” and of that substance which he took from man made he a woman, whom he presented to him. Then said Adam, “This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man,” Gen. ii, 21, &c.

The woman was seduced by the tempter; and she seduced her husband to eat of the forbidden fruit. When called to judgment for this transgression before God, Adam attempted to cast the blame upon his wife, and the woman upon the serpent tempter. But God declared them all guilty, and punished the serpent by degradation; the woman by painful childbearing and subjection; and the man by agricultural labour and toil; of which punishments every day witnesses the fulfilment. As their natural passions now became irregular, and their exposure to accidents was great, God made a covering of skins for Adam and for his wife; and expelled them from the garden, to the country without; placing at the east of the garden cherubims and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life. It is not known how long Adam and his wife continued in paradise: some say, many years; others, not many days; others, not many hours. Adam called his wife's name Eve, which signifies "the mother of all living." Shortly after, Eve brought forth Cain, Gen. iv, 1, 2. It is believed that she had a girl at the time, and that, generally, she had twins. The Scriptures notice only three sons of Adam: Cain, Abel, and Seth; and omits daughters; except that Moses tells us, "Adam begat sons and daughters;" no doubt many. He died, aged nine hundred and thirty, B. C. 3074.

Upon this history, so interesting to all Adam's descendants, some remarks may be offered.

1. It is disputed whether the name Adam is derived from red earth. Sir W. Jones thinks it may be from Adim, which in Sanscrit signifies, the first. The Persians, however, denominate him Adamah, which signifies, according to Sale, red earth. The term for woman is Aisha, the feminine of Aish, man, and signifies, therefore, maness or female man.

2. The manner in which the creation of Adam is narrated indicates something peculiar and eminent in the being to be formed. Among the heavenly bodies the earth, and above all the various productions of its surface, vegetable and animal, however perfect in their kinds, and beautiful and excellent in their respective natures, not one being was found to whom the rest could minister instruction; inspire with moral delight; or lead up to the Creator himself. There was, properly speaking, no intellectual being; none to whom the whole frame and furniture of material nature could minister knowledge; no one who could employ upon them the generalizing faculty, and make them the basis of inductive knowledge. If, then, it was not wholly for himself that the world was created by God; and if angels were not so immediately connected with this system, as to lead us to suppose that it was made for them; a rational inhabitant was obviously still wanting to complete the work, and to constitute a perfect whole. The formation of such a being was marked, therefore, by a manner of

proceeding which serves to impress us with a sense of the greatness of the work. Not that it could be a matter of more difficulty to Omnipotence to create man than any thing beside; but principally, it is probable, because he was to be the lord of the whole and therefore himself accountable to the original proprietor; and was to be the subject of another species of government, a moral administration; and to be constituted an image of the intellectual and moral perfections, and of the immortality, of the common Maker. Every thing therefore, as to man's creation, is given in a solemn and deliberative form, and contains also an intimation of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, all equally possessed of creative power, and therefore Divine, to each of whom man was to stand in relations the most sacred and intimate:--“And God said, Let US make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion,” &c.

3. It may be next inquired in what that image of God in which man was made consists.

It is manifest from the history of Moses, that human nature has two essential constituent parts, the BODY formed out of preëxisting matter, the earth; and a LIVING SOUL, breathed into the body by an inspiration from God. “And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils (or face) the breath of life, (lives,) and man became a living soul.” Whatever was thus imparted to the body of man, already “formed,” and perfectly finished in all its parts, was the only cause of life; and the whole tenor of Scripture shows that this was the rational spirit itself, which, by a law of its Creator, was incapable of death, even after the body had fallen under that penalty.

The “image” or likeness of God in which man was made has, by some, been assigned to the body; by others, to the soul. It has, also, been placed in the circumstance of his having “dominion” over the other creatures. As to the body, it is not necessary to prove that in no sense can it bear the image of God; that is, be “like” God. An upright form has no more likeness to God than a prone or reptile one; God is incorporeal, and cannot be the antitype of any thing material.

Equally unfounded is the notion that the image of God in man consisted in the “dominion” which was granted to him over this lower world. Limited dominion may, it is true, be an image of large and absolute dominion; but man is not said to have been made in the image of God's dominion, which is an accident merely, for, before creatures existed, God himself could have no dominion:--he was made in the image and likeness of God himself. Still farther, it is evident that man, according to the history, was made in the image of God in order to his having dominion, as the Hebrew particle

imports; and, therefore, his dominion was consequent upon his formation in the “image” and “likeness” of God, and could not be that image itself.

The notion that the original resemblance of man to God must be placed in some one essential quality, is not consistent with holy writ, from which alone we can derive our information on this subject. We shall, it is true, find that the Bible partly places it in what is essential to human nature; but that it should comprehend nothing else, or consist in one quality only, has no proof or reason; and we are, in fact, taught that it comprises also what is so far from being essential that it may be both lost and regained. When God is called “the Father of spirits,” a likeness is suggested between man and God in the spirituality of their nature. This is also implied in the striking argument of St. Paul with the Athenians: “Forasmuch, then, as we are the OFFSPRING of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device;”--plainly referring to the idolatrous statues by which God was represented among Heathens. If likeness to God in man consisted in bodily shape, this would not have been an argument against human representations of the Deity; but it imports, as Howe well expresses it, that “we are to understand that our resemblance to him, as we are his offspring, lies in some higher, more noble, and more excellent thing, of which there can be no figure; as who can tell how to give the figure or image of a thought, or of the mind or thinking power?” In spirituality, and, consequently, immateriality, this image of God in man, then, in the first instance, consists. Nor is it any valid objection to say, that “immateriality is not peculiar to the soul of man; for we have reason to believe that the inferior animals are actuated by an immaterial principle.” This is as certain as analogy can make it: but though we allow a spiritual principle to animals, its kind is obviously inferior; for that spirit which is incapable of induction and moral knowledge, must be of an inferior order to the spirit which possesses these capabilities; and this is the kind of spirit which is peculiar to man.

The sentiment expressed in Wisdom ii, 23, is an evidence that, in the opinion of the ancient Jews, the image of God in man comprised immortality also. “For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity:” and though other creatures were made capable of immortality, and at least the material human frame, whatever we may think of the case of animals, would have escaped death, had not sin entered the world; yet, without admitting the absurdity of the “natural immortality” of the human soul, that essence must have been constituted immortal in a high and peculiar sense which has ever retained its prerogative of continued duration amidst the universal death not only of animals, but of the bodies of all human beings. There appears also a manifest allusion to man’s immortality, as being included in the image of

God, in the reason which is given in Genesis for the law which inflicts death on murderers: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." The essence of the crime of homicide is not confined here to the putting to death the mere animal part of man; and it must, therefore, lie in the peculiar value of life to an immortal being, accountable in another state for the actions done in this, and whose life ought to be specially guarded for this very reason, that death introduces him into changeless and eternal relations, which were not to be left to the mercy of human passions.

To these we are to add the intellectual powers, and we have what divines, in perfect accordance with the Scriptures, have called, "the NATURAL image of God in his creatures," which is essential and ineffaceable. Man was made capable of knowledge, and he was endowed with liberty of will.

This natural image of God was the foundation of that MORAL image by which also man was distinguished. Unless he had been a spiritual, knowing, and willing being, he would have been wholly incapable of moral qualities. That he had such qualities eminently, and that in them consisted the image of God, as well as in the natural attributes just stated, we have also the express testimony of Scripture: "Lo this only have I found, that God made man UPRIGHT; but they have sought out many inventions." There is also an express allusion to the moral image of God, in which man was at first created, in Colossians iii, 10: "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of Him that created him;" and in Ephesians iv, 24: "Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." In these passages the Apostle represents the change produced in true Christians by the Gospel, as a "renewal of the image of God in man; as a new or second creation in that image;" and he explicitly declares, that that image consists in "knowledge," in "righteousness," and in "true holiness."

This also may be finally argued from the satisfaction with which the historian of the creation represents the Creator as viewing the works of his hands as "very good," which was pronounced with reference to each of them individually, as well as to the whole: "And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good." But, as to man, this goodness must necessarily imply moral as well as physical qualities. Without them he would have been imperfect as man; and had they, in their first exercises, been perverted and sinful, he must have been an exception, and could not have been pronounced "very good." The goodness of man, as a rational being, must lie in devotedness and consecration to God; consequently, man was at first holy. A rational creature, as such, is capable of knowing, loving, serving, and living in communion with the Most Holy One. Adam, at first,

did or did not exert this capacity; if he did not, he was not very good,--not good at all.

4. On the intellectual and moral endowments of the progenitor of the human race, erring views appear to have been taken on both sides.

In knowledge, some have thought him little inferior to the angels; others, as furnished with but the simple elements of science and of language. The truth seems to be that, as to capacity, his intellect must have been vigorous beyond that of any of his fallen descendants; which itself gives us very high views of the strength of his understanding, although we should allow him to have been created "lower than the angels." As to his actual knowledge, that would depend upon the time and opportunity he had for observing the nature and laws of the objects around him; and the degree in which he was favoured with revelations from God on moral and religious subjects.

On the degree of moral excellence also in the first man, much license has been given to a warm imagination, and to rhetorical embellishment; and Adam's perfection has sometimes been fixed at an elevation which renders it exceedingly difficult to conceive how he could fall into sin at all. On the other hand, those who either deny or hold very slightly the doctrine of our hereditary depravity, delight to represent Adam as little superior in moral perfection and capability to his descendants. But, if we attend to the passages of holy writ above quoted, we shall be able, on this subject, to ascertain, if not the exact degree of his moral endowments, yet that there is a certain standard below which they cannot be placed.--Generally, he was made in the image of God, which, we have already proved, is to be understood morally as well as naturally. Now, however the image of any thing may be limited in extent, it must still be an accurate representation as far as it goes. Every thing good in the creation must always be a miniature representation of the excellence of the Creator; but, in this case, the "goodness," that is, the perfection, of every creature, according to the part it was designed to act in the general assemblage of beings collected into our system, wholly forbids us to suppose that the image of God's moral perfections in man was a blurred and dim representation. To whatever extent it went, it necessarily excluded all that from man which did not resemble God; it was a likeness to God in "righteousness and true holiness," whatever the degree of each might be, and excluded all admixture of unrighteousness and unholiness. Man, therefore, in his original state, was sinless, both in act and in principle. Hence it is said that "God made man UPRIGHT." That this signifies moral rectitude cannot be doubted; but the import of the word is very extensive. It expresses, by an easy figure, the exactness of truth, justice, and obedience; and it

comprehends the state and habit both of the heart and the life. Such, then, was the condition of primitive man; there was no obliquity in his moral principles, his mind, or affections; none in his conduct. He was perfectly sincere and exactly just, rendering from the heart all that was due to God and to the creature. Tried by the exactest plummet, he was upright; by the most perfect rule, he was straight.

The “knowledge” in which the Apostle Paul, in the passage quoted above from Colossians iii, 10, places “the image of God” after which man was created, does not merely imply the faculty of understanding, which is a part of the natural image of God; but that which might be lost, because it is that in which we may be “renewed.” It is, therefore, to be understood of the faculty of knowledge in right exercise; and of that willing reception, and firm retaining, and hearty approval, of religious truth, in which knowledge, when spoken of morally, is always understood in the Scriptures. We may not be disposed to allow, with some, that Adam understood the deep philosophy of nature, and could comprehend and explain the sublime mysteries of religion. The circumstance of his giving names to the animals, is certainly no sufficient proof of his having attained to a philosophical acquaintance with their qualities and distinguishing habits, although we should allow their names to be still retained in the Hebrew, and to be as expressive of their peculiarities as some expositors have stated. Sufficient time appears not to have been afforded him for the study of the properties of animals, as this event took place previous to the formation of Eve; and as for the notion of his acquiring knowledge by intuition, this is contradicted by the revealed fact, that angels themselves acquire their knowledge by observation and study, though no doubt, with great rapidity and certainty. The whole of this transaction was supernatural; the beasts were “brought” to Adam, and it is probable that he named them under a Divine suggestion. He has been also supposed to be the inventor of language, but his history shows that he was never without speech. From the first he was able to converse with God; and we may, therefore, infer that language was in him a supernatural and miraculous endowment. That his understanding was, as to its capacity, deep and large beyond any of his posterity, must follow from the perfection in which he was created; and his acquisitions of knowledge would, therefore, be rapid and easy. It was, however, in moral and religious truth, as being of the first concern to him, that we are to suppose the excellency of his knowledge to have consisted. “His reason would be clear, his judgment uncorrupted, and his conscience upright and sensible.” The best knowledge would, in him, be placed first, and that of every other kind be made subservient to it, according to its relation to that. The Apostle adds to knowledge, “righteousness and true holiness;” terms which express, not merely freedom from sin, but positive and active virtue.



Sober as these views of man's primitive state are, it is not, perhaps, possible for us fully to conceive of so exalted a condition as even this. Below this standard it could not fall; and that it implied a glory, and dignity, and moral greatness of a very exalted kind, is made sufficiently apparent from the degree of guilt charged upon Adam when he fell: for the aggravating circumstances of his offence may well be deduced from the tremendous consequences which followed.

5. The salvation of Adam has been disputed; for what reason does not appear, except that the silence of Scripture, as to his after life, has given bold men occasion to obtrude their speculations upon a subject which called for no such expression of opinion. As nothing to the contrary appears, the charitable inference is, that as he was the first to receive the promise of redemption, so he was the first to prove its virtue. It is another presumption, that as Adam and Eve were clothed with skins of beasts, which could not have been slain for food, these were the skins of their sacrifices; and as the offering of animal sacrifice was an expression of faith in the appointed propitiation, to that refuge we may conclude they resorted, and through its merits were accepted.

6. The Rabbinical and Mohammedan traditions and fables respecting the first man are as absurd as they are numerous. Some of them indeed are monstrous, unless we suppose them to be allegories in the exaggerated style of the orientals. Some say that he was nine hundred cubits high; whilst others, not satisfied with this, affirm that his head touched the heavens. The Jews think that he wrote the ninety-first Psalm, invented the Hebrew letters, and composed several treatises; the Arabians, that he preserved twenty books which fell from heaven; and the Musselmen, that he himself wrote ten volumes.

7. That Adam was a type of Christ, is plainly affirmed by St. Paul, who calls him "the figure of him who was to come." Hence our Lord is sometimes called, not inaptly, the Second Adam. This typical relation stands sometimes in SIMILITUDE, sometimes in CONTRAST. Adam was formed immediately by God, as was the humanity of Christ. In each the nature was spotless, and richly endowed with knowledge and true holiness. Both are seen invested with dominion over the earth and all its creatures; and this may explain the eighth Psalm, where David seems to make the sovereignty of the first man over the whole earth in its pristine glory, the prophetic symbol of the dominion of Christ over the world restored. Beyond these particulars fancy must not carry us; and the typical CONTRAST must also be limited to that which is stated in Scripture, or supported by its allusions. Adam and Christ were each a public person, a

federal head to the whole race of mankind; but the one was the fountain of sin and death, the other of righteousness and life. By Adam's transgression "many were made sinners," Rom. v, 14–19. Through him, "death passed upon all men, because all have sinned" in him. But he thus prefigured that one man, by whose righteousness the "free gift comes upon all men to justification of life." The first man communicated a living soul to all his posterity; the other is a quickening Spirit, to restore them to newness of life now, and to raise them up at the last day. By the imputation of the first Adam's sin, and the communication of his fallen, depraved nature, death reigned over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression; and through the righteousness of the Second Adam, and the communication of a divine nature by the Holy Spirit, favour and grace shall much more abound in Christ's true followers unto eternal life. See Redemption.

ADAMA, one of the five cities which were destroyed by fire from heaven, and buried under the waters of the Dead Sea, Gen. xiv, 2; Deut. xxix, 23. It was the most easterly of all those which were swallowed up; and there is some probability that it was not entirely sunk under the waters; or that the inhabitants of the country built a new city of the same name upon the eastern shore of the Dead Sea: for Isaiah, according to the Septuagint, says, "God will destroy the Moabites, the city of Ar, and the remnant of Adama."

ADAMANT, אֲדָמָן, Ἀδάμας, Eccclus. xvi, 16. A stone of impenetrable hardness. Sometimes this name is given to the diamond; and so it is rendered, Jer. xvii, 1. But the Hebrew word rather means a very hard kind of stone, probably the smiris, which was also used for cutting, engraving, and polishing other hard stones and crystals. The word occurs also in Ezek. iii, 9, and Zech. vii, 12. In the former place the Lord says to the Prophet, "I have made thy forehead as an adamant, firmer than a rock;" that is, endued thee with undaunted courage. In the latter, the hearts of wicked men are declared to be as adamant; neither broken by the threatenings and judgments of God, nor penetrated by his promises, invitations, and mercies. See Diamond.

ADAMITES, sects reputed to have professed the attainment of a perfect innocence, so that they wore no clothes in their assemblies. But Lardner doubts their existence in ancient, and Beausobre in modern, times.

ADAR, the twelfth month of the ecclesiastical, and the sixth of the civil, year among the Hebrews. It contains but twenty-nine days, and answers to our February, and sometimes enters into March, according to the course of the moon, by which they regulated their seasons.

ADARCONIM, אדרכונים, a sort of money, mentioned 1 Chron. xxix, 7, and Ezra viii, 27. The Vulgate translates it, golden pence, the LXX, pieces of gold. They were darics, a gold coin, which some value at twenty drachms of silver.

ADER. Jerom observes, that the place where the angels declared the birth of Jesus Christ to the shepherds, was called by this name, Luke ii, 8, 9. The empress Helena built a church on this spot, the remains of which are still visible.

ADDER, a venomous serpent, more usually called the viper. In our translation of the Bible we find the word adder five times; but without sufficient authority from the original.

שפיפון, in Gen. xlix, 17, is probably the cerastes; a serpent of the viper kind, of a light brown colour, which lurks in the sand and the tracks of wheels in the road, and unexpectedly bites not only the unwary traveller, but the legs of horses and other beasts. By comparing the Danites to this artful reptile, the patriarch intimated that by stratagem, more than by open bravery, they should avenge themselves of their enemies and extend their conquests.-- פתן, in Psalm lviii, 4; xci, 13, signifies an asp. We may perhaps trace to this the Python of the Greeks, and its derivatives. (See Asp.)-- עכשוב, עכשוב, found only in Psalm cxl, 3, is derived from a verb which signifies to bend back on itself. The Chaldee Paraphrasts render it עכביש, which we translate elsewhere, spider: they may therefore have understood it to have been the tarantula. It is rendered asp by the Septuagint and Vulgate, and is so taken, Rom. iii, 13. The name is from the Arabic achasa. But there are several serpents which coil themselves previously to darting on their enemy; if this be a character of the asp, it is not peculiar to that reptile.-- צפעני, or צפעני, Prov. xxiii, 32; Isaiah xi, 8; xiv, 29; lix, 5; and Jer. viii, 17, is that deadly serpent called the basilisk, said to kill with its very breath. See Cockatrice.

In Psalm lviii, 5, reference is made to the effect of musical sounds upon serpents. That they might be rendered tame and harmless by certain charms, or soft and sweet sounds, and trained to delight in music, was an opinion which prevailed very early and universally.

Many ancient authors mention this effect; Virgil speaks of it particularly, Æn. vii, v, 750.

Quin et Marrubia venit de gente sacerdos,  
Fronde super galeam et felici comptus oliva,  
Archippi regis missu fortissimus Umbro;  
Vipereo generi, et graviter spirantibus hydris

Spargere qui somnos cantuque manuque solebat,  
Mulcebatque iras, et morsus arte levabat.

“Umbro, the brave Marrubian priest, was there,  
Sent by the Marsian monarch to the war.  
The smiling olive with her verdant boughs  
Shades his bright helmet and adorns his brows;  
His charms in peace the furious serpent keep;  
And lull the envenom’d viper’s race to sleep:  
His healing hand allay’d the raging pain,  
And at his touch the poisons fled again.”

Pitt.

Mr. Boyle quotes the following passage from Sir H. Blunt’s Voyage into the Levant:--

“Many rarities of living creatures I saw in Grand Cairo; but the most ingenious was a nest of serpents, of two feet long, black and ugly, kept by a Frenchman, who, when he came to handle them, would not endure him, but ran and hid in their hole. Then he would take his cittern and play upon it. They, hearing his music, came all crawling to his feet, and began to climb up him, till he gave over playing, then away they ran.”

The wonderful effect which music produces on the serpent tribes, is confirmed by the testimony of several respectable moderns. Adders swell at the sound of a flute, raising themselves up on the one half of their body, turning themselves round, beating proper time, and following the instrument. Their head, naturally round and long like an eel, becomes broad and flat like a fan. The tame serpents, many of which the orientals keep in their houses, are known to leave their holes in hot weather, at the sound of a musical instrument, and run upon the performer. Dr. Shaw had an opportunity of seeing a number of serpents keep exact time with the Dervishes in their circulatory dances, running over their heads and arms, turning when they turned, and stopping when they stopped. The rattlesnake acknowledges the power of music as much as any of his family; of which the following instance is a decisive proof: When Chateaubriand was in Canada, a snake of that species entered their encampment; a young Canadian, one of the party, who could play on the flute, to divert his associates, advanced against the serpent with his new species of weapon: on the approach of his enemy, the haughty reptile curled himself into a spiral line, flattened his head, inflated his cheeks, contracted his lips, displayed his envenomed fangs, and his bloody throat, his double tongue glowed like two flames of fire; his eyes were burning coals; his body, swollen with rage, rose and fell like the bellows of a forge; his dilated skin assumed a dull and scaly appearance; and his tail, which sounded the denunciation of death, vibrated with so great rapidity as to resemble a light

vapour. The Canadian now began to play upon his flute, the serpent started with surprise, and drew back his head. In proportion as he was struck with the magic effect, his eyes lost their fierceness, the oscillations of his tail became slower, and the sound which it emitted became weaker, and gradually died away. Less perpendicular upon their spiral line, the rings of the fascinated serpent were by degrees expanded, and sunk one after another upon the ground, in concentric circles. The shades of azure, green, white, and gold, recovered their brilliancy on his quivering skin, and slightly turning his head, he remained motionless, in the attitude of attention and pleasure. At this moment, the Canadian advanced a few steps, producing with his flute sweet and simple notes. The reptile, inclining his variegated neck, opened a passage with his head through the high grass, and began to creep after the musician, stopping when he stopped, and beginning to follow him again, as soon as he moved forward. In this manner he was led out of their camp, attended by a great number of spectators, both savages and Europeans, who could scarcely believe their eyes, when they beheld this wonderful effect of harmony. The assembly unanimously decreed, that the serpent which had so highly entertained them, should be permitted to escape. Many of them are carried in baskets through Hindostan, and procure a maintenance for a set of people who play a few simple notes on the flute, with which the snakes seem much delighted, and keep time by a graceful motion of the head, erecting about half their length from the ground, and following the music with gentle curves, like the undulating lines of a swan's neck.

But on some serpents, these charms seem to have no power; and it appears from Scripture, that the adder sometimes takes precautions to prevent the fascination which he sees preparing for him: "for the deaf adder shutteth her ear, and will not hear the voice of the most skilful charmer." The threatening of the Prophet Jeremiah proceeds upon the same fact: "I will send serpents" (cockatrices) "among you, which will not be charmed, and they shall bite you." In all these quotations, the sacred writers, while they take it for granted that many serpents are disarmed by charming, plainly admit that the powers of the charmer are in vain exerted upon others.

It is the opinion of some interpreters, that the word שָׂהַל, which in some parts of Scripture denotes a lion, in others means an adder, or some other kind of serpent. Thus, in the ninety-first Psalm, they render it the basilisk: "Thou shalt tread upon the adder and the basilisk, the young lion and the dragon thou shalt trample under foot." Indeed, all the ancient expositors agree, that some species of serpent is meant, although they cannot determine what particular serpent the sacred writer had in view. The learned Bochart thinks it extremely probable that the holy Psalmist in this verse treats of serpents only; and, by consequence, that both the terms שָׂהַל

and כפיר mean some kind of snakes, as well as תנין and פתן; because the coherence of the verse is by this view better preserved, than by mingling lions and serpents together, as our translators and other interpreters have commonly done; nor is it easy to imagine what can be meant by treading upon the lion, and trampling the young lion under foot; for it is not possible in walking to tread upon the lion, as upon the adder, the basilisk, and other serpents.

To ADJURE, to bind by oath, as under the penalty of a fearful curse, Joshua vi, 26; Mark v, 7. 2. To charge solemnly, as by the authority, and under pain, of the displeasure of God, Matt. xxvi, 63; Acts xix, 13.

ADONAI, one of the names of God. This word in the plural number signifies my Lords. The Jews, who either out of respect or superstition, do not pronounce the name of Jehovah, read Adonai in the room of it, as often as they meet with Jehovah in the Hebrew text. But the ancient Jews were not so scrupulous. Neither is there any law which forbids them to pronounce any name of God.

ADONIS. The text of the Vulgate in Ezek. viii, 14, says, that the Prophet saw women sitting in the temple, and weeping for Adonis; but according to the reading of the Hebrew text, they are said to weep for Thamuz, or Tammuz, the hidden one. Among the Egyptians Adonis was adored under the name of Osiris, the husband of Isis. But he was sometimes called by the name of Ammuz, or Tammuz, the concealed, probably to denote his death or burial. The Hebrews, in derision, sometimes call him the dead, Psalm cvi, 28; Lev. xix, 28; because they wept for him, and represented him as dead in his coffin; and at other times they denominate him the image of jealousy, Ezek. viii, 3, 5, because he was the object of the jealousy of Mars. The Syrians, Phœnicians, and Cyprians, called him Adonis; and Calmet is of opinion that the Ammonites and Moabites designated him by the name of Baal-peor.

The manner in which they celebrated the festival of this false deity was as follows: They represented him as lying dead in his coffin, wept for him, bemoaned themselves, and sought for him with great eagerness and inquietude. After this, they pretended that they had found him again, and that he was still living. At this good news they exhibited marks of the most extravagant joy, and were guilty of a thousand lewd practices, to convince Venus how much they congratulated her on the return and revival of her favourite, as they had before condoled with her on his death. The Hebrew women, of whom the Prophet Ezekiel speaks, celebrated the feasts of Tammuz, or Adonis, in Jerusalem; and God showed the Prophet these women weeping for this infamous god, even in his temple.

Fabulous history gives the following account of Adonis: He was a beautiful young shepherd, the son of Cyniras, king of Cyprus, by his own daughter Myrrha. The goddess Venus fell in love with this youth, and frequently met him on mount Libanus. Mars, who envied this rival, transformed himself into a wild boar, and, as Adonis was hunting, struck him in the groin and killed him. Venus lamented the death of Adonis in an inconsolable manner. The eastern people, in imitation of her mourning, generally established some solemn days for the bewailing of Adonis. After his death, Venus went to the shades, and obtained from Proserpine, that Adonis might be with her six months in the year, and continue the other six in the infernal regions. Upon this were founded those public rejoicings, which succeeded the lamentations of his death. Some say that Adonis was a native of Syria; some, of Cyprus; and others, of Egypt.

ADOPTION. An act by which one takes another into his family, owns him for his son, and appoints him his heir. The Greeks and Romans had many regulations concerning adoption. It does not appear that adoption, properly so called, was formerly in use among the Jews. Moses makes no mention of it in his laws; and the case of Jacob's two grandsons, Gen. xlviii, 14, seems rather a substitution.

2. Adoption in a theological sense is that act of God's free grace by which, upon our being justified by faith in Christ, we are received into the family of God, and entitled to the inheritance of heaven. This appears not so much a distinct act of God, as involved in, and necessarily flowing from, our justification; so that, at least the one always implies the other. Nor is there any good ground to suppose that in the New Testament the term adoption is used with any reference to the civil practice of adoption by the Greeks, Romans, or other Heathens, and therefore it is not judicious to illustrate the texts in which the word occurs by their formalities. The Apostles in using the term appear to have had before them the simple view, that our sins had deprived us of our sonship, the favour of God, and the right to the inheritance of eternal life; but that, upon our return to God, and reconciliation with him, our forfeited privileges were not only restored, but greatly heightened through the paternal kindness of God. They could scarcely be forgetful of the affecting parable of the prodigal son; and it is under the same view that St. Paul quotes from the Old Testament, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and I will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

Adoption, then, is that act by which we who were alienated, and enemies, and disinherited, are made the sons of God, and heirs of his eternal glory. "If children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ;" where it is to be remarked, that it is not in our own right, nor in the right of any work done in us, or which we ourselves do, though it should be an evangelical work, that we become heirs; but jointly with Christ, and in his right.

3. To this state belong, freedom from a servile spirit, for we are not servants but sons; the special love and care of God our heavenly Father; a filial confidence in him; free access to him at all times and in all circumstances; a title to the heavenly inheritance; and the Spirit of adoption, or the witness of the Holy Spirit to our adoption, which is the foundation of all the comfort we can derive from those privileges, as it is the only means by which we can know that they are ours.

4. The last mentioned great privilege of adoption merits special attention. It consists in the inward witness or testimony of the Holy Spirit to the sonship of believers, from which flows a comfortable persuasion or conviction of our present acceptance with God, and the hope of our future and eternal glory. This is taught in several passages of Scripture:--

Rom. viii, 15, 16, "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." In this passage it is to be remarked, 1. That the Holy Spirit takes away "fear," a servile dread of God as offended. 2. That the "Spirit of God" here mentioned, is not the personified spirit or genius of the Gospel, as some would have it, but "the Spirit itself," or himself, and hence he is called in the Galatians, "the Spirit of his Son," which cannot mean the genius of the Gospel. 3. That he inspires a filial confidence in God, as our Father, which is opposed to "the fear" produced by the "spirit of bondage." 4. That he excites this filial confidence, and enables us to call God our Father, by witnessing, bearing testimony with our spirit, "that we are the children of God."

Gal. iv, 4-6, "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons; and because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Here also are to be noted, 1. The means of our redemption from under (the curse of) the law,--the incarnation and sufferings of Christ. 2. That the adoption of sons follows upon our actual redemption from that curse, or, in other words, upon our pardon. 3. That upon our being



pardoned, the “Spirit of the Son” is “sent forth into our hearts,” producing the same effect as that mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans, viz. filial confidence in God,--“crying, Abba, Father.” To these texts are to be added all those passages, so numerous in the New Testament, which express the confidence and the joy of Christians; their friendship with God; their confident access to him as their God; their entire union and delightful intercourse with him in spirit.

This has been generally termed the doctrine of assurance, and, perhaps, the expressions of St. Paul, “the full assurance of faith,” and “the full assurance of hope,” may warrant the use of the word. But as there is a current and generally understood sense of this term, implying that the assurance of our present acceptance and sonship implies an assurance of our final perseverance, and of an indefeasible title to heaven; the phrase, a comfortable persuasion, or conviction of our justification and adoption, arising out of the Spirit’s inward and direct testimony, is to be preferred.

There is, also, another reason for the sparing and cautious use of the term assurance, which is, that it seems to imply, though not necessarily, the absence of all doubt, and shuts out all those lower degrees of persuasion which may exist in the experience of Christians. For, our faith may not at first, or at all times, be equally strong, and the testimony of the Spirit may have its degrees of clearness. Nevertheless, the fulness of this attainment is to be pressed upon every one: “Let us draw near,” says St. Paul to all Christians, “with full assurance of faith.”

It may serve, also, to remove an objection sometimes made to the doctrine, and to correct an error which sometimes pervades the statement of it, to observe that this assurance, persuasion, or conviction, whichever term be adopted, is not of the essence of justifying faith; that is, justifying faith does not consist in the assurance that I am now forgiven, through Christ. This would be obviously contradictory. For we must believe before we can be justified; much more before we can be assured, in any degree, that we are justified:--this persuasion, therefore, follows justification, and is one of its results. But though we must not only distinguish, but separate, this persuasion of our acceptance from the faith which justifies, we must not separate it, but only distinguish it, from justification itself. With that come in as concomitants, adoption, the “Spirit of adoption,” and regeneration.

ADORATION, the act of rendering divine honours; or of addressing God or any other being as supposing it to be God. (See Worship.) The word is compounded of ad, “to,” and os, “mouth;” and literally signifies to apply the hand to the mouth; manum ad os admovere, “to kiss the hand;” this being in eastern countries one of the great marks of respect and submission.

To this mode of idolatrous worship Job refers, xxxi, 26, 27. See also 1 Kings xix, 18.

The Jewish manner of adoration was by prostration, bowing, and kneeling. The Christians adopted the Grecian, rather than the Roman, method, and always adored uncovered. The ordinary posture of the ancient Christians was kneeling; but on Sundays, standing.

Adoration is also used for certain extraordinary acts of civil honour, which resemble those paid to the Deity, yet are given to men.

We read of adorations paid to kings, princes, emperors, popes, bishops, abbots, &c, by kneeling, falling prostrate, kissing the feet, hands, garments, &c.

The Persian manner of adoration, introduced by Cyrus, was by bending the knee, and falling on the face at the prince's feet, striking the earth with the forehead, and kissing the ground. This was an indispensable condition on the part of foreign ministers and ambassadors, as well as the king's own vassals, of being admitted to audience, and of obtaining any favour. This token of reverence was ordered to be paid to their favourites as well as to themselves, as we learn from the history of Haman and Mordecai, in the book of Esther; and even to their statues and images; for Philostratus informs us that, in the time of Apollonius, a golden statue of the king was exposed to all who entered Babylon, and none but those who adored it were admitted within the gates. The ceremony, which the Greeks called *προσκυνεῖν*, Conon refused to perform to Artaxerxes, and Callisthenes to Alexander the Great, as reputed it impious and unlawful.

The adoration performed to the Roman and Grecian emperors consisted in bowing or kneeling at the prince's feet, laying hold of his purple robe, and then bringing the hand to the lips. Some attribute the origin of this practice to Constantius. They were only persons of rank or dignity that were entitled to the honour. Bare kneeling before the emperor to deliver a petition, was also called adoration.

It is particularly said of Dioclesian, that he had gems fastened to his shoes, that divine honours might be more willingly paid him, by kissing his feet. And this mode of adoration was continued till the last age of the Greek monarchy. When any one pays his respects to the king of Achen in Sumatra, he first takes off his shoes and stockings, and leaves them at the door.

The practice of adoration may be said to be still subsisting in England, in the custom of kissing the king's or queen's hand.

Adoration is also used in the court of Rome, in the ceremony of kissing the pope's feet. It is not certain at what period this practice was introduced into the church: but it was probably borrowed from the Byzantine court, and accompanied the temporal power. Dr. Maclaine, in the chronological table which he has subjoined to his translation of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, places its introduction in the eighth century, immediately after the grant of Pepin and Charlemagne. Baronius traces it to a much higher antiquity, and pretends that examples of this homage to the vicars of Christ occur so early as the year 204. These prelates finding a vehement disposition in the people to fall down before them, and kiss their feet, procured crucifixes to be fastened on their slippers; by which stratagem, the adoration intended for the pope's person is supposed to be transferred to Christ. Divers acts of this adoration we find offered even by princes to the pope; and Gregory XIII, claims this act of homage as a duty.

Adoration properly is paid only to the pope when placed on the altar, in which posture the cardinals, conclavists, alone are admitted to kiss his feet. The people are afterward admitted to do the like at St. Peter's church; the ceremony is described at large by Guicciardin.

Adoration is more particularly used for kissing one's hand in presence of another as a token of reverence. The Jews adored by kissing their hands, and bowing down their heads; whence in their language kissing is properly used for adoration. This illustrates a passage in Psalm ii, "Kiss the Son lest he be angry;"--that is, pay him homage and worship.

It was the practice among the Greek Christians to worship with the head uncovered, 1 Cor. xi; but in the east the ancient custom of worshipping with the head covered was retained.

ADRAMMELECH, the son of Sennacherib, king of Assyria. The king returning to Nineveh, after his unhappy expedition made into Judea against king Hezekiah, was killed by his two sons, Adrammelech and Sharezer, whilst at his devotions in the temple of his god Nisroch, Isaiah xxxvii, 38; 2 Kings xix. It is not known what prompted these two princes to commit this parricide; but after they had committed the murder, they fled for safety to the mountains of Armenia, and their brother, Esarhaddon, succeeded to the crown.

Adrammelech was also one of the gods adored by the inhabitants of Sepharvaim, who were settled in the country of Samaria, in the room of the

Israelites, who were carried beyond the Euphrates. The Sepharvaites made their children pass through the fire in honour of this idol, and another, called Anammelech, 2 Kings xvii, 31. The Rabbins say, that Adrammelech was represented under the form of a mule; but there is much more reason to believe that Adrammelech meant the sun, and Anammelech the moon; the first signifying the magnificent king, the second the gentle king,--many eastern nations adoring the moon as a god, not as a goddess.

ADRAMYTTIUM, a city on the west coast of Mysia, in Lesser Asia, over against the isle of Lesbos. It was in a ship belonging to this place, that St. Paul sailed from Cesarea to proceed to Rome as a prisoner, Acts xxvii, 2. It is now called Edremit.

ADRIA. This name, which occurs in Acts xxvii, 27, is now confined to the gulf lying between Italy on the one side, and the coasts of Dalmatia and Albania on the other. But in St. Paul's time it was extended to all that portion of the Mediterranean between Crete and Sicily. Thus Ptolemy says that Sicily was bounded on the east by the Adriatic, and Crete in a similar manner on the west; and Strabo says that the Ionian Gulf was a part of what, in his time, was called the Adriatic Sea.

ADULLAM, a city in the tribe of Judah, to the west of Hebron, whose king was slain by Joshua, Josh. xii, 15. It is frequently mentioned in the history of Saul and David; and is chiefly memorable from the cave in its neighbourhood, where David retired from Achish, king of Gath, when he was joined by the distressed and discontented, to the number of four hundred, over whom he became captain, 1 Sam. xxii, 1. Judas Maccabeus encamped in the plain of Adullam, where he passed the Sabbath day, 2 Mac. xii, 38. Eusebius says that, in his time, Adullam was a very great town, ten miles to the east of Eleutheropolis.

27ADULTERY, the violation of the marriage bed. The law of Moses punished with death both the man and the woman who were guilty of this crime, Lev. xx, 10. If a woman was betrothed to a man, and was guilty of this infamous crime before the marriage was completed, she was, in this case, along with her paramour, to be stoned, Deut. xxii, 22–24.

When any man among the Jews, prompted by jealousy, suspected his wife of the crime of adultery, he brought her first before the judges, and informed them that, in consequence of his suspicions, he had privately admonished her, but that she was regardless of his admonitions. If before the judges she asserted her innocency, he required that she should drink the waters of jealousy, that God might by these means discover what she attempted to conceal, Num. v, 12, &c. The man then produced his

witnesses, and they were heard. After this, both the man and the woman were conveyed to Jerusalem, and placed before the sanhedrim; the judges of which, by threats and other means, endeavoured to confound the woman, and make her confess. If she persisted in denying the fact, she was led to the eastern gate of the court of Israel, stripped of her own clothes, and dressed in black, before great numbers of her own sex. The priest then told her, that if she was really innocent, she had nothing to fear; but if guilty, she might expect to suffer all that the law had denounced against her, to which she answered, "Amen, amen." The priest then wrote the terms of the law in this form:--"If a strange man hath not come near you, and you are not polluted by forsaking the bed of your husband, these bitter waters, which I have cursed, will not hurt you: but if you have polluted yourself by coming near to another man, and gone astray from your husband,--may you be accursed of the Lord, and become an example for all his people; may your thigh rot, and your belly swell till it burst; may these cursed waters enter into your belly, and being swelled therewith, may your thighs putrefy."

After this, the priest filled a pitcher out of the brazen vessel, near the altar of burnt offerings, cast some dust of the pavement into it, mingled something with it as bitter as wormwood, and then read the curses, and received her answer of Amen. Another priest, in the meantime, tore off her clothes as low as her bosom--made her head bare--untied the tresses of her hair--fastened her clothes, which were thus torn, with a girdle under her breasts, and then presented her with the tenth part of an ephah, or about three pints, of barley meal. The other priest then gave her the waters of jealousy, or bitterness, to drink; and as soon as the woman had swallowed them, he gave her the meal in a vessel like a frying-pan into her hand. This was stirred before the Lord, and part of it thrown into the fire of the altar. If the wife was innocent, she returned with her husband, and the waters, so far from injuring her, increased her health, and made her more fruitful; but if she was guilty, she grew pale immediately, her eyes swelled; and, lest she should pollute the temple, she was instantly carried out, with these symptoms upon her, and died instantly, with all the ignominious circumstances related in the curses.

On this law of Moses, Michaëlis has the following remarks:--

"This oath was, perhaps, a relic of some more severe and barbarous consuetudinary laws, whose rigours Moses mitigated; as he did in many other cases, where an established usage could not be conveniently abolished altogether. Among ourselves, in barbarous times, the ordeal, or trial by fire, was, notwithstanding the parity of our married people, in common use; and this, in point of equity, was much the same in effect, as

if the husband had had the right to insist on his wife submitting to the hazardous trial of her purity, by drinking a poisoned potion; which, according to an ancient superstition, could never hurt her if she was innocent. And, in fact, such a right is not altogether unexampled; for, according to Oldendorp's History of the Mission of the Evangelical Brethren, in the Caribbee Islands, it is actually in use among some of the savage nations in the interior parts of Western Africa.

“Now, when in place of a poisoned potion like this, which very few husbands can be very willing to have administered to their wives, we see, as among the Hebrews, an imprecation-drink, whose avenger God himself promises to become, we cannot but be struck with the contrast of wisdom and clemency which such a contrivance manifests. In the one case, (and herein consists their great distinction,) innocence can only be preserved by a miracle; while, on the other, guilt only is revealed and punished by the hand of God himself.

“By one of the clauses of the oath of purgation, (and had not the legislator been perfectly assured of his divine mission, the insertion of any such clause would have been a very bold step indeed,) a visible and corporeal punishment was specified, which the person swearing imprecated on herself, and which God himself was understood as engaging to execute. To have given so accurate a definition of the punishment that God meant to inflict, and still more one that consisted of such a rare disease, would have been a step of incomprehensible boldness in a legislator who pretended to have a divine mission, if he was not, with the most assured conviction, conscious of its reality.

“Seldom, however, very seldom, was it likely that Providence would have an opportunity of inflicting the punishment in question. For the oath was so regulated, that a woman of the utmost effrontery could scarcely have taken it without changing colour to such a degree as to betray herself.

“In the first place, it was not administered to the woman in her own house, but she was under the necessity of going to that place of the land where God in a special manner had his abode, and took it there. Now, the solemnity of the place, unfamiliarized to her by daily business or resort, would have a great effect upon her mind. In the next place, there was offered unto God what was termed an execration offering, not in order to propitiate his mercy, but to invoke his vengeance on the guilty. Here the process was extremely slow, which gave her more time for reflection than to a guilty person could be acceptable, and that, too, amidst a multitude of unusual ceremonies. For the priest conducted her to the front of the sanctuary, and took holy water, that is, water out of the priests' laver, which

stood before it, together with some earth off its floor, which was likewise deemed holy; and having put the earth in the water, he then proceeded to uncover the woman's head, that her face might be seen, and every change on her countenance during the administration of the oath accurately observed: and this was a circumstance which, in the east, where the women are always veiled, must have had a great effect; because a woman, accustomed to wear a veil, could, on so extraordinary an occasion, have had far less command of her eyes and her countenance than a European adulteress, who is generally a perfect mistress in all the arts of dissimulation, would display. To render the scene still more awful, the tresses of her hair were loosened, and then the execration offering was put into her hand, while the priest held in his the imprecation water. This is commonly termed the bitter water; but we must not understand this as if the water had really been bitter; for how could it have been so? The earth of the floor of the tabernacle could not make it bitter. Among the Hebrews, and other oriental nations, the word bitter was rather used for curse: and, strictly speaking, the phrase does not mean bitter water, but the water of bitternesses, that is, of curses. The priest now pronounced the oath, which was in all points so framed that it could excite no terrors in the breast of an innocent woman; for it expressly consisted in this, that the imprecation water should not harm her if she was innocent. It would seem as if the priest here made a stop, and again left the woman some time to consider whether she would proceed with the oath. This I infer from the circumstance of his speech not being directly continued in verse 21st, which is rather the apodosis of what goes before; and from the detail proceeding anew in the words of the historian, Then shall the priest pronounce the rest of the oath and the curses to the woman; and proceed thus.--After this stop he pronounced the curses, and the woman was obliged to declare her acquiescence in them by a repeated Amen. Nor was the solemn scene yet altogether at an end; but rather, as it were commenced anew. For the priest had yet to write the curses in a book, which I suppose he did at great deliberation; having done so, he washed them out again in the very imprecation water, which the woman had now to drink; and this water being now presented to her, she was obliged to drink it, with this warning and assurance, in the name of God, that if she was guilty, it would prove within her an absolute curse. Now, what must have been her feelings, while drinking, if not conscious of purity? In my opinion she must have conceived that she already felt an alteration in the state of her body, and the germ, as it were, of the disease springing within her. Conscience and imagination would conspire together, and render it almost impossible for her to drink it out. Finally, the execration offering was taken out of her hand, and burnt upon the altar. I cannot but think that, under the sanction of such a purgatorium, perjury must have been a very rare occurrence indeed. If it happened but once in an age, God had bound himself to punish

it; and if this took place but once, (if but one woman who had taken the oath was attacked with that rare disease which it threatened,) it was quite enough to serve as a deterrent to all others for at least one generation.”

This procedure had also the effect of keeping in mind, among the Jews, God’s high displeasure against this violation of his law; and though some lax moralists have been found, in modern times, to palliate it, yet the Christian will always remember the solemn denunciations of the New Testament against a crime so aggravated, whether considered in its effects upon the domestic relations, upon the moral character of the guilty parties, or upon society at large,--“Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.”

Adultery, in the prophetic scriptures, is often metaphorically taken, and signifies idolatry, and apostasy from God, by which men basely defile themselves, and wickedly violate their ecclesiastical and covenant relation to God, Hos. ii, 2; Ezek. xvi.

ADVOCATE, Παράκλητος, a patron, one who pleads the cause of any one before another. In this sense the term is applied to Christ our intercessor, 1 John ii, 1. It signifies also a comforter, and an instructor; and is used of the Holy Spirit, John xiv, 16, and xv, 26.

ADYTUM is a Greek word, signifying inaccessible, by which is understood the most retired and secret place of the Heathen temples, into which none but the priests were allowed to enter. The adytum of the Greeks and Romans answered to the sanctum sanctorum of the Jews, and was the place from whence oracles were delivered.

ÆRA, a series of years, commencing from a certain point of time called an epocha: thus we say, the Christian æra; that is, the number of years elapsed since the birth of Christ. The generality of authors use the terms æra and epocha in a synonymous sense; that is, for the point of time from which any computation begins.

The ancient Jews made use of several æras in their computation; sometimes they reckoned from the deluge, sometimes from the division of tongues; sometimes from their departure out of Egypt; and at other times from the building of the temple; and sometimes from the restoration after the Babylonish captivity: but their vulgar æra was from the creation of the world, which falls in with the year of the Julian period 953; and consequently they supposed the world created 294 years sooner than according to our computation. But when the Jews became subject to the Syro-Macedonian kings, they were obliged to make use of the æra of the Seleucidæ in all their contracts, which from thence was called the æra of



contracts. This æra begins with the year of the world 3692, of the Julian period 4402, and before Christ 312. The æra in general use among the Christians is that from the birth of Jesus Christ, concerning the true time of which chronologers differ; some place it two years, others four, and again others five, before the vulgar æra, which is fixed for the year of the world 4004: but Archbishop Usher, and after him the generality of modern chronologers, place it in the year of the world 4000.

The ancient Heathens used several æras:

1. The æra of the first olympiad is placed in the year of the world 3228, and before the vulgar æra of Jesus Christ 776.
2. The taking of Troy by the Greeks, in the year of the world 2820, and before Jesus Christ 1884.
3. The voyage undertaken for the purpose of bringing away the golden fleece, in the year of the world 2760.
4. The foundation of Rome, in 2856.
5. The æra of Nabonassar, in 3257.
6. The æra of Alexander the Great, or his last victory over Darius, in 3674, and before Jesus Christ 330.

AERIANS, a sect which arose about the middle of the fourth century, being the followers of Aërius, (who must be distinguished from Arius and Aëtius,) a monk and a presbyter of Sebastia, in Pontus. He is charged with being an Arian, or Semi-Arian; but the heaviest accusation against him is an attempt to reform the church; and, by rejecting prayers for the dead, with certain fasts and festivals then superstitiously observed, to reduce Christianity as nearly as possible “to its primitive simplicity; a purpose, indeed, laudable and noble,” says Dr. Mosheim, “when considered in itself: though the principles from whence it springs, and the means by which it is executed, are sometimes, in many respects, worthy of censure, and may have been so in the case of this reformer.” This gentle rebuke probably refers to a report that the zeal of Aërius originated in his being disappointed of the bishopric of Sebastia, (conferred on Eustathius,) which led him to affirm that the Scriptures make no distinction between a presbyter and a bishop, which he founded chiefly on 1 Tim. iv, 14. Hence he is considered by many, as the father of the modern Presbyterians.--“For this opinion, chiefly,” says Dr. Turner, “he is ranked among the heretics, by Epiphanius, his contemporary, who calls it a notion full of folly and madness. His followers were driven from the churches, and out of all the towns and villages, and were obliged to assemble in the woods, caverns, and open defiles.”

AETIANS, another branch (as it is said) of Arians, so called from Aëtius, bishop of Antioch, who is also charged with maintaining “faith without works,” as “sufficient to salvation,” or rather justification; and with maintaining “that sin is not imputed to believers.” It is added, that he taught

God had revealed to him things which he had “concealed from the Apostles;” which, perhaps, is only a misrepresentation of what he taught on the doctrine of divine influences.

AFFINITY. There are several degrees of affinity, wherein marriage was prohibited by the law of Moses: thus the son could not marry his mother, nor his father’s wife, Lev. xviii, 7, &c. The brother could not marry his sister, whether she were so by the father only, or only by the mother, and much less if she were his sister both by the same father and mother. The grandfather could not marry his granddaughter, either by his son or daughter. No one could marry the daughter of his father’s wife; nor the sister of his father or mother; nor the uncle, his niece; nor the aunt, her nephew; nor the nephew, the wife of his uncle by the father’s side. The father-in-law could not marry his daughter-in-law; nor the brother the wife of his brother, while living; nor even after the death of his brother, if he left children. If he left no children, the surviving brother was to raise up children to his deceased brother by marrying his widow. It was forbidden to marry the mother and the daughter at one time, or the daughter of the mother’s son, or the daughter of her daughter, or two sisters, together.

It is true the patriarchs, before the law, married their sisters, as Abraham married Sarah, who was his father’s daughter by another mother; and two sisters together, as Jacob married Rachel and Leah; and their own sisters, both by father and mother, as Seth and Cain. But these cases are not to be proposed as examples; because in some they were authorized by necessity; in others, by custom; and the law as yet was not in being. If some other examples may be found, either before or since the law, the Scripture expressly disapproves of them; as Reuben’s incest with Balah, his father’s concubine; and the action of Amnon with his sister Tamar; and that of Herod Antipas, who married Herodias, his sister-in-law, his brother Philip’s wife, while her husband was yet living; and that which St. Paul reproves and punishes among the Corinthians, 1 Cor. v, 1.

AGABUS, a prophet, and as the Greeks say, one of the seventy disciples of our Saviour. He foretold that there would be a great famine over all the earth; which came to pass accordingly, under the emperor Claudius, in the fourth year of his reign, A. D. 44, Acts xi, 28.

Ten years after this, as St. Paul was going to Jerusalem, and had already landed at Cæsarea, in Palestine, the same prophet, Agabus, arrived there, and coming to visit St. Paul and his company, he took this Apostle’s girdle, and binding himself hand and feet, he said, “Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles,” Acts xxi, 10. We know no other

particulars of the life of Agabus. The Greeks say that he suffered martyrdom at Antioch.

AGAG. This seems to have been a common name of the princes of Amalek, one of whom was very powerful as early as the time of Moses, Num. xxiv, 7. On account of the cruelties exercised by this king and his army against the Israelites, as they returned from Egypt, a bloody and long contested battle took place between Joshua and the Amalekites, in which the former was victorious, Exod. xvii, 8–13. At the same time, God protested with an oath to destroy Amalek, verses 14–16; Deut. xxv, 17–19, A. M. 302513. About four hundred years after this, the Lord remembered the cruel treatment of his people, and his own oath; and he commanded Saul, by the mouth of Samuel, to destroy the Amalekites. Saul mustered his army, and found it two hundred thousand strong, 1 Sam. xv, 1, &c. Having entered into their country, he cut in pieces all he could meet with from Havilah to Shur. Agag their king, and the best of their cattle, were however spared, an act of disobedience on the part of Saul, probably dictated by covetousness. But Agag did not long enjoy this reprieve; for Samuel no sooner heard that he was alive, than he sent for him; and notwithstanding his insinuating address, and the vain hopes with which he flattered himself that the bitterness of death was past, he caused him to be hewed to pieces in Gilgal before the Lord, saying, “As, כאשר, in the same identical mode as, thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women.” This savage chieftain had hewed many prisoners to death; and, therefore, by command of the Judge of the whole earth, he was visited with the same punishment which he had inflicted upon others.

AGAPÆ. See Love Feast.

AGAR, mount Sinai, so called, Gal. iv, 24, 25. But this reading is doubtful, many MSS. having the verse, “for this Sinai is a mountain of Arabia.” Some critics however contend for the reading of the received text, and urge that Agar, which signifies “a rocky mountain,” is the Arabic name for Sinai.

AGATE, שבו, Exod. xxviii, 19; xxxix, 12. In the Septuagint ἀγάτης, and Vulgate, achates. A precious stone, semi-pellucid. Its variegations are sometimes most beautifully disposed, representing plants, trees, rivers, clouds, &c. Its Hebrew name is, perhaps, derived from the country whence the Jews imported it; for the merchants of Sheba brought to the market of Tyre all kinds of precious stones, Ezek. xxvii, 22. The agate was the second stone in the third row of the pectoral of the high priest, Exod. xxviii, 19, and xxxix, 12.

AGE, in the most general sense of the term, denotes the duration of any substance, animate or inanimate; and is applied either to the whole period of its existence, or to that portion of it which precedes the time to which the description of it refers. In this sense it is used to signify either the whole natural duration of the LIFE of man, or any interval of it that has elapsed before the period of which we speak. When age is understood of a certain portion of the life of man, its whole duration is divided into four different ages, viz. infancy, youth, manhood, and old age: the first extending to the fourteenth year; the second, denominated youth, adolescence, or the age of puberty, commencing at fourteen, and terminating at about twenty-five; manhood, or the virile age, concluding at fifty; and the last ending at the close of life. Some divide the first period into infancy and childhood; and the last likewise into two stages, calling that which succeeds the age of seventy-five, decrepit old age. Age is applicable to the duration of things inanimate or factitious; and in this use of the term we speak of the age of a house, of a country, of a state or kingdom, &c.

Age, in chronology, is used for a century, or a period of one hundred years: in which sense it is the same with *seculum*, and differs from generation. It is also used in speaking of the times past since the creation of the world. The several ages of the world may be reduced to three grand epochas, viz. the age of the law of nature, called by the Jews the void age, from Adam to Moses. The age of the Jewish law, from Moses to Christ, called by the Jews the present age. And the age of grace, from Christ to the present year. The Jews call the third age, the age to come, or the future age; denoting by it the time from the advent of the Messiah to the end of the world. The Romans distinguished the time that preceded them into three ages: the obscure or uncertain age, which reached down as low as Ogyges king of Attica, in whose reign the deluge happened in Greece; the fabulous or heroic age, which ended at the first olympiad; and the historical age, which commenced at the building of Rome. Among the poets, the four ages of the world are, the golden, the silver, the brazen, and the iron age.

Age is sometimes used among the ancient poets in the same sense as generation, or a period of thirty years. Thus Nestor is said to have lived three ages, when he was ninety years old.

The period preceding the birth of Jesus Christ has been generally divided into six ages. The first extends from the creation to the deluge, and comprehends 1656 years. The second age, from the deluge to Abraham's entering the land of promise, A. M. 2082, comprehends 426 years. The third age from Abraham's entrance into the promised land to the Exodus, A. M. 2512, includes 430 years. The fourth age, from the Exodus to the building of the temple by Solomon, A. M. 2992, contains 480 years. The

fifth age from the foundation of Solomon's temple to the Babylonish captivity, A. M. 3416, comprehends 424 years. The sixth age, from the Babylonish captivity to the birth of Jesus Christ, A. M. 4000, the fourth year before the vulgar æra, includes 584 years. Those who follow the Septuagint, or Greek version, divide this period into seven ages, viz. 1. From the creation to the deluge, 2262 years. 2. From the deluge to the confusion of tongues, 738 years. 3. From this confusion to the calling of Abraham, 460 years. 4. From this period to Jacob's descent into Egypt, 215 years; and from this event to the Exodus, 430 years, making the whole 645 years. 5. From the Exodus to Saul, 774 years. 6. From Saul to Cyrus, 583 years. 7. From Cyrus to the vulgar æra of Christians, 538 years; the whole period from the creation to this period containing 6000 years.

AGRIPPA, surnamed Herod, the son of Aristobulus and Mariamne, and grandson of Herod the Great, was born A. M. 3997, three years before the birth of our Saviour, and seven years before the vulgar æra. After the death of his father Aristobulus, Josephus informs us that Herod, his grandfather, took care of his education, and sent him to Rome to make his court to Tiberius. Agrippa, having a great inclination for Caius, the son of Germanicus, and grandson of Antonia, chose to attach himself to this prince, as if he had some prophetic views of the future elevation of Caius, who at that time was beloved by all the world. The great assiduity and agreeable behaviour of Agrippa so far won upon this prince, that he was unable to live without him. Agrippa, being one day in conversation with Caius, was overheard by one Eutyclus, a slave whom Agrippa had emancipated, to say that he should be glad to see the old emperor take his departure for the other world and leave Caius master of this, without meeting with any obstacle from the emperor's grandson, Tiberius Nero. Eutyclus, some time after this, thinking he had reason to be dissatisfied with Agrippa, communicated the conversation to the emperor; whereupon Agrippa was loaded with fetters, and committed to the custody of an officer. Soon after this, Tiberius dying, and Caius Caligula succeeding him, the new emperor heaped many favours and much wealth upon Agrippa, changed his iron fetters into a chain of gold, set a royal diadem on his head, and gave him the tetrarchy which Philip, the son of Herod the Great, had been possessed of, that is, Batanæa and Trachonitis. To this he added that of Lysanias; and Agrippa returned very soon into Judea, to take possession of his new kingdom. The emperor Caius, desiring to be adored as a god, commanded to have his statue set up in the temple of Jerusalem. But the Jews opposed this design with so much resolution, that Petronius was forced to suspend his proceedings in this affair, and to represent, in a letter to the emperor, the resistance he met with from the Jews. Agrippa, who was then at Rome, coming to the emperor at the very time he was reading the letter, Caius told him that the Jews were the only people of all mankind

who refused to own him for a deity; and that they had taken arms to oppose his resolution. At these words Agrippa fainted away, and, being carried home to his house, continued in that state for a long time. As soon as he was somewhat recovered, he wrote a long letter to Caius, wherein he endeavoured to soften him; and his arguments made such an impression upon the emperor's mind, that he desisted, in appearance, from the design which he had formed of setting up his statue in the temple. Caius being killed in the beginning of the following year, A. D. 41, Agrippa, who was then at Rome, contributed much by his advice to maintain Claudius in possession of the imperial dignity, to which he had been advanced by the army. The emperor, as an acknowledgment for his kind offices, gave him all Judea, and the kingdom of Chalcis, which had been possessed by Herod his brother. Thus Agrippa became of a sudden one of the greatest princes of the east, and was possessed of as much, if not more territory, than had been held by Herod the Great, his grandfather. He returned to Judea, and governed it to the great satisfaction of the Jews. But the desire of pleasing them, and a mistaken zeal for their religion, induced him to put to death the Apostle James, and to cast Peter into prison with the same design; and, but for a miraculous interposition, which, however, produced no effect upon the mind of the tyrant, his hands would have been imbrued in the blood of two Apostles, the memory whereof is preserved in Scripture. At Cæsarea, he had games performed in honour of Claudius. Here the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon waited on him to sue for peace. Agrippa being come early in the morning into the theatre, with a design to give them audience, seated himself on his throne, dressed in a robe of silver tissue, worked in the most admirable manner. The rising sun darted his golden beams thereon, and gave it such a lustre as dazzled the eyes of the spectators; and when the king began his speech to the Tyrians and Sidonians, the parasites around him began to say, it was "the voice of a god and not of man." Instead of rejecting these impious flatteries, Agrippa received them with an air of complacency; and the angel of the Lord smote him because he did not give God the glory. Being therefore carried home to his palace, he died, at the end of five days, racked with tormenting pains in his bowels, and devoured with worms. Such was the death of Herod Agrippa, A. D. 44, after a reign of seven years. He left a son of the same name, and three daughters--Bernice, who was married to her uncle Herod, her father's brother; Mariamne, betrothed to Julius Archelaus; and Drusilla, promised to Epiphanius, the son of Archelaus, the son of Comagena.

AGRIPPA, son of the former Agrippa, was at Rome with the emperor Claudius when his father died. The emperor, we are told by Josephus, was inclined to give him all the dominions that had been possessed by his father, but was dissuaded from it, Agrippa being only seventeen years of age; and he kept him therefore at his court four years.

Three years after this, Herod, king of Chalcis, and uncle to young Agrippa, dying, the emperor gave his dominions to this prince, who, notwithstanding, did not go into Judea till four years after, A. D. 53; when, Claudius taking from him the kingdom of Chalcis, gave him the provinces of Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, Batanæa, Paneas, and Abylene, which formerly had been in the possession of Lysanias. After the death of Claudius, his successor, Nero, who had a great affection for Agrippa, to his other dominions added Julias in Peræa, and that part of Galilee to which Tarichæa and Tiberias belonged. Festus governor of Judea, coming to his government, A. D. 60, king Agrippa and Bernice, his sister, went as far as Cæsarea to salute him; and as they continued there for some time, Festus talked with the king concerning the affair of St. Paul, who had been seized in the temple about two years before, and within a few days previous to his visit had appealed to the emperor. Agrippa wishing to hear Paul, that Apostle delivered that noble address in his presence which is recorded, Acts xxvi.

AGUR. The thirtieth chapter of Proverbs begins with this title: “The words of Agur, 32<sup>nd</sup> the son of Jakeh;” and the thirty-first, with “the words of king Lemuel;” with respect to which some conjecture that Solomon describes himself under these appellations; others, that these chapters are the productions of persons whose real names are prefixed. Scripture history, indeed, affords us no information respecting their situation and character; but there must have been sufficient reason for regarding their works in the light of inspired productions, or they would not have been admitted into the sacred canon.

They are called Massa, a term frequently applied to the undoubted productions of the prophetic Spirit; and it is not improbable that the authors meant, by the adoption of this term, to lay claim to the character of inspiration. A succession of virtuous and eminent men, favoured with divine illuminations, flourished in Judea till the final completion of the sacred code; and, most likely, many more than those whose writings have been preserved. Agur may then have been one of those prophets whom Divine providence raised up to comfort or admonish his chosen people; and Lemuel may have been some neighbouring prince, the son of a Jewish woman, by whom he was taught the Massa contained in the thirty-first chapter. These, of course, can only be considered as mere conjectures; for, in the absence of historic evidence, who can venture to pronounce with certainty? The opinion, however, that Agur and Lemuel are appellations of Solomon, is sanctioned by so many and such respectable writers, that it demands a more particular examination.

The knowledge of names was anciently regarded as a matter of the highest importance, in order to understand the nature of the persons or things which they designate; and, in the opinion of the rabbins, was preferable even to the study of the written law. The Heathens paid considerable attention to it, as appears from the Cratylus of Plato; and some of the Christian fathers entertained very favourable notions of such knowledge. The Jewish doctors, it is true, refined upon the subject with an amazing degree of subtilty, grounding upon it many ridiculous ideas and absurd fancies; yet it is unquestionable that many of the proper names in Scripture are significant and characteristic. Thus the names Eve, Cain, Seth, Noah, Abraham, Israel, &c, were imposed by reason of their being expressive of the several characters of the persons whom they represent. Reasoning from analogy, we may infer that all the proper names in the Old Testament, at their original imposition, were intended to denote some quality or circumstance in the person or thing to which they belong; and though many, from transference, have ceased to be personally characteristic, yet are they all significative.

As the custom of imposing descriptive names prevailed in the primitive ages, it is not impossible that Agur and Lemuel may be appropriated to Solomon, and Jakeh to David as mystic appellations significative of their respective characters. It is even some confirmation of this opinion, that Solomon is denominated Jedidiah (beloved of the Lord) by the Prophet Nathan; and that in the book of Ecclesiastes, he styles himself Koheleth, or the Preacher. Nevertheless, this hypothesis does not appear to rest upon a firm foundation. It is foreign to the simplicity of the sacred penmen, and contrary to their custom in similar cases, to adopt a mystic name, without either explaining it, or alleging the reasons for its adoption. In the names Eve, Cain, Seth, Noah, &c, before alluded to; in the appellation Nabal; in the enigmatical names in the first chapter of Hosea; in the descriptive names given to places, as Beersheba, Jehovah-jireh, Peniel, Bethel, Gilgal; and in many other instances, the meaning of the terms is either explained, or the circumstances are mentioned which led to their selection. When Solomon is called Jedidiah, it is added that it was "because of the Lord;" and when he styles himself Koheleth, an explanatory clause is annexed, describing himself "the son of David, the king of Jerusalem." But if Solomon be meant by the titles Agur and Lemuel, he is so called without any statement of the reasons for their application, and without any explanation of their import; a circumstance unusual with the sacred writers, and the reverse to what is practised in the book of Proverbs, where his proper name, Solomon, is attributed to him in three different places. Nor is anything characteristic of the Jewish monarchs discoverable in the terms themselves. Jakeh, which denotes obedient, is no more applicable to David than to Nathan, or any other personage of eminent worth and piety among



the Israelites. The name of Agur is not of easy explanation; some giving it the sense of recollectus, that is, recovered from his errors, and become penitent; an explanation more applicable to David than to Solomon. Simon, in his lexicon, says it may perhaps denote "him who applies to the study of wisdom;" an interpretation very suitable to the royal philosopher, but not supported by adequate authority; and in his Onomasticon he explains it in a different manner. Others suppose that it means collector; though it has been argued, that, as it has a passive form, it cannot have an active sense. But this is not a valid objection, as several examples may be produced from the Bible of a similar form with an active signification. If such be its meaning, it is suitable to Solomon, who was not the collector or compiler, but the author, of the Proverbs. With respect to the name Lemuel, it signifies one that is for God, or devoted to God; and is not, therefore, peculiarly descriptive of Solomon. It appears, then, that nothing can be inferred from the signification of the names Agur and Lemuel in support of the conjecture, that they are appellations of Solomon. The contents, likewise, of the two chapters in question strongly militate against this hypothesis.

When all these circumstances are taken into consideration, together with the extreme improbability that Solomon should be denominated three times by his proper name, and afterward, in the same work, by two different enigmatical names, we are fully warranted in rejecting the notion, that the wise monarch is designed by the appellations Agur and Lemuel. And it seems most reasonable to consider them as denoting real persons.

AHAB, the son and successor of Omri. He began his reign over Israel, A. M. 3086, and reigned 22 years. In impiety he far exceeded all the kings of Israel. He married Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, king of Zidon, who introduced the whole abominations and idols of her country, Baal and Ashtaroth.

2. Ahab the son of Kolaiah, and Zedekiah the son of Maaseiah, were two false prophets, who, about A. M. 3406, seduced the Jewish captives at Babylon with hopes of a speedy deliverance, and stirred them up against Jeremiah. The Lord threatened them with a public and ignominious death, before such as they had deceived; and that their names should become a curse; men wishing that their foes might be made like Ahab and Zedekiah, whom Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon roasted in the fire, Jer. xxix, 21, 22.

AHASUERUS was the king of Persia, who advanced Esther to be queen, and at her request delivered the Jews from the destruction plotted for them by Haman. Archbishop Usher is of opinion that this Ahasuerus was Darius

Hystaspes; and that Atossa was the Vashti, and Artystona the Esther, of the Scriptures. But, according to Herodotus, the latter was the daughter of Cyrus, and therefore could not be Esther; and the former had four sons by Darius, besides daughters, born to him after he was king; and therefore she could not be the queen Vashti, divorced from her husband in the third year of his reign, nor he the Ahasuerus who divorced her. Besides, Atossa retained her influence over Darius to his death, and obtained the succession of the crown for his son, Xerxes; whereas Vashti was removed from the presence of Ahasuerus by an irrevocable decree, Esther i, 19. Joseph Scaliger maintains that Xerxes was the Ahasuerus, and Hamestris his queen, the Esther, of Scripture. The opinion is founded on the similitude of names, but contradicted by the dissimilitude of the characters of Hamestris and Esther. Besides, Herodotus says that Xerxes had a son by Hamestris that was marriageable in the seventh year of his reign; and therefore she could not be Esther. The Ahasuerus of Scripture, according to Dr. Prideaux, was Artaxerxes Longimanus. Josephus positively says that this was the person. The Septuagint, through the whole book of Esther, uses Artaxerxes for the Hebrew Ahasuerus wherever the appellation occurs; and the apocryphal additions to that book every where call the husband of Esther Artaxerxes; and he could be no other than Artaxerxes Longimanus. The extraordinary favour shown to the Jews by this king, first in sending Ezra, and afterward Nehemiah, to relieve this people, and restore them to their ancient prosperity, affords strong presumptive evidence that they had near his person and high in his regard such an advocate as Esther. Ahasuerus is also a name given in Scripture, Ezra iv, 6, to Cambyses, the son of Cyrus; and to Astyages, king of the Medes, Dan. ix, 1.

AHAVA. The name of a river of Babylonia, or rather of Assyria, where Ezra assembled those captives whom he afterward brought into Judea, Ezra viii, 15. The river Ahava is thought to be that which ran along the Adabene, where a river Diava, or Adiava, is mentioned, and on which Ptolemy places the city Abane or Aavane. This is probably the country called Ava, whence the kings of Assyria translated the people called Avites into Palestine, and where they settled some of the captive Israelites, 2 Kings xvii, 24; xviii, 34; xix, 13; xvii, 31. Ezra, intending to collect as many Israelites as he could, who might return to Judea, halted in the country of Ava, or Aahava, whence he sent agents into the Caspian mountains, to invite such Jews as were willing to join him, Ezra viii, 16. The history of Izates, king of the Adiabeniens, and of his mother Helena, who became converts to Judaism some years after the death of Jesus Christ, sufficiently proves that there were many Jews still settled in that country.

AHAZ succeeded his father Jotham, as king of Israel, at the age of twenty years, reigned till the year before Christ, 726, and addicted himself to the

practice of idolatry. After the customs of the Heathen, he made his children to pass through fire; he shut up the temple, and destroyed its vessels. He became tributary to Tiglath-pileser, whose assistance he supplicated against the kings of Syria and Israel. Such was his impiety, that he was not allowed burial in the sepulchres of the kings of Israel, 2 Kings xvi; 2 Chron. xxviii.

AHAZIAH, the son of Ahab, king of Israel. Ahaziah reigned two years, partly alone, and partly with his father Ahab, who appointed him his associate in the kingdom a year before his death. Ahaziah imitated his father's impieties, 1 Kings xxii, 52, &c, and paid his adorations to Baal and Ashtaroth, the worship of whom had been introduced into Israel by Jezebel his mother. The Moabites, who had been always obedient to the kings of the ten tribes, ever since their separation from the kingdom of Judah, revolted after the death of Ahab, and refused to pay the ordinary tribute. Ahaziah had not leisure or power to reduce them, 2 Kings i, 1, 2, &c, for, about the same time, having fallen through a lattice from the top of his house, he was considerably injured, and sent messengers to Ekron to consult Baalzebub, the god of that place, whether he should recover, 2 Kings i, 1–17. Elijah met the messengers, and informed them he should certainly die; and he died accordingly.

2. Ahaziah, king of Judah, the son of Jehoram and Athaliah. He succeeded his father in the kingdom of Judah, A. M. 3119; being in the twenty-second year of his age, 2 Kings viii, 26, &c; and he reigned one year only in Jerusalem. He walked in the ways of Ahab's house, to which he was related, his mother being of that family. Joram, king of Israel, 2 Kings viii, going to attack Ramoth Gilead, which the kings of Syria had taken from his 34predecessors, was there dangerously wounded, and carried by his own appointment to Jezreel, for the purpose of surgical assistance. Ahaziah, Joram's friend and relation, accompanied him in this war, and came afterward to visit him at Jezreel. In the meantime, Jehu, the son of Nimshi, whom Joram had left besieging the fortress of Ramoth, rebelled against his master, and set out with a design of extirpating the house of Ahab, according to the commandment of the Lord, 2 Kings ix. Joram and Ahaziah, who knew nothing of his intentions, went to meet him. Jehu killed Joram dead upon the spot: Ahaziah fled, but Jehu's people overtook him at the going up of Gur, and mortally wounded him; notwithstanding which, he had strength enough to reach Megiddo, where he died. His servants, having laid him in his chariot, carried him to Jerusalem, where he was buried with his fathers, in the city of David.

AHIJAH, the prophet of the Lord, who dwelt in Shiloh. He is thought to be the person who spoke twice to Solomon from God, once while he was

building the temple, 1 Kings vi, 11, at which time he promised him the divine protection; and again, 1 Kings xi, 11, after his falling into his irregularities, with great threatenings and reproaches. Ahijah was one of those who wrote the history or annals of this prince, 2 Chron. ix, 29. The same prophet declared to Jeroboam, that he would usurp the kingdom, 1 Kings xi, 29, &c; and, about the end of Jeroboam's reign, he also predicted the death of Abijah, the only pious son of that prince, as is recorded 1 Kings xiv, 2, &c. Ahijah, in all probability, did not long survive the delivery of this last prophecy; but we are not informed of the time and manner of his death.

AHIKAM, the son of Shaphan, and father of Gedaliah. He was sent by Josiah, king of Judah, to Huldah the prophetess, 2 Kings xxii, 12, to consult her concerning the book of the law, which had been found in the temple.

AHIMAAZ, the son of Zadok, the high priest. Ahimaaz succeeded his father under the reign of Solomon. He performed a very important piece of service for David during the war with Absalom. While his father Zadok was in Jerusalem, 2 Sam. xv, 29, Ahimaaz and Jonathan continued without the city, xvii, 17, near En-Rogel, or the fountain of Rogel; thither a maid servant came to tell them the resolution which had been taken in Absalom's council: whereupon they immediately departed to give the king intelligence. But being discovered by a young lad who gave information concerning them to Absalom, that prince sent orders to pursue them: Ahimaaz and Jonathan, fearing to be taken, retired to a man's house at Baharim, in whose court-yard there was a well, wherein they concealed themselves. After the battle, in which Absalom was overcome and slain, xviii, Ahimaaz desired leave of Joab to carry the news thereof to David. But instead of him Joab sent Cushie to carry the news, and told Ahimaaz that he would send him to the king upon some other occasion; but soon after Cushie was departed, Ahimaaz applied again to Joab, praying to be permitted to run after Cushie; and, having obtained leave, he ran by the way of the plain, and outran Cushie. He was succeeded in the priesthood by his son Azariah.

AHIMELECH. He was the son of Ahitub, and brother of Ahia, whom he succeeded in the high priesthood. He is called Abiathar, Mark ii, 26. During his priesthood the tabernacle was at Nob, where Ahimelech, with other priests, had their habitation. David, being informed by his friend Jonathan that Saul was determined to destroy him, thought it prudent to retire. He therefore went to Nob, to the high priest Ahimelech, who gave him the shew bread, and the sword of Goliath. One day, when Saul was complaining of his officers, that no one was affected with his misfortunes, or gave him any intelligence of what was carrying on against him, 1 Sam.

xxii, 9, &c, Doeg related to him what had occurred when David came to Ahimelech the high priest. On this information, Saul convened the priests, and having charged them with the crime of treason, ordered his guards to slay them, which they refusing to do, Doeg, who had been their accuser, at the king's command became their executioner, and with his sacrilegious hand massacred no less than eighty-five of them; the Septuagint and Syriac versions make the number of priests slain by Doeg three hundred and five. Nor did Saul stop here; but, sending a party to Nob, he commanded them to slay men, women, and children, and even cattle, with the edge of the sword. Only one son of Ahimelech, named Abiathar, escaped the carnage and fled to David.

AHITHOPHEL, a native of Giloh, who, after having been David's counsellor, joined in the rebellion of Absalom, and assisted him with his advice. Hushai, the friend of David, was employed to counteract the counsels of Ahithophel, and to deprive Absalom, under a pretence of serving him, of the advantage that was likely to result from the measures which he proposed. One of these measures was calculated to render David irreconcilable, and was immediately adopted; and the other to secure, or to slay him. Before the last counsel was followed, Hushai's advice was desired; and he recommended their assembling together the whole force of Israel, putting Absalom at their head, and overwhelming David by their number. The treacherous counsel of Hushai was preferred to that of Ahithophel; with which the latter being disgusted he hastened to his house at Giloh, where he put an end to his life. He probably foresaw Absalom's defeat, and dreaded the punishment which would be inflicted on himself as a traitor, when David was resettled on the throne. A. M. 2981. B. C. 1023. 2 Sam. xv, xvii.

AHOLIBAH. This and Aholah are two feigned names made use of by Ezekiel, xxiii, 4, to denote the two kingdoms of Judah and Samaria. Aholah and Aholibah are represented as two sisters of Egyptian extraction. Aholah stands for Samaria, and Aholibah for Jerusalem. The first signifies a tent, and the second, 35my tent is in her. They both prostituted themselves to the Egyptians and Assyrians, in imitating their abominations and idolatries; for which reason the Lord abandoned them to those very people for whose evil practices they had shown so passionate an affection. They were carried into captivity, and reduced to the severest servitude.

AI, called by the LXX, Gai, by Josephus Aina, and by others Ajah, a town of Palestine, situate west of Bethel, and at a small distance north-west of Jericho. The three thousand men, first sent by Joshua to reduce this city, were repulsed, on account of the sin of Achan, who had violated the anathema pronounced against Jericho, by appropriating a part of the spoil.

After the expiation of this offence, the whole army of Israel marched against Ai, with orders to treat that city as Jericho had been treated, with this difference, that the plunder was to be given to the army. Joshua, having appointed an ambush of thirty thousand men, marched against the city, and by a feigned retreat, drew out the king of Ai with his troops; and upon a signal given by elevating his shield on the top of a pike, the men in ambush entered the city and set fire to it. Thus the soldiers of Ai, placed between two divisions of Joshua's army, were all destroyed; the king alone being preserved for a more ignominious death on a gibbet, where he hung till sunset. The spoil of the place was afterward divided among the Israelites. The men appointed for ambush are, in one place, said to be thirty thousand, and in another five thousand. For reconciling this apparent contradiction, most commentators have generally supposed, that there were two bodies placed in ambuscade between Bethel and Ai, one of twenty-five thousand and the other of five thousand men; the latter being probably a detachment from the thirty thousand first sent, and ordered to lie as near to the city as possible. Masius allows only five thousand men for the ambuscade, and twenty-five thousand for the attack.

AICHMALOTARCH, Αιχμαλοτάρχης signifies the prince of the captivity, or chief of the captives. The Jews pretend that this was the title of him who had the government of their people during the captivity of Babylon; and they believe these princes or governors to have been constantly of the tribe of Judah, and family of David. But they give no satisfactory proof of the real existence of these Aichmalotarchs. There was no prince of the captivity before the end of the second century, from which period the office continued till the eleventh century. The princes of the captivity resided at Babylon, where they were installed with great ceremony, held courts of justice, &c, and were set over the eastern Jews, or those settled in Babylon, Chaldæa, Assyria, and Persia. Thus they affected to restore the splendour of their ancient monarchy, and in this view the following account may be amusing. The ceremonial of the installation is thus described: The spiritual heads of the people, the masters of the learned schools, the elders, and the people, assembled in great multitudes within a stately chamber, adorned with rich curtains, in Babylon, where, during his days of splendour, the Resch-Glutha fixed his residence. The prince was seated on a lofty throne. The heads of the schools of Sura and Pumbeditha on his right hand and left. These chiefs of the learned men then delivered an address, exhorting the new monarch not to abuse his power; and reminded him that he was called to slavery rather than to sovereignty, for he was prince of a captive people. On the next Thursday he was inaugurated by the laying on of hands, and the sound of trumpets, and acclamations. He was escorted to his palace with great pomp, and received magnificent presents from all his subjects. On the Sabbath all the principal people being assembled before

his house, he placed himself at their head, and, with his face covered with a silken veil, proceeded to the synagogue. Benedictions and hymns of thanksgiving announced his entrance. They then brought him the book of the law, out of which he read the first line, afterward he addressed the assembly, with his eyes closed out of respect. He exhorted them to charity, and set the example by offering liberal alms to the poor. The ceremony closed with new acclamations, and prayers to God that, under the new prince, he would be pleased to put an end to their calamities. The prince gave his blessing to the people, and prayed for each province, that it might be preserved from war and famine. He concluded his orisons in a low voice, lest his prayer should be repeated to the jealous ears of the native monarchs, for he prayed for the restoration of the kingdom of Israel, which could not rise but on the ruins of their empire. The prince returned to his palace, where he gave a splendid banquet to the chief persons of the community. After that day he lived in a sort of stately oriental seclusion, never quitting his palace, except to go to the schools of the learned, where, as he entered, the whole assembly rose and continued standing, till he took his seat. He sometimes paid a visit to the native sovereign in Babylon (Bagdad.) This probably refers to a somewhat later period. On these great occasions his imperial host sent his own chariot for his guest; but the prince of the captivity dared not accept the invidious distinction, he walked in humble and submissive modesty behind the chariot. Yet his own state was by no means wanting in splendour: he was arrayed in cloth of gold; fifty guards marched before him; all the Jews who met him on the way paid their homage, and fell behind into his train. He was received by the eunuchs, who conducted him to the throne, while one of his officers, as he marched slowly along, distributed gold and silver on all sides. As the prince approached the imperial throne, he prostrated himself on the ground, in token of vassalage. The eunuchs raised him and placed him on the left hand of the sovereign. After the first salutation, the prince represented the grievances, or discussed the affairs, of his people.

The court of the Resch-Glutha is described as splendid. In imitation of his Persian master, he had his officers, counsellors, and cup-bearers; and rabbins were appointed as satraps over the different communities. This state, it is probable, was maintained by a tribute raised from the body of the people, and substituted for that which, in ancient times was paid for the temple in Jerusalem. His subjects in Babylonia were many of them wealthy.

AIJALON, a city of the Canaanites; the valley adjoining to which is memorable in sacred history from the miracle of Joshua, in arresting the course of the sun and moon, that the Israelites might have sufficient light to pursue their enemies, Joshua x, 12, 13. Aijalon was afterward a Levitical

city, and belonged to the tribe of Dan; who did not, however, drive out the Amorite inhabitants, Judges i, 35.

AIR, that thin, fluid, elastic, transparent, ponderous, compressible body which surrounds the terraqueous globe to a considerable height. In Scripture it is sometimes used for heaven; as, “the birds of the air;” “the birds of heaven.” To “beat the air,” and “to speak to the air,” 1 Cor. ix, 26, signify to fatigue ourselves in vain, and to speak to no purpose. “The prince of the power of the air” is the head and chief of the evil spirits, with which both Jews and Heathens thought the air was filled.

ALABASTER, Ἀλάβαστρον, the name of a genus of fossils nearly allied to marble. It is a bright elegant stone, sometimes of a snowy whiteness. It may be cut freely, and is capable of a fine polish; and, being of a soft nature, it is wrought into any form or figure with ease. Vases or cruises were anciently made of it, wherein to preserve odoriferous liquors and ointments. Pliny and others represent it as peculiarly proper for this purpose; and the druggists in Egypt have, at this day, vessels made of it, in which they keep their medicines and perfumes.

In Matt. xxvi, 6, 7, we read that Jesus being at table in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, a woman came thither and poured an alabaster box of ointment on his head. St. Mark adds, “She brake the box,” which merely refers to the seal upon the vase which closed it, and kept the perfume from evaporating. This had never been removed, but was on this occasion broken, that is, first opened.

ALBIGENSES. See Waldenses.

ALEPH, א, the name of the first letter in the Hebrew alphabet, from which the alpha of the Syrians and Greeks was formed. This word signifies, prince, chief, or thousand, expressing, as it were, a leading number.

ALEXANDER, commonly called the Great, son and successor of Philip, king of Macedon, is denoted in the prophecies of Daniel by a leopard with four wings, signifying his great strength, and the unusual rapidity of his conquests, Dan. vii, 6; and by a one-horned he-goat running over the earth so swiftly as not to touch it, attacking a ram with two horns, overthrowing him, and trampling him under foot, without any being able to rescue him, Dan. viii, 4–7. The he-goat prefigured Alexander; the ram, Darius Codomannus, the last of the Persian kings. In the statue beheld by Nebuchadnezzar in his dream, Dan. ii, 39, the belly of brass was the emblem of Alexander. He was appointed by God to destroy the Persian empire, and to substitute in its room the Grecian monarchy.



Alexander succeeded his father Philip, A. M. 3668, and B. C. 336. He was chosen, by the Greeks, general of their troops against the Persians, and entered Asia at the head of thirty-four thousand men, A. M. 3670. In one campaign, he subdued almost all Asia Minor; and afterward defeated, in the narrow passes which led from Syria to Cilicia, the army of Darius, which consisted of four hundred thousand foot, and one hundred thousand horse. Darius fled, and left in the hands of the conqueror, his camp, baggage, children, wife, and mother.

After subduing Syria, Alexander came to Tyre; and the Tyrians refusing him entrance into their city, he besieged it. At the same time he wrote to Jaddus, high priest of the Jews, that he expected to be acknowledged by him, and to receive from him the same submission which had hitherto been paid to the king of Persia. Jaddus refusing to comply under the plea of having sworn fidelity to Darius, Alexander resolved to march against Jerusalem, when he had reduced Tyre. After a long siege, this city was taken and sacked; and Alexander entered Palestine, A. M. 3672, and subjected it to his obedience. As he was marching against Jerusalem, the Jews became greatly alarmed, and had recourse to prayers and sacrifices. The Lord, in a dream, commanded Jaddus to open the gates to the conqueror, and, at the head of his people, dressed in his pontifical ornaments, and attended by the priests in their robes, to advance and meet the Macedonian king. Jaddus obeyed; and Alexander perceiving this company approaching, hastened toward the high priest, whom he saluted. He then adored God, whose name was engraven on a thin plate of gold, worn by the high priest upon his forehead. The kings of Syria who accompanied him, and the great officers about Alexander, could not comprehend the meaning of his conduct. Parmenio alone ventured to ask him why he adored the Jewish high priest; Alexander replied, that he paid this respect to God, and not to the high priest. "For," added he, "whilst I was yet in Macedonia, I saw the God of the Jews, who appeared to me in the same form and dress as the high priest at present, and who encouraged me and commanded me to march boldly into Asia, promising that he would be my guide, and give me the empire of the Persians. As soon, therefore, as I perceived this habit, I recollected the vision, and understood that my undertaking was favoured by God, and that under his protection I might expect prosperity."

Having said this, Alexander accompanied Jaddus to Jerusalem, where he offered sacrifices in the temple according to the directions of the high priest. Jaddus is said to have showed him the prophecies of Daniel, in which the destruction of the Persian empire by Alexander is declared. The king was therefore confirmed in his opinion, that God had chosen him to

execute this great work. At his departure, Alexander bade the Jews ask of him what they would. The high priest desired only the liberty of living under his government according to their own laws, and an exemption from tribute every seventh year, because in that year the Jews neither tilled their grounds, nor reaped their fruits. With this request Alexander readily complied.

Having left Jerusalem, Alexander visited other cities of Palestine, and was every where received with great testimonies of friendship and submission. The Samaritans who dwelt at Sichem, and were apostates from the Jewish religion, observing how kindly Alexander had treated the Jews, resolved to say that they also were by religion Jews. For it was their practice, when they saw the affairs of the Jews in a prosperous state, to boast that they were descended from Manasseh and Ephraim; but when they thought it their interest to say the contrary, they failed not to affirm, and even to swear, that they were not related to the Jews. They came, therefore, with many demonstrations of joy, to meet Alexander, as far almost as the territories of Jerusalem. Alexander commended their zeal; and the Sichemites entreated him to visit their temple and city. Alexander promised this at his return; but as they petitioned him for the same privileges as the Jews, he asked them if they were Jews. They replied, they were Hebrews, and were called by the Phœnicians, Sichemites. Alexander said that he had granted this exemption only to the Jews, but that at his return he would inquire into the affair, and do them justice.

This prince having conquered Egypt, and regulated it, gave orders for the building of the city of Alexandria, and departed thence, about spring, in pursuit of Darius. Passing through Palestine, he was informed that the Samaritans, in a general insurrection, had killed Andromachus, governor of Syria and Palestine, who had come to Samaria to regulate some affairs. This action greatly incensed Alexander, who loved Andromachus. He therefore commanded all those who were concerned in his murder to be put to death, and the rest to be banished from Samaria; and settled a colony of Macedonians in their room. What remained of their lands he gave to the Jews, and exempted them from the payment of tribute. The Samaritans who escaped this calamity, retired to Sichem, at the foot of mount Gerizim, which afterward became their capital. Lest the eight thousand men of this nation, who were in the service of Alexander, and had accompanied him since the siege of Tyre, if permitted to return to their own country, should renew the spirit of rebellion, he sent them into Thebais, the most remote southern province of Egypt, where he assigned them lands.

Alexander, after defeating Darius in a pitched battle, and subduing all Asia and the Indies with incredible rapidity, gave himself up to intemperance.

Having drunk to excess, he fell sick and died, after he had obliged “all the world to be quiet before him,” 1 Macc. i, 3. Being sensible that his end was near, he sent for the grandees of his court, and declared that “he gave the empire to the most deserving.” Some affirm that he regulated the succession by a will. The author of the first book of Maccabees says, that he divided his kingdom among his generals while he was living, 1 Macc. i, 7. This he might do; or he might express his foresight of what actually took place after his death. It is certain, that a partition was made of Alexander’s dominions among the four principal officers of his army, and that the empire which he founded in Asia subsisted for many ages. Alexander died, A. M. 3684, and B. C. 323, in the thirty-third year of his age, and the twelfth of his reign. The above particulars of Alexander are here introduced because, from his invasion of Palestine, the intercourse of the Jews with the Greeks became intimate, and influenced many events of their subsequent history.

On the account above given of the interview between Alexander and the Jewish high priest, by Josephus, many doubts have been cast by critics. But the sudden change of his feelings toward them, and the favour with which the nation was treated by him, render the story not improbable.

ALEXANDRIA, a famous city of Egypt, and, during the reign of the Ptolemies, the regal capital of that kingdom. It was founded by Alexander the Great: who being struck with the advantageous situation of the spot where the city afterward stood, ordered its immediate erection; drew the plan of the city himself, and peopled it with colonies of Greeks and Jews: to which latter people, in particular, he gave great encouragement. They were, in fact, made free citizens, and had all the privileges of Macedonians granted to them; which liberal policy contributed much to the rise and prosperity of the new city; for this enterprising and commercial people knew much better than either the Greeks or the Egyptians how to turn the happy situation of Alexandria to the best account. The fall of Tyre happening about the same time, the trade of that city was soon drawn to Alexandria, which became the centre of commercial intercourse between the east and the west; and in process of time grew to such an extent, in magnitude and wealth, as to be second in point of population and magnificence to none but Rome itself.

Alexandria owed much of its celebrity as well as its population to the Ptolemies. Ptolemy Soter, one of Alexander’s captains, who, after the death of this monarch, was first governor of Egypt, and afterward assumed the title of king, made this city the place of his residence, about B. C. 304. This prince founded an academy, called the Museum, in which a society of learned men devoted themselves to philosophical studies, and the

improvement of all the other sciences; and he also gave them a library, which was prodigiously increased by his successors. He likewise induced the merchants of Syria and Greece to reside in this city, and to make it a principal mart of their commerce. His son and successor, Ptolemy Philadelphus, pursued the designs of his father.

In the hands of the Romans, the successors of the Macedonians in the government of Egypt, the trade of Alexandria continued to flourish, until luxury and licentiousness paved the way, as in every similar instance, for its overthrow.

Alexandria, together with the rest of Egypt, passed from the dominion of the Romans to that of the Saracens. With this event, the sun of Alexandria may be said to have set: the blighting hand of Islamism was laid on it; and although the genius and the resources of such a city could not be immediately destroyed, it continued to languish until the passage by the Cape of Good Hope, in the fifteenth century, gave a new channel to the trade which for so many centuries had been its support; and at this day, Alexandria, like most eastern cities, presents a mixed spectacle of ruins and wretchedness,--of fallen greatness and enslaved human beings.

Some idea may be formed of the extent and grandeur of Alexandria, by the boast made by Amrou: "I have taken," said he, "the great city of the west. It is impossible for me to enumerate the variety of its riches and beauty. I shall content myself with observing, that it contains four thousand palaces, four thousand baths, four hundred theatres or places of amusement, twelve thousand shops for the sale of vegetable foods, and forty thousand tributary Jews."

It was in Alexandria chiefly that the Grecian philosophy was engrafted upon the stock of ancient oriental wisdom. The Egyptian method of teaching by allegory was peculiarly favourable to such a union: and we may well suppose that when Alexander, in order to preserve by the arts of peace that extensive empire which he had obtained by the force of arms, endeavoured to incorporate the customs of the Greeks with those of the Persian, Indian, and other eastern nations, the opinions as well as the manners of this feeble and obsequious race would, in a great measure, be accommodated to those of their conquerors. This influence of the Grecian upon the oriental philosophy continued long after the time of Alexander, and was one principal occasion of the confusion of opinions which occurs in the history of the Alexandrian and Christian schools. Alexander, when he built the city of Alexandria, with a determination to make it the seat of his empire, and peopled it with emigrants from various countries, opened a new mart of philosophy, which emulated the fame of Athens itself. A

general indulgence was granted to the promiscuous crowd assembled in this rising city, whether Egyptians, Grecians, Jews, or others, to profess their respective systems of philosophy without molestation. The consequence was, that Egypt was soon filled with religious and philosophical sectaries of every kind; and particularly, that almost every Grecian sect found an advocate and professor in Alexandria. The family of the Ptolemies, as we have seen, who after Alexander obtained the government of Egypt, from motives of policy encouraged this new establishment. Ptolemy Lagus, who had obtained the crown of Egypt by usurpation, was particularly careful to secure the interest of the Greeks in his favour, and with this view invited people from every part of Greece to settle in Egypt, and removed the schools of Athens to Alexandria. This enlightened prince spared no pains to raise the literary, as well as the civil, military, and commercial credit of his country. Under the patronage first of the Egyptian princes, and afterward of the Roman emperors, Alexandria long continued to enjoy great celebrity as the seat of learning, and to send forth eminent philosophers of every sect to distant countries. It remained a school of learning, as well as a commercial emporium, till it was taken, and plundered of its literary treasures by the Saracens. Philosophy, during this period, suffered a grievous corruption from the attempt which was made by philosophers of different sects and countries, Grecian, Egyptian, and oriental, who were assembled in Alexandria, to frame, from their different tenets, one general system of opinions. The respect which had long been universally paid to the schools of Greece, and the honours with which they were now adorned by the Egyptian princes, induced other wise men, and even the Egyptian priests and philosophers themselves, to submit to this innovation. Hence arose a heterogeneous mass of opinions, under the name of the Eclectic philosophy, and which was the foundation of endless confusion, error, and absurdity, not only in the Alexandrian school, but among Jews and Christians; producing among the former that specious kind of philosophy, which they called their Cabala, and among the latter innumerable corruptions of the Christian faith.

At Alexandria there was, in a very early period of the Christian æra, a Christian school of considerable eminence. St. Jerome says, the school at Alexandria had been in being from the time of St. Mark. Pantænus, placed by Lardner at the year 192, presided in it. St. Clement of Alexandria succeeded Pantænus in this school about the year 190; and he was succeeded by Origen. The extensive commerce of Alexandria, and its proximity to Palestine, gave an easy entrance to the new religion, and when Adrian visited Egypt, he found a church composed of Jews and Greeks, sufficiently important to attract the notice of that inquisitive prince. The theological system of Plato was introduced into both the philosophical and Christian schools of Alexandria; and of course many of his sentiments and

expressions were blended with the opinions and language of the professors and teachers of Christianity.

Alexandria was the source, and for some time the principal stronghold, of Arianism; which had its name from its founder, Arius, a presbyter of the church of this city, about the year 315. His doctrines were condemned by a council held here in the year 320; and afterward by a general council of three hundred and eighty fathers, held at Nice, by order of Constantine, in 325. These doctrines, however, which suited the reigning taste for disputative theology, and the pride and self-sufficiency of nominal Christians, better than the unsophisticated simplicity of the Gospel, spread 39widely and rapidly notwithstanding. Arius was steadfastly opposed by the celebrated Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, the intrepid champion of the catholic faith, who was raised to the archiepiscopal throne of Alexandria in 326.

This city was, in 415, distinguished by a fierce persecution of the Jews by the patriarch Cyril. They who had enjoyed the rights of citizens, and the freedom of religious worship, for seven hundred years, ever since the foundation of the city, incurred the hatred of this ecclesiastic; who, in his zeal for the extermination of heretics of every kind, pulled down their synagogues, plundered their property, and expelled them, to the number of forty thousand, from the city.

It was in a ship belonging to the port of Alexandria, that St. Paul sailed from Myra, a city of Lycia, on his way to Rome, Acts xxvii, 5, 6. Alexandria was also the native place of Apollos.

ALEXANDRIAN LIBRARY. This celebrated collection of books was first founded by Ptolemy Soter, for the use of the academy, or society of learned men, which he had founded at Alexandria. Beside the books which he procured, his son, Ptolemy Philadelphus, added many more, and left in this library at his death a hundred thousand volumes; and the succeeding princes of this race enlarged it still more, till at length the books lodged in it amounted to the number of seven hundred thousand volumes. The method by which they are said to have collected these books was this: they seized all the books that were brought by the Greeks or other foreigners into Egypt, and sent them to the academy, or museum, where they were transcribed by persons employed for that purpose. The transcripts were then delivered to the proprietors, and the originals laid up in the library. Ptolemy Euergetes, for instance, borrowed of the Athenians the works of Sophocles, Euripides, and Æschylus, and only returned them the copies, which he caused to be transcribed in as beautiful a manner as possible; the originals he retained for his own library, presenting the Athenians with

fifteen talents for the exchange, that is, with three thousand pounds sterling and upwards. As the museum was at first in the quarter of the city called Bruchion, the library was placed there; but when the number of books amounted to four hundred thousand volumes, another library, within the Serapeum, was erected by way of supplement to it, and, on that account, called the daughter of the former. The books lodged in this increased to the number of three hundred thousand volumes; and these two made up the number of seven hundred thousand volumes, of which the royal libraries of the Ptolemies were said to consist. In the war which Julius Cæsar waged with the inhabitants of Alexandria, the library of Bruchion was accidentally, but unfortunately, burnt. But the library in Serapeum still remained, and there Cleopatra deposited the two hundred thousand volumes of the Pergamean library with which she was presented by Marc Antony. These, and others added to them from time to time, rendered the new library more numerous and considerable than the former; and though it was plundered more than once during the revolutions which happened in the Roman empire, yet it was as frequently supplied with the same number of books, and continued, for many ages, to be of great fame and use, till it was burnt by the Saracens, A. D. 642. Abulpharagius, in his history of the tenth dynasty, gives the following account of this catastrophe: John Philoponus, surnamed the Grammarian, a famous Peripatetic philosopher, being at Alexandria when the city was taken by the Saracens, was admitted to familiar intercourse with Amrou, the Arabian general, and presumed to solicit a gift, inestimable in his opinion, but contemptible in that of the barbarians; and this was the royal library. Amrou was inclined to gratify his wish, but his rigid integrity scrupled to alienate the least object without the consent of the caliph. He accordingly wrote to Omar, whose well known answer was dictated by the ignorance of a fanatic: "If these writings of the Greeks agree with the Koran, or book of God, they are useless, and need not be preserved; if they disagree, they are pernicious, and ought to be destroyed." The sentence of destruction was executed with blind obedience: the volumes of paper or parchment were distributed to the four thousand baths of the city; and such was their number, that six months were barely sufficient for the consumption of this precious fuel.

ALGUM, אלגום or 1 אלגומים, Kings x, 11, 12. This is the name of a kind of wood, or tree, large quantities of which were brought by the fleet of Solomon from Ophir, of which he made pillars for the house of the Lord, and for his own palace; also musical instruments. See *Almug*.

ALLEGORY, a figure in rhetoric, whereby we make use of terms which, in their proper signification, mean something else than what they are brought to denote; or it is a figure whereby we say one thing, expecting it shall be understood of another, to which it alludes; or which, under the

literal sense of the words, conceals a foreign or distant meaning. An allegory is, properly, a continued metaphor, or a series of several metaphors in one or more sentences. Such is that beautiful allegory in Horace, lib. i, Od. 14.

“O navis, referent in mare te novi  
Fluctus,” &c.

[O ship, shall new billows drive thee again to sea, &c.]

Where the ship is usually held to stand for the republic; waves, for civil war; port, for peace and concord; oars, for soldiers; and mariners for magistrates. Thus, also, in Prior’s Henry and Emma, Emma describes her constancy to Henry in the following allegorical manner:--

“Did I but purpose to embark with thee  
On the smooth surface of a summer’s sea,  
While gentle zephyrs play with prosperous gales,  
And fortune’s favour fills the swelling sails;  
But would forsake the ship, and make the shore,  
When the winds whistle, and the tempests roar?”

Cicero, likewise, speaking of himself, in Pison. c. 9, tom. vi, p. 187, uses this allegorical language: 40“Nor was I so timorous, that, after I had steered the ship of the state through the greatest storms and waves, and brought her safe into port, I should fear the cloud of your forehead, or your colleague’s pestilential breath. I saw other winds, I perceived other storms, I did not withdraw from other impending tempests; but I exposed myself singly to them for the common safety.” Here the state is compared to a ship, and all the things said of it under that image, are expressed in metaphors made use of to denote the dangers with which it had been threatened. We have also a very fine example of an allegory in Psalm lxxx; in which the people of Israel are represented under the image of a vine, and the figure is supported throughout with great correctness and beauty. Whereas, if, instead of describing the vine as wasted by the boar from the wood, and devoured by the wild beasts of the field, the Psalmist had said, it was afflicted by Heathens, or overcome by enemies, which is the real meaning, the figurative and the literal meaning would have been blended, and the allegory ruined. The learned Bishop Lowth, De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum, Præl. 10, 11, has specified three forms of allegory that occur in sacred poetry. The first is that which rhetoricians call a continued metaphor. When several metaphors succeed each other, they alter the form of the composition; and this succession has very properly, in reference to the etymology of the word, been denominated by the Greeks *αλληγορια*, an allegory; although Aristotle, instead of considering it as a new species of figure, has referred it to the class of metaphors. The principle of allegory



in this sense of the term, and of the simple metaphor, is the same; nor is it an easy matter to restrict each to its proper limit, and to mark the precise termination of the one, and the commencement of the other. This eminently judicious critic observes, that when the Hebrew poets use the congenial figures of metaphor, allegory, and comparison, particularly in the prophetic poetry, they adopt a peculiar mode of doing it, and seldom regulate the imagery which they introduce by any fixed principle or standard. Not satisfied with a simple metaphor, they often run it into an allegory, or blend with it a direct comparison. The allegory sometimes follows, and sometimes precedes the simile: to this is added a frequent change of imagery, as well as of persons and tenses; and thus are displayed an energy and boldness, both of expression and meaning, which are unconfined by any stated rules, and which mark the discriminating genius of the Hebrew poetry. Thus, in Gen. xlix, 9, "Judah is a lion's whelp;" this metaphor is immediately drawn out into an allegory, with a change of person: "From the prey, my son, thou art gone up," that is, to the mountains, which is understood; and in the succeeding sentences the person is again changed, the image is gradually advanced, and the metaphor is joined with a comparison that is repeated.

"He stoopeth down, he coucheth as a lion;  
And as a lioness; who shall rouse him?"

A similar instance occurs in the prophecy, recorded in Psalm cx, 3, which explicitly foretels the abundant increase of the Gospel on its first promulgation. This kind of allegory, however, sometimes assumes a more regular and perfect form, and then occupies the whole subject and compass of the discourse. An example of this kind occurs in Solomon's well known allegory, Eccles. xii, 2–6, in which old age is so admirably depicted. There is also, in Isaiah xxviii, 24–29, an allegory, which, with no less elegance of imagery, is more simple and regular, as well as more just and complete, both in the form and the method of treating it. Another kind of allegory is that which, in the proper and more restricted sense, may be called a parable; and consists of a continued narration of some fictitious event, accommodated, by way of similitude, to the illustration of some important truth. The Greeks call these allegories *αιβοι* or apologues, and the Latins *fabulæ*, or fables. (See Parable.) The third species of allegory, which often occurs in the prophetic poetry, is that in which a double meaning is couched under the same words, or when the same discourse, differently interpreted, designates different events, dissimilar in their nature, and remote as to time. These different relations are denominated the literal and mystical senses. This kind of allegory, which the learned prelate calls mystical, seems to derive its origin from the principles of the Jewish religion; and it differs from the two former species in a variety of respects. In these allegories the writer may adopt any imagery that is most suitable to his fancy or

inclination; but the only proper materials for this allegory must be supplied from the sacred rites of the Hebrews themselves; and it can only be introduced in relation to such things as are immediately connected with the Jewish religion, or their immediate opposites. The former kinds partake of the common privileges of poetry; but the mystical allegory has its foundation in the nature of the Jewish economy, and is adapted solely to the poetry of the Hebrews. Besides, in the other forms of allegory, the exterior or ostensible imagery is mere fiction, and the truth lies altogether in the interior or remote sense; but in this allegory each idea is equally agreeable to truth. The exterior or ostensible image is itself a reality; and although it sustains another character, it does not wholly lay aside its own. There is also a great variety in the use and conduct of the mystical allegory; in the modes in which the corresponding images are arranged, and in which they are obscured or eclipsed by one another. Sometimes the obvious or literal sense is so prominent and conspicuous, both in the words and sentiments, that the remote or figurative sense is scarcely permitted to glimmer through it. On the other hand, the figurative sense is more frequently found to beam forth with so much perspicuity and lustre, that the literal sense is quite cast into the shade, or becomes indiscernible. Sometimes the principal or figurative idea is exhibited to the attentive eye with a constant and equal light; and sometimes it unexpectedly glares upon us, and breaks forth with sudden and astonishing coruscations, like a flash of lightning bursting from the clouds. But the mode or form of this figure which possesses the chief beauty and elegance, is, when the two images, equally conspicuous, run, as it were, parallel throughout the whole poem, mutually illustrating and correspondent to each other. The learned author has illustrated these observations by instances selected from Psalms ii, and lxxii. He adds, that the mystical allegory is, on account of the obscurity resulting from the nature of the figure, and the style of the composition, so agreeable to the nature of the prophecy, that it is the form which it generally, and indeed lawfully, assumes, as best adapted to the prediction of future events. It describes events in a manner exactly conformable to the intention of prophecy; that is, in a dark, disguised, and intricate manner, sketching out, in a general way, their form and outline; and seldom descending to a minuteness of description and exactness of detail.

ALLELUIA, or Hallelu-jah, הללו יה, praise the Lord; or, praise to the Lord: compounded of הללו, praise ye, and יה, the Lord. This word occurs at the beginning, or at the end, of many Psalms. Alleluia was sung on solemn days of rejoicing: “And all her streets shall sing Alleluia,” says Tobit, speaking of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, Tob. xiii, 18. St. John, in the Revelation, xix, 1, 3, 4, 6, says, “I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, who cried, Alleluia; and the four living creatures fell down, and

worshipped God, saying, Alleluia.” This expression of joy and praise was transferred from the synagogue to the church. At the funeral of Fabiola, “several psalms were sung with loud alleluias,” says Jerom, in *Epitaphio Paulæ*, “The monks of Palestine were awaked at their midnight watchings, with the singing of alleluias.” It is still occasionally used in devotional psalmody.

ALMAH, עלמה, a Hebrew word signifying properly a virgin, a young woman unacquainted with man. In this sense it occurs in the famous passage of Isaiah, vii, 14: “Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son.” The Hebrew has no term that more properly signifies a virgin than *almah*. St. Jerom, in his commentary on this passage, observes, that the Prophet declined using the word *bethaul* which signifies any young woman, or young person, but employed the term *almah*, which denotes a virgin never seen by man. This is the import of the word *almah*, which is derived from a root which signifies to conceal. It is very well known, that young women in the east do not appear in public, but are shut up in their houses, and their mothers’ apartments, like nuns. The Chaldee paraphrast and the Septuagint translate *almah* “a virgin;” and Akiba, the famous rabbin, who was a great enemy to Christ and Christians, and lived in the second century, understands it in the same manner. The Apostles and Evangelists, and the Jews of our Saviour’s time, explained it in the same sense, and expected a Messiah born of a virgin.

The Jews, that they may obscure this plain text, and weaken this proof of the truth of the Christian religion, pretend that the Hebrew word signifies a young woman, and not a virgin. But this corrupt translation is easily confuted. 1. Because this word constantly denotes a virgin in all other passages of Scripture in which it is used. 2. From the intent of the passage, which was to confirm their faith by a strange and wonderful sign. It surely could be no wonder, that a young woman should conceive a child; but it was a very extraordinary circumstance that a virgin should conceive and bear a son.

ALMIGHTY, an attribute of the Deity, Gen. xvii, 1. The Hebrew name, שדי, *Shaddai*, signifies also all-sufficient, or all-bountiful. See Gen. xxviii, 3; xxxv, 11; xliii, 14; xlix, 25. Of the omnipotence of God, we have a most ample revelation in the Scriptures, expressed in the most sublime language. From the annunciation by Moses of a divine existence who was “in the beginning,” before all things, the very first step is to the display of his almighty power in the creation out of nothing, and the immediate arrangement in order and perfection, of the “heaven and the earth;” by which is meant, not this globe only with its atmosphere, or even with its own celestial system, but the universe itself; for “he made the stars also.”

We are thus at once placed in the presence of an agent of unbounded power; for we must all feel that a being which could create such a world as this, must, beyond all comparison, possess a power greater than any which we experience in ourselves, than any which we observe in other visible agents, and to which we are not authorized by our observation or knowledge to assign any limits of space or duration.

2. That the sacred writers should so frequently dwell upon the omnipotence of God, has important reasons which arise out of the very design of the revelation which they were the means of communicating to mankind. Men were to be reminded of their obligations to obedience; and God is therefore constantly exhibited as the Creator, the Preserver, and Lord of all things. His solemn worship and fear were to be enjoined upon them; and, by the manifestation of his works, the veil was withdrawn from his glory and majesty. Idolatry was to be checked and reprov'd, and the true God was therefore placed in contrast with the limited and powerless gods of the Heathen: "Among the gods of the nations, is there no god like unto thee; neither are there any works like thy works." Finally, he is exhibited as the object of trust to creatures constantly reminded by experience of their own infirmity and dependence; and to them it is essential to know, that his power is absolute, unlimited, and irresistible, and that, in a word, he is "mighty to save."

3. In a revelation which was thus designed to awe and control the wicked, and to afford strength of mind and consolation to good men under all circumstances, the omnipotence of God is therefore placed in a great variety of impressive views, and connected with the most striking illustrations.

It is declared by the fact of creation, the 42creation of beings out of nothing; which itself, though it had been confined to a single object, however minute, exceeds finite comprehension, and overwhelms the faculties. This with God required no effort: "He spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast." The vastness and variety of his works enlarge the conception: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work." "He spreadeth out the heavens, and treadeth upon the waves of the sea; he maketh Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south; he doeth great things, past finding out, yea, and wonders without number. He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing. He bindeth up the waters in the thick clouds, and the cloud is not rent under them; he hath compassed the waters with bounds until the day and night come to an end." The ease with which he sustains, orders, and controls the most powerful and unruly of the elements, arrays his omnipotence with an aspect of ineffable dignity

and majesty: "By him all things consist." "He brake up for the sea a decreed place, and set bars and doors, and said, Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." "He looketh to the end of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven, to make the weight for the winds, to weigh the waters by measure, to make a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning of the thunder." "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, meted out heaven with a span, comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance." The descriptions of the divine power are often terrible: "The pillars of heaven tremble, and are astonished at his reproof; he divideth the sea by his power." "He removeth the mountains, and they know it not; he overturneth them in his anger; he shaketh the earth out of her place, and the pillars thereof tremble; he commandeth the sun and it riseth not, and seaeth up the stars." The same absolute subjection of creatures to his dominion is seen among the intelligent inhabitants of the material universe; and angels, mortals the most exalted, and evil spirits, are swayed with as much ease as the most passive elements: "He maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." They veil their faces before his throne, and acknowledge themselves his servants: "It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers," "as the dust of the balance, less than nothing and vanity." "He bringeth princes to nothing." "He setteth up one and putteth down another;" "for the kingdom is the Lord's, and he is governor among the nations." "The angels that sinned he cast down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." The closing scenes of this world complete these transcendent conceptions of the majesty and power of God. The dead of all ages rise from their graves at his voice: and the sea gives up the dead which are in it. Before his face heaven and earth fly away; the stars fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven are shaken. The dead, small and great, stand before God, and are divided as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats. The wicked go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.

4. Of these amazing views of the omnipotence of God, spread almost through every page of the Scriptures, the power lies in their truth. They are not eastern exaggerations, mistaken for sublimity. Every thing in nature answers to them, and renews from age to age the energy of the impression which they cannot but make on the reflecting mind. The order of the astral revolutions indicates the constant presence of an invisible but incomprehensible power. The seas hurl the weight of their billows upon the rising shores, but every where find a "bound fixed by a perpetual decree." The tides reach their height; if they flowed on for a few hours, the earth would change places with the bed of the sea; but, under an invisible control, they become refluent. The expression, "He toucheth the mountains and

they smoke,” is not mere imagery:--every volcano is a testimony of its truth; and earthquakes proclaim, that, before him, “the pillars of the world tremble.” Men collected into armies, or populous nations, give us vast ideas of human power; but let an army be placed amidst the sand storms and burning winds of the desert, as, in the east; or, before “his frost,” as in our own day in Russia, where one of the mightiest armaments was seen retreating before, or perishing under, an unexpected visitation of snow and storm; or let the utterly helpless state of a populous country which has been visited by famine, or by a resistless pestilential disease, be reflected upon; and we feel that it is scarcely a figure of speech to say, that “all nations before him are less than nothing and vanity.”

5. Nor, in reviewing this doctrine of Scripture, ought the great practical uses made of the omnipotence of God, by the sacred writers, to be overlooked. By them nothing is said for the mere display of knowledge, as in Heathen writers; and we have no speculations without a subservient moral. To excite and keep alive in man the fear and worship of God, and to bring him to a felicitous confidence in that almighty power which pervades and controls all things, are the noble ends of those ample displays of the omnipotence of God, which roll through the sacred volume with a sublimity that inspiration only could supply. “Declare his glory among the Heathen, his marvellous works among all nations; for great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised.--Glory and honour are in his presence, and strength and gladness in his place.--Give unto the Lord, ye kindreds of the people, give unto the Lord glory and strength; give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name.--The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?--The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid? If God be for us, who then can be against us? Our help standeth in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth.--What time I am afraid, I will trust in thee.”--Thus, as one observes, 43“our natural fears, of which we must have many, remit us to God, and remind us, since we know what God is, to lay hold on his almighty power.”

6. Ample, however, as are these views of the power of God, the subject is not exhausted. As, when the Scriptures speak of the eternity of God, they declare it so as to give us a mere glimpse of that fearful peculiarity of the divine nature, that God is the fountain of being to himself, and that he is eternal, because he is the “I am;” so we are taught not to measure God’s omnipotence by the actual displays of it which we see around us. These are the manifestations of the fact, but not the measure of the attribute; and should we resort to the discoveries of modern philosophy, which, by the help of instruments, has so greatly enlarged the known boundaries of the visible universe, and add to the stars which are visible to the naked eye, those new exhibitions of the divine power in the nebulous appearances of

the heavens which are resolvable into myriads of distinct celestial luminaries, whose immense distances commingle their light before it reaches our eyes; we thus almost infinitely expand the circle of created existence, and enter upon a formerly unknown and overwhelming range of divine operation. But still we are only reminded, that his power is truly almighty and measureless--“Lo, all these are parts of his ways; but how little a portion is known of him, and the thunder of his power who can understand?” It is a mighty conception that we form of a power from which all other power is derived, and to which it is subordinate; which nothing can oppose; which can beat down and annihilate all other power whatever; which operates in the most perfect manner, at once, in an instant, with the utmost ease; but the Scriptures lead us to the contemplation of greater and even unfathomable depths. The omnipotence of God is inconceivable and boundless. It arises from the infinite perfection of God, that his power can never be actually exhausted; and, in every imaginable instant in eternity, that inexhaustible power of God can, if it please him, be adding either more creatures to those in existence, or greater perfection to them; since “it belongs to self-existent being, to be always full and communicative, and, to the communicated contingent being, to be ever empty and craving.”

7. One limitation of the divine power it is true we can conceive, but it detracts nothing from its perfection. Where things in themselves imply a contradiction, as that a body may be extended and not extended, in a certain place and not in it, at the same time; such things cannot be done by God, because contradictions are impossible in their own nature. Nor is it any derogation from the divine power to say, they cannot be done; for as the object of the understanding, of the eye, and the ear, is that which is intelligible, visible, and audible; so the object of power must be that which is possible; and as it is no prejudice to the most perfect understanding, or sight, or hearing, that it does not understand what is not intelligible, or see what is not visible, or hear what is not audible; so neither is it any diminution to the most perfect power, that it does not do what is not possible. In like manner, God cannot do any thing that is repugnant to his other perfections: he cannot lie, nor deceive, nor deny himself; for this would be injurious to his truth. He cannot love sin, nor punish innocence; for this would destroy his holiness and goodness: and therefore to ascribe a power to him that is inconsistent with the rectitude of his nature, is not to magnify but debase him; for all unrighteousness is weakness, a defection from right reason, a deviation from the perfect rule of action, and arises from a want of goodness and power. In a word, since all the attributes of God are essentially the same, a power in him which tends to destroy any other attribute of the divine nature, must be a power destructive of itself. Well, therefore, may we conclude him absolutely omnipotent, who, by being able to effect all things consistent with his perfections, showeth

infinite ability, and, by not being able to do any thing repugnant to the same perfections, demonstrates himself subject to no infirmity.

8. Nothing certainly in the finest writings of antiquity, were all their best thoughts collected as to the majesty and power of God, can bear any comparison with the views thus presented to us by divine revelation. Were we to forget, for a moment, what is the fact, that their noblest notions stand connected with fancies and vain speculations which deprive them of their force, still their thoughts never rise so high; the current is broken, the round of lofty conception is not completed, and, unconnected as their views of divine power were with the eternal destiny of man, and the very reason of creation, we never hear in them, as in the Scriptures, “the THUNDER of his power.”

ALMOND TREE, לוז. Arabic, lauz. Translated hazel, Gen. xxx, 37; שקד, rendered almond, Gen. xliii, 11; Exod. xxv, 33, 34; xxxvii, 19, 20; Num. xvii, 8; Eccles. xii, 5; and Jer. i, 11. The first name may be that of the tree; the other, that of the fruit, or nut.

A tree resembling the peach tree in its leaves and blossoms, but the fruit is longer and more compressed, the outer green coat is thinner and drier when ripe, and the shell of the stone is not so rugged. This stone, or nut, contains a kernel, which is the only esculent part. The whole arrives at maturity in September, when the outer tough cover splits open and discharges the nut. From the circumstance of its blossoming the earliest of any of the trees, beginning as soon as the rigour of winter is past, and before it is in leaf, it has its Hebrew name shakad, which comes from a verb signifying to make haste, to be in a hurry, or to awake early. To the forwardness of the almond tree there seems to be a reference in Jeremiah: “The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Jeremiah, what seest thou? And I said, I see a rod of an almond tree. Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten my word to perform it;” or rather, “I am hastening, or watching over my word to fulfil it,” Jer. i, 11, 12. In this manner it is rendered by the Seventy; 44and by the Vulgate, *Vigilabo ego super verbum meum*. [I will watch over my word.] This is the first vision with which the Prophet was honoured; and his attention is roused by a very significant emblem of that severe correction with which the Most High was hastening to visit his people for their iniquity; and from the species of tree to which the rod belonged, he is warned of its near approach. The idea which the appearance of the almond rod suggested to his mind, is confirmed by the exposition of God himself: “I am watching over, or on account of, my word to fulfil it;” and this double mode of instruction, first by emblem, and then by exposition, was certainly intended to make a deeper impression on the mind both of Jeremiah and of the people to whom he was sent.



It is probable that the rods which the princes of Israel bore, were scions of the almond tree, at once the ensign of their office, and the emblem of their vigilance. Such, we know from the testimony of Scripture, was the rod of Aaron; which renders it exceedingly probable, that the rods of the other chiefs were from the same tree.

The hoary head is beautifully compared by Solomon to the almond tree, covered in the earliest days of spring with its snow white flowers, before a single leaf has budded: "The almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and desire shall fail," Eccl. xii, 5. Man has existed in this world but a few days, when old age begins to appear, sheds its snows upon his head, prematurely nips his hopes, darkens his earthly prospects, and hurries him into the grave.

ALMUG TREE, a certain kind of wood, mentioned 1 Kings, x, 11; 2 Chron. ii, 8; ix, 10, 11. Jerom and the Vulgate render it, ligna thyina, and the Septuagint ξύλα πλεκτητά, wrought wood. Several critics understand it to mean gummy wood; but a wood abounding in resin must be very unfit for the uses to which this is said to be applied. Celsus queries if it be not the sandal; but Michaelis thinks the particular species of wood to be wholly unknown to us. Dr. Shaw supposes that the almug tree was the cypress; and he observes that the wood of this tree is still used in Italy and other places for violins, harpsichords, and other stringed instruments.

ALOE, עלר, a plant with broad leaves, nearly two inches thick, prickly and serrated. It grows about two feet high. A very bitter gum is extracted from it, used for medicinal purposes, and anciently for embalming dead bodies. Nicodemus is said, John xix, 39, to have brought one hundred pounds' weight of myrrh and aloes to embalm the body of Jesus. The quantity has been exclaimed against by certain Jews, as being enough for fifty bodies. But instead of ἑκατὸν it might originally have been written δέκατον, ten pounds' weight. However, at the funeral of Herod there were five hundred ἀρωματόφοροις, spice bearers; and at that of R. Gamaliel, eighty pounds of opobalsamum were used.

The wood which God showed Moses, that with it he might sweeten the waters of Marah, is called alvah, Exod. xv, 25. The word has some relation to aloe; and some interpreters are of opinion that Moses used a bitter sort of wood, that so the power of God might be the more remarkable. Mr. Bruce mentions a town, or large village, by the name of Elvah. It is thickly planted with trees; is the oasis parva of the ancients; and the last inhabited place to the west that is under the jurisdiction of Egypt. He also observes that the Arabs call a shrub or tree, not unlike our hawthorn, either in wood

or flower, by the name of elvah. “It was this,” say they, “with which Moses sweetened the waters of Marah; and with this, too, did Kalib Ibn el Walid sweeten those of Elvah, once bitter, and give the place the name of this circumstance.” It may be that God directed Moses to the very wood proper for the purpose. M. Neibuhr, when in these parts, inquired after wood capable of this effect, but could gain no information of any such. It will not, however, from hence follow that Moses really used a bitter wood; but, as Providence usually works by the proper and fit means to accomplish its ends, it seems likely that the wood he made use of was, in some degree at least, corrective of that quality which abounded in the water, and so rendered it potable. This seems to have been the opinion of the author of Ecclesiasticus, xxxviii, 5. That other water, also, requires some correction, and that such a correction is applied to it, appears from the custom in Egypt in respect to that of the Nile, which, though somewhat muddy, is rendered pure and salutary by being put into jars, the inside of which is rubbed with a paste made of bitter almonds. The first discoverers of the Floridas are said to have corrected the stagnant and fetid water they found there, by infusing in it branches of sassafras; and it is understood that the first inducement of the Chinese to the general use of tea, was to correct the water of their ponds and rivers.

The Lign-Aloe, or agallochum, Num. xxiv, 6; Psalm xlv, 9; and Cantic. iv, 14. אהלה, masculine, אהל, whose plural is אהלים, is a small tree about eight or ten feet high. That the flower of this plant yielded a fragrance, is assured to us in the following extract from Swinburne’s Travels, letter xii: “This morning, like many of the foregoing ones, was delicious. The sun rose gloriously out of the sea, and all the air around was perfumed with the effluvia of the aloe, as its rays sucked up the dew from the leaves.” This extremely bitter plant contains under the bark three sorts of wood. The first is black, solid, and weighty; the second is of a tawny colour, of a light spongy texture, very porous, and filled with a resin extremely fragrant and agreeable; the third kind of wood, which is the heart, has a strong aromatic odour, and is esteemed in the east more precious than gold itself. It is used for perfuming habits and apartments, and is administered as a cordial in fainting and epileptic fits. These pieces, called calunbac, are carefully preserved in pewter boxes, to prevent their drying. When they are used they are ground upon a marble with such liquids as are best suited to the purpose for which they are intended. This wood, mentioned Cantic. iv, 14, in conjunction with several other odoriferous plants there referred to, was 45in high esteem among the Hebrews for its exquisite exhalations.

The scented aloe, and each shrub that showers  
Gum from its veins, and odours from its flowers.

Thus the son of Sirach, Ecclesiasticus xxiv, 15: "I gave a sweet smell like the cinnamon and aspalathus. I yielded a pleasant odour like the best myrrh; like galbanum and onyx, and fragrant storax, and like the fume of frankincense in the tabernacle." It may not be amiss to observe that the Persian translator renders *ahalim*, sandal wood; and the same was the opinion of a certain Jew in Arabia who was consulted by Neibuhr.

ALPHA, the first letter of the Greek alphabet; Omega being the last letter. Hence Alpha and Omega is a title which Christ appropriates to himself, Rev. i, 8; xxi, 6; xxii, 13; as signifying the beginning and the end, the first and the last, and thus properly denoting his perfection and eternity.

ALPHEUS, father of James the less, Matt. x, 3; Luke vi, 15. Alpheus was the husband of Mary, believed to have been sister to the mother of Christ; for which reason, James is called the Lord's brother; but the term brother is too general in its application to fix their relation, though the fact is probable. Many are of opinion that Cleopas, mentioned Luke xxiv, 18, is the same as Alpheus; Alpheus being his Greek name, and Cleopas his Hebrew, or Syriac name, according to the custom of this province, (or of the time,) where men often had two names; by one of which they were known to their friends and countrymen, by the other to the Romans or strangers.

2. Alpheus, father of Levi, or Matthew, whom Jesus took to be an Apostle and Evangelist, Mark ii, 14.

ALTAR. Sacrifices are nearly as ancient as worship, and altars are of almost equal antiquity. Scripture speaks of altars, erected by the patriarchs, without describing their form, or the materials of which they were composed. The altar which Jacob set up at Bethel, was the stone which had served him for a pillow; Gideon sacrificed on the rock before his house. The first altars which God commanded Moses to raise, were of earth or rough stones; and it was declared that if iron were used in constructing them they would become impure, Exod. xx, 24, 25. The altar which Moses enjoined Joshua to build on Mount Ebal, was to be of unpolished stones, Deut. xxvii, 5; Josh. viii, 31; and it is very probable that such were those built by Samuel, Saul, and David. The altar which Solomon erected in the temple was of brass, but filled, it is believed, with rough stones, 2 Chron. iv, 1-3. It was twenty cubits long, twenty wide, and ten high. That built at Jerusalem, by Zerubbabel, after the return from Babylon, was of rough stones; as was that of Maccabees. Josephus says that the altar which in his time was in the temple was of rough stones, fifteen cubits high, forty long, and forty wide.

Among the Romans altars were of two kinds, the higher and the lower; the higher were intended for the celestial gods, and were called *altaria*, from *altus*; the lower were for the terrestrial and infernal gods, and were called *aræ*. Those dedicated to the heavenly gods were raised a great height above the surface of the earth; those of the terrestrial gods were almost even with the surface; and those for the infernal deities were only holes dug in the ground called *scrobiculi*.

Before temples were in use the altars were placed in the groves, highways, or on tops of mountains, inscribed with the names, ensigns, or characters of the respective gods to whom they belonged. The great temples at Rome generally contained three altars; the first in the sanctuary, at the foot of the statue, for incense and libations; the second before the gate of the temple, for the sacrifices of victims; and the third was a portable one for the offerings and sacred vestments or vessels to lie upon. The ancients used to swear upon the altars upon solemn occasions, such as confirming alliances, treaties of peace, &c. They were also places of refuge, and served as an asylum and sanctuary to all who fled to them, whatever their crimes were.

The principal altars among the Jews were those of incense, of burnt-offering, and the altar or table for the shew bread. The altar of incense was a small table of shittim wood covered with plates of gold. It was a cubit long, a cubit broad, and two cubits high. At the four corners were four horns. The priest, whose turn it was to officiate, burnt incense on this altar, at the time of the morning sacrifice between the sprinkling of the blood and the laying of the pieces of the victim on the altar of burnt-offering. He did the same also in the evening, between the laying of the pieces on the altar and the drink-offering. At the same time the people prayed in silence, and their prayers were offered up by the priests. The altar of burnt-offering was of shittim wood also, and carried upon the shoulders of the priests, by staves of the same wood overlaid with brass. In Moses's days it was five cubits square, and three high: but it was greatly enlarged in the days of Solomon, being twenty cubits square, and ten in height. It was covered with brass, and had a horn at each corner to which the sacrifice was tied. This altar was placed in the open air, that the smoke might not sully the inside of the tabernacle or temple. On this altar the holy fire was renewed from time to time, and kept constantly burning. Hereon, likewise, the sacrifices of lambs and bullocks were burnt, especially a lamb every morning at the third hour, or nine of the clock, and a lamb every afternoon at three, *Exod. xx, 24, 25; xxvii, 1, 2, 4; xxxviii, 1*. The altar of burnt-offering had the privilege of being a sanctuary or place of refuge. The wilful murderer, indeed, sought protection there in vain; for by the express command of God he might be dragged to justice, even from the altar. The altar or table of shew bread was of shittim wood also, covered with plates

of gold, and had a border round it adorned with sculpture. It was two cubits long, one wide, and one and a half in height. This table stood in the sanctum sanctorum, [holy of holies,] and upon it were placed the loaves of shew bread. After the return of the Jews from their captivity, and the building of the second temple, the form and size of the altars were somewhat changed.

Sacrifices according to the laws of Moses, could not be offered except by the priests; and at any other place than on the altar of the tabernacle or the temple. Furthermore, they were not to be offered to idols, nor with any superstitious rites. See Lev. xvii, 1–7; Deut. xii, 15, 16. Without these precautionary measures, the true religion would hardly have been secure. If a different arrangement had been adopted, if the priests had been scattered about to various altars, without being subjected to the salutary restraint which would result from a mutual observation of each other, they would no doubt some of them have willingly consented to the worship of idols; and others, in their separate situation, would not have been in a condition to resist the wishes of the multitude, had those wishes been wrong. The necessity of sacrificing at one altar, (that of the tabernacle or temple,) is frequently and emphatically insisted on, Deut. xii, 13, 14; and all other altars are disapproved, Lev. xxvi, 30, compare Joshua xxii, 9–34. Notwithstanding this, it appears that, subsequently to the time of Moses, especially in the days of the kings, altars were multiplied; but they fell under suspicions, although some of them were perhaps sacred to the worship of the true God. It is, nevertheless, true, that prophets, whose characters were above all suspicion, sacrificed, in some instances, in other places than the one designated by the laws, 1 Sam. xiii, 3–14; xvi, 1–5; 1 Kings xviii, 21–40.

AMALEKITES, a people whose country adjoined the southern border of the land of Canaan, in the north-western part of Arabia Petræa. They are generally supposed to have been the descendants of Amalek, the son of Eliphaz, and grandson of Esau. But Moses speaks of the Amalekites long before this Amalek was born; namely in the days of Abraham, when Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, devastated their country, Gen. xiv, 7; from which it may be inferred that there was some other and more ancient Amalek, from whom this people sprang. The Arabians have a tradition that this Amalek was a son of Ham; and when we consider that so early as the march from Egypt the Amalekites were a people powerful enough to attack the Israelites, it is far more probable that they should derive their ancestry from Ham, than from the then recent stock of the grandson of Esau. It may also be said, that the character and fate of this people were more consonant with the dealings of Providence toward the families of the former. This

more early origin of the Amalekites will likewise explain why Balaam called them the “first of the nations.”

They are supposed by some to have been a party or tribe of the shepherds who invaded Egypt, and kept it in subjection for two hundred years. This will agree with the Arabian tradition as to their descent. It also agrees with their pastoral and martial habits, as well as with their geographical position; which was perhaps made choice of on their retiring from Egypt, adjoining that of their countrymen the Philistines, whose history is very similar. It also furnishes a motive for their hostility to the Jews, and their treacherous attempt to destroy them in the desert. The ground of this hostility has been very generally supposed to have been founded in the remembrance of Jacob’s depriving their progenitor of his birthright. But we do not find that the Edomites, who had this ground for a hatred to the Jews, made any attempt to molest them, nor that Moses ever reproaches the Amalekites for attacking the Israelites as their brethren; nor do we ever find in Scripture that the Amalekites joined with the Edomites, but always with the Canaanites and the Philistines. These considerations would be sufficient, had we no other reasons for believing them not to be of the stock of Esau. They may, however, be deduced from a higher origin; and viewing them as Cuthite shepherds and warriors, we have an adequate explanation both of their imperious and warlike character, and of the motive of their hostility to the Jews in particular. If expelled with the rest of their race from Egypt, they could not but recollect the fatal overthrow at the Red Sea; and if not participators in that catastrophe, still, as members of the same family, they must bear this event in remembrance with bitter feelings of revenge. But an additional motive is not wanting for this hostility, especially for its first act. The Amalekites probably knew that the Israelites were advancing to take possession of the land of Canaan, and resolved to frustrate the purposes of God in this respect. Hence they did not wait for their near approach to that country, but came down from their settlements, on its southern borders, to attack them unawares at Rephidim. Be this as it may, the Amalekites came on the Israelites, when encamped at that place, little expecting such an assault. Moses commanded Joshua, with a chosen band, to attack the Amalekites; while he, with Aaron and Hur, went up the mountain Horeb. During the engagement, Moses held up his hands to heaven; and so long as they were maintained in this attitude, the Israelites prevailed, but when through weariness they fell, the Amalekites prevailed. Aaron and Hur, seeing this, held up his hands till the latter were entirely defeated with great slaughter, *Exod. xvii.*

The Amalekites were indeed the earliest and the most bitter enemies the Jews had to encounter. They attacked them in the desert; and sought every opportunity afterward of molesting them. Under the judges, the

Amalekites, in conjunction with the Midianites, invaded the land of Israel; when they were defeated by Gideon, Judges vi, vii. But God, for their first act of treachery, had declared that he would “utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven;” a denunciation which was not long after accomplished. Saul destroyed their entire army, with the exception of Agag their king; for sparing whom, and permitting the Israelites to take the spoil of their foes, he incurred the displeasure of the Lord, who took the sceptre from him. Agag was immediately afterward hewn in pieces by Samuel, 1 Sam. xv. It is remarkable, that most authors make Saul’s pursuit of the Amalekites to commence from the lower Euphrates, instead of from the southern border of the land of Canaan. (See Havilah.) David a few years after, defeated another of their armies; of whom only four hundred men escaped on camels, 1 Sam. xxx; after which event, the Amalekites appear to have been obliterated as a nation.

AMASA, the son of Ithra and Abigail, David’s sister, whom Absalom, when he rebelled against his father, appointed general of his army, 2 Sam. xvii, 25. Amasa having thus received the command of Absalom’s troops, engaged his cousin Joab, general of David’s army, and was worsted. But, after the defeat of Absalom’s party, David, being angry at Joab for killing Absalom, pardoned Amasa, and gave him the command of his own army. Upon the revolt of Sheba, the son of Bichri, David gave orders to Amasa to assemble all Judah and march against Sheba. Amasa not being able to form his army in the time prescribed, David directed Abishai to pursue Sheba with the guards. Joab, with his people, accompanied him; and these troops were scarcely got as far as the great stone in Gibeon, before Amasa came and joined them with his forces. Then said Joab to Amasa, “Art thou in health, my brother?” and took him by the beard with his right hand to kiss him; and treacherously smote him under the fifth rib, so that he expired.

AMAZIAH, one of the kings of Judah, 2 Chron. xxiv, 27, son of Joash, succeeded his father A. M. 3165, B. C. 839. He was twenty-five years of age when he began to reign, and reigned twenty-nine years at Jerusalem. “He did good in the sight of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart.” When settled in his kingdom, he put to death the murderers of his father, but avoided a barbarous practice then too common, to destroy also their children; in which he had respect to the precept, “The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin,” Deut. xxiv, 16; 2 Chron. xxv, 1–3.

In the muster which Amaziah made of his people, he found three hundred thousand men able to bear arms. He hired, besides, one hundred thousand

men of Israel; for which he paid the king of Israel a hundred talents, about thirty-four thousand pounds English. His design was to employ these troops against Edom, which had revolted from Judah, in the reign of Joram, about fifty-four years before, 2 Kings, viii, 20. But a prophet of the Lord came to him, and said, "O king, let not the army of Israel go with thee; for the Lord is not with Israel." Amaziah, hereupon, sent back those troops; and they returning, strongly irritated against Amaziah, dispersed themselves over the cities of Judah, from Bethoron to Samaria, killed three thousand men, and carried off a great booty, to make themselves amends for the loss of the plunder of Edom. Amaziah, with his own forces gave battle to the Edomites in the Valley of Salt, and defeated them; but having thus punished Edom, and taken their idols, he adored them as his own deities. This provoked the Lord, who permitted Amaziah to be so blinded as to believe himself invincible. He therefore sent to defy the king of Israel, saying, "Come, let us look one another in the face." The motive of this challenge was probably to oblige Joash, king of Israel, to repair the ravages which his troops had committed on their return homewards. Joash answered him by the fable of the cedar of Lebanon, and the thistle trodden down by a beast, 2 Kings xiv, 8, 9. But Amaziah, deaf to these reasonings, advanced to Bethshemesh, and was defeated and taken prisoner there, by Joash, who carried him to Jerusalem. Joash ordered the demolition of four hundred cubits of the city wall, carried to Samaria all the gold and silver, the rich vessels of the house of God, the treasuries of the royal palace, and the sons of those among his own people who had been hostages there. Amaziah reigned after this, fifteen or sixteen years at Jerusalem, but returned not to the Lord. He endeavoured to escape from a conspiracy to Lachish; but was assassinated. He was buried with his ancestors in the city of David, and Uzziah, or Azariah, his son, about sixteen years of age, succeeded him.

AMBASSADOR, a messenger sent by a sovereign, to transact affairs of great moment. Ministers of the Gospel are called ambassadors, because, in the name of Jesus Christ the King of kings, they declare his will to men, and propose the terms of their reconciliation to God, 2 Cor. v, 20; Eph. vi, 20. Eliakim, Shebna, and Joah, the servants of king Hezekiah, were called "ambassadors of peace." In their master's name they earnestly solicited a peace from the Assyrian monarch, but were made "to weep bitterly" with the disappointment and refusal, Isaiah xxxiii, 7.

AMBER,  $\lambda\mu\psi\eta$ , Ezek. i, 4, 27; viii, 2. The amber is a hard inflammable bitumen. When rubbed it is highly endowed with that remarkable property called electricity, a word which the moderns have formed from its Greek name ἤλεκτρον. But the ancients had also a mixed metal of fine copper and silver, resembling the amber in colour, and called by the same name. From



the version of Ezekiel i, 4, by the LXX, Καὶ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ αὐτοῦ ὡς ὄρασις ἤλεκτρον ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ πυρὸς, “And in the midst of it as the appearance of electrum in the midst of the fire,” it appears that those translators by ἤλεκτρον, could not mean amber, which grows dim as soon as it feels the fire, and quickly dissolves into a resinous or pitchy substance; but the mixed metal above mentioned, which is much celebrated by the ancients for its beautiful lustre, and which, when exposed to the fire like other metals, grows more bright and shining. St. Jerom, Theodoret, St. Gregory and Origen think, that, in the above cited passages from Ezekiel, a precious and highly polished metal is meant.

48AMEN. אָמֵן, in Hebrew, signifies true, faithful, certain. It is used likewise in affirmation; and was often thus employed by our Saviour: “Amen, amen,” that is, “Verily, verily.” It is also understood as expressing a wish, “Amen! so be it!” or an affirmation, “Amen, yes, I believe it:” Num. v, 22. She shall answer, “Amen! Amen!” Deut. xxvii, 15, 16, 17, &c. “All the people shall answer, Amen! Amen!” 1 Cor. xiv, 16. “How shall he who occupieth the place of the unlearned, say, Amen! at thy giving of thanks? seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest.” “The promises of God are Amen in Christ;” that is, certain, confirmed, granted, 2 Cor. i, 20. The Hebrews end the five books of Psalms, according to their distribution of them, with “Amen, amen;” which the Septuagint translate, Γένοιτο, γένοιτο, and the Latins, Fiat, fiat. The Gospels, &c, are ended with AMEN. The Greek, Latin, and other churches, preserve this word in their prayers, as well as alleluia and hosanna. At the conclusion of the public prayers, the people anciently answered with a loud voice, “Amen!” and Jerom says, that, at Rome, when the people answered, “Amen!” the sound was like a clap of thunder, in similitudinem cœlestis tonitruī Amen reboat. [Amen rings again like a peal of thunder.] The Jews assert that the gates of heaven are opened to him who answers, “Amen!” with all his might.

The Jewish doctors give three rules for pronouncing the word: 1. That it be not pronounced too hastily and rapidly, but with a grave and distinct voice. 2. That it be not louder than the tone of him that blesses. 3. That it be expressed in faith, with a certain persuasion that God would bless them, and hear their prayers.

Amen is a title of our Lord, “The Amen, the true and faithful witness,” Rev. i, 14.

AMETHYST. אֶמֶתֶשֶׁת, Exod. xxviii, 19; and xxix, 12; and once in the New Testament, Rev. XXI, 20, ἀμέθυστος.

A transparent gem, of a colour which seems composed of a strong blue and deep red; and, according as either prevails, affords different tinges of purple, sometimes approaching to violet, and sometimes even fading to a rose colour. The stone called amethyst by the ancients was evidently the same with that now generally known by this name; which is far from being the case with regard to some other gems. The oriental is the hardest, scarcest, and most valuable. It was the ninth stone in the pectoral of the high priest, and is mentioned as the twelfth in the foundations of the New Jerusalem.

AMMINADAB, or ABINADAB, a Levite, and an inhabitant of Kirjath-jearim, with whom the ark was deposited after it was brought back from the land of the Philistines, 1 Sam. vii. This Amminadab dwelt in Gibeath, that is to say, in the highest part of the city of Kirjath-jearim.

2. The chariots of Amminadab are mentioned, Canticles vi, 12, as being extremely light. He is thought to have been some celebrated charioteer, whose horses were singularly swift.

AMMON, or HAMMON, or JUPITER-AMMON, an epithet given to Jupiter in Lybia, where was a celebrated temple of that deity under the denomination of Jupiter Ammon, which was visited by Alexander the Great.

The word Amoun, which imports "shining," according to Jablonski, denoted the effects produced by the sun on attaining the equator, such as the increase of the days; a more splendid light; and, above all, the fortunate presage of the inundation of the Nile, and its consequent abundance.

Ammon is by others derived from Ham, the son of Noah, who first peopled Egypt and Lybia, after the flood; and, when idolatry began to gain ground soon after this period, became the chief deity of those two countries, in which his descendants continued. A temple, it is said, was built to his honour, in the midst of the sandy deserts of Lybia, upon a spot of good ground, about two leagues broad, which formed a kind of island or oasis in a sea of sand. He was esteemed the Zeus of Greece, and the Jupiter of Latium, as well as the Ammon of the Egyptians. In process of time, these two names were joined; and he was called Jupiter Ammon. For this reason the city of Ammon, No-ammon, or the city of Ham, was called by the Greeks Diospolis, or the city of Jupiter. Plutarch says, that of all the Egyptian deities which seemed to have any correspondence with the Zeus of Greece, Amon or Ammon was the most peculiar and appropriate. From Egypt his name and worship were brought into Greece; as indeed were almost all the names of all the deities that were there worshipped. Jupiter

Ammon, or the Egyptian Jupiter, was usually represented under the figure of a ram; though in some medals he appears of a human shape, having only two ram's horns growing out beneath his ears. The Egyptians, says Proclus, in the *Timæus* of Plato, had a singular veneration for the ram, because the image of Ammon bore its head, and because this first sign of the zodiac was the presage of the fruits of the earth. Eusebius adds, that this symbol marked the conjunction of the sun and moon in the sign of the ram.

2. Ammon, or Ben-Ammi, the son of Lot, by his youngest daughter, Gen. xix, 38. He was the father of the Ammonites, and dwelt on the east side of the Dead Sea, in the mountains of Gilead.

AMMONIANS, the disciples of Ammonius Saccas, of the Alexandrian school. His character was so equivocal, that it is disputed whether he was a Heathen or a Christian. Mr. Milner calls him "a Pagan Christian," who imagined "that all religions, vulgar and philosophical, Grecian and barbarous, Jewish and Gentile, meant the same thing in substance. He undertook, by allegorizing and subtilizing various fables and systems, to make up a coalition of all sects and religions; and from his labours, continued by his disciples,--some of whose works still remain,--his followers were taught to look on Jew, philosopher, vulgar, Pagan, and Christian, as all of the same creed," and worshippers of the same God, whether denominated "Jehovah, Jove, or Lord."

AMMONITES, the descendants of Ammon, the son of Lot. They took possession of the country called by their name, after having driven out the Zamzummims, who were its ancient inhabitants. The precise period at which this expulsion took place is not ascertained. The Ammonites had kings, and were uncircumcised, Jer. ix, 25, 26, and seem to have been principally addicted to husbandry. They, as well as the Moabites, were among the nations whose peace or prosperity the Israelites were forbidden to disturb, Deut. ii, 19, &c. However, neither the one nor the other were to be admitted into the congregation to the tenth generation, because they did not come out to relieve them in the wilderness, and were implicated in hiring Balaam to curse them. Their chief and peculiar deity is, in Scripture, called Moloch. Chemosh was also a god of the Ammonites. Before the Israelites entered Canaan, the Amorites conquered a great part of the country belonging to the Ammonites and Moabites; but it was retaken by Moses, and divided between the tribes of Gad and Reuben. Previous to the time of Jephthah, B. C. 1188, the Ammonites engaged as principals in a war, under a king whose name is not given, against the Israelites. This prince, determining to recover the ancient country of the Ammonites, made a sudden irruption into it, reduced the land, and kept the inhabitants in subjection for eighteen years. He afterward crossed Jordan with a design

of falling upon the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Ephraim. The Israelites resisted the invader; and, assembling at Mizpeh, chose Jephthah for their general, and sent an expostulatory message to the king of the Ammonites, Judges x, xi. The king replied, that those lands belonged to the Ammonites, who had been unjustly dispossessed of them by the Israelites, when they came out of Egypt, and exhorted Jephthah to restore them peaceably to the lawful owners. Jephthah remonstrated on the injustice of his claim; but finding a war inevitable, he fell upon the Ammonites near Aroer, and defeated them with great slaughter. On this occasion the Ammonites lost twenty cities; and thus an end was put, after eighteen years' bondage, to the tyranny of Ammon over the Israelites beyond Jordan. In the days of Saul, 1 Sam. xi, B. C. 1095, the old claim of the Ammonites was revived by Nahash their king, and they laid siege to the city of Jabesh. The inhabitants were inclined to acknowledge Nahash as their sovereign; but he would accept their submission only on condition that every one of them should consent to lose his right eye, and that thus he might fix a lasting reproach upon Israel: but from this humiliating and severe requisition they were delivered by Saul, who vanquished and dispersed the army of Nahash. Upon the death of Nahash, David sent ambassadors to his son and successor Hanun, to congratulate him on his accession; but these ambassadors were treated as spies, and dismissed in a very reproachful manner, 2 Sam. x. This indignity was punished by David with rigour. Rabbah, the capital of Hanun, and the other cities of Ammon, which resisted the progress of the conqueror, were destroyed and razed to the ground; and the inhabitants were put to death or reduced to servitude. In the reign of Jehoshaphat the Ammonites united with their brethren, the Moabites, and the inhabitants of Mount Seir, against the king of Judah; but they were completely routed. They were afterward overthrown by Uzziah, king of Judah, and made tributary, 2 Chron. xxvi, 8; and rebelling in the reign of his son Jotham, they were reduced to the necessity of purchasing peace at a very dear rate. After the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, were carried into captivity by Tiglath Pileser, B. C. 740, the Ammonites and Moabites took possession of the cities belonging to these tribes, and were reproached for it by Jeremiah, xlix, 1. Their ambassadors were exhorted to submit to Nebuchadnezzar, and threatened, on their refusal, with captivity and slavery, Jer. xxvii, 2, 3, 4. The Prophet Ezekiel, xxv, 4–10, denounces their entire destruction, and informs them, that God would deliver them up to the people of the east; and that the Ammonites should no more be mentioned among the nations: and this punishment they were to suffer for insulting the Israelites on account of their calamities, and the destruction of their temple by the Chaldeans. This malediction began to be inflicted upon them in the fifth year after the taking of Jerusalem, when Nebuchadnezzar made war against all the people around Judea, A. M. 3420 or 3421, B. C. 583. It is probable that Cyrus granted to the

Ammonites and Moabites liberty to return into their own country, whence they had been removed by Nebuchadnezzar; for they were exposed to the revolutions that were common to the people of Syria and Palestine, and were subject sometimes to the kings of Egypt, and sometimes to the kings of Syria. Polybius informs us, that Antiochus the Great took Rabbath, or Philadelphia, the capital of the Ammonites, demolished the walls, and put a garrison into it, A. M. 3806, B. C. 198. During the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Ammonites manifested their hatred to the Jews, and exercised great cruelties against such of them as lived in their parts. At length their city Jaser, and the neighbouring town, fell a prey to the Jews, who smote the men, carried their wives and children into captivity, and plundered and burned the city. Thus ended their last conflict with the descendants of Israel. Ammon was, however, a highly productive and populous country when the Romans became masters of all the provinces of Syria; and several of the ten allied cities, which gave name to the celebrated Decapolis, were included within its boundaries. Even when first invaded by the Saracens, this country, including Moab, was enriched by the various benefits of trade, covered with a line of forts, and possessed some strong and populous cities. Volney bears witness, "that in the immense plains of the Hauran, ruins are continually to be met with, and that what is said of its actual fertility perfectly corresponds with the idea given of it in the Hebrew writings." The fact of its natural fertility is corroborated by every traveller who has visited it. And "it is evident," says Burckhardt, 50 "that the whole country must have been extremely well cultivated in order to have afforded subsistence to the inhabitants of so many towns," as are now visible only in their ruins. While the fruitfulness of the land of Ammon, and the high degree of prosperity and power in which it subsisted long prior and long subsequent to the date of the predictions, are thus indisputably established by historical evidence and by existing proofs, the researches of recent travellers (who were actuated by the mere desire of exploring these regions and obtaining geographical information) have made known its present aspect; and testimony the most clear, unexceptionable, and conclusive, has been borne to the state of dire desolation to which it is and has long been reduced.

It was prophesied concerning Ammon, "Son of man, set thy face against the Ammonites, and prophesy against them. I will make Rabbah of the Ammonites a stable for camels and a couching place for flocks. Behold, I will stretch out my hand upon thee, and deliver thee for a spoil to the Heathen; I will cut thee off from the people, and cause thee to perish out of the countries; I will destroy thee. The Ammonites shall not be remembered among the nations. Rabbah" (the chief city) "of the Ammonites shall be a desolate heap. Ammon shall be a perpetual desolation," Ezek. xxv, 2, 5, 7, 10; xxi, 32; Jer. xlix, 2; Zeph. ii, 9.

Ammon was to be delivered to be a spoil to the Heathen--to be destroyed, and to be a perpetual desolation. "All this country, formerly so populous and flourishing, is now changed into a vast desert." (Seetzen's Travels.) Ruins are seen in every direction. The country is divided between the Turks and the Arabs, but chiefly possessed by the latter. The extortions of the one, and the depredations of the other, keep it in "perpetual desolation," and make it "a spoil to the Heathen." "The far greater part of the country is uninhabited, being abandoned to the wandering Arabs, and the towns and villages are in a state of total ruin." (Ibid.) "At every step are to be found the vestiges of ancient cities, the remains of many temples, public edifices, and Greek churches." (Burckhardt's Travels.) The cities are left desolate. "Many of the ruins present no objects of any interest. They consist of a few walls of dwelling houses, heaps of stones, the foundations of some public edifices, and a few cisterns filled up; there is nothing entire, though it appears that the mode of building was very solid, all the remains being formed of large stones. In the vicinity of Ammon there is a fertile plain interspersed with low hills, which for the greater part are covered with ruins." (Burckhardt's Travels in Syria.) While the country is thus despoiled and desolate, there are valleys and tracts throughout it which "are covered with a fine coat of verdant pasture, and are places of resort to the Bedouins, where they pasture their camels and their sheep." (Buckingham's Travels in Palestine.) "The whole way we traversed," says Seetzen, "we saw villages in ruins, and met numbers of Arabs with their camels," &c. Mr. Buckingham describes a building among the ruins of Ammon, "the masonry of which was evidently constructed of materials gathered from the ruins of other and older buildings on the spot. On entering it at the south end," he adds, "we came to an open square court, with arched recesses on each side, the sides nearly facing the cardinal points. The recesses in the northern and southern wall were originally open passages, and had arched door ways facing each other; but the first of these was found wholly closed up, and the last was partially filled up, leaving only a narrow passage, just sufficient for the entrance of one man and of the goats, which the Arab keepers drive in here occasionally for shelter during the night." He relates that he lay down among "flocks of sheep and goats," close beside the ruins of Ammon; and particularly remarks that, during the night, he "was almost entirely prevented from sleeping by the bleating of flocks." So literally true is it, although Seetzen, and Burckhardt, and Buckingham, who relate the facts, make no reference or allusion whatever to any of the prophecies, and travelled for a different object than the elucidation of the Scriptures,--that "the chief city of the Ammonites is a stable for camels, and a couching place for flocks."

“The Ammonites shall not be remembered among the nations.” While the Jews, who were long their hereditary enemies, continue as distinct a people as ever, though dispersed among all nations, no trace of the Ammonites remains; none are now designated by their name, nor do any claim descent from them. They did exist, however, long after the time when the eventual annihilation of their race was foretold; for they retained their name, and continued a great multitude until the second century of the Christian æra. (Justin Martyr.) “Yet they are cut off from the people. Ammon has perished out of the countries; it is destroyed.” No people is attached to its soil; none regard it as their country and adopt its name: “And the Ammonites are not remembered among the nations.”

“Rabbah” (Rabbah Ammon, the chief city of Ammon) “shall be a desolate heap.” Situated, as it was, on each side of the borders of a plentiful stream, encircled by a fruitful region, strong by nature and fortified by art, nothing could have justified the suspicion, or warranted the conjecture in the mind of an uninspired mortal, that the royal city of Ammon, whatever disasters might possibly befall it in the fate of war or change of masters, would ever undergo so total a transmutation as to become a desolate heap. But although, in addition to such tokens of its continuance as a city, more than a thousand years had given uninterrupted experience of its stability, ere the prophets of Israel denounced its fate; yet a period of equal length has now marked it out, as it exists to this day, a desolate heap, a perpetual or permanent desolation. Its ancient name is still preserved by the Arabs, and its site is now “covered with the ruins of private buildings--nothing of them remaining except the foundations and some of the door posts. The buildings, 51exposed to the atmosphere, are all in decay,” (Burckhardt’s Travels in Syria,) so that they may be said literally to form a desolate heap. The public edifices, which once strengthened or adorned the city, after a long resistance to decay, are now also desolate; and the remains of the most entire among them, subjected as they are to the abuse and spoliation of the wild Arabs, can be adapted to no better object than “a stable for camels.” Yet these broken walls and ruined palaces, says Mr. Keith, which attest the ancient splendour of Ammon, can now be made subservient, by means of a single act of reflection, to a far nobler purpose than the most magnificent edifices on earth can be, when they are contemplated as monuments on which the historic and prophetic truth of Scripture is blended in one bright inscription.

AMORITES, the descendants of Amori, or Hæmorri, or Amorrhæus, Gen. x, 16, the fourth son of Canaan, whose first possessions were in the mountains of Judea, among the other families of Canaan: but, growing strong above their fellows, and impatient of confinement within the narrow boundaries of their native district, they passed the Jordan, and extended

their conquests over the finest provinces of Moab and Ammon; seizing and maintaining possession of that extensive and almost insulated portion of country included between the rivers Jordan, Jabbok, and Arnon. This was the kingdom, and Heshbon the capital, of the Amorites, under Sihon their king, when the Israelites, in their way from Egypt, requested a passage through their country. This request, however, Sihon refused; and came out against them with all his force, when he was slain, his people extirpated, and his kingdom taken possession of by the Israelites. It was subsequently divided between the tribes of Reuben and Gad, Num. xiii, 29; xxi, 13, 25; Joshua v, 1; xi, 3; Judges xi, 19, 22.

AMOS, the fourth of the minor prophets, who in his youth had been a herdsman in Tekoa, a small town about four leagues southward of Jerusalem. He was sent to the people of Samaria, to bring them back to God by repentance, and reformation of manners. Hence it is natural to suppose that he must have been born within the territories of Israel, and that he only retired to Tekoa, on being expelled from Bethel by Amaziah, the priest of the calves at Bethel. He frequently complains of the violence offered him by those who endeavoured to impose silence on him. He boldly inveighs against the crying sins of the Israelites, such as idolatry, oppression, wantonness, and obstinacy. Nor does he spare the sins of Judah, such as their carnal security, sensuality, and injustice. He utters frequent threatenings against them both, and predicts their ruin. It is observable in this prophecy, that, as it begins with denunciations of judgment and destruction against the Syrians, Philistines, Tyrians, and other enemies of the Jews, so it concludes with comfortable promises of the restoration of the tabernacle of David, and the establishment of the kingdom of Christ. Amos was called to the prophetic office in the time of Uzziah, king of Judah, and Jeroboam, the son of Joash, king of Israel.

Some writers, in adverting to the condition of Amos, have, with a minute affectation of criticism, pretended to discover a certain rudeness and vulgarity in his style; and even Jerom is of opinion that he is deficient in magnificence and sublimity. He applies to him the words which St. Paul speaks of himself, that he was rude in speech, though not in knowledge; and his authority, says Bishop Lowth, "has influenced many commentators to represent him as entirely rude, and void of elegance; whereas it requires but little attention to be convinced that he is not a whit behind the very chiefest of the prophets;" equal to the greatest in loftiness of sentiment, and scarcely inferior to any in the splendour of his diction, and in the elegance of his composition. Mr. Locke has observed, that his comparisons are chiefly drawn from lions, and other animals, because he lived among, and was conversant with, such objects. But, indeed, the finest images and allusions, which adorn the poetical parts of Scripture, in general are drawn



from scenes of nature, and from the grand objects that range in her walks; and true genius ever delights in considering these as the real sources of beauty and magnificence. The whole book of Amos is animated with a fine and masculine eloquence.

AMULET, a charm or supposed preservative against diseases, witchcraft, or any other mischief. They were very frequent among the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans, and were made of stone, metal, animal substances, or, in short, any thing which a weak imagination suggested. The Jews were very superstitious in the use of amulets, but the Mishna forbids them, unless received from some person of whose cures, at least, three instances could be produced. The phylacteries worn by the Pharisees and others of the Jewish nation were a sort of amulets.

Amulets among the Greeks were called, φυλακτήρια, περιάπτα, ἀποτέλεσματα, περιάμματα, βρήβια, and ἐξκόλπια. The Latins called them amuleta, appensa, pentacula, &c. Remains of this superstition continue among ignorant people even in this country, which ought to be strongly discountenanced as weak or wicked. The word amulet is probably derived from amula, a small vessel with lustral water in it, anciently carried in the pocket for the sake of purification and expiation.

AMYRALDISM, a name given by some writers to the doctrine of universal grace, as explained and asserted by Amyraldus, or Moses Amyraut, and his followers, among the reformed in France, toward the middle of the seventeenth century. This doctrine principally consisted of the following particulars, viz. that God desires the happiness of all men, from which none are excluded by a divine decree; that none can obtain salvation without faith in Christ; that God refuses to none the power of believing, though he does not grant to all his assistance, that they may improve this power to saving purposes; and that many perish through their own fault. Those who embraced this doctrine were called Universalists, although, it is evident that they rendered grace universal in words, but partial in reality, and are chargeable with greater inconsistencies than the Supralapsarians. Amyraldus is said to have formed his system with a view of producing a reconciliation between the Lutherans and Calvinists. This theory was supported in England by Baxter. See Baxterianism.

ANABAPTISTS, a name given to those Christians who maintain that baptism ought always to be performed by immersion; that it ought not to be administered to children before the age of discretion; and that at this age it ought to be readministered to those who have been baptized in their infancy. They affirm that the administration of this sacrament is neither valid nor useful, if it be done by sprinkling only, and not by immersion; or

if the persons who receive it be not in a condition to give the reasons of their belief. The Anabaptists of Germany brought the name into great odium by their turbulent conduct; but by the people of this persuasion generally, the conduct of these fanatics was at all times condemned. In England they form a most respectable, though not a very numerous body.

The word Anabaptist is compounded of ἀνά, new, and βαπτιστής, a baptist; and has been indiscriminately applied to people of very different principles. Many of them object to the name, because the baptism of infants by sprinkling is, in their opinion, no baptism; and others hold nothing in common excepting some one or other of the above mentioned opinions concerning baptism. See Baptism.

**ANAGOGICAL.** This is one of the four senses in which Scripture may be interpreted, viz. the literal, allegorical, anagogical, and tropological. The anagogical sense is given when the text is explained with regard to the end which Christians should have in view, that is, eternal life: for example, the rest of the Sabbath, in the anagogical sense, corresponds to the repose of everlasting blessedness.

**ANAK, ANAKIM,** famous giants in Palestine. Anak, father of the Anakim, was son of Arba, who gave his name to Kirjath-Arba, or Hebron. Anak had three sons, Sheshai, Ahiman, and Talmi, whose descendants were terrible for their fierceness and stature. The Hebrew spies reported that in comparison of those monstrous men, they themselves were but grasshoppers. Some have thought that the name Phœnician, given to the Canaanites, and particularly to the Sidonians, was originally from Bene-Anak, sons of Anak. Caleb, assisted by the tribe of Judah, took Kirjath-Arba, and destroyed the Anakim, A. M. 2559. Josh. xv, 14; Judg. i, 20.

**ANALOGY OF FAITH.** This has been often and largely descanted upon as an important rule for interpreting Scripture, founded, as it is said, upon Rom. xii, 6, "Let us prophesy according to the proportion" (analogy) "of faith."

The principle of this rule has been thus stated: It is evident the Almighty doth not act without a design in the system of Christianity, any more than in the works of nature. Now this design must be uniform; for as in the system of the universe every part is proportioned to the whole, and made subservient to it,--so, in the system of the Gospel, all the various truths, doctrines, declarations, precepts, and promises must correspond with, and tend to, the end designed. For instance, supposing the glory of God in the salvation of sinners by free grace be the grand design,--then, whatever doctrine, assertion, or hypothesis agrees not with this, it is to be considered

as false. The effect however of this view of the case appears to be often delusive. If nothing more be meant than that, what is obscure in a revelation should be interpreted by that which is plain, the same rule applies to all sober interpretations of any book whatever; but if we call our opinions, perhaps hastily taken up, or admitted on some authority without examination by the light of Scripture, “the analogy of faith,” we shall greatly err. On this subject Dr. Campbell remarks:--

“In vain do we search the Scriptures for their testimony concerning Christ, if, independently of these Scriptures, we have received a testimony from another quarter, and are determined to admit nothing as the testimony of Scripture which will not perfectly quadrate with that formerly received. This was the very source of the blindness of the Jews in our Saviour’s time. They searched the Scriptures as much as we do; but, in the disposition they were in, they would never have discovered what that sacred volume testifies of Christ. Why? because their great rule of interpretation was the analogy of the faith; or, in other words, the system of the Pharisean scribes, the doctrine then in vogue, and in the profound veneration of which they had been educated. This is that veil by which the understandings of that people were darkened, even in reading the law, and of which the Apostle observed, that it remained unremoved in his day, and of which we ourselves have occasion to observe, that it remains unremoved in ours. And is it not precisely in the same way that the phrase is used by every sect of Christians, for the particular system or digest of tenets for which they themselves have the greatest reverence? The Latin church, and even the Greek, are explicit in their declarations on this article. With each, the analogy of the faith is their own system alone. And that different parties of Protestants, though more reserved in their manner of speaking, aim at the same thing, is undeniable; the same, I mean, considered relatively to the speakers; for, absolutely considered, every party means a different thing. ‘But,’ say some, ‘is not this mode of interpretation warranted by Apostolical authority? Does not Paul, Rom. xii, 6, in speaking of the exercise of the spiritual gifts, enjoin the prophets to prophesy *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*, according to the proportion of faith, as our translators render it, but as some critics explain it, according to the analogy of the faith?’ Though this exposition has been admitted into 53 some versions, and adopted by Hammond and other commentators, and may be called literal, it is suited neither to the ordinary meaning of the words, nor to the tenor of the context. The word *ἀναλογία* strictly denotes proportion, measure, rate, but by no means that complex notion conveyed in the aforesaid phrase by the term analogy, which has been well observed by Whitby to be particularly unsuitable in this place, where the Apostle treats of those who speak by inspiration, not of those who explain what has been thus spoken by others. The context manifestly leads us to understand

ἀναλογία πίστεως, verse 6, as equivalent to μέτρον πίστεως, verse 3. And for the better understanding of this phrase, the measure of faith, it may be proper to observe, 1. That a strong conviction of any tenet, from whatever cause it arises, is in Scripture sometimes termed faith. Thus in the same epistle, Rom. xiv, 22, the Apostle says, ‘Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God.’ The scope of his reasoning shows that nothing is there meant by faith, but a conviction of the truth in regard to the article of which he had been treating, namely, the equality of days and meats, in point of sanctity, under the Gospel dispensation. The same is evidently the meaning of the word, verse 23, ‘Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin;’ where, without regard to the morality of an action abstractly considered, that is concluded to be sin which is done by one who doubts of its lawfulness. 2. As to spiritual gifts, prophecy and inspiration in particular, they appear to have been accompanied with such a faith or conviction that they came from the Spirit, as left no room for hesitation. And indeed it is easy to perceive that something of this kind was absolutely necessary to enable the inspired person to distinguish what proceeded from the Spirit of God, from what was the creature of his own imagination. The prophets of God were not acted upon like machines in delivering their predictions, as the diviners were supposed to be among the Heathen, but had then, as at other times, the free use of their faculties, both of body and mind.” This caution is therefore with great propriety given them by the Apostle, to induce them to be attentive in prophesying, not to exceed the precise measure allowed them, (for different measures of the same gift were committed to different persons,) and not to mingle aught of their own with the things of God’s Spirit. Let him prophesy according to the proportion in which he has received this gift, which is in proportion to his faith. Though a sense somewhat different has been given to the words by some ancient Greek expositors, none of them seems to have formed a conception of that sense, which, as was observed above, has been given by some moderns. This has, nevertheless, a sound and sober principle included in it, although capable of great abuse. Undoubtedly there is a class of great and leading truths in the Scriptures so clearly revealed as to afford principles of interpretation in doubtful passages, and these are so obvious that persons of sound minds and hearts will not need those formal rules for the application of the analogy of faith to interpretation, which have been drawn up by several writers, and which when not misleading, are generally superfluous.

ANANIAS was the son of Nebedæus, high priest of the Jews. According to Josephus, he succeeded Joseph, the son of Camith, in the forty-seventh year of the Christian æra; and was himself succeeded by Ishmael, the son of Tabæus, in the year 63. Quadratus, governor of Syria, coming into Judæa, on the rumours which prevailed among the Samaritans and Jews, sent the high priest Ananias to Rome, to vindicate his conduct to the

emperor. The high priest justified himself, was acquitted, and returned. St. Paul being apprehended at Jerusalem by the tribune of the Roman troops that guarded the temple, declared to him that he was a citizen of Rome. This obliged the officer to treat him with some regard. As he was ignorant of what the Jews accused him, the next day he convened the priests, and placed St. Paul in the midst of them, that he might justify himself. St. Paul began as follows: "Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day." He had scarcely spoken this, when the high priest, Ananias, commanded those who were near him to smite him on the face. The Apostle immediately replied, "God shall judge thee, thou whited wall; for, sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" They that stood by said, "Revilest thou God's high priest?" And Paul answered, "I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest; for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people," Acts xxii, 23, 24; xxiii, 1-5; by which words many suppose that the Apostle spake in bitter irony; or at least that he considered Ananias as a usurper of the office of the priesthood.

After this, the assembly being divided in opinion, St. Paul was sent by the tribune to Cæsarea, that Felix, governor of the province, might take cognizance of the affair. When it was known that the Apostle had arrived at Cæsarea, Ananias the high priest, and other Jews, went thither to accuse him; but the affair was adjourned, and St. Paul continued two years in prison in that city, Acts xxiv.

The Apostle's prediction that God would smite Ananias, was thus accomplished: Albinus, governor of Judæa, being come into that country, Ananias found means to gain him by presents; and Ananias, by reason of this patronage, was considered as the first man of his nation. However, there were in his party some violent persons, who plundered the country, and seized the tithes of the priests; and this they did with impunity, on account of the great credit of Ananias. At the same time, several companies of assassins infested Judæa, and committed great ravages. When any of their companions fell into the hands of the governors of the province, and were about to be executed, they failed not to seize some domestic or relation of the high priest Ananias, that he might procure the liberty of their associates, in exchange for those whom they detained. 54Having taken Eleazer, one of Ananias's sons, they did not release him till ten of their companions were liberated. By this means their number considerably increased, and the country was exposed to their ravages. At length, Eleazer, the son of Ananias, heading a party of mutineers, seized the temple, and forbade any sacrifices for the emperor. Being joined by the assassins, he pulled down the house of his father Ananias, with his brother, hid himself in the aqueducts belonging to the royal palace, but was soon discovered,

and both of them were killed. Thus God smote this whited wall, in the very beginning of the Jewish wars.

2. Ananias, one of the first Christians of Jerusalem, who being converted, with his wife Sapphira, sold his estate; (as did the other Christians at Jerusalem, under a temporary regulation that they were to have all things in common;) but privately reserved a part of the purchase money to himself. Having brought the remainder to St. Peter, as the whole price of the inheritance sold, the Apostle, to whom the Holy Ghost had revealed this falsehood, rebuked him severely, as having lied not unto men but unto God, Acts v. At that instant, Ananias, being struck dead, fell down at the Apostle's feet; and in the course of three hours after, his wife suffered a similar punishment. This happened, A. D. 33, or 34. It is evident, that in this and similar events, the spectators and civil magistrates must have been convinced that some extraordinary power was exerted; for if Peter had himself slain Ananias, he would have been amenable to the laws as a murderer. But, if by forewarning him that he should immediately die, and the prediction came to pass, it is evident that the power which attended this word of Peter was not from Peter, but from God. This was made the more certain by the death of two persons, in the same manner, and under the same circumstances, which could not be attributed to accident.

3. Ananias, a disciple of Christ, at Damascus, whom the Lord directed to visit Paul, then lately converted. Ananias answered, "Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem; and how he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call upon thy name." But the Lord said unto him, "Go thy way, for he is a chosen vessel unto me." Ananias, therefore, went to the house in which God had revealed unto him that Paul was, and putting his hands on him, said, "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus who appeared unto thee in the way, hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost," Acts ix, 10–12, &c. We are not informed of any other circumstance of the life of Ananias.

ANATHEMA, from ἀνατίθημι, signifies something set apart, separated, or devoted, Mic. iv, 13, or the formula by which this is effected. To anathematize is generally understood to denote the cutting off or separating any one from the communion of the faithful, the number of the living, or the privileges of society; or the devoting of an animal, city, or other thing, to destruction. See Accursed.

ANATHEMA MARANATHA. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha," 1 Cor. xvi, 22. Why these two words, one Greek and the other Syriac, were not translated, is not obvious. They

are the words with which the Jews began their greater excommunication, whereby they not only excluded sinners from their society, but delivered them up to the divine cherem, or anathema, that is, to misery in this life, and perdition in the life to come. "Let him be Anathema" is, "Let him be accursed." Maranatha signifies, "The Lord cometh," or, "will come;" that is, to take vengeance. See See Accursed.

ANDREW, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, a native of Bethsaida, and the brother of Peter. He was at first a disciple of John the Baptist, whom he left to follow our Saviour, after the testimony of John, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," John i, 29, and was the first disciple received by our Saviour. Andrew then introduced his brother Simon, and they went with him to the marriage in Cana, but afterward returned to their ordinary occupation, not expecting, perhaps, to be farther employed in his service. However, some months after, Jesus meeting them, while fishing together, called them to a regular attendance upon him, and promised to make them fishers of men, Matt. iv, 19.

After our Saviour's ascension, tradition states that Andrew was appointed to preach in Scythia and the neighbouring countries. According to Eusebius, after this Apostle had planted the Gospel in several places, he came to Patræ, in Achaia, where, endeavouring to convert the pro-consul Ægeas, he was, by that governor's orders, first scourged, and then crucified. The time of his suffering martyrdom is not known; but all the ancient and modern martyrologies of the Greeks and Latins agree in celebrating his festival on the 30th of November. His body was embalmed, and decently interred at Patræ, by Maximilla, a lady of great quality and estate. It was afterward removed to Constantinople, by Constantine the Great, who buried it in the great church which he had built to the honour of the Apostles. It is not known for what reason painters represent St. Andrew's cross like an X. Peter Chrysologus says that he was crucified upon a tree; and the spurious Hippolytus assures us that it was an olive tree. Nevertheless, the tradition which describes him to have been nailed to a cross is very ancient.

ANGEL, a spiritual, intelligent substance, the first in rank and dignity among created beings. The word angel, ἀγγέλος, is not properly a denomination of nature but of office; denoting as much as nuncius, messenger, a person employed to carry one's orders, or declare his will. Thus it is St. Paul represents angels, Heb. i, 14, where he calls them "ministering spirits;" and yet custom has prevailed so much, that angel is now commonly taken for the denomination of a particular order of spiritual beings, of great understanding and power, superior to the souls or spirits of men. Some of these are spoken of in Scripture in such a manner as

plainly to signify that they are real beings, of a spiritual nature, of high power, perfection, dignity, and happiness. Others of them are distinguished as not having kept their first station, Jude 6. These are represented as evil spirits, enemies of God, and intent on mischief. The devil as the head of them, and they as his angels, are represented as the rulers of the darkness of this world, or spiritual wickednesses, or wicked spirits, τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπθρανίοις, Eph. vi, 12; which may not be unfitly rendered, “the spiritual managers of opposition to the kingdom of God.”

The existence of angels is supposed in all religions, though it is incapable of being proved a priori. Indeed, the ancient Sadducees are represented as denying all spirits; and yet the Samaritans, and Caraites, who are reputed Sadducees, openly allowed them: witness Abusaid, the author of an Arabic version of the Pentateuch; and Aaron, a Caraites Jew, in his comment on the Pentateuch; both extant in manuscript in the king of France’s library. In the Alcoran we find frequent mention of angels. The Mussulmen believe them of different orders or degrees, and to be destined for different employments both in heaven and on earth. They attribute exceedingly great power to the angel Gabriel, as that he is able to descend in the space of an hour from heaven to earth; to overturn a mountain with a single feather of his wing, &c. The angel Asrael, they suppose, is appointed to take the souls of such as die; and another angel, named Esraphil, they tell us, stands with a trumpet ready in his mouth to proclaim the day of judgment.

The Heathen philosophers and poets were also agreed as to the existence of intelligent beings, superior to man; as is shown by St. Cyprian in his treatise of the vanity of idols; from the testimonies of Plato, Socrates, Trismegistus, &c. They were acknowledged under different appellations; the Greeks calling them dæmons, and the Romans genii, or lares. Epicurus seems to have been the only one among the old philosophers who absolutely rejected them.

Authors are not so unanimous about the nature as about the existence of angels. Clemens Alexandrinus believed they had bodies; which was also the opinion of Origen, Cæsarius, Tertullian, and several others. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nicene, St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, &c, held them to be mere spirits. It has been the more current opinion, especially in later times, that they are substances entirely spiritual, who can, at any time, assume bodies, and appear in human or other shapes. Ecclesiastical writers make a hierarchy of nine orders of angels. Others have distributed angels into nine orders, according to the names by which they are called in Scripture, and reduced these orders into three hierarchies; to the first of which belong seraphim, cherubim, and thrones; to the second, dominions, virtues, and powers; and to the third, principalities, archangels, and angels.



The Jews reckon four orders or companies of angels, each headed by an archangel; the first order being that of Michael; the second, of Gabriel; the third, of Uriel; and the fourth, of Raphael. Following the Scripture account, we shall find mention made of different orders of these superior beings; for such a distinction of orders seems intimated in the names given to different classes. Thus we have thrones, dominions, principalities, or principedoms, powers, authorities, living ones, cherubim, and seraphim. That some of these titles may indicate the same class of angels is probable; but that they all should be but different appellations of one common and equal order is improbable. We learn also from Scripture, that they dwell in the immediate presence of God; that they “excel in strength;” that they are immortal; and that they are the agents through which God very often accomplishes his special purposes of judgment and mercy. Nothing is more frequent in Scripture than the missions and appearances of good and bad angels, whom God employed to declare his will; to correct, teach, reprove, and comfort. God gave the law to Moses, and appeared to the old patriarchs, by the mediation of angels, who represented him, and spoke in his name, Acts vii, 30, 35; Gal. iii, 19; Heb. xiii, 2.

Though the Jews, in general, believed the existence of angels, there was a sect among them, namely, the Sadducees, who denied the existence of all spirits whatever, God only excepted, Acts xxiii, 8. Before the Babylonish captivity, the Hebrews seem not to have known the names of any angel. The Talmudists say they brought the names of angels from Babylon. Tobit, who is thought to have resided in Nineveh some time before the captivity, mentions the angel Raphael, Tob. iii, 17; xi, 2, 7; and Daniel, who lived at Babylon some time after Tobit, has taught us the names of Michael and Gabriel, Dan. viii, 16; ix, 21; x, 21. In the New Testament, we find only the two latter mentioned by name.

There are various opinions as to the time when the angels were created. Some think this took place when our heavens and the earth were made. For this opinion, however, there is no just foundation in the Mosaic account. Others think that angels existed long before the formation of our solar system; and Scripture seems to favour this opinion, Job xxxviii, 4, 7, where God says, “Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?--and all the sons of God shouted for joy.” Though it be a universal opinion that angels are of a spiritual and incorporeal nature, yet some of the fathers, misled by a passage in Gen. vi, 2, where it is said, “The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose,” imagined them to be corporeal, and capable of sensual pleasures. But, without noticing all the wild reveries which have been propagated by bold or ignorant persons, let it suffice to observe, that by “the sons of God” we are evidently to understand the descendants of Seth,

who, for the great piety wherein they continued for some time, were so called; and that “the daughters of men” were the progeny of wicked Cain.

56As to the doctrine of tutelary or guarding angels, presiding over the affairs of empires, nations, provinces, and particular persons, though received by the later Jews, it appears to be wholly Pagan in its origin, and to have no countenance in the Scriptures. The passages in Daniel brought to favour this notion are capable of a much better explanation; and when our Lord declares that the “angels” of little children “do always behold the face of God,” he either speaks of children as being the objects of the general ministry of angels, or, still more probably, by angels he there means the disembodied spirits of children; for that the Jews called disembodied spirits by the name of angels, appears from Acts xii, 15.

On this question of guardian angels, Bishop Horsley observes: “That the holy angels are often employed by God in his government of this sublunary world, is indeed to be clearly proved by holy writ. That they have power over the matter of the universe, analogous to the powers over it which men possess, greater in extent, but still limited, is a thing which might reasonably be supposed, if it were not declared. But it seems to be confirmed by many passages of holy writ; from which it seems also evident that they are occasionally, for certain specific purposes, commissioned to exercise those powers to a prescribed extent. That the evil angels possessed before their fall the like powers, which they are still occasionally permitted to exercise for the punishment of wicked nations, seems also evident. That they have a power over the human sensory, which they are occasionally permitted to exercise, and by means of which they may inflict diseases, suggest evil thoughts, and be the instruments of temptation, must also be admitted. But all this amounts not to any thing of a discretionary authority placed in the hands of tutelar angels, or to an authority to advise the Lord God with respect to the measures of his government. Confidently I deny that a single text is to be found in holy writ, which, rightly understood, gives the least countenance to the abominable doctrine of such a participation of the holy angels in God’s government of the world. In what manner then, it may be asked, are the holy angels made at all subservient to the purposes of God’s government? This question is answered by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews, in the last verse of the first chapter; and this is the only passage in the whole Bible in which we have any thing explicit upon the office and employment of angels: ‘Are they not all,’ saith he, ‘ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them that shall be heirs of salvation?’ They are all, however high in rank and order, nothing more than ‘ministering spirits,’ or, literally, ‘serving spirits;’ not invested with authority of their own, but ‘sent forth,’ occasionally sent forth, to do such

service as may be required of them, ‘for them that shall be heirs of salvation.’”

The exact number of angels is no where mentioned in Scripture; but it is always represented as very great. Daniel, vii, 10, says of the Ancient of Days, “A fiery stream came from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him.” Jesus Christ says, that his heavenly Father could have given him more than twelve legions of angels, that is, more than seventy-two thousand, Matt. xxvi, 53; and the Psalmist declares, that the chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels, lxviii, 17, These are all intended not to express any exact number, but indefinitely a very large one.

Though all the angels were created alike good, yet Jude informs us, verse 6, that some of them “kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation,” and these God hath “reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.” Speculations on the cause and occasion of their fall are all vain and trifling. Milton is to be read on this subject, as on others, not as a divine, but as a poet. All we know, is, that they are not in their first “estate,” or in their original place; that this was their own fault, for “they left their own habitation;” that they are in chains, yet with liberty to tempt; and that they are reserved to the general judgment.

Dr. Prideaux observes, that the minister of the synagogue, who officiated in offering the public prayers, being the mouth of the congregation, delegated by them, as their representative, messenger, or angel, to address God in prayer for them, was in Hebrew called sheliack-zibbor, that is, the angel of the church; and that from hence the chief ministers of the seven churches of Asia are in the Revelation, by a name borrowed from the synagogue, called angels of those churches.

THE ANGEL OF THE LORD, or the Angel Jehovah, a title given to Christ in his different appearances to the patriarchs and others in the Old Testament.

When the Angel of the Lord found Hagar in the wilderness, “she called the name of Jehovah that spake to her, Thou God seest me.”--Jehovah appeared unto Abraham in the plains of Mamre. Abraham lifted up his eyes, and three men, three persons in human form, “stood by him.” One of the three is called Jehovah. And Jehovah said, “Shall I hide from Abraham the thing that I do?” Appearances of the same personage occur to Isaac and to Jacob under the name of “the God of Abraham, and of Isaac.” After one of these manifestations, Jacob says, “I have seen God face to face;” and at another,

“Surely the Lord (Jehovah) is in this place.” The same Jehovah was made visible to Moses, and gave him his commission; and God said, “I am that I am; thou shalt say to the children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you.” The same Jehovah went before the Israelites by day in a pillar of cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire; and by Him the law was given amidst terrible displays of power and majesty from Mount Sinai. “I am the Lord (Jehovah) thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage: Thou shalt have no other gods before me,” &c. The collation of a few passages, or of the different parts of the 57same passages, of Scripture, will show that Jehovah, and “the Angel of the Lord,” when used in this eminent sense, are the same person. Jacob says of Bethel, where he had exclaimed, “Surely Jehovah is in this place;” “The Angel of God appeared to me in a dream, saying, I am the God of Bethel.” Upon his death bed he gives the names of God and Angel to this same person: “The God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.” So in Hosea xii, 2, 5, it is said, “By his strength he had power with God; yea, he had power over the Angel, and prevailed.” “We found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us, even the Lord God of Hosts; the Lord is his memorial.” Here the same person has the names, God, Angel, and Lord God of Hosts. “The Angel of the Lord called to Abraham a second time from heaven, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, (Jehovah,) that, since thou hast done this thing, in blessing will I bless thee.” The Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in a flame of fire; but this same Angel “called to him out of the bush, and said, I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; and Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God.” To omit many other passages, St. Stephen, in alluding to this part of the history of Moses, in his speech before the council, says, “There appeared to Moses in the wilderness of Mount Sinai, an Angel of the Lord in a flame of fire,” showing that that phraseology was in use among the Jews in his day, and that this Angel and Jehovah were regarded as the same being; for he adds, “Moses was in the church in the wilderness with the Angel which spoke unto him in Mount Sinai.” There is one part of the history of the Jews in the wilderness, which so fully shows that they distinguished this Angel of Jehovah from all created angels, as to deserve particular attention. In Exodus xxiii, 20, God makes this promise to Moses and the Israelites: “Behold, I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice; provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my name is in him.” Of this Angel let it be observed, that he is here represented as the guide and protector of the Israelites; to him they were to owe their conquests and their settlement in the promised land, which are in other places often attributed to the immediate agency of God; that they are cautioned to “beware of him,” to reverence and stand in dread of him; that

the pardoning of transgressions belongs to him; finally, "that the name of God was in him." This name must be understood of God's own peculiar name, Jehovah, I am, which he assumed as his distinctive appellation at his first appearing to Moses; and as the names of God are indicative of his nature, he who had a right to bear the peculiar name of God, must also have his essence. This view is put beyond all doubt by the fact, that Moses and the Jews so understood the matter; for afterward when their sins had provoked God to threaten not to go up with them himself, but to commit them to "an angel who should drive out the Canaanite," &c, the people mourned over this as a great calamity, and Moses betook himself to special intercession, and rested not until he obtained the repeal of the threat, and the renewed promise, "My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest." Nothing, therefore, can be more clear than that Moses and the Israelites considered the promise of the Angel, in whom was "the name of God," as a promise that God himself would go with them. With this uncreated Angel, this presence of the Lord, they were satisfied, but not with "an angel" indefinitely, who was by nature of that order of beings usually so called, and therefore a created being; for at the news of God's determination not to go up with them, Moses hastens to the tabernacle to make his intercessions, and refuses an inferior conductor:--"If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence."

The Jews held this Word, or Angel of the Lord, to be the future Messiah, as appears from the writings of their older rabbins. So that he appears as the Jehovah of all the three dispensations, and yet is invariably described as a separate person from the unseen Jehovah who sends him. He was then the Word to be made flesh, and to dwell for a time among us, to open the way to God by his sacrifice, and to rescue the race, whose nature he should assume, from sin and death. This he has now actually effected; and the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian religions are thus founded upon the same great principles,--the fall and misery of mankind, and their deliverance by a Divine Redeemer.

ANGELICS, worshippers of angels. Those who consider this as a sect of the Apostolic age, think St. Paul, Coloss. ii, 18, cautions Christians against a superstitious reverence of these celestial agents of the Deity, which they conceive to have been borrowed from the idolatrous reverence paid by the Heathen to genii and demons. The Jews of that time are also accused of worshipping angels, and probably this superstition might through them influence the Judaizing members of some of the Apostolic churches. This idolatry may now be too justly charged upon the Romish and some other corrupt churches.

ANGER, a resentful emotion of the mind, arising upon the receipt, or supposed receipt, of an affront or injury; and also simple feeling of strong displeasure at that which is in itself evil, or base, or injurious to others. In the latter sense it is not only innocent but commendable. Strong displeasure against evil doers, provided it be free from hatred and malice, and interferes not with a just placableness, is also blameless, Eph. iv, 26. When it is vindictive against the person of our neighbour, or against the innocent creatures of God, it is wicked, Matt. v, 22. When anger, hatred, wrath, and fury, are ascribed to God, they denote no tumultuous passion, but merely his holy and just displeasure with sin and sinners; 58and the evidence of it in his terrible threatenings, or righteous judgments, Psalm vi, 1, and vii, 11. We must, however, take care that we refine not too much. These are Scriptural terms, and are often used of God; and though they express not a tumultuous, much less an unjust, passion, there is something in God which answers to them. In him they are principles arising out of his holy and just nature; and for this reason they are more steady and uniform, and more terrible, than if they were emotions, or as we say passions. Nor can we rightly regard the severity of the judgments which God has so often executed upon sin without standing in awe of him, “as a consuming fire” to the ungodly.

ANIMAL, is an organized and living body, endowed with sensation. Minerals are said to grow or increase, plants to grow and live, and animals alone to have sensation. The Hebrews distinguished animals into pure and impure, clean and unclean; or those which might be eaten and offered, and those whose use was prohibited. The sacrifices which they offered, were, 1. Of the beeve kind; a cow, bull, or calf. The ox could not be offered, because it was mutilated; and when it is said oxen were sacrificed, we are to understand bulls, Lev. xxii, 18, 19. Calmet thinks, that the mutilation of animals was neither permitted, nor used, among the Israelites. 2. Of the goat kind; a he-goat, a she-goat, or kid, Lev. xxii, 24. 3. Of the sheep kind; a ewe, ram, or lamb. When it is said sheep are offered, rams are chiefly meant, especially in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin; for as to peace-offerings, or sacrifices of pure devotion, a female might be sometimes offered, provided it was pure, and without blemish, Lev. iii, 1.

Besides these three sorts of animals, used in sacrifices, many others might be eaten, wild or tame; as the stag, the roe-buck, and in general all that have cloven feet, or that chew the cud, Lev. ix, 2, 3, &c. All that have not cloven hoofs, and do not chew the cud, were esteemed impure, and could neither be offered nor eaten. The fat of all sorts of animals sacrificed was forbidden to be eaten. The blood of all kinds of animals generally, and in all cases, was prohibited on pain of death, Lev. iii, 17; vii, 23–27. Neither did the Israelites eat animals which had been taken and touched by a devouring or

impure beast, as a dog, a wolf, a boar, &c, Exodus xxii, 3; nor of any animal that died of itself. Whoever touched its carcass was impure until the evening; and till that time, and before he had washed his clothes, he did not return to the company of other Jews, Lev. xi, 39, 40; xvii, 15; xxii, 8. Fish that had neither fins nor scales were unclean, Lev. xi, 20. Birds which walk on the ground with four feet, as bats, and flies that have many feet, were impure. The law, however, excepts locusts, which have their hind feet higher than those before, and rather leap than walk. These were clean, and might be eaten, Lev. xi, 21, 22, as they still are in Palestine. The distinction between clean and unclean animals has been variously accounted for. Some have thought it symbolical, intended to teach the avoidance of those evil qualities for which the unclean animals were remarkable; others, that, in order that the Hebrews might be preserved from idolatry, they were commanded to kill and eat many animals which were sacred among the Egyptians, and were taught to look with abhorrence upon others which they revered. Others have found a reason in the unwholesomeness of the flesh of the creatures pronounced by the law to be unclean, so that they resolve the whole into a sanative regulation. But it is not to be forgotten that this division of animals into clean and unclean existed both before the law of Moses, and even prior to the flood. The foundation of it was therefore clearly sacrificial; for before the deluge it could not have reference to health, since animal food was not allowed to man prior to the deluge; and as no other ground for the distinction appears, except that of sacrifice, it must therefore have had reference to the selection of victims to be solemnly offered to God, as a part of worship, and as the means of drawing near to him by expiatory rites for the forgiveness of sins. Some it is true, have regarded this distinction of clean and unclean beasts as used by Moses by way of prolepsis, or anticipation,--a notion which, if it could not be refuted by the context, would be perfectly arbitrary. Not only are the beasts, which Noah was to receive, spoken of as clean and unclean; but it will be noticed, that, in the command to take them into the ark, a difference is made in the number to be preserved--the clean being to be received by sevens, and the unclean by two of a kind. This shows that this distinction among beasts had been established in the time of Noah; and thus the assumption of a prolepsis is refuted. The critical attempts which have been made to show that animals were allowed to man for food, previous to the flood, have wholly failed.

A second argument is furnished by the prohibition of blood for food, after animals had been granted to man for his sustenance along with the "herb of the field." This prohibition is repeated by Moses to the Israelites, with this explanation:--"I have given it upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls." From this it has indeed been argued, that the doctrine of the atoning power of blood was new, and was then, for the first time,

announced by Moses, or the same reason for the prohibition would have been given to Noah. To this we may reply, 1. That unless the same be supposed as the ground of the prohibition of blood to Noah, as that given by Moses to the Jews, no reason at all can be conceived for this restraint being put upon the appetite of mankind from Noah to Moses. 2. That it is a mistake to suppose, that the declaration of Moses to the Jews, that God had “given them the blood for an atonement,” is an additional reason for the interdict, not to be found in the original prohibition to Noah. The whole passage in Lev. xvii, is, “And thou shalt say to them, Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood, I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and I will cut him off from among his people: FOR THE LIFE of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it upon the altar, to make atonement for your souls: for it is the BLOOD (or LIFE) that maketh atonement for the soul.” The great reason, then, of the prohibition of blood is, that it is the LIFE; and what follows respecting atonement is exegetical of this reason; the life is in the blood, and the blood or life is given as an atonement. Now, by turning to the original prohibition in Genesis, we find that precisely the same reason is given: “But the flesh with the blood, which is the life thereof, shall ye not eat.” The reason, then, being the same, the question is, whether the exegesis added by Moses must not necessarily be understood in the general reason given for the restraint to Noah. Blood is prohibited for this cause, that it is the life; and Moses adds, that it is “the blood,” or life, “which makes atonement.” Let any one attempt to discover any cause for the prohibition of blood to Noah, in the mere circumstance that it is “the life,” and he will find it impossible. It is no reason at all, moral or instituted, except that as it was life substituted for life, the life of the animal in sacrifice for the life of man, and that it had a sacred appropriation. The manner, too, in which Moses introduces the subject is indicative that, although he was renewing a prohibition, he was not publishing a “new doctrine;” he does not teach his people that God had then given, or appointed, blood to make atonement; but he prohibits them from eating it, because he had made this appointment, without reference to time, and as a subject with which they were familiar. Because the blood was the life, it was sprinkled upon, and poured out at, the altar: and we have in the sacrifice of the paschal lamb, and the sprinkling of its blood, a sufficient proof, that, before the giving of the law, not only was blood not eaten, but was appropriated to a sacred sacrificial purpose. Nor was this confined to the Jews; it was customary with the Romans and Greeks, who, in like manner, poured out and sprinkled the blood of victims at their altars, a rite derived, probably, from the Egyptians, as they derived it, not from Moses, but from the sons of Noah. The notion, indeed, that the blood of the victims was peculiarly sacred to the gods, is impressed upon all ancient Pagan mythology.



If, therefore, the distinction of animals into clean and unclean existed before the flood, and was founded upon the practice of animal sacrifice, we have not only a proof of the antiquity of that practice, but that it was of divine institution and appointment, since almighty God gave laws for its right and acceptable performance. Still farther, if animal sacrifice was of divine appointment, it must be concluded to be typical only, and designed to teach the great doctrine of moral atonement, and to direct faith to the only true sacrifice which could take away the sins of men;--“the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,”--the victim “without spot,” who suffered the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. See Sacrifices.

ANISE, an annual umbeliferous plant, the seeds of which have an aromatic smell, a pleasant warm taste, and a carminative quality. But by ἀνηθον, Matt. xxiii, 23, the dill is meant. Our translators seem to have been first misled by a resemblance of the sound. No other versions have fallen into the mistake. The Greek of anise is ἄνισον; but of dill, ἄνηθον.

ANNA, the daughter of Phanuel, a prophetess and widow, of the tribe of Asher, Luke ii, 36, 37. She was married early, and had lived only seven years with her husband. Being then disengaged from the ties of marriage, she thought only of pleasing the Lord; and continued without ceasing in the temple, serving God night and day, with fasting and prayer, as the Evangelist expresses it. However, her serving God at the temple night and day, says Dr. Prideaux, is to be understood no otherwise than that she constantly attended the morning and evening sacrifice at the temple; and then with great devotion offered up her prayers to God; the time of morning and evening sacrifice being the most solemn time of prayer among the Jews, and the temple the most solemn place for this devotion. Anna was fourscore years of age when the holy virgin came to present Jesus in the temple; and entering accidentally, while Simeon was pronouncing his thanksgiving, she likewise began to praise God, and to speak of the Messiah to all those who waited for redemption in Jerusalem. We know nothing more either of the life or death of this holy woman.

ANNAS, or ANANUS, as Josephus calls him, was the son of Seth, and high priest of the Jews. He succeeded Joazar, the son of Simon, enjoyed the high priesthood eleven years, and was succeeded by Ishmael, the son of Phabi. After he was deposed, he still preserved the title of high priest, and had a great share in the management of public affairs. He is called high priest in conjunction with Caiaphas, when John the Baptist entered upon the exercise of his mission; though Calmet thinks that at that time he did not, strictly speaking, possess or officiate in that character, Luke iii, 2. On

the contrary, Macknight and some others are of opinion, that at this time Caiaphas was only the deputy of Annas. He was father-in-law to Caiaphas; and Jesus Christ was carried before him, directly after his seizure in the garden of Olives, John xviii, 13. Josephus remarks, that Annas was considered as one of the happiest men of his nation, for five of his sons were high priests, and he himself possessed that great dignity many years. This was an instance of good fortune which, till that time, had happened to no person.

ANOINT, to pour oil upon, Gen. xxviii, 18; xxxi, 13. The setting up of a stone and anointing it by Jacob, as here recorded, in grateful memory of his celestial vision, probably became the occasion of idolatry in succeeding ages, and gave rise to the erection of temples composed of shapeless masses of unhewn stone, of which so many astonishing remains are scattered up and down the Asiatic and the European world.

Under the law persons and things set apart for sacred purposes were anointed with the holy oil; which appears to have been a typical representation of the communication of the Holy Ghost to Christ and to his church. See Exod. xxviii, xxix. Hence the Holy Spirit is called an unction or anointing, 1 John ii, 20, 27; and our Lord is called the “Messiah,” or “Anointed One,” to denote his being called to the offices of mediator, prophet, priest, and king, to all of which he was consecrated by the anointing of the Holy Ghost, Matt. iii, 16, 17.

When we hear of the anointing of the Jewish kings, we are to understand by it the same as their inauguration; inasmuch as anointing was the principal ceremony on such an occasion, 2 Sam. ii, 4; v, 3. As far as we are informed, however, unction, as a sign of investiture with the royal authority, was bestowed only upon Saul and David, and subsequently upon Solomon and Joash, who ascended the throne under such circumstances, that there was danger of their right to the succession being forcibly disputed, 1 Sam. x, 24; 2 Sam. ii, 4; v, 1–3; 1 Chron. xi, 1, 2; 2 Kings xi, 12–20; 2 Chron. xxiii, 1–21. The ceremony of regal anointing needed not to be repeated in every instance of succession to the throne, because the unction which the first one who held the sceptre in any particular line of princes had received was supposed to suffice for the succeeding incumbents in the same descent.

In the kingdom of Israel, those who were inducted into the royal office appear to have been inaugurated with some additional ceremonies, 2 Kings ix, 13. The private anointings which we learn to have been performed by the prophets, 2 Kings ix, 3, comp. 1 Sam. x, 1; xvi, 1–13, were only

prophetic symbols or intimations that the persons who were thus anointed should eventually receive the kingdom.

The holy anointing oil which was made by Moses, Exod. xxx, 22–33, for the maintaining and consecrating of the king, the high priest, and all the sacred vessels made use of in the house of God, was one of those things, as Dr. Prideaux observes, which was wanting in the second temple. The oil made and consecrated for this use was commanded to be kept by the children of Israel, throughout their generations, and therefore it was laid up in the most holy place of the tabernacle and the first temple.

ANOMŒANS, the name by which the pure Arians were called in the fourth century, in contradistinction to the Semi-Arians. The word is formed from the Greek ἀνόμοιος, different. For the pure Arians asserted, that the Son was of a nature different from, and in nothing like, that of the Father; whereas the Semi-Arians acknowledged a likeness of nature in the Son, at the same time that they denied, with the pure Arians, the consubstantiality of the Word. The Semi-Arians condemned the Anomœans in the council of Seleucia; and the Anomœans, in their turn, condemned the Semi-Arians in the councils of Constantinople and Antioch, erasing the word like out of the formula of Rimini and Constantinople.

ANSWER. Beside the common usage of this word, in the sense of a reply, it has other significations. Moses, having composed a thanksgiving, after the passage of the Red Sea, Miriam, it is said, answered, “Sing ye to the Lord” &c.--meaning, that Moses, with the men on one side, and Miriam, with the women on the other side, sung the same song, as it were, in two choruses, or divisions; of which one answered the other. Num. xxi, 17, “Then Israel sung this song, Spring up, O well, answer unto it;” that is, sing responsively, one side (or choir) singing first, and then the other. 1 Sam. xxix, 5, “Is not this David of whom they sung one to another in dances, saying, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands?” They sung this song to his honour in distinct choruses.

This word is taken likewise for, to accuse or to defend any one, judicially. Gen. xxx, 33, “My righteousness shall answer for me;” it shall be my advocate before thee. Deut. xxxi, 21, “The song which thou shalt compose and teach them shall testify (answer) against them as a witness.” Isaiah says, “The show of their countenance will testify (answer) against them;” their impudence will be like a witness and an accuser. Hosea, v, 5, “The pride of Israel doth testify (answer) to his face.”

To answer, is likewise taken in a bad sense; as when it is said that a son answers his father insolently, or a servant his master. Rom. ix, 20, “Who

art thou that repliest against God?” that is, to contest or debate with him. John xviii, 22, “Answerest thou the high priest so?” St. Paul declares that he “had in himself the answer (or sentence) of death;” 2 Cor. i, 9; like a man who has had notice of condemnation, he had a certain assurance of dying.

To answer is also used in Scripture for the commencement of a discourse, when no reply to any question or objection is intended. This mode of speaking is often used by the evangelists, “And Jesus answered and said.” It is a Hebrew idiom.

ANT, נמלה, in the Turkish and Arabic, neml, Prov. vi, 6; xxx, 25. It is a little insect, famous from all antiquity for its social habits, its economy, unwearied industry, and prudent foresight. It has afforded a pattern of commendable frugality to the profuse, and of unceasing diligence to the slothful. Solomon calls the ants “exceeding wise; for though a race not strong, yet they prepare their meat in the summer.” He therefore sends the sluggard to these little creatures, to learn wisdom, foresight, care, and diligence.

“Go to the ant; learn of its ways, be wise;  
It early heaps its stores, lest want surprise.  
Skill’d in the various year, the prescient sage  
Beholds the summer chill’d in winter’s rage.  
Survey its arts; in each partition’d cell  
Economy and plenty deign to dwell.”

That the ant hoarded up grains of corn against winter for its sustenance, was very generally believed by the ancients, though 61 modern naturalists seem to question the fact. Thus Horace says,

“-----Sicut

Parvula (nam exemplo est) magni formica laboris  
Ore trahit quodcunque potest, atque addit acervo  
Quem struit, haud ignara ac non incauta futuri;  
Quæ, simul inversum contristat aquarius annum,  
Non usquam prorepat, et illis utitur ante  
Quæsitis sapiens.”

Sat. i, l. i, v. 33.

“For thus the little ant (to human lore  
No mean example) forms her frugal store,  
Gather’d with mighty toil on every side,  
Nor ignorant nor careless to provide  
For future want; yet, when the stars appear  
That darkly sadden the declining year,

No more she comes abroad, but wisely lives  
On the fair stores industrious summer gives.”

The learned Bochart, in his *Hierozoicon*, has displayed his vast reading on this subject, and has cited passages from Pliny, Lucian, Ælian, Zoroaster, Origen, Basil, and Epiphanius, the Jewish rabbins and Arabian naturalists, all concurring in opinion that ants cut off the heads of grain, to prevent their germinating; and it is observable that the Hebrew name of the insect is derived from the verb גמל, which signifies to cut off, and is used for cutting off ears of corn, Job xxiv, 24.

The following remarks are from “the Introduction to Entomology,” by Kirby and Spence:

“Till the manners of exotic ants are more accurately explored, it would be rash to affirm that no ants have magazines of provisions; for, although, during the cold of our winters in this country, they remain in a state of torpidity, and have no need of food, yet in warmer regions, during the rainy seasons, when they are probably confined to their nests, a store of provisions may be necessary for them. Even in northern climates, against wet seasons, they may provide in this way for their sustenance and that of the young brood, which, as Mr. Smeatham observes, are very voracious, and cannot bear to be long deprived of their food; else why do ants carry worms, living insects, and many other such things, into their nests? Solomon’s lesson to the sluggard has been generally adduced as a strong confirmation of the ancient opinion: it can, however, only relate to the species of a warm climate, the habits of which are probably different from those of a cold one; so that his words, as commonly interpreted, may be perfectly correct and consistent with nature, and yet be not at all applicable to the species that are indigenous to Europe.”

The ant, according to the royal preacher, is one of those things which are little upon the earth, but exceeding wise. The superior wisdom of the ant has been recognised by many writers. Horace in the passage from which the preceding quotation is taken, praises its sagacity; Virgil celebrates its foresight, in providing for the wants and infirmities of old age, while it is young and vigorous:--

---atque inopi metuens formica senectæ.

[And the ant dreading a destitute old age.]

And we learn from Hesiod, that among the earliest Greeks it was called Idris, that is, wise, because it foresaw the coming storm, and the inauspicious day, and collected her store. Cicero believed that the ant is not only furnished with senses, but also with mind, reason and memory:--In formica non modo sensus sed etiam mens, ratio, memoria. [The ant

possesses not only senses, but also mind, reason, memory.] The union of so many noble qualities in so small a corpuscle, is indeed one of the most remarkable phenomena in the works of nature.

ANTHROPOMORPHITES, a sect of ancient heretics, who were so denominated from two Greek words ἄνθρωπος, man, and μόρφη, shape. They understood every thing spoken in Scripture in a literal sense, and particularly that passage of Genesis in which it is said, “God made man after his own image.” Hence they maintained, that God had a human shape.

ANTHROPOPATHY, a metaphor by which things belonging to creatures and especially to man are ascribed to God. Instances of this abound in the Scriptures, by which they adapt themselves to human modes of speaking, and to the limited capacities of men. These anthropopathies we must however interpret in a manner suitable to the majesty of the divine nature. Thus, when the members of a human body are ascribed to God, we must understand by them those perfections of which such members in us are the instruments. The eye, for instance, represents God’s knowledge and watchful care; the arm, his power and strength; the ears, the regard he pays to prayer and to the cry of oppression and misery, &c. Farther, when human affections are attributed to God, we must so interpret them as to imply no imperfection, such as perturbed feeling in him. When God is said to repent, the antecedent, by a frequent figure of speech, is put for the consequent; and in this case we are to understand an altered mode of proceeding on the part of God, which in man is the effect of repenting.

ANTICHRIST, compounded of ἀντί, contra, against, and Χριστός, Christ, in a general sense, denotes an adversary of Christ, or one who denies that the Messiah is come. In this sense, Jews, infidels, &c, may be said to be antichrists. The epithet, in the general sense of it, is also applicable to any power or person acting in direct opposition to Christ or his doctrine. Its particular meaning is to be collected from those passages of Scripture in which it occurs. Accordingly, it may either signify one who assumes the place and office of Christ, or one who maintains a direct enmity and opposition to him. The Fathers all speak of antichrist as a single man; though they also assure us, that he is to have divers precursors, or forerunners. Yet many Protestant writers apply to the Romish church, and the pope who is at the head of it, the several marks and signatures of antichrist enumerated in the Apocalypse, which would imply antichrist to be, not a single person, but a corrupt society, or a long series of persecuting pontiffs, or rather, a certain power and government, that may be held for many generations, by a number of individuals succeeding one another. The antichrist mentioned by the Apostle John, first Epistle ii, 18, and more particularly described in the book 62 of Revelation, seems evidently to be

the same with the man of sin, &c, characterized by St. Paul in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, chap. ii; and the whole description literally applies to the Papal power. A late writer, after collecting the principal prophecies relating to antichrist, infers from them that a power, sometimes represented as the little horn, the man of sin, the antichrist, the beast, the harlot, the star falling from heaven, the false prophet, the dragon, or as the operation of false teachers, was to be expected to arise in the Christian world to persecute and oppress, and delude the disciples of Christ, corrupt the doctrine of the primitive church, enact new laws, and establish its dominion over the minds of mankind. He then proceeds to show, from the application of prophecy to history, and to the remarkable train of events that are now passing in the world, how exactly Popery, Mohammedanism, and Infidelity, correspond with the character given in Scripture of the power of antichrist, which was to prevail a certain time for the especial trial and punishment of the corrupted church of Christ. Upon this system, the different opinions of the Protestants and Papists, concerning the power of antichrist, derived from partial views of the subject, are not wholly incompatible with each other. With respect to the commonly received opinion, that the church of Rome is antichrist, Mede and Newton, Daubuz and Clarke, Lowman and Hurd, Jurieu, Vitringa, and many other members of the Protestant churches who have written upon the subject, concur in maintaining, that the prophecies of Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John, point directly to this church. This was likewise the opinion of the first reformers; and it was the prevalent opinion of Christians, in the earliest ages, that antichrist would appear soon after the fall of the Roman empire. Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, applied the prophecies concerning the beast in the Revelation, the man of sin, and the apostasy from the faith mentioned by St. Paul, to him who should presume to claim the title of universal priest, or universal bishop, in the Christian church; and yet his immediate successor, Boniface III, received from the tyrant Phocas the precise title which Gregory had thus censured. At the synod of Rheims, held in the tenth century, Arnulphus, bishop of Orleans, appealed to the whole council, whether the bishop of Rome was not the antichrist of St. Paul, "sitting in the temple of God," and perfectly corresponding with the description of him given by St. Paul. In the eleventh century, all the characters of antichrist seemed to be so united in the person of Pope Hildebrand, who took the name of Gregory VII, that Johannes Aventinus, a Romish historian, speaks of it as a subject in which the generality of fair, candid, and ingenuous writers agreed, that at that time began the reign of antichrist. And the Albigenses and Waldenses, who may be called the Protestants of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, expressly asserted in their declarations of faith, that the church of Rome was the whore of Babylon. The Papists imagine they view in the prophetic picture of antichrist, imperial Rome, elated by her victories, exulting in her sensuality and her spoils, polluted

by idolatry, persecuting the people of God, and finally falling like the first Babylon; whilst a new and holy city, represented by their own communion, filled with the spotless votaries of the Christian faith, rises out of its ruins, and the victory of the cross is completed over the temples of Paganism. This scheme has had its able advocates, at the head of whom may be placed Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, Grotius, and Hammond. Some writers have maintained, that Caligula was antichrist; and others have asserted the same of Nero. But in order to establish the resemblance, they violate the order of time, disregard the opinions of the primitive Christians, and overlook the appropriate descriptions of the Apostles. After the point had been maturely debated at the council of Gap, held in 1603, a resolution was taken thereupon to insert an article in the confession of faith, whereby the Pope is formally declared to be antichrist. Pope Clement VIII was stung with this decision; and even king Henry IV, of France was not a little mortified, to be thus declared, as he said, an imp of antichrist.

In the book of Daniel it is foretold, that this power should exercise dominion until a time and times, and the dividing of time, Dan. vii, 25. This expression is generally admitted to denote 1260 years. The Papal power was completely established in the year 755, when it obtained the exarchate of Ravenna. Some, however, date the rise of antichrist in the year of Christ 606; and Mede places it in 456. If the rise of antichrist be not reckoned till he was possessed of secular authority, his fall will happen when this power shall be taken away. If his rise began, according to Mede in 456, he must have fallen in 1716; if in 606, it must be in 1866; if in 755, in 2015. If, however, we use prophetic years, consisting of three hundred and sixty days, and date the rise of antichrist in the year 755, his fall will happen in the year of Christ 2000. Every thing however in the state of the world betokens a speedy overthrow of the Papal and Mohammedan powers, both of which have indeed been already greatly weakened.

ANTI-LIBANUS. The Greeks give this name to that chain of mountains east of Libanus, which, properly speaking, forms, together with Libanus, but one ridge of mountains, extending from north to south, and afterward from south to north, in the shape almost of a horse shoe, for the space of about fourscore leagues. The western part of these mountains was called Libanus; the eastern was called Antilibanus; the former reached along the Mediterranean, from Sidon, almost to Arada, or Symira. The Hebrew text never mentions Antilibanus; but uses the general name Libanus: and the coins struck at Laodicea and Hierapolis, have the inscription, "cities of Libanus," though they belong rather to Antilibanus. The Septuagint, on the contrary, puts Antilibanus often instead of Libanus. The valley which separates Libanus from Antilibanus is very fruitful: it was formerly, on the side of Syria, inclosed with a wall, whereof there are now no traces.



Strabo says, that the name of Cælo-Syria, or “the hollow Syria,” belongs principally to the valley between Libanus and Antilibanus.

ANTINOMIANS are those who maintain that the law is of no use or obligation under the Gospel dispensation, or who hold doctrines that clearly supersede the necessity of good works and a virtuous life. The Antinomians took their origin from John Agricola, about the year 1538, who taught that the law was in no wise necessary under the Gospel; that good works do not promote our salvation, nor ill ones hinder it; that repentance is not to be preached from the decalogue, but only from the Gospel. This sect sprung up in England during the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell; and extended their system of libertinism much farther than Agricola, the disciple of Luther. Some of their teachers expressly maintained, that as the elect cannot fall from grace nor forfeit the divine favour, the wicked actions they commit are not really sinful, nor are to be considered as instances of their violation of the divine law; and that consequently they have no occasion either to confess their sins, or to break them off by repentance. According to them, it is one of the essential and distinctive characters of the elect, that they cannot do any thing which is displeasing to God. Luther, Rutherford, Schlüsselburgh, Sedgwick, Gataker, Witsius, Bull, Williams, &c, have written refutations; Crisp, Richardson, Saltmarsh, &c, defences, of the Antinomians; Wigandus, a comparison between ancient and modern Antinomians.

The doctrine of Agricola was in itself obscure, and is thought to have been represented worse than it really was by Luther, who wrote against him with acrimony, and first styled him and his followers Antinomians. Agricola, in defending himself, complained that opinions were imputed to him which he did not hold. The writings of Dr. Crisp in the seventeenth century are considered as highly favourable to Antinomianism, though he acknowledges that, “in respect of the rules of righteousness, or the matter of obedience, we are under the law still, or else,” as he adds, “we are lawless, to live every man as seems good in his own eyes, which no true Christian dares so much as think of.” The following sentiments, however, among others, are taught in his sermons: “The law is cruel and tyrannical, requiring what is naturally impossible.” “The sins of the elect were so imputed to Christ, as that though he did not commit them, yet they became actually his transgressions, and ceased to be theirs.” “The feelings of conscience, which tell them that sin is theirs, arise from a want of knowing the truth.” “It is but the voice of a lying spirit in the hearts of believers, that saith they have yet sin wasting their consciences, and lying as a burden too heavy for them to bear.” “Christ’s righteousness is so imputed to the elect, that they, ceasing to be sinners, are as righteous as he was, and all that he was.” “An elect person is not in a condemned state while an unbeliever;

and should he happen to die before God call him to believe, he would not be lost." "Repentance and confession of sin are not necessary to forgiveness. A believer may certainly conclude before confession, yea, as soon as he hath committed sin, the interest he hath in Christ, and the love of Christ embracing him." These dangerous sentiments, and others of a similar bearing, have been fully answered by many writers; but by none more ably than by the Rev. John Fletcher, in his "Checks to Antinomianism."

ANTIOCH, a city of Upper Syria, on the river Orontes, about twenty miles from the place where it discharges itself into the Mediterranean. It was built by Seleucus Nicanor, about three hundred years before Christ; and became the seat of empire of the Syrian kings of the Macedonian race, and afterward of the Roman governors of the eastern provinces; being very centrally and commodiously situated midway between Constantinople and Alexandria, about seven hundred miles from each, in  $37^{\circ} 17'$  north latitude, and  $36^{\circ} 45'$  east longitude. No city perhaps, Jerusalem excepted, has experienced more frequent revolutions, or suffered more numerous and dire calamities, than Antioch; as, besides the common plagues of eastern cities, pestilence, famine, fire, and sword, it has several times been entirely overthrown by earthquakes.

In 362, the emperor Julian spent some months at Antioch; which were chiefly occupied in his favourite object of reviving the mythology of Paganism. The grove at Daphne, planted by Seleucus, which, with its temple and oracle, presented, during the reigns of the Macedonian kings of Syria, the most splendid and fashionable place of resort for Pagan worship in the east, had sunk into neglect since the establishment of Christianity. The altar of the god was deserted, the oracle was silenced, and the sacred grove itself defiled by the interment of Christians. Julian undertook to restore the ancient honours and usages of the place; but it was first necessary to take away the pollution occasioned by the dead bodies of the Christians, which were disinterred and removed! Among these was that of Babylas, a bishop of Antioch, who died in prison in the persecution of Decius, and after resting near a century in his grave within the walls of Antioch, had been removed by order of Gallus into the midst of the grove of Daphne, where a church was built over him; the remains of the Christian saint effectually supplanting the former divinity of the place, whose temple and statue, however, though neglected, remained uninjured. The Christians of Antioch, undaunted by the conspiracy against their religion, or the presence of the emperor himself, conveyed the relics of their former bishop in triumph back to their ancient repository within the city. The immense multitude who joined in the procession, chanted forth their execrations against idols and idolaters; and on the same night the image and the temple

of the Heathen god were consumed by the flames. A dreadful vengeance might be expected to have followed these scenes; but the real or affected clemency of Julian contented itself with shutting up the cathedral, and confiscating its wealth. Many Christians, indeed, suffered from the zeal of the Pagans; but, as it would appear, without the sanction of the emperor.

In 1268, Antioch was taken by Bibars, or Bondocdar, sultan of Egypt. The slaughter of seventeen thousand, and the captivity of one hundred thousand of its inhabitants, mark the final siege and fall of Antioch; which, while they close the long catalogue of its public woes, attest its extent and population. From this time it remained in a ruinous and nearly deserted condition, till, with the rest of Syria, it passed into the hands of the Ottoman Turks, with whose empire it has ever since been incorporated.

To distinguish it from other cities of the same name, the capital of Syria was called Antiochia apud Daphnem, or Antioch near Daphne, a village in the neighbourhood, where was a temple dedicated to the goddess of that name; though, in truth, the chief deity of the place was Apollo, under the fable of his amorous pursuit of the nymph Daphne; and the worship was worthy of its object. The temple stood in the midst of a grove of laurels and cypresses, where every thing was assembled which could minister to the senses; and in whose recesses the juvenile devotee wanted not the countenance of a libertine god to abandon himself to voluptuousness. Even those of riper years and graver morals could not with safety breathe the atmosphere of a place where pleasure, assuming the character of religion, roused the dormant passions, and subdued the firmness of virtuous resolution. Such being the source, the stream could scarcely be expected to be more pure; in fact, the citizens of Antioch were distinguished only for their luxury in life and licentiousness in manners. This was an unpromising soil for Christianity to take root in. But here, nevertheless, it was planted at an early period, and flourished vigorously. It should be observed, that the inhabitants of Antioch were partly Syrians, and partly Greeks; chiefly, perhaps, the latter, who were invited to the new city by Seleucus. To these Greeks, in particular, certain Cypriot and Cyrenian converts, who had fled from the persecution which followed the death of Stephen, addressed themselves; “and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord.” When the heads of the church at Jerusalem were informed of this success, they sent Barnabas to Antioch, who encouraged the new disciples, and added many to their number; and finding how great were both the field and the harvest, went to Tarsus to solicit the assistance of Paul. Both this Apostle and Barnabas then taught conjointly at Antioch; and great numbers were, by their labours during a whole year, added to the rising church, Acts xi, 19–26; xv, 22–35. Here they were also joined by Peter, who was

reproved by Paul for his dissimulation, and his concession to the Jews respecting the observance of the law, Gal. ii, 11–14.

Antioch was the birthplace of St. Luke and Theophilus, and the see of the martyr Ignatius. In this city the followers of Christ had first the name of Christians given them. We have the testimony of Chrysostom, both of the vast increase of this illustrious church in the fourth century, and of the spirit of charity which continued to actuate it. It consisted at this time of not less than a hundred thousand persons, three thousand of whom were supported out of the public donations. It is painful to trace the progress of declension in such a church as this. But the period now referred to, namely, the age of Chrysostom, toward the close of the fourth century, may be considered as the brightest of its history subsequent to the Apostolic age, and that from which the church at Antioch may date its fall. It continued, indeed, outwardly prosperous; but superstition, secular ambition, the pride of life; pomp and formality in the service of God, in place of humility and sincere devotion; the growth of faction, and the decay of charity; showed that real religion was fast disappearing, and that the foundations were laid of that great apostasy which, in two centuries from this time, overspread the whole Christian world, led to the entire extinction of the church in the east, and still holds dominion over the fairest portions of the west.

Antioch, under its modern name of Antakia, is now but little known to the western nations. It occupies, or rather did till lately occupy, a remote corner of the ancient enclosure of its walls. Its splendid buildings were reduced to hovels; and its population of half a million, to ten thousand wretched beings, living in the usual debasement and insecurity of Turkish subjects. Such was nearly its condition when visited by Pocock about the year 1738, and again by Kinneir in 1813. But its ancient subterranean enemy, which, since its destruction in 587, never long together withheld its assaults, has again triumphed over it: the earthquake of the 13th of August, 1822, laid it once more in ruins; and every thing relating to Antioch is past.

ANTIOCH, of Pisidia. Beside the Syrian capital, there was another Antioch visited by St. Paul when in Asia, and called, for the sake of distinction, Antiochia ad Pisidiam, as belonging to that province, of which it was the capital. Here Paul and Barnabas preached; but the Jews, jealous, as usual, of the reception of the Gospel by the Gentiles, raised a sedition against them, and obliged them to leave the city, Acts xiii, 14, to the end. There were several other cities of the same name, sixteen in number, in Syria and Asia Minor, built by the Seleucidæ, the successors of Alexander in these countries; but the above two are the only ones which it is necessary to describe as occurring in Scripture.

ANTIOCHUS. There were many kings of this name in Syria, much celebrated in the Greek, Roman, and Jewish histories, after the time of Seleucus Nicanor, the father of Antiochus Soter, and reckoned the first king of Syria, after Alexander the Great.

1. Antiochus Soter was the son of Seleucus Nicanor, and obtained the surname of Soter, or Saviour, from having hindered the invasion of Asia by the Gauls. Some think that it was on the following occasion: The Galatians having marched to attack the Jews in Babylon, whose army consisted only of eight thousand men, reinforced with four thousand Macedonians, the Jews defended themselves with so much bravery, that they killed one hundred and twenty thousand men, 2 Mac. viii, 20. It was perhaps, too, on this occasion, that Antiochus Soter made the Jews of Asia free of the cities belonging to the Gentiles, and permitted them to live according to their own laws.

2. Antiochus Theos, or, the God, was the son and successor of Antiochus Soter. He married Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt. Laodice, his first wife, seeing herself despised, poisoned Antiochus, Berenice, and their son, who was intended to succeed in the kingdom. After this, Laodice procured Seleucus Callinicus, her son by Antiochus, to be acknowledged king of Syria. These events were foretold by Daniel: "And in the end of years," the king of Egypt, or of the south, and the king of Syria, or of the north, "shall join themselves together; for the king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement: but she shall not retain the power of the arm; neither shall he stand, nor his arm: but she shall be given up, and they that brought her, and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in these times," Dan. xi, 6.

3. Antiochus the Great was the son of Seleucus Callinicus, and brother to Seleucus Ceraunus, whom he succeeded in the year of the world 3781, and before Jesus Christ 223. He made war against Ptolemy Philopator, king of Egypt, but was defeated near Raphia, 3 Mac. i. Thirteen years after, Ptolemy Philopator being dead, Antiochus resolved to become master of Egypt. He immediately seized Cœlo-Syria, Phenicia, and Judea; but Scopas, general of the Egyptian army, entered Judea while Antiochus was occupied by the war against Attalus, and retook those places. However, he soon lost them again to Antiochus. On this occasion happened what Josephus relates of this prince's journey to Jerusalem. After a victory which he had obtained over Scopas, near the springs of Jordan, he became master of the strong places in Cœlo-Syria and Samaria; and the Jews submitted freely to him, received him into their city and furnished his army plentifully with provisions. In reward for their affection, Antiochus granted them, according to Josephus, twenty thousand pieces of silver, to purchase beasts

for sacrifice, one thousand four hundred and sixty measures of meal, and three hundred and seventy-five measures of salt to be offered with the sacrifices, and timber to rebuild the porches of the Lord's house. He exempted the senators, scribes, and singing men of the temple, from the capitation tax; and he permitted the Jews to live according to their own laws in every part of his dominions. He also remitted the third part of their tribute, to indemnify them for their losses in the war; he forbade the Heathens to enter the temple without being purified, and to bring into the city the flesh of mules, asses, and horses to sell, under a severe penalty.

In the year of the world 3815, Antiochus was overcome by the Romans, and obliged to cede all his possessions beyond Mount Taurus, to give twenty hostages, among whom was his own son Antiochus, afterward surnamed Epiphanes, and to pay a tribute of twelve thousand Euboic talents, each fourteen Roman pounds in weight. To defray these charges, he resolved to seize the treasures of the temple of Belus, at Elymais; but the people of that country, informed of his design, surprised and destroyed him, with all his army, in the year of the world 3817, and before Jesus Christ 187. He left two sons, Seleucus Philopator, and Antiochus Epiphanes, who succeeded him.

4. Antiochus Epiphanes, the son of Antiochus the Great, having continued a hostage at Rome fourteen years, his brother Seleucus resolved to procure his return to Syria, and sent his own son Demetrius to Rome in the place of Antiochus. Whilst Antiochus was on his journey to Syria, Seleucus died, in the year of the world 3829. When, therefore, Antiochus landed, the people received him as some propitious deity come to assume the government, and to oppose the enterprises of Ptolemy, king of Egypt, who threatened to invade Syria. For this reason Antiochus obtained the surname of Epiphanes, the illustrious, or of one appearing like a god.

Antiochus quickly turned his attention to the possession of Egypt, which was then enjoyed by Ptolemy Philometor, his nephew, son to his sister Cleopatra, whom Antiochus the Great had married to Ptolemy Epiphanes, king of Egypt. He sent Apollonius, one of his officers, into Egypt, apparently to honour Ptolemy's coronation, but in reality to obtain intelligence whether the great men of the kingdom were inclined to place the government of Egypt in his hands during the minority of the king his nephew, 2 Mac. iv, 21, &c. Apollonius, however, found them not disposed to favour his master; and this obliged Antiochus to make war against Philometor. He came to Jerusalem in 3831, and was received there by Jason, to whom he had sold the high priesthood. He designed to attack Egypt, but returned without effecting any thing. The ambition of those Jews who sought the high priesthood, and bought it of Antiochus, was the

beginning of those calamities which overwhelmed their nation under this prince. Jason procured himself to be constituted in this dignity in the stead of Onias III; but Menelaus offering a greater price, Jason was deprived, and Menelaus appointed in his place. These usurpers of the high priesthood, to gratify the Syrians, assumed the manners of the Greeks, their games and exercises, and neglected the worship of the Lord, and the temple service.

War broke out between Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philometor. Antiochus entered Egypt in the year of the world 3833, and reduced almost the whole of it to his obedience, 2 Mac. v, 3–5. The next year he returned; and whilst he was engaged in the siege of Alexandria, a false report was spread of his death. The inhabitants of Jerusalem testifying their joy at this news, Antiochus, when returning from Egypt, entered this city by force, treated the Jews as rebels, and commanded his troops to slay all they met. Eighty thousand were killed, made captives, or sold on this occasion. Antiochus, conducted by the corrupt high priest Menelaus, entered into the holy of holies, whence he took and carried off the most precious vessels of that holy place, to the value of one thousand eight hundred talents. In the year 3835, Antiochus made a third expedition against Egypt, which he entirely subdued. The year following, he sent Apollonius into Judea, with an army of twenty-two thousand men, and commanded him to kill all the Jews who were of full age, and to sell the women and young men, 2 Mac. v, 24, 25. These orders were too punctually executed. It was on this occasion that Judas Maccabæus retired into the wilderness with his father and his brethren, 2 Mac. v, 29. These misfortunes were only preludes of what they were to suffer; for Antiochus, apprehending that the Jews would never be constant in their obedience to him, unless he obliged them to change their religion, and to embrace that of the Greeks, issued an edict, enjoining them to conform to the laws of other nations, and forbidding their usual sacrifices in the temple, their festivals, and their Sabbath. The statue of Jupiter Olympus was placed upon the altar of the temple, and thus the abomination of desolation was seen in the temple of God. Many corrupt Jews complied with these orders; but others resisted them. Mattathias and his sons retired to the mountains. Old Eleazar, and the seven brethren, suffered death with great courage at Antioch, 2 Mac. vii. Mattathias being dead, Judas Maccabæus headed those Jews who continued faithful, and opposed with success the generals whom king Antiochus sent into Judea. The king, informed of the valour and resistance of Judas, sent new forces; and, finding his treasures exhausted, he resolved to go into Persia to levy tributes, and to collect large sums which he had agreed to pay to the Romans, 1 Mac. iii, 5–31; 2 Mac. ix, 1, &c; 1 Mac. vi, 1, &c. Knowing that very great riches were lodged in the temple of Elymais, he determined to carry it off; but the inhabitants of the country made so vigorous a

resistance, that he was forced to retreat toward Babylonia. When he was come to Ecbatana, he was informed of the defeat of Nicanor and Timotheus, and that Judas Maccabæus had retaken the temple of Jerusalem, and restored the worship of the Lord, and the usual sacrifices. On receiving this intelligence, the king was transported with indignation; and, threatening to make Jerusalem a grave for the Jews, commanded the driver of his chariot to urge the horses forward, and to hasten his journey. However, divine vengeance soon overtook him: he fell from his chariot, and bruised all his limbs. He was also tormented with such pains in his bowels, as allowed him no rest; and his disease was aggravated by grief and vexation. In this condition he wrote to the Jews very humbly, promised them many things, and engaged even to turn Jew, if God would restore him to health. He earnestly recommended to them his son Antiochus, who was to succeed him, and entreated them to favour the young prince, and to continue faithful to him. He died, overwhelmed with pain and grief, in the mountains of Paratacene, in the little town of Tabes, in the year of the world 3840, and before Jesus Christ 164.

5. Antiochus Eupator, son of Antiochus Epiphanes, was only nine years old when his father died and left him the kingdom of Syria. Lysias, who governed the kingdom in the name of the young prince, led against Judea an army of one hundred thousand foot, twenty thousand horse, and thirty elephants, 1 Mac. vi; 2 Mac. xiii. He besieged and took the fortress of Bethsura, and thence marched against Jerusalem. The city was ready to fall into his hands when Lysias received the news that Philip, whom Antiochus Epiphanes had entrusted with the regency of the kingdom, had come to Antioch to take the government, according to the disposition of the late king. He therefore proposed an accommodation with the Jews, that he might return speedily to Antioch and oppose Philip. After concluding a peace, he immediately returned into Syria, with the young king and his army.

In the meantime, Demetrius Soter, son of Seleucus Philopator, and nephew to Antiochus Epiphanes, to whom by right the kingdom belonged, having escaped from Rome, came into Syria. Finding the people disposed for revolt, Demetrius headed an army, and marched directly to Antioch, against Antiochus and Lysias. However, the inhabitants did not wait till he besieged the city; but opened the gates, and delivered to him Lysias and the young king Antiochus Eupator, whom Demetrius caused to be put to death, without suffering them to appear in his presence. Antiochus Eupator reigned only two years, and died in the year of the world 3842, and before Jesus Christ 162.



6. Antiochus Theos, or the Divine, the son of Alexander Balas, king of Syria, was brought up by the Arabian prince Elmachuel, or, as he is called in the Greek, Simalcue, 1 Mac. xi, 39, 40, &c. Demetrius Nicanor, king of Syria, having rendered himself odious to his troops, one Diodotus, otherwise called Tryphon, came to Zabdiel, a king in Arabia, and desired him to entrust him with young Antiochus, whom he promised to place on the throne of Syria, which was then possessed by Demetrius Nicanor. After some hesitation, Zabdiel complied with the request; and Tryphon carried Antiochus into Syria, and put the crown on his head. The troops dismissed by Demetrius, came and joined Tryphon, who, having formed a powerful army, defeated Demetrius, and forced him to retreat to Seleucia. Tryphon seized his elephants, and rendered himself master of Antioch, in the year of the world 3859, and before Jesus Christ 145. Antiochus Theos, to strengthen himself in his new acquisition, sent letters to Jonathan Maccabæus, 67<sup>th</sup> high priest and prince of the Jews, confirming him in the high priesthood, and granting him four toparchies, or four considerable places, in Judea. He also received Jonathan into the number of his friends, sent him vessels of gold, permitted him to use a gold cup, to wear purple, and a golden buckle; and he gave his brother, Simon Maccabæus, the command of all his troops on the coast of the Mediterranean, from Tyre to Egypt. Jonathan, engaged by so many favours, declared resolutely for Antiochus, or rather for Tryphon, who reigned under the name of this young prince; and on several occasions, he attacked the generals of Demetrius, who still possessed many places beyond Jordan and in Galilee, 1 Macc. xi, 63, &c; xii, 24, 34. Tryphon, seeing young Antiochus in peaceable possession of the kingdom of Syria, resolved to usurp his crown. He thought it necessary, in the first place, to secure Jonathan Maccabæus who was one of the most powerful supporters of Antiochus's throne. He came, therefore, with troops into Judea, invited Jonathan to Ptolemais, and there, on frivolous pretences, made him prisoner. However, Simon, Jonathan's brother, headed the troops of Judea, and opposed Tryphon, who intended to take Jerusalem. Tryphon, being disappointed, put Jonathan to death at Bassa or Bascama, and returned into Syria, where, without delay, he executed his design of killing Antiochus. He corrupted the royal physicians, who, having published that Antiochus was tormented with the stone, murdered him, by cutting him without any necessity. Thus Tryphon was left master of Syria, in the year of the world 3861, and before Jesus Christ 143.

7. Antiochus Sidetes, or Soter the Saviour, or Eusebes the pious, was the son of Demetrius Soter, and brother to Demetrius Nicanor. Tryphon, the usurper of the kingdom of Syria, having rendered himself odious to his troops, they deserted him, and offered their services to Cleopatra, the wife of Demetrius Nicanor. She lived in the city of Seleucia, shut up with her

children, while her husband Demetrius was a prisoner in Persia, where he had married Rodeguna, the daughter of Arsaces king of Persia. Cleopatra, therefore sent to Antiochus Sidetes, her brother-in-law, and offered him the crown of Syria, if he would marry her; to which Antiochus consented. This prince was then at Cnidus, where his father, Demetrius Soter had placed him with one of his friends. He came into Syria, and wrote to Simon Maccabæus, to engage him against Tryphon, 1 Macc. xv, 1, 2, 3, &c. He confirmed the privileges which the kings of Syria had granted to Simon, permitted him to coin money with his own stamp, declared Jerusalem and the temple exempt from royal jurisdiction, and promised other favours as soon as he should obtain peaceable possession of the kingdom which had belonged to his ancestors. Antiochus Sidetes having married his sister-in-law, Cleopatra, in the year of the world 3865, the troops of Tryphon resorted to him in crowds. Tryphon, thus abandoned, retired to Dora, in Phœnicia, whither Antiochus pursued him with an army of 120,000 foot, 800 horse, and a powerful fleet. Simon Maccabæus sent Antiochus two thousand chosen men, but the latter refused them and revoked all his promises. He also sent Athenobius to Jerusalem to oblige Simon to restore to him Gazara and Joppa, with the citadel of Jerusalem; and to demand of him five hundred talents more, as reparation for injuries the king had suffered, and as tribute for his own cities. At the same time he threatened to make war upon him, if he did not comply. Simon showed Athenobius all the lustre of his wealth and power, told him he had in his possession no place which belonged to Antiochus, and said that the cities of Gazara and Joppa had greatly injured his people, and he would give the king for the property of them one hundred talents. Athenobius returned with great indignation to Antiochus, who was extremely offended at Simon's answer. In the meantime, Tryphon having escaped privately from Dora, embarked in a vessel and fled. Antiochus pursued him, and sent Cendebeus with troops into the maritime parts of Palestine, and commanded him to rebuild Cedron, and fight the Jews. John Hircanus, son of Simon Maccabæus, was then at Gaza, and gave notice to his father of the coming of Cendebeus. Simon furnished his sons, John Hircanus and Judas with troops, and sent them against Cendebeus, whom they routed in the plain and pursued to Azotus.

Antiochus followed Tryphon, till he forced him to kill himself in the year of the world 3869. After this, Antiochus thought only of reducing to his obedience those cities which, in the beginning of his father's reign, had shaken off their subjection. Simon Maccabæus, prince and high priest of the Jews, being treacherously murdered by Ptolemy, his son-in-law, in the castle of Docus, near Jericho, the murderer immediately sent to Antiochus Sidetes to demand troops, that he might recover for him the country and cities of the Jews. Antiochus came in person with an army, and besieged

Jerusalem, which was bravely defended by John Hircanus. The siege was long protracted; and the king divided his army into seven parts, and guarded all the avenues of the city. It being the time for celebrating the feast of tabernacles, the Jews desired of Antiochus a truce for seven days. The king not only granted this request, but sent them bulls with gilded horns, and vessels of gold and silver filled with incense, to be offered in the temple. He also ordered such provisions as they wanted, to be given to the Jewish soldiers. This courtesy of the king so won the hearts of the Jews, that they sent ambassadors to treat of peace, and to desire that they might live according to their own laws. Antiochus required that they should surrender their arms, demolish the city walls, pay tribute for Joppa and the other cities they possessed out of Judea, and receive a garrison into Jerusalem. To these conditions, except the last, the Jews consented; for they could not be induced to see an army of strangers in their capital, and chose rather to give hostages and five hundred talents of silver. The king entered the city, beat down the breast work above the walls, and returned to Syria, in the year of the world 3870, and before Jesus Christ 134. Three years after, Antiochus marched against the Persians, or Parthians, and demanded the liberty of his brother Demetrius Nicanor, who had been made prisoner long before by Arsaces, and was detained for the purpose of being employed in exciting a war against Antiochus. This war, therefore, Antiochus thought proper to prevent. With an army of eighty thousand, or, as Orosius says, of one hundred thousand men, he marched toward Persia, and no sooner appeared on the frontiers of that country, than several eastern princes, detesting the pride and avarice of the Persians, came and surrendered. Antiochus defeated his enemies in three engagements, and took Babylon. He was accompanied in these expeditions by John Hircanus, high priest of the Jews, who, it is supposed, obtained the surname of Hircanus from some gallant action which he performed.

As the army of Antiochus was too numerous to continue assembled in any one place, he was obliged to divide it, to put it into winter quarters. These troops behaved with so much insolence, that they alienated the minds of all men. The cities in which they were, privately surrendered to the Persians; and all resolved to attack, in one day, the garrisons they contained, that the troops being separated might not assist each other. Antiochus at Babylon obtained intelligence of this design, and, with the few soldiers about him, endeavoured to succour his people. He was attacked in the way by Phraates, king of Persia, whom he fought with great bravery; but being at length deserted by his own forces, according to the generality of historians, he was overpowered and killed by the Persians or Parthians. Appian, however, says that he killed himself, and Ælian, that he threw himself headlong from a precipice. This event took place in the year of the world

3874, and before Jesus Christ 130. After the death of Sidetes, Demetrius Nicanor, or Nicetor, reascended the throne of Syria.

ANTIPÆDOBAPTISTS, a denomination given to those who object to the baptism of infants. The word is derived from ἀντι, against, παῖς, παιδός, a child, βαπτίζω, I baptize. See Baptism.

ANTIPAS, Antipas-Herod, or Herod-Antipas, was the son of Herod the Great, and Cleopatra of Jerusalem. Herod the Great, in his first will, declared him his successor in the kingdom; but he afterward named his son Archelaus king of Judea, and gave to Antipas only the title of tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa. Archelaus going to Rome, to persuade the emperor to confirm his father's will, Antipas also went thither. The emperor bestowed on Archelaus one moiety of what had been assigned him by Herod, with the quality of ethnarch, and promised to grant him the title of king when he had shown himself deserving of it by his virtues. To Antipas, Augustus gave Galilee and Peræa; and to Philip, Herod's other son, the Batanæa, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, with some other places.

Antipas, returning to Judea, took great pains in adorning and fortifying the principal places of his dominions. He married the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia, whom he divorced about A. D. 33, that he might marry his sister-in-law, Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip, who was still living. John the Baptist, exclaiming against this incest, was seized by order of Antipas, and imprisoned in the castle of Machærus. Josephus says, that Antipas caused John to be taken, because he drew too great a concourse after him; and Antipas was afraid he should use his influence over the people to induce them to revolt. But Josephus has reported the pretence for the true cause. The evangelists, who were better informed than Josephus, as being eye witnesses of what passed, and particularly acquainted with John and his disciples, assure us, that the true reason of imprisoning John was the aversion of Herod and Herodias against him, on account of his liberty in censuring their scandalous marriage, Matt. xiv, 3, 4; Mark vi, 14, 17, 18; Luke iii, 19, 20. When the king was celebrating his birth day, with the principal persons of his court, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased him so well that he swore to give her whatever she should ask. She consulted her mother, who advised her to ask the head of John the Baptist. Returning, therefore, to the hall, she addressed herself to the king, and said, "Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger." The king was afflicted at this request; but in consideration of his oath, and of the persons at table with him, he sent one of his guards, who beheaded John in prison. The head was brought in, and given to the young woman, who delivered it to her mother, Matt. xiv, 5, 6, &c. Aretas, king of Arabia, to revenge the affront which Herod had offered to his daughter, declared war

against him, and vanquished him in a very obstinate contest. Josephus tells us, that the Jews attributed the defeat of Herod to the death of John the Baptist. In the year of the Christian æra 39, Herodias being jealous of the prosperity of her brother Agrippa, who from a private person had become king of Judea, persuaded her husband, Herod-Antipas, to visit Rome, and desire the same dignity of the emperor Caius. She resolved to accompany him; and hoped that her presents and appearance would contribute to procure the emperor's favour. However, Agrippa obtaining intelligence of this design, wrote to the emperor and accused Antipas. The messenger of Agrippa arrived at Baiæ, where the emperor was, at the very time when Herod received his first audience. Caius, on the delivery of Agrippa's letters, read them with great earnestness. In these letters, Agrippa accused Antipas of having been a party in Sejanus's conspiracy against Tiberius, and said that he still carried on a correspondence with Artabanus, king of Parthia, against the Romans. As a proof of this, he affirmed that Antipas had in his arsenals arms for seventy thousand men. Caius being angry, demanded hastily of Antipas, if it were true that he had such a quantity of arms? The king not daring to deny it, was instantly banished to Lyons in 69Gaul. The emperor offered to forgive Herodias, in consideration of her brother Agrippa; but she chose rather to follow her husband, and to share his fortune in banishment. This is that Antipas, who, being at Jerusalem at the time of our Saviour's passion, ridiculed Jesus whom Pilate had sent to him, dressed him in worn-out royalty, and sent him back to Pilate as a mock king, whose ambition gave him no umbrage, Luke xxiii, 7, 11. The year of the death of Antipas is unknown; but it is certain that he, as well as Herodias, died in exile. Josephus says, that he died in Spain, whither Caius, on his coming into Gaul the first year of his banishment, might order him to be sent.

2. Antipas, the faithful martyr or witness mentioned in the book of Revelation, ii, 13. He is said to have been one of our Saviour's first disciples, and to have suffered martyrdom at Pergamus, of which he was bishop. His Acts relate that he was burnt in a brazen bull. Though ancient ecclesiastical history furnishes no account of this Antipas, yet it is certain that, according to all the rules of language, what is said concerning him by St. John must be understood literally, and not mystically, as some interpreters have done.

ANTIPATRIS, Acts xxiii, 31, a town in Palestine, anciently called Caphar-Saba, according to Josephus; but named Antipatris by Herod the Great, in honour of his father Antipater. It was situated in a pleasant valley, near the mountains, in the way from Jerusalem to Cæsarea. Josephus places it at about the distance of seventeen miles from Joppa. To this place St. Paul was brought in his way to the governor of Judea at Cæsarea, Acts xxiii, 31.

ANTITYPE, that which answers to a type or figure. A type is a model, mould, or pattern; that which is formed according to it is an antitype. See Type.

ANTONIA, one of the towers of Jerusalem, called by Herod after M. Antony. The Romans generally kept a garrison in this tower; and from thence it was that the tribune ran with his soldiers to rescue St. Paul out of the hands of the Jews, who had seized him in the temple, and designed to have murdered him, Acts xxi, 31, 32.

APE, אָפֶה, κῆφος and κῆπος, cephus, 1 Kings x, 22; 2 Chron. ix, 21. This animal seems to be the same with the ceph of the Ethiopians, of which Pliny speaks, l. viii, c. 19: "At the games given by Pompey the Great," says he, "were shown cephs brought from Ethiopia, which had their fore feet like a human hand, their hind legs and feet also resembled those of a man." The Scripture says that the fleet of Solomon brought apes, or rather monkeys, &c, from Ophir. The learned are not agreed respecting the situation of that country; but Major Wilford says that the ancient name of the River Landi sindh in India was Cophes. May it not have been so called from the אָפֶה inhabiting its banks?

We now distinguish this tribe of creatures into 1. Monkeys, those with long tails; 2. Apes, those with short tails; 3. Baboons, those without tails. The ancient Egyptians are said to have worshipped apes; it is certain that they are still adored in many places in India. Maffeus describes a magnificent temple dedicated to the ape, with a portico for receiving the victims sacrificed, supported by seven hundred columns.

"With glittering gold and sparkling gems they shine,  
But apes and monkeys are the gods within."

Figures of apes are also made and revered as idols, of which we have several in Moore's "Hindoo Pantheon;" also in the avatars, given in Maurice's "History of India," &c. In some parts of the country the apes are held sacred, though not resident in temples; and incautious English gentlemen, by attempting to shoot these apes, (rather, perhaps, monkeys,) have been exposed, not only to all manner of insults and vexations from the inhabitants of the villages, &c, adjacent, but have even been in danger of their lives.

APHARSACHITES, a people sent by the kings of Assyria to inhabit the country of Samaria, in the room of those Israelites who had been removed beyond the Euphrates, Ezra v, 6. They, with the other Samaritans, opposed the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, Ezra iv, 9.

APIS, a symbolical deity worshipped by the Egyptians. It was an ox, having certain exterior marks, in which animal the soul of the great Osiris was supposed to subsist. The ox was probably made the symbol of Osiris because he presided over agriculture.

APOCALYPSE, Ἀποκάλυψις, signifies revelation. It is, however, particularly applied to the Revelations which St. John had in the isle of Patmos, whither he had been banished. The testimonies in favour of the book of the Revelation being a genuine work of St. John the Evangelist are very full and satisfactory. Andrew, bishop of Cæsarea in Capadocia, in the fifth century, assures us that Papias acknowledged the Revelation to be inspired. But the earliest author now extant who mentions this book is Justin Martyr, who lived about sixty years after it was written, and he ascribes it to St. John. So does Iræneus, whose evidence is alone sufficient upon this point; for he was the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of John himself; and he expressly tells us that he had the explanation of a certain passage in this book from those who had conversed with St. John the author. These two fathers are followed by Clement of Alexandria, Theophilus of Antioch, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, Jerome, Athanasius, and many other ecclesiastical writers, all of whom concur in considering the Apostle John as the author of the Revelation. Some few persons, however, doubted the genuineness of this book in the third and fourth centuries; but since that time it has been very generally acknowledged to be canonical; and, indeed, as Mr. Lowman observes, "hardly any one book has received more early, more authentic, and more satisfactory attestations." The omission of this book in some of the early catalogues of the Scriptures, was probably not owing to any suspicion concerning its authenticity or genuineness, but because its obscurity and mysteriousness were thought to render it less fit to be read publicly and generally. It is called the Revelation of 70 John the Divine; and this appellation was first given to St. John by Eusebius, not to distinguish him from any other person of the same name, but as an honourable title, intimating that to him was more fully revealed the system of divine counsels than to any other prophet of the Christian dispensation.

St. John was banished to Patmos in the latter part of the reign of Domitian, and he returned to Ephesus immediately after the death of that emperor, which happened in the year 96; and as the Apostle states, that these visions appeared to him while he was in that island, we may consider this book as written in the year 95 or 96.

In the first chapter, St. John asserts the divine authority of the predictions which he is about to deliver; addresses himself to the churches of the

Proconsular Asia; and describes the first vision, in which he is commanded to write the things then revealed to him. The second and third chapters contain seven epistles to the seven churches in Asia; namely, of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea, which relate chiefly to their then respective circumstances and situation. At the fourth chapter the prophetic visions begin, and reach to the end of the book. They contain a prediction of all the most remarkable revolutions and events in the Christian church from the time of the Apostle to the final consummation of all things. An attempt to explain these prophecies does not fall within the design of this work; and therefore those who are disposed to study this sublime and mysterious book are referred to Mede, Daubuz, Sir Isaac Newton, Lowman, Bishop Newton, Bishop Hurd, and many other excellent commentators. These learned men agree in their general principles concerning the interpretation of this book, although they differ in some particular points; and it is not to be expected that there should be a perfect coincidence of opinion in the explanation of those predictions which relate to still future times; for, as the incomparable Sir Isaac Newton observes, "God gave these and the prophecies of the Old Testament, not to gratify men's curiosity, by enabling them to foreknow things, but that after they were fulfilled they might be interpreted by the event, and his own prescience, not that of the interpreters, be then manifested thereby to the world." "To explain this book perfectly," says Bishop Newton, "is not the work of one man, or of one age; but probably it never will be clearly understood, till it is all fulfilled." It is graciously designed, that the gradual accomplishment of these predictions should afford, in every succeeding period of time, additional testimony to the divine origin of our holy religion.

APOCRYPHA, books not admitted into the sacred canon, being either spurious, or at least not acknowledged to be divine. The word Apocrypha is of Greek origin, and is either derived from the words ἀπὸ τῆς κρύπτῆς, because the books in question were removed from the crypt, chest, ark, or other receptacle in which the sacred books were deposited whose authority was never doubted, or more probably from the verb ἀποκρύπτω, to hide or conceal, because they were concealed from the generality of readers, their authority not being recognised by the church, and because they are books which are destitute of proper testimonials, their original being obscure, their authors unknown, and their character either heretical or suspected. The advocates of the church of Rome, indeed, affirm that some of these books are divinely inspired; but it is easy to account for this: the apocryphal writings serve to countenance some of the corrupt practices of that church. The Protestant churches not only account those books to be apocryphal and merely human compositions which are esteemed such by the church of Rome, as the Prayer of Manasseh, the third and fourth books of Esdras, the



addition at the end of Job, and the hundred and fifty-first Psalm; but also the books of Tobit, Judith, the additions to the book of Esther, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch the Prophet, with the Epistle of Jeremiah, the Song of the Three Children, the Story of Susanna, the Story of Bel and the Dragon, and the first and second books of Maccabees. The books here enumerated are unanimously rejected by Protestants for the following reasons:--

1. They possess no authority whatever, either external or internal, to procure their admission into the sacred canon. None of them are extant in Hebrew; all of them are in the Greek language, except the fourth book of Esdras, which is only extant in Latin. They were written for the most part by Alexandrian Jews, subsequently to the cessation of the prophetic spirit, though before the promulgation of the Gospel. Not one of the writers in direct terms advances a claim to inspiration; nor were they ever received into the sacred canon by the Jewish church, and therefore they were not sanctioned by our Saviour. No part of the apocrypha is quoted, or even alluded to, by him or by any of his Apostles; and both Philo and Josephus, who flourished in the first century of the Christian æra, are totally silent concerning them.

2. The apocryphal books were not admitted into the canon of Scripture during the first four centuries of the Christian church. They are not mentioned in the catalogue of inspired writings made by Melito bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the second century, nor in those of Origen in the third century, of Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerom, Rufinus, and others of the fourth century; nor in the catalogue of canonical books recognised by the council of Laodicea, held in the same century, whose canons were received by the catholic church; so that as Bishop Burnet well observes, we have the concurring sense of the whole church of God in this matter. To this decisive evidence against the canonical authority of the apocryphal books, we may add that they were never read in the Christian church until the fourth century; when, as Jerom informs us, they were read “for example of life, and instruction of planners; but were not applied to establish any doctrine.” And contemporary writers state, that although they were not approved as canonical or inspired writings, yet some of them, particularly Judith, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus, were allowed to be perused by catechumens. As a proof that they were not regarded as canonical in the fifth century, Augustine relates, that when the book of Wisdom and other writings of the same class were publicly read in the church, they were given to the readers or inferior ecclesiastical officers, who read them in a lower place than those which were universally acknowledged to be canonical, which were read by the bishops and presbyters in a more eminent and

conspicuous manner. To conclude: notwithstanding the veneration in which these books were held by the western church, it is evident that the same authority was never ascribed to them as to the Old and New Testament until the last council of Trent, at its fourth session, presumed to place them all (except the Prayer of Manasseh and the third and fourth books of Esdras) in the same rank with the inspired writings of Moses and the Prophets.

APOLLINARIANS, or Apollinarists, or, as they are called by Epiphanius, Dimaritatæ, a sect who derive their principal name from Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, in the fourth century. Apollinaris strenuously defended the divinity of Christ against the Arians; but by indulging too freely in philosophical distinctions and subtleties, he denied in some measure his humanity. He maintained that the body which Christ assumed was endowed with a sensitive, and not a rational, soul; and that the divine nature performed the functions of reason, and supplied the place of the intellectual principle in man. Hence it seemed to follow, that the divine nature in Christ was blended with the human and suffered with it the pains of crucifixion and death. Apollinaris and his followers have been charged with other errors by certain ancient writers; but it is not easy to determine how far their charge is worthy of credit. The doctrine of Apollinaris was first condemned by a council at Alexandria in 362, and afterward in a more formal manner by a council at Rome in 375, and by another council in 378, which deposed Apollinaris from his bishopric. In short, it was attacked at the same time by the laws of the emperors, the decrees of councils, and the writings of the learned; and sunk by degrees under their united force.

APOLLOS was a Jew of Alexandria, who came to Ephesus in the year of our Lord 54, during the absence of St. Paul, who had gone to Jerusalem, Acts xviii, 24. He was an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures; but he knew only the baptism of John, and was not fully informed of the higher branches of Gospel doctrine. However, he acknowledged that Jesus Christ was the Messiah, and declared himself openly as his disciple. At Ephesus, therefore, he began to speak boldly in the synagogue, and demonstrated by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ. Aquila and Priscilla, having heard him there, took him with them, and instructed him more fully in the ways of God. Some time after, he was inclined to go into Achaia, and the brethren wrote to the disciples there, desiring them to receive him. He was very useful at Corinth, where he watered what St. Paul had planted, 1 Cor. iii, 6. It has been supposed, that the great admiration of his disciples for him tended to produce a schism. Some said, "I am of Paul;" some, "I am of Apollos;" and others, "I am of Cephas." But this division, which St. Paul mentions and reproves in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, did not prevent Paul and Apollos, personally, from being closely united in the

bonds of Christian charity and affection. Apollos, hearing that the Apostle was at Ephesus, went to meet him, and was there when St. Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians; in which he observes, that he had earnestly entreated Apollos to return to Corinth: but though he had not prevailed with him, Apollos gave him room to hope that he would visit that city at a favourable opportunity. Some have supposed, that the Apostle names Apollos and Cephas, not as the real persons in whose name parties had been formed in Corinth, but that, in order to avoid provoking a temper which he wished to subside, he transfers “by a figure” to Apollos and himself what was really meant of other parties, whom from prudence he declines to mention. However this might be, the reluctance of Apollos to return to Corinth seems to countenance the general opinion. St. Jerom says that Apollos was so dissatisfied with the division which had happened on his account at Corinth, that he retired into Crete with Zeno, a doctor of the law; but that the evil having been corrected by the letter of St. Paul to the Corinthians, Apollos returned to that city, of which he afterward became bishop. The Greeks say that he was bishop of Duras; some, that he was bishop of Iconium, in Phrygia; and others of Cæsarea.

APOLLYON. See Abaddon.

APOLOGIES, in ecclesiastical history, were defences (so the Greek word means) of Christianity, presented to Heathen emperors, by the Christian fathers, who were therefore called Apologists. The first was presented to the emperor Adrian, by Quadratus, A. D. 126, a fragment of which is preserved by Eusebius; but another, presented soon after to the same, by Aristides, a converted Athenian philosopher, is totally lost. Justin Martyr wrote two apologies; the latter (to the Roman senate) is imperfect at the beginning; but the former, addressed to Antoninus Pius, is preserved entire, and was published in English, in 1709, by the Rev. W. Reeves, together with one by Tertullian, the Octavius (a dialogue) of Minucius Felix, and the Commentary of Vincentius Lirinensis, with notes and preliminary dissertations to each, in 2 vols. 8vo. The Apologies are curious and valuable remains of antiquity, as showing what were the objections of the Heathens, and the manner in which they were rebutted by the early Christians.

APOSTASY, a deserting or abandoning of the true religion. The word is borrowed from the Latin *apostatare*, or *apostare*, to despise or violate any thing. Hence *apostatare leges* anciently signified to transgress the laws. The Latin *apostatare*, again, comes from *ἀπό*, from, and *ἵστημι*, I stand. Among the Romanists, apostasy also signifies the forsaking of a religious order, whereof a man had made profession, without a lawful dispensation. The ancients distinguished three kinds of apostasy: the first, a

supererogatione, is committed by a priest, or religious, who abandons his profession, and returns to his lay state; the second, a *mandatis Dei*, by a person of any condition, who abandons the commands of God, though he retains his faith; the third, a *fide*, by him who not only abandons his works, but also the faith. There is this difference between an apostate and a heretic; that the latter only abandons a part of the faith, whereas the former renounces the whole. The primitive Christian church distinguished several kinds of apostasy. The first was that of those who relapsed from Christianity into Judaism; the second, that of those who blended Judaism and Christianity together; and the third was that of those who, after having been Christians, voluntarily relapsed into Paganism.

APOSTLE, ἀπόστολος, one of the twelve disciples of Jesus Christ, commissioned by him to preach his Gospel, and propagate it to all parts of the earth. The word originally signifies a person delegated or sent; from ἀποστέλλω, mitto; in which sense it occurs in Herodotus, and other profane authors. Hence, in the New Testament, the term is applied to divers sorts of delegates; and to the twelve disciples by way of eminence. They were limited to the number twelve, in allusion to the twelve tribes of Israel. See Matt. xix, 28; Luke xxii, 30; Rev. xxi, 12–14; and compare Exod. xxiv, 4; Deut. i, 23; and Josh. iv, 2, 3. Accordingly care was taken, on the death of Judas, to choose another, to make up the number, Acts i, 21, 22, 26. Of the first selection and commission of the twelve Apostles, we have an account, Luke vi, 13, &c; Matt. x, 1, &c. Having chosen and constituted twelve persons, under the name of Apostles, our blessed Lord determined that for some time they should be continually with him, not only to attend upon his public ministry, but to enjoy the benefit of his private conversation, that he might furnish them the better for the great work in which they were to be employed; and that, at length, after suitable preparation, he might, with greater advantage, send them abroad to preach his Gospel, and thus make way for his own visits to some more distant parts, where he had not yet been; and to enable them more effectually to do this, he endowed them with the power of working miracles, of curing diseases, and casting out demons. About the commencement of the third year of his ministry, according to the common account of its duration, he sent them out two by two, that they might be assistants to each other in their work; and commanded them to restrict their teaching and services to the people of Israel, and to avoid going to the Gentiles or to the Samaritans; to declare the approach of the kingdom of heaven, and the establishment of the Gospel dispensation; to exercise the miraculous powers with which they had been endowed gratuitously; and to depend for their subsistence on the providence of God, and on the donations of those to whom they ministered. Their names were, Simon Peter; Andrew, his brother; James the greater, the son of Zebedee; and John his brother, who was the beloved disciple;

Philip of Bethsaida; Bartholomew; Thomas, called Didymus, as having a twin brother; Matthew or Levi, who had been a publican; James, the son of Alphaeus, called James the less; Lebbeus, surnamed Thaddeus, and who was also called Judas or Jude, the brother of James; Simon, the Canaanite, so called, as some have thought, because he was a native of Cana, or, as Dr. Hammond thinks, from the Hebrew זִנְיָ, signifying the same with Zelotes, or the Zealot, a name given to him on account of his having before professed a distinguishing zeal for the law; and Judas Iscariot, or a man of Cariath, Josh. xv, 25, who afterward betrayed him, and then laid violent hands on himself. Of these, Simon, Andrew, James the greater, and John, were fishermen; Matthew, and James the son of Alphaeus, were publicans; and the other six were probably fishermen, though their occupation is not distinctly specified.

After the resurrection of our Saviour, and not long before his ascension, the place of Judas the traitor was supplied by Matthias, supposed by some to have been Nathanael of Galilee, to whom our Lord had given the distinguishing character of an "Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile;" and the twelve Apostles, whose number was now completed, received a new commission, of a more extensive nature than the first, to preach the Gospel to all nations, and to be witnesses of Christ, not only in Jerusalem, in all Judea, and in Samaria, but unto the uttermost parts of the earth; and they were qualified for the execution of their office by a plenteous effusion of miraculous powers and spiritual gifts, and particularly the gift of tongues. In consequence of this commission, they preached first to the Jews, then to the Samaritans, and afterward to the idolatrous Gentiles. Their signal success at Jerusalem, where they opened their commission, alarmed the Jewish sanhedrim, before which Peter and John were summoned, and from which they received a strict charge never more to teach, publicly or privately, in the name of Jesus of Nazareth. The noble reply and subsequent conduct of the Apostles are well known. This court of the Jews was so awed and incensed, as to plot the death of the twelve Apostles, as the only effectual measure for preventing the farther spread of Christianity. Gamaliel interposed, by his prudent and moderate counsel; and his speech had so good an effect upon the sanhedrim, that, instead of putting Peter and John to death, they scourged them, renewed their charge and threats, and then dismissed them. The Apostles, however, were not discouraged nor restrained; they counted it an honour to suffer such indignities, in token of their affection to their Master, and zeal in his cause; and they persisted in preaching daily in the courts of the temple, and in other places, that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised and long expected Messiah. Their doctrine spread, and the number of converts in Jerusalem still increased. During the violent persecution that raged at Jerusalem, soon after the martyrdom of St. Stephen, several of the leading men among the

Christians were dispersed; some of them travelled through the regions of Judea and Samaria, and others to Damascus, Phœnicia, the Island of Cyprus, and various parts of Syria; but the twelve Apostles remained, with undaunted firmness, at Jerusalem, avowing their attachment to the persecuted interest of Christ, and consulting how they might best provide for the emergencies of the church, in its infant and oppressed state.

When the Apostles, during their abode at Jerusalem, heard that many of the Samaritans had embraced the Gospel, Peter and John were deputed to confer upon them the gift of the Holy Spirit; for to the Apostles belonged the prerogative of conferring upon others spiritual gifts and miraculous powers. In their return to Jerusalem, from the city of Samaria, they preached the Gospel in many Samaritan villages. The manner of its being sent to Ethiopia, by the conversion of the eunuch who was chief treasurer to Candace, queen of the country, is related in Acts viii, 26, &c. After the Christian religion had been planted in Jerusalem, Judea, and Samaria, and sent into Ethiopia, one of the uttermost parts of the earth, Acts i, 8; and after it had been preached about eight years to the Jews only, God, in his wise and merciful providence, disposed things for the preaching of it among the Gentiles. Cæsarea was the scene in which the Apostle Peter was to open his commission for this purpose; and Cornelius, one of the devout Gentiles, and a man distinguished by his piety and charity, was the first proselyte to Christianity. After Peter had laid the foundation of a Christian church among the devout Gentiles, others imitated his example, and a great number of persons of this description embraced the Christian faith, more especially at Antioch, where the disciples, whom their enemies had hitherto called Galileans, Nazarenes, and other names of reproach, and who, among themselves, had been called “disciples,” “believers,” “the church,” “the saints,” and “brethren,” were denominated, probably not without a divine direction, Christians.

When Christianity had been preached for about eight years among the Jews only, and for about three years more among the Jews and devout Gentiles, the next stage of its progress was to the idolatrous Gentiles, in the year of Christ 44, and the fourth year of the emperor Claudius. Barnabas and Saul were selected for this purpose, and constituted in an extraordinary manner Apostles of the Gentiles, or uncircumcision. Barnabas was probably an elder of the first rank; he had seen Christ in the flesh, had been an eye witness of his being alive again after his crucifixion, and had received the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, as being one of the hundred and twenty. Saul also, since his conversion had preached as a superior prophet, about seven years to the Jews only, and about two years more to the Jews and devout Gentiles. They had both been born in Gentile countries; and therefore may be supposed to have had more respect and affection for the

Gentiles than most of the Jews, who were natives of Judea. Saul had been converted, and had hitherto preached chiefly on Gentile ground; and he had joined with Barnabas in teaching devout Gentiles for a whole year, at Antioch in Syria; by all which previous steps they were regularly conducted to the last gradation, or the conversion of the idolatrous Gentiles. But it was necessary, in order to the being an Apostle, to have seen our Lord Jesus Christ alive after his crucifixion, for the Apostles were in a peculiar manner the witnesses of his resurrection. Some have supposed that Saul saw the person of Jesus, when he was converted, near the city of Damascus; but others, who conceive from the history of this event, that this could not have been the case, as he was instantly struck blind, are of opinion that the season, when his Apostolic qualification and commission were completed, was that mentioned by himself, Acts xxii, 17, when he returned to Jerusalem the second time after his conversion, saw the Lord Jesus Christ in person, and received the command to go quickly out of Jerusalem, that he might be sent unto the Gentiles. See also Acts xxvi, 16–20, where he gives an account of the object of his commission. He also received a variety of gifts and powers, which, superadded to his own genius and learning, as well as fortitude and patience, eminently qualified him for the office of an Apostle, and for that particular exercise of it which was assigned to him. St. Paul is frequently called the Apostle, by way of eminence; and the Apostle of the Gentiles, because his ministry was chiefly employed for the conversion of the Gentiles, as that of St. Peter was for Jews, who is therefore styled the Apostle of the circumcision.

The Apostles having continued at Jerusalem twelve years after the ascension of Christ, as tradition reports, according to his command, determined to disperse themselves in different parts of the world. But what were the particular provinces assigned to each, does not certainly appear from any authentic history. Socrates says, that Thomas took Parthia for his lot; Matthew, Ethiopia, and Bartholomew, India. Eusebius gives the following account: “Thomas, as we learn by tradition, had Parthia for his lot; Andrew, Scythia; John, Asia, who having lived there a long time, died at Ephesus. Peter, as it seems, preached to the dispersed Jews in Pontus and Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia; at length, coming to Rome, he was crucified with his head downward, as he had desired. What need I to speak of St. Paul, who fully preached the Gospel of Christ, from Jerusalem to Illyricum, and at last died a martyr at Rome, in the time of Nero?” From this passage we may conclude, that at the beginning of the fourth century, there were not any certain and well attested accounts of the places out of Judea, in which several of the Apostles of Christ preached; for if there had, Eusebius must have been acquainted with them.

The stories that are told concerning their arrival and exploits among the Gauls, the English, the Spaniards, the Germans, the Americans, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Russians, are too romantic in their nature, and of too recent a date, to be received by an impartial inquirer after truth. These fables were for the most part forged after the time of Charlemagne, when most of the Christian churches contended about the antiquity of their origin, with as much vehemence as the Arcadians, Egyptians, and Greeks disputed formerly about their seniority and precedence.

It appears, however, that all of the Apostles did not die by martyrdom. Heraclion, cited by Clemens Alexandrinus, reckons among the Apostles who did not suffer martyrdom, Matthew, Thomas, Philip, and Levi, probably meaning Lebbeus.

To the Apostles belonged the peculiar and exclusive prerogative of writing doctrinal and preceptive books of authority in the Christian church; and it sufficiently appears that no epistles or other doctrinal writings of any person who was of a rank below that of an Apostle, were received by Christians as a part of their rule of faith. With respect to the writings of Mark and Luke, they are reckoned historical, not doctrinal or dogmatical; and Augustine says, that Mark and Luke wrote at a time when their writings might be approved not only by the church, but by Apostles still living.

The appellation of Apostles was also given to the ordinary travelling ministers of the church. Thus St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, xvi, 7, says, "Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and fellow prisoners, who are of note among the Apostles." In this inferior sense the appellation is applied, by Clement of Alexandria, to Barnabas; who was not an Apostle in the highest sense of the word, so as the twelve and Paul were Apostles. Tertullian calls all the seventy disciples Apostles; and Clement calls Barnabas Apostolical merely in another place, and says that he was one of the seventy, and fellow labourer of Paul. These, says Dr. Lardner, are the highest characters which he really intends to give to Barnabas, and what he means when he styles him Apostle; therefore he need not be supposed to ascribe to Barnabas that large measure of inspiration and high authority, which was peculiar to the Apostles, strictly and properly so called. In a similar subordinate form, St. Clement of Rome is called Apostle. Timothy also is called by Salvian, Apostle, meaning merely Apostolical, or a companion and disciple of Apostles.

Apostle was likewise a title given to those sent by the churches, to carry their alms to the poor of other churches. This usage they borrowed from the synagogues, who called those whom they sent on this message, by the same name; and the function or office itself ἀποστολή, that is, mission. Thus



St. Paul, writing to the Philippians, tells them, that Epaphroditus, their Apostle, had ministered to his wants, chap. ii, 25. It is applied in like manner to those persons who first planted the Christian faith in any place.

Apostle is also used among the Jews, for a kind of officer anciently sent into the several parts and provinces in their jurisdiction, by way of visiter, or commissary; to see that the laws were duly observed, and to receive the moneys collected for the reparation of the temple, and the tribute payable to the Romans. These apostles were a degree below the officers of the synagogues, called patriarchs, and received their commissions from them. Some authors observe, that St. Paul had borne this office; and that it is this he alludes to in the beginning of the Epistle to the Galatians: as if he had said, Paul, no longer an apostle of the synagogue, nor sent by men to maintain the law of Moses, but now an Apostle and envoy of Jesus Christ, &c. St. Jerom, though he does not believe that St. Paul had been an apostle of this kind, yet imagines that he alludes to it in the passage just cited.

APOSTLES' CREED. See Creed.

APPELLATIO, an appeal. The Sempronian law secured this privilege to the Roman citizens, that they could not be capitally convicted, but by the suffrage of the people; and in whatever provinces they happened to reside, if the governor showed a disposition to condemn them to death, to scourge, or deprive them of their property, they had liberty to appeal from his jurisdiction to the judgment of the people. This law, which was enacted under the republican form of government, continued in force under the emperors; so that if any freeman of Rome thought himself ill used and aggrieved by the presidents in any of the provinces, he could, by appeal, remove his cause to Rome, to the determination of the emperor. A number of persons, we are told, were delegated by Augustus, all of consular rank, to receive the appeals of the people in the provinces. These observations will explain the nature of St. Paul's appeal in the Acts of the Apostles.

APPII FORUM, a place about fifty miles from Rome, near the modern town of Piperno on the road to Naples. It probably had its name from the statue of Appius Claudius, a Roman consul, who paved the famous way from Rome to Capua, and whose statue was set up here. To this place some Christians from Rome came to meet St. Paul, Acts xxviii, 15.

APPLE TREE, תפוח, Prov. xxv, 11; Cant. ii, 3, 5; vii, 8; viii, 5; Joel i, 12. As the best apples of Egypt, though ordinary, are brought thither by sea from Rhodes, and by land from Damascus, we may believe that Judea, an intermediate country between Egypt and Damascus, has none that are of any value. Can it be imagined, then, that the apple trees of which the

Prophet Joel speaks, i, 12, and 75 which he mentions among the things that gave joy to the inhabitants of Judea, were those that we call by that name? Our translators must surely have been mistaken here, since the apples which the inhabitants of Judea eat at this day are of foreign growth, and at the same time but very indifferent.

There are five places, beside this in Joel, in which the word occurs; and from them we learn that it was thought the noblest of the trees of the wood, and that its fruit was very sweet or pleasant, Cant. ii, 3; of the colour of gold, Prov. xxv, 11; extremely fragrant, Cant. vii, 8; and proper for those to smell that were ready to faint, Cant. ii, 5. We may be sure that the taphuach was very early known in the holy land, as it is mentioned in the book of Joshua as having given name to a city of Manasseh and one of Judah. Several interpreters and critics render פֶּר עֵץ הָדָר, Lev. xxiii, 40, branches, or fruit, of the beautiful tree; and understand it of the citron; and it is known that the Jews still make use of the fruit of this tree at their yearly feast of tabernacles.

Citron trees are very noble, being large, their leaves beautiful, ever continuing on the trees, of an exquisite smell, and affording a most delightful shade. It might well, therefore, be said, "As the citron tree is among the trees of the wood, so is my beloved among the sons." This is a delicate compliment, comparing the fine appearance of the prince, amid his escort, to the superior beauty with which the citron tree appears among the ordinary trees of the forest; and the compliment is heightened by an allusion to the refreshing shade and the exhilarating fruit.

The exhilarating effects of the fruit are mentioned Cant. ii, 5, "Comfort me with citrons." Egmont and Heyman tell us of an Arabian who was in a great measure brought to himself, when overcome with wine, by the help of citrons and coffee.

To the manner of serving up these citrons in his court, Solomon seems to refer, when he says, "A word fitly spoken is like golden citrons in silver baskets;" whether, as Maimonides supposes, in baskets wrought with open work, or in salvers curiously chased, it nothing concerns us to determine; the meaning is, that an excellent saying, suitably expressed, is as the most acceptable gift in the fairest conveyance. So the rabbins say, that the tribute of the first ripe fruits was carried to the temple in silver baskets.

APRIES, a king of Egypt, called in the sacred writings Pharaoh Hophrah, Jer. xliv, 30. Apries was the son of Psammis, and grandson of Necho, or Nechao, who waged war against Josiah, king of the Jews. He reigned twenty-five years, and was long considered as one of the happiest princes

in the world; but having equipped a fleet for the reduction of the Cyrenians, he lost in this expedition almost the whole of his army. The Egyptians resolved to make him responsible for this ill success, rebelled, and pretended that he undertook the war only to get rid of his subjects, and that he might govern the remainder more absolutely. Apries deputed Amasis, one of his officers, to suppress the rebellion, and induce the people to return to their allegiance. But, while Amasis was haranguing them, one of the multitude placed a diadem about his helmet, and proclaimed him king. The rest applauded him; and Amasis having accepted their offer, continued with them, and confirmed them in their rebellion. Amasis put himself at the head of the rebels, and marched against Apries, whom he defeated and took prisoner. Amasis treated him with kindness; but the people were not satisfied till they had taken him from Amasis and strangled him. Such was the end of Apries, according to Herodotus. Jeremiah threatened this prince with being delivered into the hands of his enemies, as he had delivered Zedekiah, king of Judah, into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.

Apries had made a league with Zedekiah, and promised him assistance, Ezek. xvii, 15. Zedekiah, therefore, relying on his forces, revolted from Nebuchadnezzar, in the year of the world 3414, and before Jesus Christ 590. Early in the year following, Nebuchadnezzar marched against Hezekiah; but as other nations of Syria had shaken off their obedience, he first reduced them to their duty, and toward the end of the year besieged Jerusalem, 2 Kings xxv, 5; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 17; Jer. xxxix, 1; lii, 4. Zedekiah defended himself in Jerusalem, long and obstinately, that he might give time to Pharaoh Hophrah, or Apries, to come to his assistance. Apries advanced with a powerful army; and the king of Babylon raised the siege, and marched to meet him. But Apries not daring to hazard a battle against the Chaldeans, retreated into Egypt, and abandoned Zedekiah. Ezekiel reproaches Egypt severely with this baseness, and says that it had been a staff of reed to the house of Israel, and an occasion of falling; for when they took hold of it by the hand, it broke and rent all their shoulder. He therefore prophesies that Egypt should be reduced to a solitude, and that God would send against it the sword, which would destroy in it man and beast, Ezek. xxix. This was afterward accomplished, first, in the time of Apries; and secondly, in the conquest of Egypt by the Persians.

**AQUILA.** This person was a native of Pontus in Asia Minor, and was converted by St. Paul, together with his wife Priscilla, to the Christian religion. As Aquila was by trade a tentmaker, Acts xviii, 2, 3, as St. Paul was, the Apostle lodged and wrought with him at Corinth. Aquila came thither, not long before, from Italy, being obliged to leave Rome upon the edict which the emperor Claudius had published, banishing the Jews from

that city. St. Paul afterward quitted Aquila's house, and abode with Justus, near the Jewish synagogue at Corinth; probably, as Calmet thinks, because Aquila was a converted Jew, and Justus was a convert from Paganism, that in this case the Gentiles might come and hear him with more liberty. When the Apostle left Corinth, Aquila and Priscilla accompanied him as far as Ephesus, where he left them with that church while he pursued his journey to Jerusalem. They rendered him great service in that city, so far 76as to expose their own lives to preserve his. They had returned to Rome when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, xvi, 4, wherein he salutes them with great kindness. Lastly, they were come back to Ephesus again, when St. Paul wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy, iv, 19, wherein he desires him to salute them in his name. What became of them after this time is not known.

AR, the capital city of the Moabites, situated in the hills on the south of the river Arnon. This city was likewise called Rabbah or Rabbath Moab, to distinguish it from the Ammonite Rabbah. It was afterward called by the Greeks Areopolis; and is at present termed El-Rabba. See Moab.

ARABIA. A vast country of Asia, extending one thousand five hundred miles from north to south, and one thousand two hundred from east to west; containing a surface equal to four times that of France. The near approach of the Euphrates to the Mediterranean constitutes it a peninsula, the largest in the world. It is called Jezirat-el-Arab by the Arabs; and by the Persians and Turks, Arebistan. This is one of the most interesting countries on the face of the earth. It has, in agreement with prophecy, never been subdued; and its inhabitants, at once pastoral, commercial, and warlike, are the same wild, wandering people as the immediate descendants of their great ancestor Ishmael are represented to have been.

Arabia, or at least the eastern and northern parts of it, were first peopled by some of the numerous families of Cush, who appear to have extended themselves, or to have given their name as the land of Cush, or Asiatic Ethiopia, to all the country from the Indus on the east, to the borders of Egypt on the west, and from Armenia on the north to Arabia Deserta on the south. By these Cushites, whose first plantations were on both sides of the Euphrates and Gulf of Persia, and who were the first that traversed the desert of Arabia, the earliest commercial communications were established between the east and the west. But of their Arabian territory, and of the occupation dependent on it, they were deprived by the sons of Abraham, Ishmael, and Midian; by whom they were obliterated in this country as a distinct race, either by superiority of numbers after mingling with them, or by obliging them to recede altogether to their more eastern possessions, or over the Gulf of Arabia into Africa. From this time, that is, about five

hundred and fifty years after the flood, we read only of Ishmaelites and Midianites as the shepherds and carriers of the deserts; who also appear to have been intermingled, and to have shared both the territory and the traffic, as the traders who bought Joseph are called by both names, and the same are probably referred to by Jeremiah, xxv, as “the mingled people that dwell in the desert.” But Ishmael maintained the superiority, and succeeded in giving his name to the whole people.

Arabia, it is well known, is divided by geographers into three separate regions, called Arabia Petræa, Arabia Deserta, and Arabia Felix.

The first, or Arabia Petræa, is the north-western division, and is bounded on the north by Palestine and the Dead Sea, on the east by Arabia Deserta, on the south by Arabia Felix, and on the west by the Heroopolitan branch of the Red Sea and the Isthmus of Suez. The greater part of this division was more exclusively the possession of the Midianites, or land of Midian; where Moses, having fled from Egypt, married the daughter of Jethro, and spent forty years keeping the flocks of his father-in-law: no humiliating occupation in those days, and particularly in Midian, which was a land of shepherds; the whole people having no other way of life than that of rearing and tending their flocks, or in carrying the goods they received from the east and south into Phenicia and Egypt. The word flock, used here, must not convey the idea naturally entertained in our own country of sheep only, but, together with these or goats, horned cattle and camels, the most indispensable of animals to the Midianite. It was a mixed flock of this kind which was the sole care of Moses, during a third part of his long life; in which he must have had abundance of leisure, by night and by day, to reflect on the unhappy condition of his own people, still enduring all the rigours of slavery in Egypt. It was a similar flock also which the daughters of Jethro were watering when first encountered by Moses; a trifling event in itself, but important in the history of the future leader of the Jews; and showing, at the same time, the simple life of the people among whom he was newly come, as well as the scanty supply of water in their country, and the strifes frequently occasioned in obtaining a share of it. Through a considerable part of this region, the Israelites wandered after they had escaped from Egypt; and in it were situated the mountains Horeb and Sinai. Beside the tribes of Midian, which gradually became blended with those of Ishmael, this was the country of the Edomites, the Amalekites, and the Nabathæi, the only tribe of pure Ishmaelites within its precincts. But all those families have long since been confounded under the general name of Arabs. The greater part of this district consists of naked rocks and sandy and flinty plains; but it contained also some fertile spots, particularly in the peninsula of Mount Sinai, and through the long range of Mount Seir.

Map of the  
JOURNEYINGS & ENCAMPMENTS  
of the ISRAELITES from  
EGYPT to CANAAN  
Through the Desert of  
Arabia Petræa

The second region, or Arabia Deserta, is bounded on the north and north-east by the Euphrates, on the east by a ridge of mountains which separates it from Chaldea, on the south by Arabia Felix, and on the west by Syria, Judea, and Arabia Petræa. This was more particularly the country first of the Cushites, and afterward of the Ishmaelites; as it is still of their descendants, the modern Bedouins, who maintain the same predatory and wandering habits. It consists almost entirely of one vast and lonesome wilderness, a boundless level of sand, whose dry and burning surface denies existence to all but the Arab and his camel. Yet, widely scattered over this dreary waste, some spots of comparative fertility are to be found, where, spread around a feeble spring of brackish water, a stunted verdure, or a few palm trees, fix the principal settlement of a tribe, and afford stages of refreshment in these otherwise impassable deserts. Here, with a few dates, the milk of his faithful camel, and perhaps a little corn, brought by painful journeys from distant regions, or plundered from a passing caravan, the Arab supports a hard existence, until the failure of his resources impels him to seek another oasis, or the scanty herbage furnished on a patch of soil by transient rains; or else, which is frequently the case, to resort, by more distant migration, to the banks of the Euphrates; or, by hostile inroads on the neighbouring countries, to supply those wants which the recesses of the desert have denied. The numbers leading this wandering and precarious mode of life are incredible. From these deserts Zerah drew his army of a million of men; and the same deserts, fifteen hundred years after, poured forth the countless swarms, which, under Mohammed and his successors, devastated half of the then known world.

The third region, or Arabia Felix, so denominated from the happier condition of its soil and climate, occupies the southern part of the Arabian peninsula. It is bounded on the north by the two other divisions of the country; on the south and south-east by the Indian Ocean; on the east by part of the same ocean and the Persian Gulf; and on the west by the Red Sea. This division is subdivided into the kingdoms or provinces of Yemen, at the southern extremity of the peninsula; Hejaz, on the north of the former, and toward the Red Sea; Nejed, in the central region; and Hadramant and Oman, on the shores of the Indian Ocean. The four latter subdivisions partake of much of the character of the other greater divisions

of the country, though of a more varied surface, and with a larger portion capable of cultivation. But Yemen seems to belong to another country and climate. It is very mountainous, is well watered with rains and springs, and is blessed with an abundant produce in corn and fruits, and especially in coffee, of which vast quantities are exported. In this division were the ancient cities of Nysa, Musa or Moosa, and Aden. This is also supposed to have been the country of the queen of Sheba. In Hejaz are the celebrated cities of Mecca and Medina.

Arabia Felix is inhabited by a people who claim Jotkan for their father, and so trace their descent direct from Shem, instead of Abraham and Ham. They are indeed a totally different people from those inhabiting the other quarters, and pride themselves on being the only pure and unmixed Arabs. Instead of being shepherds and robbers, they are fixed in towns and cities; and live by agriculture and commerce, chiefly maritime. Here were the people who were found by the Greeks of Egypt enjoying an entire monopoly of the trade with the east, and possessing a high degree of wealth and consequent refinement. It was here, in the ports of Sabæa, that the spices, muslins, and precious stones of India, were for many ages obtained by the Greek traders of Egypt, before they had acquired skill or courage sufficient to pass the straits of the Red Sea; which were long considered by the nations of Europe to be the produce of Arabia itself. These articles, before the invention of shipping, or the establishment of a maritime intercourse, were conveyed across the deserts by the Cushite, Ishmaelite, and Midianite carriers. It was the produce partly of India, and partly of Arabia, which the travelling merchants, to whom Joseph was sold, were carrying into Egypt. The balm and myrrh were probably Arabian, as they are still the produce of the same country; but the spicery was undoubtedly brought farther from the east. These circumstances are adverted to, to show how extensive was the communication, in which the Arabians formed the principal link: and that in the earliest ages of which we have any account, in those of Joseph, of Moses, of Isaiah, and of Ezekiel, “the mingled people” inhabiting the vast Arabian deserts, the Cushites, Ishmaelites, and Midianites, were the chief agents in that commercial intercourse which has, from the most remote period of antiquity, subsisted between the extreme east and west. And although the current of trade is now turned, caravans of merchants, the descendants of these people, may still be found traversing the same deserts, conveying the same articles, and in the same manner as described by Moses!

The singular and important fact that Arabia has never been conquered, has already been cursorily adverted to. But Mr. Gibbon, unwilling to pass by an opportunity of cavilling at revelation, says, “The perpetual independence of the Arabs has been the theme of praise among strangers

and natives; and the arts of controversy transform this singular event into a prophecy and a miracle in favour of the posterity of Ishmael. Some exceptions, that can neither be dissembled nor eluded, render this mode of reasoning as indiscreet as it is superfluous. The kingdom of Yemen has been successively subdued by the Abyssinians, the Persians, the Sultans of Egypt, and the Turks; the holy cities of Mecca and Medina have repeatedly bowed under a Scythian tyrant; and the Roman province of Arabia embraced the peculiar wilderness in which Ishmael and his sons must have pitched their tents in the face of their brethren." But this learned writer has, with a peculiar infelicity, annulled his own argument; and we have only to follow on the above passage, to obtain a complete refutation of the unworthy position with which it begins: "Yet these exceptions," says Mr. Gibbon, "are temporary or local; the body of the nation has escaped the yoke of the most powerful monarchies: the arms of Sesostris and Cyrus, of Pompey, and Trajan, could never achieve the conquest of Arabia; the present sovereign of the Turks may exercise a shadow of jurisdiction, but his pride is reduced to solicit the friendship of a people whom it is dangerous to provoke, and fruitless to attack. The obvious causes of their freedom are inscribed on the character and country of the Arabs. Many ages before Mohammed, their intrepid valour had been severely felt by their neighbours, in offensive and defensive war. The patient and active virtues of a soldier are insensibly nursed in the habits and discipline of a pastoral life. The care of the sheep and camels is abandoned to the women of the tribe; but the martial youth, under the banner of the emir, is ever on horseback and in the field, to practise the exercise of the bow, the javelin, and the scimitar. The long memory of their independence is the firmest pledge of its perpetuity; and succeeding generations are animated to prove their descent, and to maintain their inheritance. Their domestic feuds are suspended on the approach of a common enemy; and in their last hostilities against the Turks, the caravan of Mecca was attacked and pillaged by four score thousand of the confederates. When they advance to battle, the hope of victory is in the front, in the rear the assurance of a retreat. Their horses and camels, who in eight or ten days can perform a march of four or five hundred miles, disappear before the conqueror; the secret waters of the desert elude his search; and his victorious troops are consumed with thirst, hunger, and fatigue, in the pursuit of an invisible foe, who scorns his efforts, and safely reposes in the heart of the burning solitude. The arms and deserts of the Bedouins are not only the safeguards of their own freedom, but the barriers also of the happy Arabia, whose inhabitants, remote from war, are enervated by the luxury of the soil and climate. The legions of Augustus melted away in disease and lassitude; and it is only by a naval power that the reduction of Yemen has been successfully attempted. When Mohammed erected his holy standard, that kingdom was a province of the Persian empire; yet seven princes of the Homerites still reigned in



the mountains; and the vicegerent of Chosroes was tempted to forget his distant country and his unfortunate master.”

Yemen was the only Arabian province which had the appearance of submitting to a foreign yoke; but even here, as Mr. Gibbon himself acknowledges, seven of the native princes remained unsubdued: and even admitting its subjugation to have been complete, the perpetual independence of the Ishmaelites remains unimpeached. For this is not their country. Petra, the capital of the Stony Arabia, and the principal settlement of the Nabathæi, it is true, was long in the hands of the Persians and Romans; but this never made them masters of the country. Hovering troops of Arabs confined the intruders within their walls, and cut off their supplies; and the possession of this fortress gave as little reason to the Romans to exult as the conquerors of Arabia Petræa, as that of Gibraltar does to us to boast of the conquest of Spain.

The Arabian tribes were confounded by the Greeks and Romans under the indiscriminate appellation of Saracens; a name whose etymology has been variously, but never satisfactorily, explained. This was their general name when Mohammed appeared in the beginning of the seventh century. Their religion at this time was Sabianism, or the worship of the sun, moon, &c; variously transformed by the different tribes, and intermingled with some Jewish and Christian maxims and traditions. The tribes themselves were generally at variance, from some hereditary and implacable animosities; and their only warfare consisted in desultory skirmishes arising out of these feuds, and in their predatory excursions, where superiority of numbers rendered courage of less value than activity and vigilance. Yet of such materials Mohammed constructed a mighty empire; converted the relaxed Ishmaelites into good Musselmens; united the jarring tribes under one banner; supplied what was wanting in personal courage by the ardour of religious zeal; and out of a banditti, little known and little feared beyond their own deserts, raised an armed multitude, which proved the scourge of the world.

Mohammed was born in the year 569, of the noble tribe of the Koreish, and descended, according to eastern historians, in a direct line from Ishmael. His person is represented as beautiful, his manners engaging, and his eloquence powerful; but he was illiterate, like the rest of his countrymen, and indebted to a Jewish or Christian scribe for penning his Koran. Whatever the views of Mohammed might have been in the earlier part of his life, it was not till the fortieth year of his age that he avowed his mission as the Apostle of God: when so little credit did he gain for his pretensions, that in the first three years he could only number fourteen converts; and even at the end of ten years his labours and his friends were alike confined

within the walls of Mecca, when the designs of his enemies compelled him to fly to Medina, where he was favourably received by a party of the most considerable inhabitants, who had recently imbibed his doctrines at Mecca. This flight, or Hegira, was made the Mohammedan æra, from which time is computed, and corresponds with the 16th of July, 622, of the Christian æra. Mohammed now found himself sufficiently powerful to throw aside all reserve; declared that he was commanded to compel unbelievers by the sword to receive the faith of one God, and his prophet Mohammed; and confirming his credulous followers by the threats of eternal pain on the one hand, and the allurements of a sensual paradise on the other, he had, before his death, which happened in the year 632, gained over the whole of Arabia to his imposture. His death threw a temporary gloom over his cause, and the disunion of his followers threatened its extinction. Any other empire placed in the same circumstances would have crumbled to pieces; but the Arabs felt their power; they revered their founder as the chosen prophet of God; and their ardent temperament, animated by a religious enthusiasm, gave an earnest of future success, and encouraged the zeal or the ambition of their leaders. The succession, after some bloodshed, was settled, and unnumbered hordes of barbarians were ready to carry into execution the sanguinary dictates of their prophet; and, with “the Koran, tribute, or death,” as their motto, to invade the countries of the 79infidels. During the whole of the succeeding century, their rapid career was unchecked; the disciplined armies of the Greeks and Romans were unable to stand against them; the Christian churches of Asia and Africa were annihilated; and from India to the Atlantic, through Persia, Arabia, Syria, Palestine, Asia Minor, Egypt, with the whole of northern Africa, Spain, and part of France, the impostor was acknowledged. Constantinople was besieged; Rome itself was plundered; and nothing less than the subjection of the whole Christian world was meditated on the one hand and tremblingly expected on the other.

All this was wonderful; but the avenging justice of an incensed Deity, and the sure word of prophecy, relieve our astonishment. It was to punish an apostate race, that the Saracen locusts were let loose upon the earth; and the countries which they were permitted to ravage were those in which the pure light of revelation had been most abused. The eastern church was sunk in gross idolatry; vice and wickedness prevailed in their worst forms; and those who still called themselves Christians trusted more to images, relics, altars, austerities, and pilgrimages, than to a crucified Saviour.

About a hundred and eighty years from the foundation of Bagdad, during which period the power of the Saracens had gradually declined, a dreadful reaction took place in the conquered countries. The Persians on the east, and the Greeks on the west, were simultaneously roused from their long

thralldom, and, assisted by the Turks, who, issuing from the plains of Tartary, now for the first time made their appearance in the east, extinguished the power of the caliphate, and virtually put an end to the Arabian monarchy in the year 936. A succession of nominal caliphs continued to the year 1258: but the provinces were lost; their power was confined to the walls of their capital; and they were in real subjection to the Turks and the Persians until the above year, when Mostacem, the last of the Abbassides, was dethroned and murdered by Holagou, or Hulaku, the Tartar, the grandson of Zingis. This event, although it terminated the foreign dominion of the Arabians, left their native independence untouched. They were no longer, indeed, the masters of the finest parts of the three great divisions of the ancient world: their work was finished; and returning to the state in which Mohammed found them three centuries before, with the exception of the change in their religion, they remained, and still remain, the unconquered rovers of the desert.

It is not the least singular circumstance in the history of this extraordinary people, that those who, in the enthusiasm of their first successes, were the sworn foes of literature, should become for several ages its exclusive patrons. Almansor, the founder of Bagdad, has the merit of first exciting this spirit, which was encouraged in a still greater degree by his grandson Almamon. This caliph employed his agents in Armenia, Syria, Egypt, and at Constantinople, in collecting the most celebrated works on Grecian science, and had them translated into the Arabic language. Philosophy, astronomy, geometry, and medicine, were thus introduced and taught; public schools were established; and learning, which had altogether fled from Europe, found an asylum on the banks of the Tigris. Nor was this spirit confined to the capital: native works began to appear; and by the hands of copyists were multiplied out of number, for the information of the studious, or the pride of the wealthy. The rage for literature extended to Egypt and to Spain. In the former country, the Fatimites collected a library of a hundred thousand manuscripts, beautifully transcribed, and very elegantly bound; and in the latter, the Ommiades formed another of six hundred thousand volumes; forty-four of which were employed in the catalogue. Their capital, Cordova, with the towns of Malaga, Almeria, and Murcia, produced three hundred writers; and seventy public libraries were established in the cities of Andalusia. What a change since the days of Omar, when the splendid library of the Ptolemies was wantonly destroyed by the same people! A retribution, though a slight one, was thus made for their former devastations; and many Grecian works, lost in the original, have been recovered in their Arabic dress. Neither was this learning confined to mere parade, though much of it must undoubtedly have been so. Their proficiency in astronomy and geometry is attested by their astronomical tables, and by the accuracy with which, in the plain of

Chaldea, a degree of the great circle of the earth was measured. But it was in medicine that, in this dark age, the Arabians shone most: the works of Hippocrates and Galen had been translated and commented on; their physicians were sought after by the princes of Asia and Europe; and the names of Rhazis, Albucasis, and Avicenna are still revered by the members of the healing art. So little, indeed, did the physicians of Europe in that age know of the history of their own science, that they were astonished, on the revival of learning, to find in the ancient Greek authors those systems for which they thought themselves indebted to the Arabians!

The last remnant of Arabian science was found in Spain; from whence it was expelled in the beginning of the seventeenth century, by the intemperate bigots of that country, who have never had any thing of their own with which to supply its place. The Arabians are the only people who have preserved their descent, their independence, their language, and their manners and customs, from the earliest ages to the present times; and it is among them that we are to look for examples of patriarchal life and manners. A very lively sketch of this mode of life is given by Sir R. K. Porter, in the person and tribe of an Arab sheik, whom he encountered in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates. "I had met this warrior," says Sir R. K. P., "at the house of the British resident at Bagdad; and came, according to his repeated wish, to see him in a place more consonant with his habits, the tented field; and, as he expressed it, 'at the head of his children.' 80As soon as we arrived in sight of his camp, we were met by crowds of its inhabitants, who, with a wild and hurrying delight, led us toward the tent of their chief. The venerable old man came forth to the door, attended by his subjects of all sizes and descriptions, and greeted us with a countenance beaming kindness; while his words, which our interpreter explained, were demonstrative of patriarchal welcome. One of my Hindoo troopers spoke Arabic; hence the substance of our succeeding discourse was not lost on each other. Having entered, I sat down by my host; and the whole of the persons present, to far beyond the boundaries of the tent, (the sides of which were open,) seated themselves also, without any regard to those more civilized ceremonies of subjection, the crouching of slaves, or the standing of vassalage. These persons, in rows beyond rows, appeared just as he had described, the offspring of his house, the descendants of his fathers, from age to age; and like brethren, whether holding the highest or the lowest rank, they seemed to gather round their common parent. But perhaps their sense of perfect equality in the mind of their chief could not be more forcibly shown, than in the share they took in the objects which appeared to interest his feelings; and as I looked from the elders or leaders of the people, seated immediately around him, to the circles beyond circles of brilliant faces, bending eagerly toward him and his guest, (all, from the most respectably clad to those with hardly a garment covering their active

limbs, earnest to evince some attention to the stranger he bade welcome,) I thought I had never before seen so complete an assemblage of fine and animated countenances, both old and young; nor could I suppose a better specimen of the still existing state of the true Arab; nor a more lively picture of the scene which must have presented itself, ages ago, in the fields of Haran, when Terah sat in his tent door, surrounded by his sons, and his sons' sons, and the people born in his house. The venerable Arabian sheik was also seated on the ground with a piece of carpet spread under him; and, like his ancient Chaldean ancestor, turned to the one side and the other, graciously answering or questioning the groups around him, with an interest in them all which clearly showed the abiding simplicity of his government, and their obedience. On the smallest computation, such must have been the manners of these people for more than three thousand years; thus, in all things, verifying the prediction given of Ishmael at his birth, that he, in his posterity, should 'be a wild man,' and always continue to be so, though 'he shall dwell for ever in the presence of his brethren.' And that an acute and active people, surrounded for ages by polished and luxurious nations, should from their earliest to their latest times, be still found a wild people, dwelling in the presence of all their brethren, (as we may call these nations,) unsubdued and unchangeable, is, indeed, a standing miracle: one of those mysterious facts which establish the truth of prophecy." But although the manners of the Arabians have remained unaltered through so many ages, and will probably so continue, their religion, as we have seen, has sustained an important change; and must again, in the fulness of time, give place to a faith more worthy of the people.

St. Paul first preached the Gospel in Arabia, Gal. i, 17. Christian churches were subsequently founded, and many of their tribes embraced Christianity prior to the fifth century; most of which appear to have been tinged with the Nestorian heresy. At this time, however, it does not appear that the Arabians had any version of the Scriptures in their own language, to which some writers attribute the ease with which they were drawn into the Mohammedan delusion; while the "Greeks, Syrians, Armenians, Abyssinians, Copts, and others," who enjoyed that privilege, were able to resist it.

ARAM, the fifth son of Shem, Gen. x, 22. He was the father of the Syrians, who from him were called Aramæans, or Aramites.

ARARAT, a mountain of Asia, in Armenia, on which the ark of Noah rested after the cessation of the deluge. Concerning the etymology of the name, Dr. Bryant observes, that it is a compound of Ar-Arat, and signifies "the mountain of descent," being equivalent to הַר־אֲרָרַת, of the Hebrews. Of the precise situation of this mountain, different accounts have been given.

Some have supposed that it was one of the mountains which divide Armenia on the south from Mesopotamia, and that part of Assyria inhabited by the Curds, from whom those mountains took the name of Curdue, or Cardu; by the Greeks denominated Gordyæi. It is called by the Arabs Al-Judi, and also Thamanin. In confirmation of this opinion, it is alleged that the remains of the ark were to be seen on these mountains; and it is said, that Berosus and Abydenus both declare, that such a report existed in their time. Epiphanius pretends, if we may credit his assertion, that the relics of the ark were to be seen in his day; and we are farther told, that the emperor Heraclius went from the town of Thamanin, up the mountain Al-Judi, and saw the place of the ark. Others maintain, that mount Ararat was situated toward the middle of Armenia, near the river Araxes, or Aras, about twelve miles from it, according to Tournefort, above two hundred and eighty miles distant from Al-Judi, to the north-east. Ararat seems to be a part of that vast chain of mountains called Caucasus and Taurus; and upon these mountains, and in the adjacent country, were preserved more authentic accounts of the ark than in almost any other part of the world. The region about Ararat, called Araratia, was esteemed among the ancients as nearly a central part of the earth; and it is certainly as well calculated as any other for the accommodation of its first inhabitants, and for the migration of colonies, upon the increase of mankind. The soil of the country was very fruitful, and especially of that part where the patriarch made his first descent. The country also was very high, though it had fine plains and valleys between the mountains. Such a country, therefore, must, after the flood, have been the soonest exsiccated, and, consequently, the soonest habitable.

The mountain which has still the name of Ararat, has retained it through all ages. Tournefort has particularly described it, and from his account it seems to consist chiefly of freestone, or calcareous sandstone. It is a detached mountain in form of a sugar loaf, in the midst of a very extensive plain, consisting of two summits; the lesser, more sharp and pointed; the higher, which is that of the ark, lies north-west of it, and raises its head far above the neighbouring mountains, and is covered with perpetual snow. When the air is clear, it does not appear to be above two leagues from Erivan, and may be seen at the distance of four or five days' journey. Its being visible at such a distance, however, is ascribed not so much to its height, as to its lonely situation, in a large plain, and upon the most elevated part of the country. The ascent is difficult and fatiguing. Tournefort attempted it; and, after a whole day's toil, he was obliged, by the snow and intense cold, to return without accomplishing his design, though in the middle of summer. On the side of the mountain that looks toward Erivan, is a prodigious precipice, very deep, with perpendicular sides, and of a rough, black appearance, as if tinged with smoke.

The summit of Ararat has never been reached, though several attempts have been made; and if the ark rested on the summit, it is certain that those who have spoken of its fragments being seen there in different ages, must have been imposed upon. It is, however, not necessary to suppose that the ark rested upon either of its tops; and that spot would certainly be chosen which would afford the greatest facility of descent. Sir Robert Ker Porter is among the modern travellers who have given us an account of this celebrated mountain:--“As the vale opened beneath us in our descent, my whole attention became absorbed in the view before me. A vast plain, peopled with countless villages; the towers and spires of the churches of Eitch-mai-adzen, arising from amidst them; the glittering waters of the Araxes, flowing through the fresh green of the vale; and the subordinate range of mountains, skirting the base of the awful monument of the antediluvian world. It seemed to stand a stupendous link in the history of man, uniting the two races of men before and after the flood. But it was not until we had arrived upon the flat plain, that I beheld Ararat in all its amplitude of grandeur. From the spot on which I stood, it appeared as if the hugest mountains of the world had been piled upon each other, to form this one sublime immensity of earth, and rock, and snow. The icy peaks of its double heads rose majestically into the clear and cloudless heavens; the sun blazed bright upon them; and the reflection sent forth a dazzling radiance, equal to other suns. This point of the view united the utmost grandeur of plain and height. But the feelings I experienced while looking on the mountain, are hardly to be described. My eye, not able to rest for any length of time upon the blinding glory of its summits, wandered down the apparently interminable sides, till I could no longer trace their vast lines in the mists of the horizon; when an inexpressible impulse, immediately carrying my eye upward again, refixed my gaze upon the awful glare of Ararat; and this bewildered sensibility of sight being answered by a similar feeling in the mind, for some moments I was lost in a strange suspension of the powers of thought.”

The separate peaks are called Great and Little Ararat, and the space between them is about seven miles. “These inaccessible summits,” continues Sir R. K. Porter, “have never been trodden by the foot of man since the days of Noah, if even then; for my idea is, that the ark rested in the space between these heads, and not on the top of either. Various attempts have been made in different ages to ascend these tremendous mountain-pyramids, but in vain: their form, snows, and glaciers, are insurmountable obstacles: the distance being so great from the commencement of the icy region to the highest points, cold alone would be the destruction of any person who should have the hardihood to persevere. On viewing mount Ararat from the northern side of the plain, its

two heads are separated by a wide cleft, or rather glen, in the body of the mountain. The rocky side of the greater head runs almost perpendicularly down to the north-east, while the lesser head rises from the sloping bottom of the cleft, in a perfectly conical shape. Both heads are covered with snow. The form of the greater is similar to the less, only broader and rounder at the top; and shows to the north-west a broken and abrupt front, opening, about half way down, into a stupendous chasm, deep, rocky, and peculiarly black. At that part of the mountain, the hollow of the chasm receives an interruption from the projection of minor mountains, which start from the sides of Ararat like branches from the root of a tree, and run along, in undulating progression, till lost in the distant vapours of the plain." Dr. Shuckford argues that the true Ararat lies among the mountains of the north of India; but Mr. Faber has answered his reasoning, and proved by a comparison of geographical notices incidentally mentioned in the Old Testament, that the Ararat of Armenia is the true Ararat.

ARCHANGEL, according to some, means an angel occupying the eighth rank in the celestial order or hierarchy; but others reckon it a title only applicable to our Saviour; Jude 9; Dan. xii, 1; 1 Thess. iv, 16. On this point Bishop Horsley has the following observations:--"It has been for a long time a fashion in the church to speak very frequently and familiarly of archangels as beings of an order with which we are perfectly well acquainted. Some say there are seven of them. Upon what solid ground that assertion stands, I know not; but this I know, the word 'archangel' is not to be found in any one passage of the Old Testament: in the New Testament it occurs twice, 82 and only twice. One of the two passages is in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians; where the Apostle, among the circumstances of the pomp of our Lord's descent from heaven to the final judgment, mentions 'the voice of the archangel;' the other passage is in the Epistle of St. Jude, where the title of archangel is coupled with the name of 'Michael the archangel.' This passage is so remarkably obscure that I shall not attempt to draw any conclusion from it but this, which manifestly follows, be the particular sense of the passage what it may: since this is one of the two texts in which alone the word 'archangel' is found in the whole Bible; since in this one text only the title of archangel is coupled with any name; and since the name with which it is here coupled is Michael; it follows undeniably that the archangel Michael is the only archangel of whom we know any thing from holy writ. It cannot be proved from holy writ, and, if not from holy writ, it cannot be proved at all, that any archangel exists but the one archangel Michael, and this one archangel Michael is unquestionably the Michael of the book of Daniel.

"I must observe by the way, with respect to the import of the title of archangel, that the word, by etymology, clearly implies a superiority of



rank and authority in the person to whom it is applied. It implies a command over angels; and this is all that the word of necessity implies. But it follows not, by any sound rule of argument, that, because no other superiority than that of rank and authority is implied in the title, no other belongs to the person distinguished by the title, and that he is in all other respects a mere angel. Since we admit various orders of intelligent beings, it is evident that a being highly above the angelic order may command angels.

“To ascertain, if we can, to what order of beings the archangel Michael may belong, let us see how he is described by the Prophet Daniel, who never mentions him by that title; and what action is attributed to him in the book of Daniel and in another book, in which he bears a principal part.

“Now Daniel calls him ‘one of the chief princes,’ or ‘one of the capital princes,’ or ‘one of the princes that are at the head of all:’ for this I maintain to be the full and not more than the full import of the Hebrew words. Now we are clearly got above the earth, into the order of celestials, who are the princes that are first, or at the head of all? Are they any other than the three persons in the Godhead? Michael, therefore, is one of them; but which of them? This is not left in doubt. Gabriel, speaking of him to Daniel, calls him ‘Michael your prince,’ and ‘the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people;’ that is, not for the nation of the Jews in particular, but for the children, the spiritual children, of that holy seed the elect people of God; a description which applies particularly to the Son of God, and to no one else; and in perfect consistence with this description of Michael in the book of Daniel, is the action assigned to him in the Apocalypse, in which we find him fighting with the old serpent, the deceiver of the world, and victorious in the combat. That combat who was to maintain? in that combat who was to be victorious, but the seed of the woman? From all this it is evident, that Michael is a name for our Lord himself, in his particular character of the champion of his faithful people, against the violence of the apostate faction and the wiles of the devil.” To this opinion there is nothing irreconcilable in the “voice of the archangel” mentioned in 1 Thess. iv, 16: since the “shout,” the “voice,” the “trump of God,” may all be the majestic summons of the Judge himself. At the same time we must feel that the reasoning of Bishop Horsley, though ingenious, is far from being conclusive against the existence of one or more archangels.

ARCHBISHOP, a bishop of the first class, who superintends the conduct of other bishops. Archbishops were not known in the east till about the year 320; and though there were some soon after this, who had the title, yet it was only a personal honour, by which the bishops of considerable cities were distinguished. It was not till of late that archbishops became

metropolitans, and had suffragans under them. Athanasius appears to have been the first who used the title archbishop, which he gave occasionally to his predecessor. Gregory Nazianzen, in like manner, gave it to Athanasius; not that either of them was entitled to any jurisdiction, or even any precedency, in virtue of this title. Among the Latins, Isidore Hispalensis is the first who speaks of archbishops.

ARCHELAUS, son of Herod the Great, and Maltace, his fifth wife. Herod having put to death his sons Alexander, Aristobulus, and Antipater, and expunged out of his will Herod Antipas, whom he had declared king, he substituted Archelaus, and gave Antipas the title of tetrarch only. After the death of Herod, Archelaus ordered that king's will to be read, wherein he, Archelaus, was declared king, on condition that Augustus consented. Hereupon the assembly cried, "Long live king Archelaus!" and the soldiers promised the same fidelity to him as they had shown to his father. Archelaus buried his father magnificently, came to Jerusalem, and there mourned seven days, according to custom. He then gave a splendid entertainment to the people, went to the temple, harangued the multitude, promised them good treatment, and declared he would not assume the title of king till the emperor had confirmed it, A. M. 4001; B. C. 3. The people, notwithstanding, tumultuously demanded the execution of those who advised Herod to slay certain zealots, who had pulled down a golden eagle from one of the temple gates. They also required Archelaus to divest Joazar of the high priesthood; and they vehemently reproached the memory of the late king. Archelaus sent troops to suppress the mutineers, and killed near three thousand of them about the temple. After this he embarked at Cæsarea for Rome, to procure from Augustus the confirmation of Herod's will. Antipas, his 83brother, went to Rome likewise, to dispute his title, pretending that Herod's first will should be preferred to his last, which he alleged to have been made by him when his understanding was not sound.

The two brothers, Archelaus and Antipas, procured able orators to display their pretensions before the emperor; and when they had done speaking, Archelaus threw himself at Augustus's feet. Augustus gently raised him, said he would do nothing contrary to Herod's intention or his interest, but refused to decide the affair at that time. Some time afterward, the Jews sent a solemn embassy to Rome, to desire Augustus would permit them to live according to their own laws, and on the footing of a Roman province, without being subject to kings of Herod's family, but only to the governors of Syria. Augustus heard them, and likewise heard Archelaus in reply; then broke up the assembly without declaring himself. After some days, he sent for Archelaus, gave him the title, not of king, but of ethnarch, with one moiety of the territories which his father Herod had enjoyed; promising him the crown likewise, if his good conduct deserved it. Archelaus returned

to Judea, and, under pretence that he had countenanced the seditious against him, he deprived Joazar of the high priesthood, and gave that dignity to his brother Eleazar. He governed Judea with so much violence, that, after seven years, the chiefs of the Samaritans and Jews accused him before Augustus. The emperor immediately sent for his agent at Rome, and without condescending to write to Archelaus he commanded the agent to depart instantly for Judea, and order Archelaus to Rome, to give an account of his conduct. On his arrival at Rome, the emperor called for his accusers, and permitted him to defend himself; which he did so insufficiently, that Augustus banished him to Vienne, in Gaul, where he continued in exile to the end of his life. See Antipas.

ARCHI-SYNAGOGUS, the ruler of a synagogue. See Synagogue.

ARCHITRICLINUS, ἀρχιτρικλινος, generally translated steward, signifies rather the master or superintendent of the feast; “one,” says Gaudentius, “who is the husband’s friend, and commissioned to conduct the order and economy of the feast.” He gave directions to the servants, superintended every thing, commanded the tables to be covered, or to be cleared of the dishes, as he thought proper: whence his name, as regulator of the triclinium, or festive board. He also tasted the wine, and distributed it to the guests. The author of Ecclesiasticus thus describes this office, xxxii, 1, 2: “If thou be made the master of a feast, lift not thyself up, but be among them as one of the rest: take diligent care of them, and so sit down. And when thou hast done all thy office, take thy place, that thou mayest be merry with them, and receive a crown for the well ordering of the feast.” This office is mentioned, John ii, 8, 9, upon which Theophylact remarks: “That no one might suspect that their taste was vitiated by having drunk to excess, so as not to know water from wine, our Saviour orders it to be first carried to the governor of the feast, who certainly was sober; for those who on such occasions are intrusted with this office, observe the strictest sobriety, that they may be able properly to regulate the whole.”

AREOPAGUS, the high court at Athens, famed for the justice of its decisions; and so called, because it sat on a hill of the same name, or in the suburbs of the city, dedicated to Mars, the god of war, as the city was to Minerva, his sister. St. Paul, Acts xvii, 19, &c, having preached at Athens, was carried before the Areopagites, as “a setter forth of strange gods.” On this occasion he delivered that fine sermon which is in substance recorded in Acts xvii. Dionysius, one of the judges, was converted; and the Apostle was dismissed without any farther trouble.

ARGOB, a canton lying beyond Jordan, in the half tribe of Manasseh, and in the country of Bashan, one of the most fruitful on the other side of

Jordan. In the region of Argob there were sixty cities, called Bashan-havoth-Jair, which had very high walls and strong gates, without reckoning many villages and hamlets, which were not inclosed, Deut. iii, 4–14; 1 Kings iv, 13. But Argob was more peculiarly the name of the capital city of the region of Argob, which Eusebius says was fifteen miles west of Gerara.

ARIANS, this ancient sect, was unquestionably so called from Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, in the early part of the fourth century. It is said that he aspired to episcopal honours; and after the death of Achilles, in A. D. 313, felt not a little chagrined that Alexander should be preferred before him. Whether this circumstance had any influence on his opinions, it is impossible to say; but one day, when his rival (Alexander) had been addressing the clergy in favour of the orthodox doctrine, and maintaining, in strong and pointed language, “that the Son of God was co-eternal, co-essential, and co-equal with the Father,” Arius considered this as a species of Sabellianism, and ventured to say, that it was inconsistent and impossible, since the Father, who begat, must be before the Son, who was begotten: the latter, therefore, could not be absolutely eternal. Alexander at first admonished Arius, and endeavoured to convince him of his error; but without effect, except that he became the more bold in contradiction. Some of the clergy thought their bishop too forbearing, and it is possible he felt his inferiority of talent; for Arius was a man of accomplished learning, and commanding eloquence; venerable in person, and fascinating in address. At length Alexander was roused, and attempted to silence Arius by his authority; but this not succeeding, as the latter was bold and pertinacious, Alexander, about the year 320, called a council of his clergy, by whom the reputed heretic was deposed and excommunicated. Arius now retired into Palestine, where his talents and address soon made a number of converts; and among the rest, the celebrated Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and other bishops and clergy of those parts, who assembled in council, and received the excommunicated presbyter into their communion. Eusebius also, having great interest with Constantia, the sister of Constantine, and wife of Licinius, recommended Arius to her protection and patronage; through which, and by his own eloquent letters to the clergy in various parts, his system spread with great rapidity, and to a vast extent. The emperor Constantine, who had no great skill in these matters, was grieved to see the Christian church (but just escaped from the red dragon of persecution) thus torn by intestine animosity and dissensions; he therefore determined to summon a general council of the clergy, which met at Nice, A. D. 325, and contained more than 300 bishops. Constantine attended in person, and strongly recommended peace and unanimity. Athanasius was the chief opponent of the Arians. Both parties were willing to subscribe to the language of the Scriptures, but each insisted on interpreting for

themselves. "Did the Trinitarians," says Mr. Milner, "assert that Christ was God? The Arians allowed it, but in the same sense as holy men and angels are styled gods in Scripture. Did they affirm that he was truly God? The others allowed that he was made so by God. Did they affirm that the Son was naturally of God? It was granted: Even we, said they, are of God, 'of whom are all things.'" At length the Athanasians collected a number of texts, which they conceived amounted to full proof of the Son being of one and the same substance with the Father; the Arians admitted he was of like substance, the difference in the Greek phrases being only in a single letter, -ὁμοούσιος, homoousios and ὁμοιούσιος, homoiousios. At length the former was decreed to be the orthodox faith, and the Nicene creed was framed as it remains at this day so far as concerns the person of the Son of God, who is said to be "begotten of his Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made," &c.

Arius was now excommunicated. The sentence of the council pronounced against him and his associates was followed by another of the emperor, whereby the excommunicated persons were condemned to banishment, that they might be debarred the society of their countrymen whom the church had judged unworthy to remain in her communion. Soon after which, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice, being found to continue their countenance and protection to the Arian cause, to communicate with those whom they had anathematized, and to concur in those sentiments which they had condemned by their subscriptions; they were both subjected to the same penalty of exile by the emperor, and were actually deposed, (as we learn from Athanasius,) and had successors ordained to their sees, though history is silent as to the council by which this was done. But such was the good nature and credulity of Constantine, that these men, by their usual artifices, easily imposed upon him, and brought him to such a full persuasion of their agreement with the Nicene faith, that in about three years' time they were not only recalled from banishment, but restored to their sees, and to a considerable degree of interest at court. Their thorough attachment to the cause of Arius, and their hatred of Athanasius, who had so vigorously withstood them in the council, and was now advanced to the see of Alexandria, made them watchful of every opportunity to defeat the decisions of the council.

In the meantime one who wished well to their designs, and whom Constantia had upon her death bed recommended to the emperor, did so far prevail upon the easy credulity of Constantine, by complaining that Arius had been misrepresented, and differed nothing in his sentiments from the Nicene fathers, that the indulgent emperor recalled him from his banishment, and required him to exhibit in writing, a confession of his

faith. He did this in such terms as, though they admitted of a latent reservation, yet bore the appearance of being entirely catholic; and therefore not only gave satisfaction to the emperor, but even offended some of his own followers, who from that time forth separated from him. The discerning Athanasius was not so easily imposed upon as Constantine; but, well assured of the heretic's prevarication, was resolute in refusing to admit him to communion, whom the Nicene council had so openly condemned. Upon this the emperor sent for Arius to Constantinople, and insisted upon his being received into communion, by Alexander, bishop of that city. However, on the day before this was to have taken place, Arius died suddenly from a complaint in his bowels. Some attributed this to poison; others to the judgment of God. The emperor did not long survive; and Constantius, his successor, became warmly attached to the Arian cause, as were all the court party. Successive emperors took different sides, and thus was the peace of the church agitated for many years, and practical religion sacrificed alternately to the dogmas or the interests of one party or the other; and each was in turn excommunicated, fined, imprisoned, or banished. Constantius supported Arianism triumphantly, Julian laughed at both parties, but persecuted neither, Jovian supported the Nicene doctrine. Valentinian, and his brother Valens, took contrary sides; the former supporting Athanasianism in the west, and the latter Arianism in the east; so that what was orthodoxy at Rome was heresy at Constantinople, and vice versa. The Arians themselves were not unanimous, but divided into various shades of sentiment, under their respective leaders; as Eusebians, Eudoxians, Acasians, Aëtians, &c; but the more general distinction was into Arians and Semi-Arians; the former sinking the character of the Son of God into that of a mere creature, while the latter admitted every thing but the homoousian doctrine, or his absolute equality with the Father. After this period we hear little of Arianism, till it was revived in England in the beginning of the last century by the eccentric Mr. Whiston, by Mr. Emlyn, and 85Dr. Samuel Clarke. The latter was what may be called a high or Semi-Arian, who came within a shade of orthodoxy; the two former were low Arians, reducing the rank of our Saviour to the scale of angelic beings—a creature “made out of nothing.” Since this time, however, both Arians and Socinians are sunk into the common appellation of Unitarians, or rather Humanitarians, who believe our Saviour (as Dr. Priestley expresses it) to be “a man like themselves.” The last advocates of the pure Arian doctrine, of any celebrity, were Mr. Henry Taylor, (under the signature of Ben Mordecai,) and Dr. Richard Price, in his “Sermons on the Christian Doctrine.” It may be proper to observe, that the Arians, though they denied the absolute eternity of the Son, strongly contended for his preëxistence, as the Logos, or the Word of God, “by whom the worlds were made;” and admitted, more or less explicitly, the sacrifice which he offered for sin upon the cross.

ARIEL, the capital city of Moab, frequently mentioned in Scripture, Ezra viii, 16. See Moab.

ARIMATHEA, or RAMAH, now called Ramlè, or Ramla, a pleasant town, beautifully situated on the borders of a fertile and extensive plain, abounding in gardens, vineyards, olive and date trees. It stands about thirty miles north-west of Jerusalem, on the high road to Jaffa. At this Rama, which was likewise called Ramathaim Zophim, as lying in the district of Zuph, or Zoph, Samuel was born, 1 Sam. i. This was likewise the native place of Joseph, called Joseph of Arimathea, who begged and obtained the body of Jesus from Pilate, Matt. xxvi, 57. There was another Ramah, about six miles north of Jerusalem, in a pass which separated the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, which Baasha, king of Israel, took and began to fortify; but he was obliged to relinquish it, in consequence of the alliance formed between Asa, king of Judah, and Benhadad, king of Syria, 1 Kings xv. This is the Ramah, supposed to be alluded to in the lamentation of Rachel for her children.

ARISTARCHUS, spoken of by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians, iv, 10, and often mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. He was a Macedonian, and a native of Thessalonica. He accompanied St. Paul to Ephesus, and there continued with him during the two years of his abode in that place, sharing with him in all the dangers and labours of the ministry, Acts xix, 29; xx, 4; xxvii, 2. He was near losing his life in a tumult raised by the Ephesian silversmiths. He left Ephesus with the Apostle, and went with him into Greece. From thence he attended him into Asia; from Asia into Judea, and from Judea to Rome.

ARK, arca, denotes a kind of floating vessel built by Noah, for the preservation of himself and family, with several species of animals during the deluge. The Hebrew word by which the ark is expressed, is תיבה or תבה, the constructive form of תבה, which is evidently the Greek θίβη; and so the LXX render the word in Exod. ii, 3, where only it again occurs. They also render it κιβωτὸν; Josephus, λαρνάκα; and the Vulgate, arcam; signifying an ark, coffer, or chest. Although the ark of Noah answered, in some respects, the purpose of a ship, it is not so certain that it was of the same form and shape. It has been inconclusively argued by Michaelis and some others, that if its form had not been like that of a ship, it could not have resisted the force of the waves; because it was not intended to be conducted, like a ship, from one place to another, but merely “to float on the surface of the waters,” Gen. vii, 17. It appears to have had neither helm, nor mast, nor oars; but was merely a bulky capacious vessel, light enough to be raised aloft with all its contents, by the gradual rise of the deluge. Its

shape, therefore, was of little importance; more especially as it seems to have been the purpose of Providence, in this whole transaction, to signify to those who were saved, as well as to their latest posterity, that their preservation was not in any degree effected by human contrivance. The ark in which Moses was exposed bears the same name; and some have thought that both were of the same materials. With respect to the etymology of the Hebrew word, the most rational seems to be that of Clodius, who derives it from the Arabic word *תאח*, “he collected,” from which is formed *תבה*, or *תיבה*, denoting a place in which things are collected. Foster deduces it from two Egyptian words, *thoi*, “a ship,” and *bai*, “a palm tree branch”; and such ships are still to be seen not only in Egypt, but in India and other countries; particularly in some isles of the Pacific Ocean.

To the insufficiency of the ark to contain all the creatures said to have been brought into it, objections have, at different times, been made. Bishop Wilkins and others have learnedly discussed this subject, and afforded the most satisfactory answers. Dr. Hales proves the ark to have been of the burden of forty-two thousand four hundred and thirteen tons; and asks, “Can we doubt of its being sufficient to contain eight persons, and about two hundred or two hundred and fifty pair of four-footed animals, (a number to which, according to M. Buffon, all the various distinct species may be reduced,) together with all the subsistence necessary for a twelvemonth, with the fowls of the air, and such reptiles and insects as cannot live under water?” All these various animals were controlled by the power of God, whose special agency is supposed in the whole transaction, and “the lion was made to lie down with the kid.”

Whether Noah was commanded to bring with him, into the ark, a pair of all living creatures, zoologically and numerically considered, has been doubted. During the long period between the creation and the flood, animals must have spread themselves over a great part of the antediluvian earth, and certain animals would, as now, probably become indigenous to certain climates. The pairs saved must therefore, if all the kinds were included, have travelled from immense distances. But of such marches no intimation is given in the history; and this seems to render it probable that the animals which Noah was “to bring with him” into the ark, were the animals clean and unclean of the country in which he dwelt, and which, from the capacity of the ark, must have been in great variety and number. The terms used, it is true, are universal; and it is satisfactory to know, that if taken in the largest sense there was ample accommodation in the ark. Nevertheless, universal terms in Scripture are not always to be taken mathematically, and in the vision of Peter, the phrase *πάντα τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς*,--all the four-footed beasts of the earth, must be understood of *varii generis quadrupedes*, as Schleusner paraphrases it. Thus we may easily



account for the *exuviæ* of animals, whose species no longer exist, which have been discovered in various places. The number of such extinct species probably has been greatly over-rated by Cuvier; but of the fact, to a considerable extent, there can be no doubt. It is also to be observed that the presumptive evidence of the truth of the fact of the preparation of such a vessel, and of the supernatural circumstances which attended it, is exceedingly strong. It is, in truth, the only solution of a difficulty which has no other explanation; for as a universal deluge is confirmed by the general history of the world, and by a variety of existing facts and monuments, such a structure as the ark, for the preservation and sustenance of various animals, seems to have been absolutely necessary; for as we can trace up the first imperfect rudiments of the art of ship building among the Greeks, there could be no ships before the flood; and, consequently, no animals could have been saved. Nay, it is highly improbable that even men and domestic animals could be saved, not to mention wild beasts, serpents, &c, though we should admit that the antediluvians had shipping, unless we should suppose, also, that they had a divine intimation respecting the flood, such as Moses relates; but this would be to give up the cause of infidelity. Mr. Bryant has collected a variety of ancient historical relations, which show that some records concerning the ark had been preserved among most nations of the world, and in the general system of Gentile mythology. Abydenus, with whom all the eastern writers concur, informs us that the place of descent from the ark was Armenia; and that its remains had been preserved for a long time. Plutarch mentions the Noachic dove, and its being sent out of the ark. Lucian speaks of Deucalion's going forth from the ark, and raising an altar to God. The priests of Ammonia had a custom, at particular seasons, of carrying in procession a boat, in which was an oracular shrine, held in great veneration: and this custom of carrying the deity in an ark or boat was in use also among the Egyptians. Bishop Poccoke has preserved three specimens of ancient sculpture, in which this ceremony is displayed. They were very ancient, and found by him in Upper Egypt. The ship of Isis referred to the ark, and its name, "Baris," was that of the mountain corresponding to Ararat in Armenia. Bryant finds reference to the ark in the temples of the serpent worship, called Dracontia; and also in that of Sesostris, fashioned after the model of the ark, in commemoration of which it was built, and consecrated to Osiris at Theba; and he conjectures that the city, said to be one of the most ancient in Egypt, as well as the province, was denominated from it, Theba being the appellation of the ark. In other countries, as well as in Egypt, an ark, or ship, was introduced in their mysteries, and often carried about in the seasons of their festivals. He finds, also, in the story of the Argonauts several particulars, that are thought to refer to the ark of Noah. As many cities, not in Egypt only and Bœotia, but in Cilicia, Ionia, Attica, Phthiotis, Cataonia, Syria, and Italy, were called Theba; so likewise the city Apamea

was denominated Cibotus, from κιβωτος, in memory of the ark, and of the history connected with it. The ark, according to the traditions of the Gentile world, was prophetic; and was regarded as a kind of temple or residence of the deity. It comprehended all mankind, within the circle of eight persons, who were thought to be so highly favoured of Heaven that they at last were reputed to be deities. Hence in the ancient mythology of Egypt, there were precisely eight gods; and the ark was esteemed an emblem of the system of the heavens. The principal terms by which the ancients distinguished the ark were Theba, Baris, Arguz, Aren, Arene, Arni, Laris, Boutas, Bœotus, and Cibotus; and out of these they formed different personages. See Deluge.

ARK OF THE COVENANT, a small chest or coffer, three feet nine inches in length, two feet three inches in breadth, and two feet three inches in height; in which were contained the golden pot that had manna, Aaron's rod, and the tables of the covenant, Num. xvii, 10; Heb. ix, 4. This coffer was made of shittim wood, and was covered with a lid, called the mercy seat, Exod. xxv, 17–22, &c, which was of solid gold, at the two ends whereof were two figures, called cherubim, looking toward each other, with expanded wings, which, embracing the whole circumference of the mercy seat, met in the middle. The whole, according to the rabbins, was made out of the same mass, without any of the parts being joined by solder. Over this it was that the Shechinah, or visible display of the divine presence in a luminous cloud rested, both in the tabernacle and in the temple, Lev. xvi, 2; and from hence the divine oracles were given forth by an audible voice, as often as God was consulted in behalf of his people. Hence it is that God is said in Scripture to dwell between the cherubim, on the mercy seat, because there was the seat or throne of the visible appearance of his glory among them, 2 Kings xix, 15; 2 Chron, xiii, 6; Psalm lxxx, 1, &c; and for this reason the high priest appeared before the mercy seat once every year, on the great day of expiation, at which time he was to make his nearest approach to the divine presence, to mediate and make atonement for the whole people of Israel. On the two sides of the ark there were four rings of gold, two on each side, through which staves, overlaid with gold, were put, by means whereof they carried it as they marched through the wilderness, &c, on the shoulders of the Levites, Exod. xxv, 13, 14; xxvii, 5. After the passage of the Jordan, the ark continued for 87some time at Gilgal, from whence it was removed to Shiloh. From this place the Israelites carried it to their camp, where, in an engagement with the Philistines, it fell into their hands. The Philistines, having gotten possession of the ark, carried it in triumph to one of their principal cities, named Ashdod, and placed it in the temple of Dagon, whose image fell to the ground and was broken. The Philistines also were so afflicted with emerods, that they afterward returned the ark with various presents; and it

was lodged at Kirjath-Jearim, and afterward at Nob. David conveyed it to the house of Obbedom, and from thence to his palace at Zion; and lastly, Solomon brought it into the temple which he had built at Jerusalem. It remained in the temple till the times of the last kings of Judah, who gave themselves up to idolatry, and even dared to place their idols in the holy temple itself. The priests, being unable to bear this profanation, took the ark and carried it from place to place, to preserve it from the hands of those impious princes. Josiah commanded them to bring it back to the sanctuary, and it was accordingly replaced, 2 Chron. xxxv, 3. What became of the ark at the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar, is a dispute among the rabbins. Had it been carried to Babylon with the other vessels of the temple, it would, in all probability, have been brought back with them at the close of the captivity. But that this was not the case, is agreed on all hands; whence it is probable that it was destroyed with the temple.

The ark of the covenant was, as it were, the centre of worship to all those of the Hebrew nation who served God according to the Levitical law; and not only in the temple, when they came thither to worship, but every where else in their dispersions through the whole world; whenever they prayed, they turned their faces toward the place where the ark stood, and directed all their devotions that way, Dan. vi, 10. Whence the author of the book of Cosri, justly says, that the ark, with the mercy seat and cherubim, were the foundation, root, heart, and marrow of the whole temple, and all the Levitical worship performed therein; and, therefore, had there been nothing else wanting in the second temple but the ark only, this alone would have been a sufficient reason for the old men to have wept when they remembered the first temple in which it stood; and for the saying of Haggai, ii, 3, that the second temple was as nothing compared with the first; so great a share had the ark of the covenant in the glory of Solomon's temple. However, the defect was supplied as to the outward form, for in the second temple there was also an ark of the same dimensions with the first, and put in the same place; but it wanted the tables of the law, Aaron's rod, and the pot of manna; nor was there any appearance of the divine glory over it; nor any oracles delivered from it. The only use that was made of it was to be a representation of the former on the great day of expiation, and to be a repository of the Holy Scriptures, that is, of the original copy of that collection of them made by Ezra after the captivity; in imitation of which the Jews, in all their synagogues, have a like ark or coffer in which they keep their Scriptures.

For the temple of Solomon a new ark was not made; but he constructed cherubim in the most holy place, which were designed to give additional state to this most sacred symbol of God's grace and mercy. These cherubim were fifteen feet high, and were placed at equal distance from the centre of

the ark and from each side of the wall, so that their wings being expanded, the two wings which were extended behind touched the wall, and the other two met over the ark and so overshadowed it. When these magnificent cherubim were finished, the ark was brought in and placed under their wings, 2 Chron. v, 7–10.

The ark was called the ark of the covenant, because it was a symbol of the covenant between God and his people. It was also named the ark of the testimony, because the two tables which were deposited in it were witnesses against every transgression.

ARM. As it is by this member of the body that we chiefly exert our strength, it is therefore used in Scripture for an emblem of power. Thus God is said to have delivered his people from Egyptian bondage “with a stretched-out arm,” Deut. v, 15; and he thus threatens Eli the high priest, “I will cut off thine arm, and the arm of thy father’s house,” 1 Sam. ii, 31; that is, I will deprive thee and thy family of power and authority.

ARMAGEDDON, a place spoken of, Rev. xvi, 16, which literally signifies “the mountain of Mageddon,” or “Megiddo,” a city situated in the great plain at the foot of Mount Carmel, where the good prince Josiah received his mortal wound, in the battle against Necho, king of Egypt. At Armageddon, the three unclean spirits coming out of the dragon’s mouth shall gather together the kings of the earth, to the battle of the great day of God Almighty, Rev. xvi, 13, 14; where the word Armageddon, according to Mr. Pool, does not signify any particular place, but is used in allusion to Megiddo, mentioned Judges v, 19, where Barak overcame Sisera with his great army, and where Josiah was slain, 2 Kings xxiii, 30. If so, the term must have been a proverbial one for a place of destruction and mourning.

ARMENIA, a considerable country of Asia, having Colchis and Iberia on the north, Media on the east, Mesopotamia on the south, Pontus and Cappadocia on the west, and the Euphrates and Syria on the south-west. Armenia is often confounded with Aramæa, the land of Aram or Syria; but they are totally different. Armenia, which is separated from Aram by Mount Taurus, was so denominated from Ar-Men, the mountainous country of Meni or Minni, the people of which country are mentioned under this name by Jeremiah, when summoning the nations against Babylon.

The people of this country have in all ages maintained a great similarity of character, partly commercial and partly pastoral. They have, in fact, in the northern parts of the Asiatic continent, been what the Cushites and Ishmaelites were in the south, tenders of cattle, living on the produce of

their flocks and herds, and carriers of merchandize between the neighbouring nations; a part living at home with their flocks, and a part travelling as merchants and dealers into distant countries. In the flourishing times of Tyre, the Armenians, according to Ezekiel, xxvii, 14, brought horses and mules to the markets of that city; and, according to Herodotus, they had a considerable trade in wine, which they sent down the Euphrates to Babylon, &c. At the present day, the Armenians are the principal traders of the east; and are to be found in the capacity of merchants or commercial agents all over Asia, a patient, frugal, industrious, and honest people, whose known character for these virtues has withstood the tyranny and extortions of the wretched governments under which they chiefly live.

The religion of the Armenians is a corrupt Christianity of the sect of Eutyches; that is, they own but one nature in Jesus Christ. Their rites partake of those of the Greek and Latin churches, but they reject the idolatries of both. It is indeed a remarkable instance of the firmness of this people, that while the surrounding nations submitted to the religion as well as the arms of the Turks, they have preserved the purity of their ancient faith, such as it is, to the present day. It cannot be supposed but that the Turks used every effort to impose on the conquered Armenians the doctrines of the Koran. More tolerant, indeed, than the Saracens, liberty of conscience was still not to be purchased of them but by great sacrifices, which for three centuries the Armenians have patiently endured, and exhibit to the world an honourable and solitary instance of a successful national opposition of Christianity to Mohammedanism.

ARMENIAN CHURCH, a branch, originally, of the Greek church, residing in Armenia. They probably received Christianity in the fourth century. Mr. Yeates gives the most recent account of them:--

“Their whole ecclesiastical establishment is under the government of four patriarchs; the first has his residence in Echmiadzin, or Egmiathin, near Irvan; the second, at Sis, in the lesser Armenia; the third, in Georgia; and the fourth, in Achtamar, or Altamar, on the Lake of Van; but the power of the two last is bounded within their own diocesses, while the others have more extensive authority, and the patriarch of Egmiathan has, or had, under him eighteen bishops, beside those who are priors of monasteries. The Armenians every where perform divine service in their own tongue, in which their liturgy and offices are written, in the dialect of the fourth or fifth centuries. They have the whole Bible translated from the Septuagint, as they say, so early as the time of Chrysostom. The Armenian confession is similar to that of the Jacobite Christians, both being Monophysites, acknowledging but one nature in the person of Christ; but this, according

to Mr. Simon, is little more than a dispute about terms; few of them being able to enter into the subtleties of polemics.

“In the year 1664, an Armenian bishop, named Uscan, visited Europe for the purpose of getting printed the Armenian Bible, and communicated the above particulars to Mr. Simon. In 1667, a certain patriarch of the lesser Armenia visited Rome, and made a profession of faith which was considered orthodox, and procured him a cordial reception, with the hope of reconciling the Armenian Christians to the Roman church; but, before he got out of Italy, it was found he had prevaricated, and still persisted in the errors of his church. About this time, Clement IX, wrote to the king of Persia, in favour of some Catholic converts in Armenia, and received a favourable answer; but the Armenian church could never be persuaded to acknowledge the authority of Rome.

“They have among them a number of monasteries and convents, in which is maintained a severe discipline; marriage is discountenanced, though not absolutely prohibited; a married priest cannot obtain promotion, and the higher clergy are not allowed to marry. They worship in the eastern manner, by prostration: they are very superstitious, and their ceremonies much resemble those of the Greek church. Once in their lives they generally perform a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; and in 1819, the number of Armenian pilgrims was thirteen hundred, nearly as many as the Greeks. Dr. Buchanan, however, says, ‘Of all the Christians in central Asia, they have preserved themselves most free from Mohammedan and Papal corruptions.’”

ARMIES. In the reign of David, the Hebrews acquired such skill in the military art, together with such strength, as gave them a decided superiority over their competitors on the field of battle. David increased the standing army, which Saul had introduced. Solomon introduced cavalry into the military force of the nation, also chariots. Both cavalry and chariots were retained in the subsequent age; an age, in which military arms were improved in their construction, the science of fortification made advances, and large armies were mustered. From this period, till the time when the Hebrews became subject to the Assyrians and Chaldeans, but little improvement was made in the arts of war. The Maccabees, after the return of the Hebrews from the captivity, gave a new existence to the military art among them. But their descendants were under the necessity of submitting to the superior power of the Romans.

Whenever there was an immediate prospect of war, a levy was made by the genealogists, Deut. xx, 5–9. In the time of the kings, there was a head or ruler of the persons, that made the levy, denominated *השוטר*, who kept an

account of the number of the soldiers, but who is, nevertheless, to be distinguished from the generalissimo, 2, הַסּוֹפֵר Chron. xxvi, 11. Compare 2 Sam. viii, 17; xx, 25; 1 Chron. xviii, 16. After the levy was fully made out, the genealogists gave public notice, that the following 89 persons might be excused, from military service, Deut. xx, 5–8: 1. Those who had built a house, and had not yet inhabited it. 2. Those who had planted a כֶּרֶם, that is, an olive or vine garden, and had not as yet tasted the fruit of it; an exemption, consequently, which extended through the first five years after such planting. 3. Those who had bargained for a spouse, but had not celebrated the nuptials; also those who had not as yet lived with their wife, for a year. 4. The faint-hearted, who would be likely to discourage others, and who, if they had gone into battle, where, in those early times, every thing depended on personal prowess, would only have fallen victims.

At the head of each rank or file of fifty, was the captain of fifty. The other divisions consisted of a hundred, a thousand, and ten thousand men, each one of which was headed by its appropriate commander. These divisions ranked in respect to each other according to their families, and were subject to the authority of the heads of those families, 2 Chron. xxv, 5; xxvi, 12, 13. The centurions, and chiliarchs or captains of thousands, were admitted into the councils of war, 1 Chron. xiii, 1–3; 1 Sam. xviii, 13. The leader of the whole army was denominated אֲלִי־שָׂרֵה־צִנָּא, the captain of the host. The genealogists, (in the English version, officers,) according to a law in Deut. xx, 9, had the right of appointing the persons who were to act as officers in the army; and they, undoubtedly, made it a point, in their selections, to choose those who are called heads of families. The practice of thus selecting military officers ceased under the kings. Some of them were then chosen by the king, and in other instances the office became permanent and hereditary in the heads of families. Both kings and generals had armour bearers, גִּשָּׂא כְלִים. They were chosen from the bravest of the soldiery, and not only bore the arms of their masters, but were employed to give his commands to the subordinate captains, and were present at his side in the hour of peril, 1 Sam. xiv, 6; xvii, 7. The infantry, the cavalry, and the chariots of war were so arranged, as to make separate divisions of an army, Exod. xiv, 6, 7. The infantry were divided likewise into light-armed troops, גִּדּוּדִים, and into spearmen, Genesis xlix, 19; 1 Samuel xxx, 8, 15, 23; 2 Sam. iii, 22; iv, 2; xxii, 30; Psalm xviii, 30; 2 Kings v, 2; Hosea vii, 1. The light-armed infantry were furnished with a sling and javelin, with a bow, arrows, and quiver, and also, at least in latter times, with a buckler. They fought the enemy at a distance. The spearmen, on the contrary, who were armed with spears, swords, and shields, fought hand to hand, 1 Chron. xii, 24, 34; 2 Chron. xiv, 8; xvii, 17. The light-armed troops were commonly taken from the tribes of Ephraim and Benjamin, 2 Chron. xiv, 8; xvii, 17. Compare Gen. xlix, 27; Psalm lxxviii, 9.

The art of laying out an encampment appears to have been well understood in Egypt, long before the departure of the Hebrews from that country. It was there that Moses became acquainted with that mode of encamping, which, in the second chapter of Numbers, is prescribed to the Hebrews. In the encampment of the Israelites, it appears that the holy tabernacle occupied the centre. In reference to this circumstance, it may be remarked, that it is the common practice in the east, for the prince or leader of a tribe to have his tent pitched in the centre of the others; and it ought not to be forgotten, that God, whose tent or palace was the holy tabernacle, was the prince, the leader of the Hebrews. The tents nearest to the tabernacle were those of the Levites, whose business it was to watch it, in the manner of a Pretorian guard. The family of Gershon pitched to the west, that of Kehath to the south, that of Merari to the north. The priests occupied a position to the east, opposite to the entrance of the tabernacle, Num. i, 53; iii, 21–38. At some distance to the east, were the tribes of Judah, Issachar, and Zebulon; on the south were those of Reuben, Simeon, and Gad; to the west were Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin; to the north, Dan, Asher, and Naphtali. The people were thus divided into four bodies, three tribes to a division; each of which divisions had its separate standard, דגל. Each of the large family associations likewise, of which the different tribes were composed, had a separate standard, termed, in contradistinction from the other, אור; and every Hebrew was obliged to number himself with his particular division, and follow his appropriate standard. Of military standards, there were,—1. The standard, denominated דגל; one of which pertained to each of the four general divisions. The four standards of this name were large, and ornamented with colours in white, purple, crimson, and dark blue. The Jewish Rabbins assert, (founding their statement on Genesis xlix, 3, 9, 17, 22, which in this case is very doubtful authority,) that the first of these standards, namely, that, of Judah, bore a lion; the second, or that of Reuben, bore a man; that of Ephraim, which was the third, displayed the figure of a bull; while that of Dan, which was the fourth, exhibited the representation of cherubim. They were wrought into the standards with embroidered work. 2. The standard, called אור. The ensign of this name belonged to the separate classes of families. 3. The standard, called נס. This standard was not, like the others, borne from place to place. It appears from Num. xxi, 8, 9, that it was a long pole, fixed into the earth. A flag was fastened to its top, which was agitated by the wind, and seen at a great distance, Jer. iv, 6, 21; li, 2, 12, 27; Ezek. xxvii, 7. In order to render it visible, as far as possible, it was erected on lofty mountains, and was in this way used as a signal, to assemble soldiers. It no sooner made its appearance on such an elevated position, than the war-cry was uttered, and the trumpets were blown, Isaiah v, 26; xiii, 2; xviii, 3; xxx, 17; xlix, 22; lxii, 10–13.



Before battle the various kinds of arms were put into the best order; the shields were anointed, and the soldiers refreshed themselves by taking food, lest they should become weary and faint under the pressure of their labours, Jer. xlvi, 3, 4; Isaiah xxi, 5. The soldiers, more especially the generals and kings, except when they wished to remain unknown, 1 Kings xxii, 30–34, were clothed in splendid habiliments, which are denominated, *בהדר-י-קדש*, the sacred dress, Psalm cx, 3. It was the duty of the priests, before the commencement of the battle, to exhort the Hebrews to exhibit that courage which was required by the exigency of the occasion. The words which they used were as follows:--“Hear, O Israel; ye approach this day unto battle against your enemies; let not your hearts faint; fear not, and do not tremble; neither be ye terrified, because of them. For the Lord your God is he that goeth with you, to fight for you against your enemies, to save you,” Deut. xx, 2, &c. The last ceremony, previous to an engagement, was the sounding of the sacred trumpets by the priests, Num. x, 9, 10; 2 Chron. xiii, 12–14; 1 Macc. iii, 54.

ARMINIANISM, strictly speaking, is that system of religious doctrine which was taught by Arminius, professor of divinity in the university of Leyden. If therefore we would learn precisely what Arminianism is, we must have recourse to those writings in which that divine himself has stated and expounded his peculiar tenets. This, however, will by no means give us an accurate idea of that which, since his time, has been usually denominated Arminianism. On examination, it will be found, that in many important particulars, those who have called themselves Arminians, or have been accounted such by others, differ as widely from the nominal head and founder of their sect, as he himself did from Calvin, and other doctors of Geneva. There are, indeed, certain points, with regard to which he has been strictly and uniformly followed by almost all his pretended adherents; but there are others of equal or of greater importance, dogmatically insisted on by them, to which he unquestionably never gave his sanction, and even appears to have been decidedly hostile. Such a distinction, obvious as it must be to every attentive reader, has yet been generally so far overlooked, that the memory of Arminius is frequently loaded with imputations the most unreasonable and unjust. He is accused, by the ignorant and the prejudiced, of introducing corruptions into the Christian church, which he probably never thought of, and which certainly have no place in his works. And all the odium which his followers have from time to time incurred by their varied and increasing heterodoxy, has been absurdly reflected upon him, as if he could be responsible for every error that may be sent abroad under the sanction of his name. Whatever be the number or the species of these errors, and in whatever way they may be associated with his principles, it is fair to the character of Arminius, and

useful to the interests of religious truth, to revert to his own writings as the only source from which we ought to derive information concerning the Arminian scheme; and by doing so, it may be discovered, that genuine unadulterated Arminianism is not that great and dangerous heresy which among a certain class of Christians it is too often represented to be.

Arminianism, in its proper sense, is to be considered as a separation from Calvinism, with regard to the doctrines of unconditional election, particular redemption, and other points necessarily resulting from these. The Calvinists held that God had elected a certain portion of the human race to eternal life, passing by the rest, or rather dooming them to everlasting destruction; that God's election proceeded upon no prescience of the moral principles and character of those whom he had thus predestinated, but originated solely in the motions of his free and sovereign mercy; that Christ died for the elect only, and therefore that the merits of his death can avail for the salvation of none but them; and that they are constrained by the irresistible power of divine grace to accept of him as their Saviour. To this doctrine, that of Arminius and his legitimate followers stands opposed. They do not deny an election; but they deny that it is absolute and unconditional. They argue, that an election of this kind is inconsistent with the character of God, that it destroys the liberty of the human will, that it contradicts the language of Scripture, and that it tends to encourage a careless and licentious practice in those by whom it is believed. They maintain that God has elected those only who, according, not to his decree, but to his foreknowledge, and in the exercise of their natural powers of self-determination, acting under the influence of his grace, would possess that faith and holiness to which salvation is annexed in the Gospel scheme. And those who are not elected are allowed to perish, not because they were not elected, but merely and solely in consequence of their infidelity and disobedience; on account, indeed, of which infidelity and disobedience being foreseen by God, their election did not take place. They hold, that Christ died for all men in the literal and unrestricted sense of that phrase; that his atonement is able, both from its own merit, and from the intention of him who appointed it, to expiate the guilt of every individual; that every individual is invited to partake of the benefits which it has procured; that the grace of God is offered to make the will comply with this invitation, but that this grace may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the sinner's perversity. Whether true believers necessarily persevered, or whether they might fall from their faith, and forfeit their state of grace, was a question which Arminius left in a great measure unresolved, but which was soon determined by his followers in this additional proposition, that saints may fall from the state of grace, in which they are placed by the operation of the Holy Spirit. This, indeed, seems to follow as a corollary, from what

Arminius maintained respecting the natural freedom and corruption of the will, and the resistibility of divine grace.

It may now be proper to mention some tenets with regard to which Arminianism has been much misrepresented. If a man hold that good works are necessary to justification; if he maintain that faith includes good works in its own nature; if he reject the doctrine of original sin; if he deny that divine grace is requisite for the whole work of sanctification; if he speak of human virtue as meritorious in the sight of God; it is very generally concluded, that he is an Arminian. But the truth is, that a man of such sentiments is properly a disciple of the Pelagian and Socinian schools. To such sentiments pure Arminianism is as diametrically opposite as Calvinism itself. The genuine Arminians admit the corruption of human nature in its full extent. They admit, that we are justified by faith only. They admit, that our justification originates solely in the grace of God. They admit, that the procuring and meritorious cause of our justification is the righteousness of Christ. *Propter quam, says Arminius, Deus credentibus peccatum condonat, eosque pro justis reputat non aliter atque si legem perfectè implevissent.* [For the sake of which God pardons believers, and accounts them as righteous precisely as if they had perfectly obeyed the law.] They admit in this way, that justification implies not merely forgiveness of sin, but acceptance to everlasting happiness. *Junctam habet adoptionem in filios, et collationem juris in hereditatem vitæ eternæ.* [It has connected with it adoption to sonship, and the grant of a right to the inheritance of eternal life.] They admit, in fine, that the work of sanctification, from its very commencement to its perfection in glory, is carried on by the operation of the Holy Spirit, which is the gift of God by Jesus Christ. So sound, indeed, are the Arminians with respect to the doctrine of justification, a doctrine so important and essential in the opinion of Luther, that he scrupled not to call it, *articulus ecclesiæ stantis vel cadentis*; [the article with which the church stands or falls;] that those who look into the writings of Arminius may be disposed to suspect him of having even exceeded Calvin in orthodoxy. It is certain, at least, that he declares his willingness to subscribe to every thing that Calvin has written on that leading subject of Christianity, in the third book of his Institutes; and with this declaration the tenor of his writings invariably corresponds.

The system of Arminius, then, appears to have been the same with that which was generally maintained in the reformed churches at that time; except in so far as the doctrine of the divine decrees was concerned. But the most eminent of those who became Arminians, or ranked among his professed followers, by embracing and avowing his peculiar tenets with respect to election and redemption, soon began to depart widely from the other tenets of his theological creed. They adopted views of the corruption

of man, of justification, of the righteousness of Christ, of the nature of faith, of the province of good works, of the necessity and operations of grace, that are quite contrary to those which he had entertained and published. Many of them, in process of time, differed more or less from one another, on some or all of these points. And so diversified are the forms which Arminianism, as it is called, has assumed in the course of its progress, that to describe precisely what it has been since the synod of Dort, or what it is at the present day, would be a most difficult, if not an impossible, task. Even the confession of faith, which was drawn out for the Arminians by Episcopius, and is to be found in the second volume of his works, cannot be referred to as a standard. It was composed merely to counteract the reproach of their being a society without any common principles. It is expressed chiefly in the words and phrases of Scripture, to which, of course, every one would annex his own meaning. Beside, no person, not even a pastor, was obliged, by any form, to adhere strictly to it; but every one was left entirely at liberty to interpret its language in the manner that was most agreeable to his own private sentiments. Accordingly, so various and inconsistent are their opinions, that could Arminius peruse the unnumbered volumes which have been written as expositions and illustrations of Arminian doctrine, he would be at a loss to discover his own simple system, amidst that heterogeneous mass of error with which it has been rudely mixed; and would be astonished to find, that the controversy which he had conscientiously introduced, had wandered far from the point to which he had confined it, and that with his name dogmas were associated, the unscriptural and dangerous nature of which he had pointed out and condemned.

The same temper of mind which led him to renounce the peculiarities of Calvinism, induced him also to adopt more enlarged and liberal views of church communion than those which had hitherto prevailed. While he maintained that the mercy of God is not confined to a chosen few, he conceived it to be quite inconsistent with the genius of Christianity, that men of that religion should keep at a distance from each other, and constitute separate churches, merely because they differed in their opinions as to some of its doctrinal articles. He thought that Christians of all denominations should form one great community, united and upheld by the bonds of charity and brotherly love; with the exception, however, of Roman Catholics, who, on account of their idolatrous worship and persecuting spirit, must be unfit members of such a society. That this was not only agreeable to the wishes of Arminius, but one chief object of his labours, is evident from a passage in his last will, which he made a little before his death:--*Ea proposui et docui quæ ad propagationem amplificationemque veritatis religionis Christianæ, veri Dei cultus, communis pietatis, et sanctæ inter homines convers[at]ionis, denique ad*

convenientem Christiano nomini tranquillitatem et pacem juxta verbum Dei possent conferre, excludens ex iis papatum, cum quo nulla unitas fidei, nullum pietatis aut Christianæ pacis vinculum servari potest. [I have advanced and taught those things which might contribute to the propagation and spread of the truth of Christianity, the worship of the true God, general piety, and 92a holy fellowship among men;--in fine, to a tranquillity and peace according to God's word and becoming the Christian name, excluding the Papacy, with which no unity of faith, no bond of piety, or of Christian peace can be maintained.]

Mosheim has stated this circumstance in a note to his history of the Arminian church; but his statement, or rather the conclusion which he deduces from it, is evidently unfair and incorrect. He alleges, that Arminius had actually laid the plan of that theological system which was afterward embraced by his followers; that he had inculcated the main and leading principles of it on the minds of his disciples; and that Episcopius and others, who rejected Calvinism in more points than in that which related to the divine decrees, only propagated, with greater courage and perspicuity, the doctrines which Arminianism, as taught by its founder, already contained. These allegations, it is clear, have no sort of connection with the passage from which they are drawn as inferences; and they are wholly inconsistent with the assertions, and reasonings, and declarations of Arminius, when he is discussing the merits of the question that was agitated between him and the Geneva school. Arminius, in addition to the scheme of doctrine which he taught, was anxious to establish this maxim, and to reduce it to practice, that, with the exception above mentioned, no difference of opinions should prevent Christians from remaining in one church or religious body. He did not mean to insinuate, that a difference of opinion was of no consequence at all; that they who thought one way were just as right as they who thought a contrary way; or that men have no occasion to be solicitous about the religious tenets which they hold. He did not mean to give up his own system as equally true, or equally false, with that of Calvin; and as little could he be supposed to sanction those sentiments of his followers which were in direct opposition to the sentiments which he himself had maintained. But he endeavoured, in the first place, to assert liberty of conscience, and of worship; and then, upon that fundamental principle, to persuade all Christians, however divided in opinion, to lay aside the distinctions of sect and party, and in one united body to consult that tranquillity and peace which is so agreeable to the Christian name. This we conceive to have been the object of Arminius; an object so indicative of an enlightened mind, so congenial to that charity which hopeth all things, and thinketh no evil, and so conducive to the interests of religion and the peace of the world, as to reflect the highest

honour on him by whom it was first pursued, and to constitute the true glory of Arminianism.

The controversy to which Arminianism had given rise, was carried on after the death of its founder, with the greatest eagerness, and produced the most bitter and deplorable dissensions. The Arminians requested nothing more than a bare toleration. This moderate demand, at all times reasonable and just, was particularly so in Holland, which had thrown off the yoke of civil and spiritual despotism, and where the received confession of faith had not determined the questions under debate. It was strongly urged by Grotius, Hoogerbeets, Olden Barnevelt, and other persons of respectability and influence. And Maurice, prince of Orange, and his mother the princess dowager, giving countenance to the claim, there was some prospect of the Calvinists being persuaded to enter into pacific measures, and to treat their dissenting brethren with forbearance. Accordingly, in the year 1611, a conference between the contending parties was held at the Hague, on which occasion, it is commonly asserted, the toleration required was offered to the Arminians, provided they would renounce the errors of Socinianism,-- though the papers which passed between the parties at that conference, as authenticated by each of them, contain no proviso of that description. Another conference was held at Delft, in 1613. And in 1614, the States of Holland promulgated an edict, exhorting the disputants to the exercise of mutual charity. But these and other expedients employed for the same purpose, had not the desired effect. The Calvinists expressed great indignation at the magistrates, for endeavouring, by their authority, to promote a union with such adversaries. The conduct of the States was ably and eloquently defended by Grotius, in two treatises, entitled, “*De Jure Summarum Potestatum circa sacra,*” and “*Ordinum Hollandiæ, ac West-Frisiæ Pietas a multorum calumniis vindicata.*”

The hopes of success which the Arminians entertained from the indulgent manner in which they were treated by the civil authorities, were soon blasted by a misunderstanding which had secretly subsisted for some time between the stadtholder and the principal magistrates, and at last broke forth into an open rupture. Maurice, being suspected of aiming at sovereign power, was firmly opposed by the leading persons in the government, who had been the friends and patrons of the Arminians, and to whom, therefore, these adhered at this difficult crisis. On the other hand, the Gomarists, or Calvinists, attached themselves to Maurice, and inflamed the resentment which he had already, for various reasons, conceived against the Arminians. The prince was resolved, at once to ruin the ministers who had ventured to oppose his schemes of usurpation, and to crush the Arminians, by whom those statesmen had been warmly supported. For this purpose he got the leading men cast into prison. Barnevelt, whose long and faithful

services deserved a better fate, died on the scaffold: and Grotius and Hoogerbeets, under pretexts more plausible than solid, were unjustly condemned to perpetual imprisonment, from which, however, the former afterward escaped, and fled into France. The alleged crime of the Arminians being of an ecclesiastical nature, it was thought proper to bring their cause before a national assembly of divines by which their religious opinions might be regularly and finally condemned.

Under the auspices of Maurice, therefore, 93and by the authority of the states general, a synod was convoked at Dort, in the year 1618. Before this meeting, which consisted of deputies from the United Provinces, from England, Scotland, Switzerland, and other places, the Arminians appeared, with Episcopius at their head, to answer to the accusations brought against them, of departing from the established religion. For a full account of the proceedings of this synod, the reader may consult the second and third volumes of Brandt's History of the Reformation, and the Remains of Mr. John Hales of Eaton, who was present at the meeting, and gives a simple narrative of what he saw and heard. The conduct of the synod has been applauded by some, and condemned by others. On the one hand, it has been placed above every other synod since the Apostolic age, for its temper, moderation, and sanctity; on the other, it has been charged with injustice and cruelty, and burlesqued in such lines as these:--

Dordrecht synodus nodus; chorus integer, æger; Conventus, ventus; sessio, stramen, Amen.

[The point of this doggrel, which consists chiefly in the gingle of the Latin words, is lost in a translation. The following is a literal version:--

The synod of Dort, a knot; the whole assembly, sick;  
The convention, wind; the session, straw, Amen.]

Neal remarks, that it behaved as well as most assemblies of a similar kind have done, "who have pretended to establish articles for other men's faith, with penal sanctions." This says very little for the synod of Dort; though, perhaps, it is even more than can be said with truth. Martinius of Bremen seems to have spoken much more correctly, when he told his friends, "I believe now what Gregory Nazianzen says, that he had never seen any council attended with good effects, but that it always increased the evil rather than removed it. I declare as well as that father, that I will never set my foot in any synod again. O Dort! Dort! would to God that I had never seen thee!" The Arminians, it is contended, asked more indulgence than they had reason to expect; however it is certain that the treatment which they received from the synod, was arbitrary, faithless, and oppressive. They were at length found guilty of heresy, and of hostility to their country and

its religion. And the measures adopted against them, in consequence of this sentence, were of the most severe and rigorous kind. They were excommunicated; they were driven from all their offices, civil and ecclesiastical; their ministers were prohibited from preaching; and their congregations were suppressed. Refusing to submit to the two last of these hard decrees, they were subjected to fines, imprisonments, and various other punishments. To avoid this tyrannical treatment, many of them retired to Antwerp, others to France, and a considerable number into Holstein, where they were kindly received by Frederick the duke, and where, in the form of a colony, they built for themselves a handsome town, naming it Frederickstadt, in compliment to their friend and protector. The history of this colony may be found in a work entitled *Epistolæ Præstantium et Eruditorum Virorum Ecclesiasticæ et Theologicæ*, and published by Limborch and Hartsoeker.

The tenets of the Arminians may be comprised in the following five articles relating to predestination, universal redemption, the corruption of men, conversion, and perseverance, viz. 1. That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those whom he foresaw would persevere unto the end in their faith in Christ Jesus; and to inflict everlasting punishment on those who should continue in their unbelief, and resist unto the end his divine succours; so that election was conditional, and reprobation in like manner the result of foreseen infidelity and persevering wickedness. 2. That Jesus Christ, by his sufferings and death, made an atonement for the sins of all mankind in general, and of every individual in particular; that, however, none but those who believe in him can be partakers of the divine benefits. 3. That true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of free will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing; and that, therefore, it is necessary, in order to his salvation, that he be regenerated and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ. 4. That this divine grace or energy of the Holy Ghost begins and perfects every thing that can be called good in man, and consequently all good works are to be attributed to God alone; that, nevertheless, this grace is offered to all, and does not force men to act against their inclinations, but may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse wills of impenitent sinners. 5. That God gives to the truly faithful, who are regenerated by his grace, the means of preserving themselves in this state; and though the first Arminians made some doubt with respect to the closing part of this article, their followers uniformly maintain, that the regenerate may lose true justifying faith, forfeit their state of grace, and die in their sins. The Arminians are also called Remonstrants, from an humble petition entitled their Remonstrance,



which, in the year 1610, they addressed to the States of Holland. Their principal writers are, Arminius, Episcopius, Uitenbogart, Grotius, Curcellæus, Limborch, Le Clerc, Wetstein, Goodwin, Whitby, Wesley, Fletcher, Tomline, &c. The works of Arminius, with a copious account of his life and times, have been recently translated into English, by Mr. James Nichols; and have not only served to dissipate many misconceptions respecting the sentiments of this celebrated divine, which had prevailed in England, where the Pelagianism of some eminent divines, generally called Arminian, had been unjustly charged upon him; but have added a most valuable collection of treatises to our theological literature.

ARMS. The Hebrews do not appear to have had any peculiar military habit. As the flowing dress which they ordinarily wore would have impeded their movements, they girt it closely around them when preparing for battle, and loosened it on their return, 2 Sam. xx, 8; 1 Kings xx, 11. They used the same arms as the neighbouring nations, both defensive and offensive; and these were made either of iron or of brass, principally of the latter metal. Of the defensive arms of the Hebrews, the following were the most remarkable; namely,

1. The helmet, כִּוְכֵן, for covering and defending the head. This was a part of the military provision made by Uzziah for his vast army, 2 Chron. xxvi, 14; and long before the time of that king, the helmets of Saul and of the Philistine champion were of the same metal, 1 Sam. xvii, 38. This military cap was also worn by the Persians, Ethiopians, and Libyans, Ezek. xxxviii, 5, and by the troops which Antiochus sent against Judas Maccabeus, 1 Mac. vi, 35.

2. The breastplate or corslet, שָׁדִיִן, was another piece of defensive armour. Goliath, and the soldiers of Antiochus, 1 Sam. xvii, 5; 1 Mac. vi, 35, were accoutred with this defence; which, in our authorized translation, is variously rendered habergeon, coat of mail, and brigandine, 1 Sam. xvii, 38; 2 Chron. xxvi, 14; Isa. lix, 17; Jer. xlvi, 4. Between the joints of this harness, as it is termed in 1 Kings xxii, 4, the profligate Ahab was mortally wounded by an arrow, shot at a venture. From these various renderings of the original word, it should seem that this piece of armour covered both the back and breast, but principally the latter. The corslets were made of various materials: sometimes they were made of flax or cotton, woven very thick, or of a kind of woollen felt: others again were made of iron or brazen scales, or laminæ, laid one over another, like the scales of a fish; others were properly what we call coats of mail; and others were composed of two pieces of iron or brass, which protected the back and breast. All these kinds of corslets are mentioned in the Scriptures. Goliath's coat of mail, 1 Sam. xvii, 5, was literally a corslet of scales, that is, composed of numerous

laminæ of brass, crossing each other. It was called by Virgil, and other Latin writers, squama lorica. Similar corslets were worn by the Persians and other nations. The breastplate worn by the unhappy Saul, when he perished in battle, is supposed to have been of flax, or cotton, woven very close and thick, 2 Sam. i, 9, marginal rendering.

3. The shield defended the whole body during the battle. It was of various forms, and made of wood covered with tough hides, or of brass, and sometimes was overlaid with gold, 1 Kings x, 16, 17; xiv, 26, 27. Two sorts are mentioned in the Scriptures; namely, the צנה, great shield or buckler, and the מלך, or smaller shield. It was much used by the Jews, Babylonians, Chaldeans, Assyrians, and Egyptians. David, who was a great warrior, often mentions a shield and buckler in his divine poems, to signify that defence and protection of Heaven which he expected and experienced, and in which he reposed all his trust, Psalm v, 12; and when he says, "God will with favour compass the righteous as with a shield," he seems to allude to the use of the great shield tsinnah, (which is the word he uses,) with which they covered and defended their whole bodies. King Solomon caused two different sorts of shields to be made; namely, the tsinnah, (which answers to clypeus among the Latins,) such a large shield as the infantry wore, and the maginnim, or scuta, which were used by the horsemen, and were of a much less size, 2 Chron. ix, 15, 16. The former of these are translated targets, and are double in weight to the other. The Philistines came into the field with this weapon: so we find their formidable champion was appointed, 1 Sam. xvii, 7. One bearing a shield went before him, whose proper duty it was to carry this and some other weapons, with which to furnish his master upon occasion.

The loss of the shield in fight was excessively resented by the Jewish warriors, as well as lamented by them; for it was a signal aggravation of the public mourning, that "the shield of the mighty was vilely cast away," 2 Sam. i, 21. David, a man of arms, who composed this beautiful elegy on the death of Saul, felt how disgraceful a thing it was for soldiers to quit their shields in the field.

These honourable sentiments were not confined to the Jews. We find them prevailing among most other ancient nations, who considered it infamous to cast away or lose their shield. With the Greeks it was a capital crime, and punished with death. The Lacedæmonian women, it is well known, in order to excite the courage of their sons, used to deliver to them their fathers' shields, with this short address: "This shield thy father always preserved: do thou preserve it also, or perish." Alluding perhaps to these sentiments, St. Paul, when exhorting the Hebrew Christians to

steadfastness in the faith of the Gospel, urges them not to cast away their confidence, which “hath great recompense of reward,” Heb. x, 35.

4. Another defensive provision in war was the military girdle, which was for a double purpose: first, in order to hold the sword, which hung, as it to this day, at the soldier’s girdle or belt, 1 Sam. xvii, 39: secondly, it was necessary to gird the clothes and the armour together. To gird and to arm are synonymous words in Scripture; for those who are said to be able to put on armour are, according to the Hebrew and the Septuagint, girt with a girdle; and hence comes the expression of “girding to the battle,” 1 Kings xx, 11; Isa. viii, 9; 2 Sam. xxii, 40; 1 Sam. xviii, 4. There is express mention of this military girdle, where it is recorded that Jonathan, to assure David of his entire love and friendship by some visible pledges, stripped himself not only of his usual garments, but of his military habiliments, his sword, bow, and girdle, and gave them to David.

5. Boots or greaves were part of the ancient defensive harness, because it was the custom to cast certain εμποδια, impediments, (so called, because they entangled the feet,) in the way before the enemy. The military boot or shoe was therefore necessary to guard the legs and feet from the iron stakes placed in the way to gale and wound them; and thus we are enabled to account for Goliath’s greaves of brass which were upon his legs.

The offensive weapons were of two sorts; namely, such as were employed when they came to a close engagement, and those with which they annoyed the enemy at a distance. Of the former description were the sword and the battle-axe.

1. The sword is the most ancient weapon of offence mentioned in the Bible. With it Jacob’s sons treacherously assassinated the Shechemites, Gen. xxxiv, 2. It was worn on the thigh, Psalm xlv, 4; Exod. xxxii, 27; and, it should seem on the left thigh; for it is particularly mentioned that Ehud put a dagger or short sword under his garments on his right thigh, Judges iii, 16. There appear to have been two kinds of swords in use, a larger one with one edge, which is called in Hebrew the mouth of the sword, Joshua vi, 21; and a shorter one with two edges, like that of Ehud. The modern Arabs, it is well known, wear a sabre on one side, and a cangiar or dagger in their girdles.

2. Of the battle-axe we have no description in the sacred volume: it seems to have been a most powerful weapon in the hands of cavalry, from the allusion made to it by Jeremiah: “Thou art my battle-axe and weapons of war; for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms: and with thee will I break in pieces the horse and his

rider, and with thee will I break in pieces the chariot and his rider,” Jer. li, 20, 21.

3. The spear and javelin (as the words רמה and הנית are variously rendered in Num. xxv, 7; 1 Sam. xiii, 19, and Jer. xlvi, 4) were of different kinds, according to their length or make. Some of them might be thrown or darted, 1 Sam. xviii, 11; others were a kind of long swords, Num. xxv, 8; and it appears from 2 Sam. ii, 23, that some of them were pointed at both ends. When armies were encamped, the spear of the general or commander-in-chief was stuck into the ground at his head.

4. Slings are enumerated among the military stores collected by Uzziah, 2 Chron. xxvi, 14. In the use of the sling David eminently excelled, and he slew Goliath with a stone from one. The Benjaminites were celebrated in battle because they had attained to great skill and accuracy in handling this weapon; “they could sling stones to a hair’s breadth, and not miss,” Judges xx, 16; and where it is said that they were left-handed, it should rather be rendered ambidexters; for we are told they could use “both the right hand and the left,” 1 Chron. xii, 2; that is, they did not constantly use the right hand as others did, when they shot arrows or slung stones; but they were so expert in their military exercises, that they could perform them with their left hand as well as with their right.

5. Bows and arrows are of great antiquity; indeed, no weapon is mentioned so early. Thus Isaac said to Esau, “Take thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow,” Gen. xxvii, 3; though, it is true, these are not spoken of as used in war, but in hunting; and so they are supposed and implied before this, where it is said of Ishmael, that he became an archer, he used bows and arrows in shooting of wild beasts, Gen. xxi, 20. This afterward became so useful a weapon, that care was taken to train up the Hebrew youth to it betimes. When David had, in a solemn manner, lamented the death of King Saul, he gave orders for teaching the young men the use of the bow, 1 Sam. i, 18, that they might be as expert as the Philistines, by whose bows and arrows Saul and his army were slain. These were part of the military ammunition; for in those times bows were used instead of guns, and arrows supplied the place of powder and ball. From the book of Job, xx, 24, it may be collected, that the military bow was made of steel, and consequently was very stiff and hard to bend, on which account they used their foot in bending their bows; and therefore when the prophets speak of treading the bow and of bows trodden, they are to be understood of bows bent, as our translators rightly render it, Jer. 1, 14; Isa. v, 28; xxi, 15; but the Hebrew word which is used in these places, signifies to tread upon. This weapon was thought so necessary in war, that it is there called, “the bow of war,” or the “battle-bow,” Zech. ix, 10; x, 14.

ARNON, a river or brook, mentioned Num. xxi, 24, and elsewhere. Its spring head is in the mountains of Gilead, or of the Moabites, and it discharges itself into the Dead Sea.

ARROW. See Arms. Divination with arrows was a method of presaging future events, practised by the ancients. Ezekiel, xxi, 21, informs us, that Nebuchadnezzar, putting himself at the head of his armies, to march against Zedekiah, king of the Jews, and against the king of the Ammonites, stood at the parting of two ways, to mingle his arrows together in a quiver, in order to divine from thence which way he should march. Jerom, Theodoret, and the modern commentators after them, believe that this prince took several arrows, and upon each of them wrote the name of the king, town, or province, which he was to attack: for example, upon one, Jerusalem; upon another, Rabbah, the capital of the Ammonites; and upon another, Egypt, &c. After having put these into a quiver, he shook them together, and then drew them out; and the arrow which was drawn was thought to declare the will of the gods to attack first that city, province, or kingdom, with whose name it was inscribed.

ARTAXERXES, or Ahasuerus, a king of Persia, the husband of Esther, who, in the opinion of the learned Usher and Calmet, was the Darius of profane authors. See Ahasuerus.

2. Artaxerxes Longimanus is supposed by Dr. Prideaux to be the Ahasuerus of Esther. He was the son of Xerxes, and grandson of Darius Hystaspes, and reigned in Persia from the year of the world 3531 to 3579. He permitted Ezra, with all those inclined to follow him, to return into Judea, in the year of the world 3537, Ezra vii, viii. Afterward, Nehemiah also obtained leave to return, and to build the walls and gates of Jerusalem, in the year of the world 3550, Nehem. i, 11. From this year, chronologers reckon the beginning of 96 Daniel's seventy weeks, Daniel xi, 29. These are weeks of years, and make four hundred and ninety years. Dr. Prideaux, who discourses very copiously, and with great learning, on this prophecy, maintains that the decree mentioned in it for the restoring and rebuilding of Jerusalem, cannot be understood of that granted to Nehemiah, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes; but of that granted to Ezra, by the same Artaxerxes, in the seventh year of his reign. From that time to the death of Christ, are exactly four hundred and ninety years, to a month: for in the month Nisan the decree was granted to Ezra; and in the middle of the same month Nisan, Christ suffered, just four hundred and ninety years afterward.

The easterns think that the surname of Longimanus was given to Artaxerxes by reason of the extent of his dominions; as it is commonly said

that princes have long hands: but the Greeks maintain that this prince had really longer hands or arms than usual; and that, when he stood upright, he could touch his knees. He is said to have been the handsomest man of his time. The eastern people call him Bahaman, and give him the surname of Ardschir-diraz-dest, or the long-handed. He was the son of Asfendiar, sixth king of the second dynasty of the Persians. After having extinguished the family of Rostam, which was formidable to him on account of the great men who composed it, he carried his arms into the western provinces, Mesopotamia and Syria, which formed part of his empire. He took Babylon from Belshazzar, son of Nebuchadnezzar; and he put in his place Kiresch, who by us is called Cyrus. Some Persian historians assert that the mother of Artaxerxes was a Jewess, of the tribe of Benjamin, and family of Saul; and that the most beloved of his wives was of the tribe of Judah, and race of Solomon, by Rehoboam, king of Judah. If this be true, we need not wonder that he should recommend to Cyrus to favour the Jewish nation. This Cyrus performed, by sending back the people into their own country, and permitting them to rebuild their temple. But the truth of this story is doubtful; and were it true, the interference of the special providence of God must still be acknowledged. Artaxerxes reigned forty-seven years, and died in the year of the world 3579, and before Jesus Christ 425.

ARTEMAS, St. Paul's disciple, who was sent by that Apostle into Crete, in the room of Titus, chap. iii, 12, while he continued with St. Paul at Nicopolis, where he passed the winter. We know nothing particular of the life or death of Artemas; but the employment to which he was appointed by the Apostle is a proof of his great merit.

ASA, the son and successor of Abijam, king of Judah, began to reign in the year of the world 3049, and before Christ 955. He reigned forty-one years at Jerusalem, and did right in the sight of the Lord. He purged Jerusalem from the infamous practices attending the worship of idols; and he deprived his mother of her office and dignity of queen, because she erected an idol to Astarte, which he burnt in the valley of Hinnom, 1 Kings xv, 8, &c.

The Scripture reproaches Asa with not destroying the high places, which, perhaps, he thought it politic to tolerate, to avoid the greater evil of idolatry. He carried into the house of the Lord the gold and silver vessels which his father Abijam had vowed to consecrate. He fortified several cities, and repaired others, encouraging his people to this labour while the kingdom was at peace; and the Lord favoured them with his protection. After this he levied three hundred thousand men in Judah, armed with shields and pikes; and two hundred and eighty thousand men in Benjamin, armed with shields and bows, all men of courage and valour. About this time, Zerah, king of Ethiopia, or rather of Cush, which is part of Arabia, marched against Asa

with a million of foot, and three hundred chariots of war, and advanced as far as Mareshah. This probably happened in the fifteenth year of Asa's reign, and in the year of the world 3064, 2 Chron. xv, 10. Asa advanced to meet Zerah, and encamped in the plain of Zephathah, or rather Zephatah, near Mareshah, and having prayed to the Lord, God struck the forces of Zerah with such a panic that they began to flee. Asa and his army pursued them to Geran, and slew of them a great number. After this, Asa's army returned to Jerusalem, laden with booty. The prophet Azariah met them, and said, "Hear ye me, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin, The Lord is with you while ye be with him, and if ye seek him he will be found of you; but if ye forsake him, he will forsake you.--Be ye strong, therefore, and let not your hands be weak: for your work shall be rewarded," 2 Chron. xv, 2, 7. After this exhortation, Asa, being animated with new courage, destroyed the idols of Judah, Benjamin, and Mount Ephraim; repaired the altar of burnt-offerings; and assembled Judah and Benjamin, with many from the tribes of Simeon, Ephraim, and Manasseh, and on the third day, in the fifteenth year of his reign, celebrated a solemn festival. Of the cattle taken from Zerah, they sacrificed seven hundred oxen, and seven thousand sheep; they renewed the covenant with the Lord; and, with cymbals and trumpets sounding, they swore to the covenant, and declared that whoever should forsake the true worship of God, should be put to death. The Lord gave them peace; and, according to the Chronicles, the kingdom of Judah had rest till the thirty-fifth year of Asa. Concerning this year, however, there are difficulties; and some think that we should read the twenty-fifth, instead of the thirty-fifth; since Baasha, who made war on Asa, lived no longer than the twenty-sixth year of Asa, 1 Kings xvi, 8.

In this year Baasha, king of Israel, began to fortify Ramah, on the frontiers of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, that he might prevent the Israelites from resorting to the kingdom of Judah, and the temple of the Lord at Jerusalem. When Asa was informed of this, he sent to Benhadad, king of Damascus, all the gold and silver of his palace, and of the temple, to induce him to break his alliance with Baasha, and to assist him against the king of Israel. Benhadad accepted Asa's presents, and invaded Baasha's country, where he took several cities belonging to the tribe of Naphtali. This obliged Baasha to retire from Ramah, that he might defend his dominions nearer home. Asa immediately ordered his people to Ramah, carried off all the materials prepared by Baasha, and employed them in building Geba and Mizpah. This application to Benhadad for assistance was inexcusable. It implied, that Asa distrusted God's power and goodness, which he had so lately experienced. Therefore the Prophet Hanani was sent to reprove him for his conduct. Asa, however, was so exasperated at his rebukes that he put the Prophet in chains, and at the same time ordered the execution of several persons in Judah. Toward the latter part of his life, he

was incommoded with swellings in his feet, which, gradually rising upwards, killed him. The Scripture reproaches him with having had recourse to physicians, rather than to the Lord. He was buried in the sepulchre which he had provided for himself in the city of David; and after his death they placed on the bed great quantities of perfumes and spices, with which his body was burned. His bones and ashes were then collected, and put into his grave.

ASAHHEL, the son of Zeruah, and brother of Joab. He was killed by Abner, in the battle of Gibeon, 2 Sam. ii, 18, 19, while he obstinately persisted in the pursuit of that general. To revenge his death, his brother Joab, some years after, treacherously killed Abner, who had come to wait on David at Hebron, in order to procure him to be acknowledged king by all Israel, 2 Sam. iii, 26, 27. See Abner.

ASAPH, a celebrated musician in the time of David, was the son of Barachias of the tribe of Levi. Asaph, and also his descendants, presided over the musical band in the service of the temple. Several of the psalms, as the fiftieth, the seventy-third to the eighty-third, have the name of Asaph prefixed; but it is not certain whether the words or the music were composed by him. With regard to some of them, which were written during the Babylonish captivity, they cannot in any respect be ascribed to him. Perhaps they were written or set to music by his descendants, who bore his name, or by some of that class of musicians of which the family of Asaph was the head, 1 Chron. vi, 39; 2 Chron. xxix, 30; xxxv, 15; Neh. xii, 46. The psalms which bear the name of Asaph are doctrinal or preceptive: their style, though less sweet than that of David, is more vehement, and little inferior to the grandeur of Isaiah.

ASCENSION OF CHRIST, his visible elevation to heaven. Our Saviour, having repeatedly conversed with his Apostles after his resurrection, and afforded them many infallible proofs of its reality, led them from Jerusalem to Bethany, and was raised up to heaven in their sight; there to continue till he shall descend at the last day to judge the quick and the dead. The evidences of this fact were numerous. The disciples saw him ascend, Acts i, 9, 10. Two angels testified that he did ascend, Acts i, 11. Stephen, Paul, and John saw him in his ascended state, Acts vii, 55, 56; ix; Rev. i. The ascension was demonstrated by the descent of the Holy Ghost, John xvi, 7, 14; Acts ii, 33; and the terrible overthrow and dispersion of the Jewish nation is still a standing proof of it, John viii, 21; Matt. xxvi, 64. The time of Christ's ascension was forty days after his resurrection. He continued so many days upon earth that he might give repeated proofs of his resurrection, Acts i, 3; instruct his Apostles in every thing of importance respecting their office and ministry, Acts i, 3; and might open to them the



Scriptures concerning himself, and renew their commission to preach the Gospel, Acts i, 5, 6; Mark xvi, 15. As to the manner of his ascension, it was from mount Olivet to heaven, not in appearance only, but in reality, and that visibly and locally. It was a real motion of his human nature; sudden, swift, glorious, and in a triumphant manner. He was parted from his disciples while he was solemnly blessing them; and multitudes of angels attended him with shouts of praise, Psalm lxxviii, 17; xlvii, 5, 6.

The effects or ends of his ascension were, 1. To fulfil the types and prophecies concerning it; 2. To “appear” as a priest “in the presence of God for us;” 3. To take upon him more openly the exercise of his kingly office; 4. To receive gifts for men, both ordinary and extraordinary, Psalm lxxviii, 18; 5. To open the way to heaven for his people, Heb. x, 19, 20; 6. To assure the saints of their ascension to heaven after their resurrection from the dead, John xiv, 1, 2.

ASHDOD, Azoth, according to the Vulgate, or Azotus, according to the Greek, a city which was assigned by Joshua to the tribe of Judah, but was possessed a long time by the Philistines, and rendered famous for the temple of their god Dagon, Joshua xv, 47. It lies upon the Mediterranean Sea, about nine or ten miles north of Gaza; and in the times when Christianity flourished in these parts was made an episcopal see, and continued a fair village till the days of St. Jerom. Here the ark of Jehovah triumphed over the Philistine idol Dagon, 1 Sam. v, 2.

ASHER, tribe of. The province allotted to this tribe was a maritime one, stretching along the coast from Sidon on the north to Mount Carmel on the south; including the cities Abdon, Achshaph, Accho, Achzib, Sarepta, Sidon, and Tyre. But of the northern half of this territory, that is, from Tyre northward, this tribe never became possessed, not having expelled the Phœnician inhabitants, who are supposed not to have been pure Canaanites, but a mixture of this people with a Cuthite colony from Egypt. Asher was the most northerly of the tribes; and had that of Naphtali on the west, and Zebulun on the south.

ASHES. Several religious ceremonies, and some symbolical ones, anciently depended upon the use of ashes. To repent in sackcloth and ashes, or, as an external sign of self-affliction for sin, or of suffering under some misfortune, to sit in ashes, are expressions common in Scripture. “I am but dust and ashes,” exclaims Abraham before the Lord, Gen. xviii, 27; indicating a deep sense of his own meanness in comparison with God. God threatens to shower down dust and ashes on the lands instead of rain, Deut. xxviii, 24; thereby to make them barren instead of blessing them, to dry them up instead of watering them. Tamar, after the

injury she had received from Amnon, covered her head with ashes, 2 Sam. xiii, 19. The Psalmist, in great sorrow, says poetically, he had "eaten ashes as it were bread," Psalm cii, 9; that is, he sat on ashes, he threw ashes on his head; and his food, his bread, was sprinkled with the ashes wherewith he was himself covered. So Jeremiah introduces Jerusalem saying, "The Lord hath covered me with ashes," Lamentations iii, 16. Sitting on ashes, or lying down among ashes, was a token of extreme grief. We find it adopted by Job, ii, 8; by many Jews when in great fear, Esther iv, 3; and by the king of Nineveh, Jonah iii, 6. He arose from his throne, laid aside his robe, covered himself with sackcloth, and sat in ashes. This token of affliction is illustrated by Homer's description of old Laertes grieving for the absence of his son, "Sleeping in the apartment where the slaves slept, in the ashes, near the fire." Compare Jer. vi, 26, "Daughter of my people, wallow thyself in ashes." There was a sort of ley and lustral water, made with the ashes of the heifer sacrificed on the great day of expiation; these ashes were distributed to the people, and used in purifications, by sprinkling, to such as had touched a dead body, or had been present at funerals, Num. xix, 17.

ASHKENAZ, one of the sons of Gomer, and grandson of Japheth, who gave his name to the country first peopled by him in the north and north-western part of Asia Minor, answering to Bithynia; where were traces long after of his name, particularly in that of Ascanius, applied to a bay and city, as well as to some islands lying along the coast. It was also from this country, most probably, that the king Ascanius, mentioned by Homer, came to the aid of Priamus at the siege of Troy. From the same source, likewise, the Pontus Euxinus, or Black Sea, derived its name. It may farther be remarked on the identity of these countries, that the Prophet Jeremiah, predicting the capture of Babylon, and calling by name the countries which were to rise against it, exclaims, "Call together against her the kingdoms of Ararat, (or Armenia,) Minni, and Ashkenaz:" which was literally fulfilled; as Xenophen informs us that Cyrus, after taking Sardis, became master of Phrygia on the Hellespont, and took along with him many soldiers of that country.

ASHTAROTH, or Astarte, a goddess of the Zidonians. The word Ashtaroth properly signifies flocks of sheep, or goats; and sometimes the grove, or woods, because she was goddess of woods, and groves were her temples. In groves consecrated to her, such lasciviousness was committed as rendered her worship infamous. She was also called the queen of heaven; and sometimes her worship is said to be that of "the host of heaven." She was certainly represented in the same manner as Isis, with cows' horns on her head, to denote the increase and decrease of the moon. Cicero calls her the fourth Venus of the Syrians. She is almost always joined with Baal, and

is called a god, the Scriptures having no particular word to express a goddess. It is believed that the moon was adored in this idol. Her temples generally accompanied those of the sun; and while bloody sacrifices or human victims were offered to Baal, bread, liquors, and perfumes were presented to Astarte. For her, tables were prepared upon the flat terrace roofs of houses, near gates, in porches, and at crossways, on the first day of every month; and this was called by the Greeks, Hecate's supper.

Solomon, seduced by his foreign wives, introduced the worship of Ashtaroth into Israel; but Jezebel, daughter of the king of Tyre, and wife to Ahab, principally established her worship. She caused altars to be erected to this idol in every part of Israel; and at one time four hundred priests attended the worship of Ashtaroth, 1 Kings xviii, 7.

ASHUR, the son of Shem, who gave his name to Assyria. It is believed that Ashur originally dwelt in the land of Shinar and about Babylonia, but that he was compelled by the usurper Nimrod to depart from thence, and settle higher toward the springs of the Tigris, in the province of Assyria, so called from him, where some think he built the famous city of Nineveh, and those of Rehoboth, Calah, and Resen, Gen. x, 11, 12.

ASIA, one of the four grand divisions of the earth. It is also used in a more restricted sense for Asia Minor, or Anatolia. In the New Testament it always signifies the Roman Proconsular Asia, in which the seven Apocalyptic churches were situated.

ASKELON, a city in the land of the Philistines, situated between Azoth and Gaza, upon the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, about 520 furlongs from Jerusalem. The tribe of Judah, after the death of Joshua, took the city of Askelon, Judges i, 18, being one of the five governments belonging to the Philistines. The place at present is in ruins.

ASMONÆANS, a name given to the Maccabees, the descendants of Mattathias. After the death of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jews were governed by their high priest, in subjection, however, to the Persian kings, to whom they paid tribute; but with full enjoyment of their liberties, civil and religious. Nearly three centuries of prosperity ensued, until they were cruelly oppressed by Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, when they were compelled to take up arms in their own defence. Under the able conduct of Judas, surnamed Maccabeus, and his valiant brothers, the Jews maintained a religious war for twenty-six years with five successive kings of Syria; and after destroying upwards of two hundred thousand of their best troops, the Maccabees finally established the independence of their own country, and the aggrandisement of their family. This illustrious house,

whose princes united the regal and pontifical dignity in their own persons, administered the affairs of the Jews during a period of a hundred and twenty-six years; until, disputes arising between Hyrcanus II, and his brother Aristobulus, the latter was defeated by the Romans, who captured Jerusalem, and reduced Judea to a military province, B. C. 59.

ASNAPPER, the king of Assyria, who sent the Cutheans into the country belonging to the ten tribes, Ezra iv, 10. Many take this prince to be Shalmaneser; but others, with more probability, think him to be Esarhaddon.

ASP, אֲסַפ. Deut. xxxii, 33; Job xx, 14, 16; Psalm lviii, 4; xci, 13; Isaiah xi, 8. A very venomous serpent, whose poison is so subtle as to kill within a few hours with a universal gangrene. This may well refer to the bæten of the Arabians, which M. Forskal describes as spotted with black and white, about one foot in length, and nearly half an inch in thickness, oviparous, and whose bite is death. It is the asp of the ancients, and is so called now by the literati of Cyprus, though the common people call it kufi, (κῦφι,) deaf. With the PETHEN we may connect the python of the Greeks, which was, according to fable, a huge serpent that had an oracle at mount Parnassus, famous for predicting future events. Apollo is said to have slain this serpent, and hence he was called "Pythius." Those possessed with a spirit of divination were also styled Πυθῶνες. The word occurs in Acts, xvi, 16, as the characteristic of a young woman who had a pythonic spirit. It is well known that the serpent was particularly employed by the Heathens in their enchantments and divinations. See Serpent].

Pethen, פֶּתֶן, is variously translated in our version; but interpreters generally consider it as referring to the asp. Zophar alludes to it more than once in his description of a wicked man: "Yet his meat in his bowels is turned, it is the gall of asps within him. He shall suck the poison of asps: the viper's tongue shall slay him." The venom of asps is the most subtle of all; it is incurable; and, if the wounded part be not instantly amputated, it speedily terminates the existence of the sufferer. To these circumstances, Moses evidently alludes in his character of the Heathen: "Their wine is the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps." To tread upon the asp is attended with extreme danger; therefore, to express in the strongest manner the safety which the godly man enjoys under the protection of his heavenly Father, it is promised, that he shall tread with impunity upon these venomous creatures. No person of his own accord approaches the hole of these deadly reptiles; for he who gives them the smallest disturbance is in extreme danger of paying the forfeit of his rashness with his life. Hence, the Prophet Isaiah, predicting the conversion of the Gentiles to the faith of Christ, and the glorious reign of peace and truth in those regions which,

prior to that period, were full of horrid cruelty, marvellously heightens the force of the whole description by declaring, “The sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice’ den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.”

ASS, המור, Arabic, chamara and hamar. There are three words referred by translators to the ass: 1. המור, which is the usual appellation, and denotes the ordinary kind; such as is employed in labour, carriage, and domestic services. 2. פּררא, rendered onager, or “wild ass.” 3. אהון, rendered she ass. To these we must add, ערדיא, rendered wild asses, Dan. v, 21. The prevailing colour of this animal in the east is reddish; and the Arabic word, chamara, signifies to be red.

In his natural state he is fleet, fierce, formidable, and intractable; but when domesticated, the most gentle of all animals, and assumes a patience and submission even more humble than his situation. Le Clerc observes, that the Israelites not being allowed to keep horses, the ass was not only made a beast of burden, but used on journeys; and that even the most honourable of the nation were wont to be mounted on asses, which in the eastern countries were much larger and more beautiful than they are with us. Jair of Gilead had thirty sons who rode on as many asses, and commanded in thirty cities, Judges x, 4. Abdon’s sons and grandsons rode also upon asses, Judges xii, 4. And Christ makes his solemn entry into Jerusalem riding upon an ass, Matt. xxi, 4; John xii, 14. To draw with an ox and ass together was prohibited in the Mosaic law, Deut. xxii, 10. This law is thought to have respect to some idolatrous custom of the Gentiles, who were taught to believe that their fields would be more fruitful if thus ploughed; for it is not likely that men would have yoked together two creatures so different in their tempers and motions, had they not been led to it by some superstition. There might be, however, a physical reason for this injunction. Two beasts of a different species cannot well associate together; and on this account never pull pleasantly either in the cart or plough, and are not therefore “true yoke fellows.” Le Clerc considers this law as merely symbolical, importing that we are not to form improper alliances in civil and religious life; and he thinks his opinion confirmed by these words of St. Paul, 2 Cor. vi, 14: “Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers;” which are simply to be understood as prohibiting all intercourse between Christians and idolaters, in social, matrimonial, and religious life. To teach the Jews the propriety of this, a variety of precepts relative to improper and heterogeneous mixtures were interspersed through their law; so that in civil and domestic life they might have them ever before their eyes.

The wild ass, called PARA, is probably the onager of the ancients. It is taller and a much more dignified animal than the common or domestic ass; its legs are more elegantly shaped; and it bears its head higher. It is peculiarly distinguished by a dusky woolly mane, long erect ears, and a forehead highly arched. The colour of the hair, in general, is of a silvery white. These animals associate in herds, under a leader, and are very shy. They inhabit the mountainous regions and desert parts of Tartary, Persia, &c. Anciently they were likewise found in Lycaonia, Phrygia, Mesopotamia, and Arabia Deserta. They are remarkably wild; and Job, xxxix, 5–8, describes the liberty they enjoy, the place of their retreat, their manners, and wild, impetuous, and untamable spirit. “Vain man would be wise, though he be born a wild ass’s colt,” Job xi, 12; עֵיר פָּרָא, “ass colt,” not “ass’s colt;” יָר being in apposition with פָּרָא, and not in government. The whole is a proverbial expression, denoting extreme perversity and ferocity, and repeatedly alluded to in the Old Testament. Thus, Gen. xvi, 12, it is prophesied of Ishmael that he should be פָּרָא אָדָם, a wild ass man; rough, untaught, and libertine as a wild ass. So Hosea, xiii, 15; “He (Ephraim) hath run wild (literally assified himself) amidst the braying monsters.” So again, Hosea viii, 9, the very same character is given of Ephraim, who is called “a solitary wild ass by himself;” or perhaps a solitary wild ass of the desert; for the original will bear to be so rendered. This proverbial expression has descended among the Arabians to the present day, who still employ, as Schultens has remarked, the expressions, “the ass of the desert,” or “the wild ass,” to describe an obstinate, indocile, and contumacious person. The Prophet Isaiah, xxxii, 14, describes great desolation by saying that “the wild asses shall rejoice where a city stood.” There is another kind of ass called, אֶתוֹן. Abraham had ATONOTH, Gen. xii, 16; Balaam rode on an ATON, Num. xxii, 23. We find from 1 Chron. xxvii, 30, that David had an officer expressly appointed to superintend his ATONOTH; not his ordinary asses, but those of a nobler race; which implies at least equal dignity in this officer to his colleagues mentioned with him. This notion of the ATON gives also a spirit to the history of Saul, who, when his father’s ATONOTH were lost, was at no little pains to seek them; moreover, as beside being valuable, they were uncommon, he might the more readily hear of them if they had been noticed or taken up by any one; and this leads to the true interpretation of the servant’s proposed application to Samuel, verse 6, as though he said, “In his office of magistracy this honourable man may have heard of these strayed rarities, and secured them; peradventure he can direct us.”

Thus we find that these atonoth are mentioned in Scripture, only in the possession of judges, patriarchs, and other great men; insomuch that where these are there is dignity, either expressed or implied. They were also a present for a prince; for Jacob presented Esau with twenty, Gen. xxxii, 15.

What then shall we say of the wealth of Job, who possessed a thousand? Another word which is rendered “wild ass” by our translators, Job xxxix, 5, is ORUD; which seems to be the same, that in the Chaldee of Daniel, v, 21, is called oredia. Mr. Parkhurst supposes that this word denotes the brayer, and that PARA and ORUD are only two names for the same animal. But these names may perhaps refer to different races, though of the same species; so that a description of the properties of one may apply to both, though not without some variation.

Who sent out the para free?

Or who hath loosed the bands of the orud?

Whose dwelling I have made the wilderness,

And the barren land (salt deserts) his resort:

The range of open mountains are his pasture,

And he searcheth after every green thing.

Gmelin observes that the onager is very fond of salt. Whether the “deserts” of the above text were salt marshes, or salt deserts, is of very little consequence; the circumstance shows the correctness of the Hebrew poet. In Daniel we read that Nebuchadnezzar dwelt with the OREDIA. We need not suppose that he was banished to the deserts, but was at most kept safely in an enclosure of his own park, where curious animals were kept for state and pleasure. If this be correct, then the ORUD was somewhat, at least, of a rarity at Babylon; and it might be of a kind different from the PARA, as it is denoted by another name. May it not be the Gicquetei of Professor Pallas, the wild mule of Mongalia which surpasses the onager in size, beauty, and perhaps in swiftness.

ASSIDEANS, by some named Chasideans, from chasidim, “merciful, pious.” They were a kind of religious society among the Jews, whose chief and distinguishing character was, to maintain the honour of the temple, and observe punctually the traditions of the elders. They were therefore not only content to pay the usual tribute for the maintenance of the house of God, but charged themselves with farther expense upon that account; for every day, except that of the great expiation, they sacrificed a lamb, in addition to the daily oblation, which was called the sin offering of the Assideans. They practised greater hardships and mortifications than others; and their common oath was, “By the temple;” for which our Saviour reproves the Pharisees, who had learned that oath of them, Matt. xxiii, 16. From this sect the Pharisees sprung. The Assideans are represented as a numerous sect, distinguished by its valour, as well as by its zeal for the law, 1 Mac. ii, 42. A company of them resorted to Mattathias, to fight for the law of God, and the liberties of their country. This sect arose either during the captivity, or soon after the restoration, of the Jews; and were probably

in the commencement, and long afterward, a truly pious part of the nation; but they at length became superstitious.

ASSURANCE. The sense in which this term is used theologically is that of a firm persuasion of our being in a state of salvation. The doctrine itself has been matter of dispute among divines, and when considered as implying not only that we are now accepted of God through Christ, but that we shall be finally saved, or when it is so taken as to deny a state of salvation to those who are not so assured as to be free from all doubt, it is in many views 101questionable. Assurance of final salvation must stand or fall with the doctrine of personal unconditional election, and is chiefly held by divines of the Calvinistic school; and that nothing is an evidence of a state of present salvation but so entire a persuasion as amounts to assurance in the strongest sense, might be denied upon the ground that degrees of grace, of real saving grace, are undoubtedly mentioned in Scripture. Assurance, however, is spoken of in the New Testament, and stands prominent as one of the leading doctrines of religious experience. We have “full assurance of understanding;” that is a perfect knowledge and entire persuasion of the truth of the doctrine of Christ. The “assurance of faith,” in Hebrews ix, 22, is an entire trust in the sacrifice and priestly office of Christ. The “assurance of hope,” mentioned in Hebrews vi, 11, relates to the heavenly inheritance, and must necessarily imply a full persuasion that we are “the children of God,” and therefore “heirs of his glory;” and from this passage it must certainly be concluded that such an assurance is what every Christian ought to aim at, and that it is attainable. This, however, does not exclude occasional doubt and weakness of faith, from the earlier stages of his experience.

A comforting and abiding persuasion of present acceptance by God, through Christ, we may therefore affirm, must in various degrees follow true faith. In support of this view, the following remarks may be offered:--

If it is the doctrine of the inspired records, that man is by nature prone to evil, and that in practice he violates that law under which as a creature he is placed, and is thereby exposed to punishment;--if also it is there stated, that an act of grace and pardon is promised on the conditions of repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ;--if that repentance implies consideration of our ways, a sense of the displeasure of Almighty God, contrition of heart, and consequently trouble and grief of mind, mixed, however, with a hope inspired by the promise of forgiveness, and which leads to earnest supplication for the actual pardon of sin so promised, it will follow from these premises--either, 1. That forgiveness is not to be expected till after the termination of our course of probation, that is, in another life; and that, therefore, this trouble and apprehension of mind can



only be assuaged by the hope we may have of a favourable final decision on our case;--or, 2. That sin is, in the present life, forgiven as often as it is thus repented of, and as often as we exercise the required and specific acts of trust in the merits of our Saviour; but that this forgiveness of our sins is not in any way made known unto us: so that we are left, as to our feelings, in precisely the same state as if sin were not forgiven till after death, namely, in grief and trouble of mind, relieved only by hope;--or, 3. The Scriptural view is, that when sin is forgiven by the mercy of God through Christ, we are, by some means, assured of it, and peace and satisfaction of mind take the place of anxiety and fear.

The first of these conclusions is sufficiently disproved by the authority of Scripture, which exhibits justification as a blessing attainable in this life, and represents it as actually experienced by true believers. "Therefore being justified by faith." "There is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." "Whosoever believeth is justified from all things," &c. The quotations might be multiplied, but these are decisive. The notion that though an act of forgiveness may take place, we are unable to ascertain a fact so important to us, is also irreconcilable with many scriptures in which the writers of the New Testament speak of an experience, not confined personally to themselves, or to those Christians who were endowed with spiritual gifts, but common to all Christians. "Being justified by faith we have peace with God." "We joy in God, by whom we have received the reconciliation." "Being reconciled unto God by the death of his Son." "We have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear, but the spirit of adoption, by which we cry, Abba, Father." To these may be added innumerable passages which express the comfort, the confidence, and the joy of Christians; their "friendship" with God; their "access" to him; their entire union and delightful intercourse with him; and their absolute confidence in the success of their prayers. All such passages are perfectly consistent with deep humility, and self-diffidence; but they are irreconcilable with a state of hostility between the parties, and with an unascertained and only hoped-for restoration of friendship and favour.

An assurance, therefore, that the sins which are felt to "be a burden intolerable" are forgiven, and that the ground of that apprehension of future punishment which causes the penitent to "bemoan his manifold sins," is taken away by restoration to the favour of the offended God, must be allowed, or nothing would be more incongruous and impossible than the comfort, the peace, the rejoicing of spirit, which in the Scriptures are attributed to believers.

Few Christians of evangelical views have, therefore, denied the possibility of our becoming assured of the favour of God in a sufficient degree to give

substantial comfort to the mind. Their differences have rather respected the means by which the contrite become assured of that change in their relation to Almighty God, whom they have offended, which in Scripture is expressed by the term justification. The question has been, (where the notion of an assurance of eternal salvation has not been under discussion,) by what means the assurance of the divine favour is conveyed to the mind. Some have concluded that we obtain it by inference, others by the direct testimony of the Holy Spirit to the mind. See Holy Spirit.

ASSYRIA, a kingdom of Asia, of the extent, origin, and duration of which very different accounts have been given by ancient writers. Ctesias and Diodorus Siculus affirm, that the Assyrian monarchy, under Ninus and Semiramis, comprehended the greater part of the known world: but, if this had been the case, it is not likely that Homer and Herodotus would have omitted a fact so remarkable. The sacred records intimate that none of the ancient states or kingdoms were of considerable extent; for neither Chederlaomer, nor any of the neighbouring princes, were tributary or subject to Assyria; and “we find nothing,” says Playfair, “of the greatness or power of this kingdom in the history of the judges and succeeding kings of Israel, though the latter kingdom was oppressed and enslaved by many different powers in that period.” It is therefore highly probable that Assyria was originally of small extent. According to Ptolemy, this country was bounded on the north by part of Armenia and Mount Niphates; on the west by the Tigris; on the south by Susiana; and on the east by part of Media and the mountains Choatra and Zagros. Of the origin, revolutions, and termination of Assyria, properly so called, and distinguished from the grand monarchy which afterward bore this appellation, the following account is given by Mr. Playfair, as the most probable:--“The founder of it was Ashur, the second son of Shem, who departed from Shinar, upon the usurpation of Nimrod, at the head of a large body of adventurers, and laid the foundations of Nineveh, where he resided, and erected a new kingdom, called Assyria, after his name, Gen. x, 11. These events happened not long after Nimrod had established the Chaldean monarchy, and fixed his residence at Babylon; but it does not appear that Nimrod reigned in Assyria. The kingdoms of Assyria and Babylon were originally distinct and separate, Micah v, 6; and in this state they remained until Ninus conquered Babylon, and made it tributary to the Assyrian empire. Ninus, the successor of Ashur, Gen. x, 11, seized on Chaldea after the death of Nimrod, and united the kingdoms of Assyria and Babylon. This great prince is said to have subdued Asia, Persia, Media, Egypt, &c. If he did so, the effects of his conquests were of no long duration; for, in the days of Abraham, we do not find that any of the neighbouring kingdoms were subject to Assyria. Ninus was succeeded by Semiramis, a princess bold, enterprising, and fortunate; of whose adventures and exploits many fabulous relations have

been recorded. Playfair is of opinion that there were two princesses of this name, who flourished at different periods: one, the consort of Ninus; and another, who lived five generations before Nitocris, queen of Nebuchadnezzar. Of the successors of Ninus and Semiramis nothing certain is recorded. The last of the ancient Assyrian kings was Sardanapalus, who was besieged in his capital by Arbaces, governor of Media, in concurrence with the Babylonians. These united forces defeated the Assyrian army, demolished the capital, and became masters of the empire, B. C. 821.

“After the death of Sardanapalus,” says Mr. Playfair, “the Assyrian empire was divided into three kingdoms; namely, the Median, Assyrian, and Babylonian. Arbaces retained the supreme authority, and nominated governors in Assyria and Babylon, who were honoured with the title of kings, while they remained subject and tributary to the Persian monarchs Belesis,” he says, “a Chaldean priest, who assisted Arbaces in the conquest of Sardanapalus, received the government of Babylon as the reward of his services; and Phul was intrusted with that of Assyria. The Assyrian governor gradually enlarged the boundaries of his kingdom, and was succeeded by Tiglath-pileser, Salmanasar, and Sennacherib, who asserted and maintained their independence. After the death of Assar-haddon, the brother and successor of Sennacherib, the kingdom of Assyria was split, and annexed to the kingdoms of Media and Babylon. Several tributary princes afterward reigned in Nineveh; but we hear no more of the kings of Assyria, but of those of Babylon. Cyaxares, king of Media, assisted Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, in the siege of Nineveh, which they took and destroyed, B. C. 606.”

The history of Assyria, deduced from Scripture, and acknowledged as the only authentic one by Sir Isaac Newton and many others, ascribes the foundation of the monarchy to Pul, or Phul, about the second year of Menahem, king of Israel, twenty-four years before the æra of Nabonassar, 1579 years after the flood, and, according to Blair, 769, or, according to Newton, 790, years before Christ. Menahem, having taken forcible possession of the throne of Israel by the murder of Shallum, 2 Kings xv, 10, was attacked by Pul, but prevented the hostilities meditated against him by presenting the invader with a thousand talents of silver. Pul, thus gratified, took the kingdom of Israel under his protection, returned to his own country, after having received voluntary homage from several nations in his march, as he had done from Israel, and became the founder of a great empire. As it was in the days of Pul that the Assyrians began to afflict the inhabitants of Palestine, 2 Kings xi, 9; 1 Chron. v, 26, this was the time, according to Sir Isaac Newton, when the Assyrian empire arose. Thus he interprets the words, “since the time of the kings of Assyria,” Nehem. ix,

32; that is, since the time of the kingdom of Assyria, or since the rise of that empire. But though this was the period in which the Assyrians afflicted Israel, it is not so evident that the time of the kings of Assyria must necessarily be understood of the rise of the Assyrian empire. However, Newton thus reasons; and observes, that “Pul and his successors afflicted Israel, and conquered the nations round about them; and upon the ruin of many small and ancient kingdoms erected their empire; conquering the Medes, as well as other nations.” It is farther argued, that God, by the Prophet Amos, in the reign of Jeroboam, about ten or twenty years before the reign of Pul, (see Amos vi, 13, 14,) threatened to raise up a nation against Israel; and that, as Pul reigned presently after the prophecy of Amos, and was the first upon record who began to fulfil it, he may be justly reckoned the first conqueror and founder of this empire. See 1 Chron. v, 26. Pul was succeeded on the throne of Assyria by his elder son Tiglath-pileser; and at the 103<sup>rd</sup> same time he left Babylon to his younger son Nabonassar, B. C. 747. Of the conquests of this second king of Assyria against the kings of Israel and Syria, when he took Damascus, and subdued the Syrians, we have an account in 2 Kings xv, 29, 37; xvi, 5,9; 1 Chron. v, 26; by which the prophecy of Amos was fulfilled, and from which it appears that the empire of the Assyrians was now become great and powerful. The next king of Assyria was Shalmaneser, or Salmanassar, who succeeded Tiglath-pileser, B. C. 729, and invaded Phœnicia, took the city of Samaria, and, B. C. 721, carried the ten tribes into captivity, placing them in Chalach and Chabor, by the river Gazon, and in the cities of the Medes, 2 Kings xvii, 6. Shalmaneser was succeeded by Sennacherib, B. C. 719; and in the year B. C. 714, he was put to flight with great slaughter by the Ethiopians and Egyptians. In the year B. C. 711 the Medes revolted from the Assyrians; Sennacherib was slain; and he was succeeded by his son Esar-Haddon, Asserhaddon, Asordan, Assaradin, or Sarchedon, by which names he is called by different writers. He began his reign at Nineveh, in the year of Nabonassar 42; and in the year 68 extended it over Babylon. He then carried the remainder of the Samaritans into captivity, and peopled Samaria with captives brought from several parts of his kingdom; and in the year of Nabonassar 77 or 78 he seems to have put an end to the reign of the Ethiopians over Egypt. “In the reign of Sennacherib and Asser-Hadon,” says Sir I. Newton, “the Assyrian empire seems arrived at its greatness; being united under one monarch, and containing Assyria, Media, Apolloniatis, Susiana, Chaldea, Mesopotamia, Cilicia, Syria, Phœnicia, Egypt, Ethiopia, and part of Arabia; and reaching eastward into Elymais, and Parætæcene, a province of the Medes; and if Chalach and Chabor be Colchis and Iberia, as some think, and as may seem probable from the circumcision used by those nations till the days of Herodotus, we are also to add these two provinces, with the two Armenias, Pontus, and Cappadocia, as far as to the river Halys: for Herodotus tells us that the

people of Cappadocia, as far as to that river, were called Syrians by the Greeks, both before and after the days of Cyrus; and that the Assyrians were also called Syrians by the Greeks." Asser-Hadon was succeeded in the year B. C. 668 by Saosduchinus. At this time Manasseh was allowed to return home, and fortify Jerusalem; and the Egyptians also, after the Assyrians had harassed Egypt and Ethiopia three years, Isa. xx, 3, 4, were set at liberty. Saosduchinus, after a reign of twenty years, was succeeded at Babylon, and probably at Nineveh also, by Chyniladon, in the year B. C. 647. This Chyniladon is supposed by Newton to be the Nebuchadonozor mentioned in the book of Judith, i, 1–15, who made war upon Arphaxad, king of the Medes; and, though deserted by his auxiliaries of Cilicia, Damascus, Syria, Phœnicia, Moab, Ammon, and Egypt, routed the army of the Medes, and slew Arphaxad. This Arphaxad is supposed to be either Dejoces or his son Phraortes, mentioned by Herodotus. Soon after the death of Phraortes, in the year B. C. 635, the Scythians invaded the Medes and Persians; and in 625, Nabopolassar, the commander of the forces of Chyniladon in Chaldea, revolted from him, and became king of Babylon. Chyniladon was either then or soon after succeeded at Nineveh by the last king of Assyria, called Sarac by Polyhistor. The authors of the Universal History suppose Saosduchinus to have been the Nebuchadonozor of Scripture, and Chyniladon or Chynaladan to have been the Sarac of Polyhistor. At length Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Nabopolassar, married Amyit, the daughter of Astyages, king of the Medes, and sister of Cyaxares; and by this marriage the two families having contracted affinity, they conspired against the Assyrians. Nabopolassar being old, and Astyages dead, their sons Nebuchadnezzar and Cyaxares led the armies of the two nations against Nineveh, slew Sarac, destroyed the city, and shared the kingdom of the Assyrians. This victory the Jews refer to the Chaldeans; the Greeks, to the Medes; Tobit, xiv, 15, Polyhistor, and Ctesias, to both. With this victory commenced the great successes of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyaxares, and it laid the foundation of the two collateral empires of the Babylonians and Medes, which were branches of the Assyrian empire; and hence the time of the fall of the Assyrian empire is determined, the conquerors being then in their youth. In the reign of Josiah, when Zephaniah prophesied, Nineveh and the kingdom of Assyria were standing; and their fall was predicted by that Prophet, Zeph. i, 3; ii, 13. And in the end of his reign, Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, the successor of Psammitichus, went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates, to fight against Carchemish, or Circutium; and in his way thither slew Josiah, 2 Kings xxiii, 29; 2 Chron. xxxv, 20; and therefore the last king of Assyria was not yet slain. But in the third and fourth years of Jehoiakim, the successor of Josiah, the two conquerors having taken Nineveh, and finished their war in Assyria, prosecuted their conquests westward; and, leading their forces against the king of Egypt, as an invader of their right

of conquest, they beat him at Carchemish, and took from him whatever he had recently taken from the Assyrians, 2 Kings xxiv, 7; Jer. xlvi, 2; “and therefore we cannot err,” says Sir Isaac Newton, “above a year or two, if we refer the destruction of Nineveh, and fall of the Assyrian empire, to the third year, of Jehoiakim,” or the hundred and fortieth, or, according to Blair, the hundred and forty-first year of Nabonassar; that is, the year B. C. 607.

Of the government, laws, religion, learning, customs, &c, of the ancient Assyrians, nothing absolutely certain is recorded. Their kingdom was at first small, and subsisted for several ages under hereditary chiefs; and their government was simple. Afterward, when they rose to the sublimity of empire, their government seems to have been despotic, and the empire hereditary. Their laws were probably few, and depended upon the mere will of the prince. To Ninus we may ascribe the division of the Assyrian empire into provinces and governments; for we find that this institution was fully established in the reigns of Semiramis and her successors. The people were distributed into a certain number of tribes; and their occupations or professions were hereditary. The Assyrians had several distinct councils, and several tribunals for the regulation of public affairs. Of councils there were three, which were created by the body of the people, and who governed the state in conjunction with the sovereign. The first consisted of officers who had retired from military employments; the second, of the nobility; and the third, of the old men. The sovereigns also had three tribunals, whose province it was to watch over the conduct of the people. The Assyrians have been competitors with the Egyptians for the honour of having invented alphabetic writing. It appears, from the few remains now extant of the writing of these ancient nations, that their letters had a great affinity with each other. They much resembled one another in shape; and they ranged them in the same manner, from right to left.

ASTROLOGY, the art of foretelling future events, from the aspects, positions, and influences of the heavenly bodies. The word is compounded of ἀστήρ star, and λόγος, discourse; whence, in the literal sense of the term, astrology should signify no more than the doctrine or science of the stars. Astrology judiciary, or judicial, is what we commonly call simple astrology, or that which pretends to foretel mortal events, even those which have a dependence on the free will and agency of man; as if they were directed by the stars. This art, which owed its origin to the practice of knavery on credulity, is now universally exploded by the intelligent part of mankind. Judicial astrology is commonly said to have been invented in Chaldea, and thence transmitted to the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans; though some will have it of Egyptian origin, and ascribe the invention to Cham. But we derive it from the Arabians. The Chaldeans, and the

Egyptians, and indeed almost all the nations of antiquity, were infatuated with the chimæras of astrology. It originated in the notion, that the stars have an influence, either beneficial or malignant, upon the affairs of men, which may be discovered, and made the ground of certain prediction, in particular cases; and the whole art consisted in applying astronomical observations to this fanciful purpose. Diodorus Siculus relates, that the Chaldeans learned these arts from the Egyptians; and he would not have made this assertion, if there had not been at least a general tradition that they were practised from the earliest times in Egypt. The system was, in those remote ages, intimately connected with Sabaism, or the worship of the stars as divinities; but whether it emanates from idolatry or fatality, it denies God and his providence, and is therefore condemned in the Scriptures, and ranked with practices the most offensive and provoking to the Divine Majesty.

ASTYAGES, otherwise, Cyaxares, king of the Medes, and successor to Phraortes. He reigned forty years, and died A. M. 3409. He was father to Astyages, otherwise called Darius the Mede. He had two daughters, Mandane and Amyit: Mandane married Cambyses, the Persian, and was the mother of Cyrus; Amyit married Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Nabopolassar, and was the mother of Evilmerodach.

Astyages, otherwise called Ahasuerus in the Greek, Dan. ix, 1, or Cyaxares in Xenophon, or Apandus in Ctesias, was appointed by his father Cyaxares governor of Media, and sent with Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, against Saracus, otherwise called Chynaladanus, king of Assyria. These two princes besieged Saracus in Nineveh, took the city, and dismembered the Assyrian empire. Astyages was with Cyrus at the conquest of Babylon, and succeeded Belshazzar, king of the Chaldeans, as is expressly mentioned in Daniel, v, 30, 31, A. M. 3447. After his death Cyrus succeeded him, A. M. 3456.

ASUPPIM, a word which signifies gatherings, and the name of the treasury of the temple of Jerusalem, 1 Chron. xxvi, 15.

ATHALIAH, the daughter of Omri, king of Samaria, and wife to Jehoram, king of Judah. This princess, being informed that Jehu had slain her son Ahaziah, resolved to take the government upon herself, 2 Kings xi; which that she might effect without opposition, she destroyed all the children that Jehoram had by other wives, and all their offspring. But Jehosheba, the sister of Ahaziah, by the father's side only, was at this time married to Jehoiada, the high priest; and while Athaliah's executioners were murdering the rest, she conveyed Joash the son of Ahaziah away, and kept him and his nurse concealed in an apartment of the temple, during six

years. In the seventh year, his uncle Jehoiada being determined to place him on the throne of his ancestors, and procure the destruction of Athaliah, he engaged the priests and Levites, and the leading men in all the parts of the kingdom in his interest, and in a public assembly produced him, and made them take an oath of secrecy and fidelity to him. He then distributed arms among the people, whom he divided into three bodies, one to guard the person of the king, and the other two to secure the gates of the temple. After this, he brought out the young prince, set the crown on his head, put the book of the law into his hand, and with sound of trumpet proclaimed him; which was seconded with the joyful shouts and acclamations of the people. Athaliah, hearing the noise, made all haste to the temple; but when, to her astonishment, she saw the young king seated on a throne, she rent her clothes and cried out, "Treason!" But, at the command of Jehoiada, the guards seized and carried her out of the temple, putting all to the sword who offered to rescue or assist her; and then taking her to the stable gate belonging to the palace, there put her to death, A. M. 3126.

ATHANASIANS, the orthodox followers of St. Athanasius, the great and able antagonist of Arius. The Athanasian Creed, though generally admitted not to be drawn up by this father, (but probably, as Doctor Waterland says, by Hilary, bishop of Arles, in the fifth century,) is universally allowed to contain a fair expression of his sentiments. This creed says, "The Catholic faith is this: that we worship One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity: neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost;" namely, "uncreate, incomprehensible, eternal," &c. The true key to the Athanasian Creed lies in the knowledge of the errors to which it was opposed. The Sabellians considered the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as one in person;--this was "confounding the persons:" the Arians considered them as differing in essence--three beings;--this was "dividing the substance:" and against these two hypotheses was the creed originally framed. And since every sect was willing to adopt the language of Scripture, it was thought necessary to adopt scholastic terms, in order to fix the sense of Scripture language. Many, however, hold the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, and approve its terms, who object to its damnatory clauses. See Arians.

ATHANASIUS, the celebrated patriarch of Alexandria, resisted Arius and his erroneous doctrines; and his sentiments as to the Trinity are embodied in the creed which bears his name, though not composed by him. At the Council of Nice, though then but a deacon of Alexandria, his reputation for skill in controversy gained him an honourable place in the council, and



with great dexterity he exposed the sophistry of those who pleaded on the side of Arius. Notwithstanding the influence of the emperor, who had recalled Arius from banishment, and upon a plausible confession of his faith, in which he affected to be orthodox in his sentiments, directed that he should be received by the Alexandrian church, Athanasius refused to admit him to communion, and exposed his prevarication. The Arians upon this exerted themselves to raise tumults at Alexandria, and to injure the character of Athanasius with the emperor, who was prevailed upon to pronounce against him a sentence of banishment. In the beginning of the reign of Constantius he was recalled; but was again disturbed and deposed through the influence of the Arians. Accusations were also sent against him and other bishops from the east to the west, but they were acquitted by Pope Julius in full council. Athanasius was restored to his see upon the death of the Arian bishop, who had been placed in it. Arianism, however, being in favour at court, he was condemned by a council convened at Arles, and by another at Milan, and was obliged to fly into the deserts. He returned with the other bishops whom Julian the apostate recalled from banishment, and in A. D. 362, held a council at Alexandria, where the belief of a consubstantial Trinity was openly professed. Many now were recovered from Arianism, and brought to subscribe the Nicene Creed. During the reign of Jovian also Athanasius held another council, which declared its adherence to the Nicene faith; and with the exception of a short retirement under Valens he was permitted to sit down in quiet and govern his affectionate church of Alexandria. Athanasius was an eminent instrument of maintaining the truth in an age when errors affecting the great foundation of our faith were urged with great subtlety. He was by his acuteness able to trace the enemy through his most insidious modes of attack; and thus to preserve the simple and unwary from being misled by terms and distinctions, which, whilst they sounded in unison with the true faith of the Gospel, did in fact imply, or at least open the door to, the most deadly errors. The Scripture doctrine of the Trinity, as explained by him, at length triumphed over the heresies which at one time met with so much support and sanction; and the views of Athanasius have been received, in substance, by all orthodox churches to the present time.

ATHEIST, in the strict and proper sense of the word, is one who does not believe in the existence of a God, or who owns no being superior to nature. It is compounded of the two terms,  $\alpha$  negative, and Θεός, God, signifying without God. Atheists have been also known by the name infidels; but the word infidel is now commonly used to distinguish a more numerous party, and is become almost synonymous with Deist. He who disbelieves the existence of a God, as an infinite, intelligent, and a moral agent, is a direct or speculative Atheist; he who confesses a Deity and providence in words, but denies them in his life and actions, is a practical Atheist. That Atheism

existed in some sense before the flood, may be suspected from what we read in Scripture, as well as from Heathen tradition; and it is not very unreasonable to suppose, that the deluge was partly intended to evince to the world a heavenly power, as Lord of the universe, and superior to the visible system of nature. This was at least a happy consequence of that fatal catastrophe; for, as it is observed by Dean Sherlock, “The universal deluge, and the confusion of languages, had so abundantly convinced mankind of a divine power and providence, that there was no such creature as an Atheist, till their ridiculous idolatries had tempted some men of wit and thought, rather to own no God than such as the Heathens worshipped.”

Atheistical principles were long nourished and cherished in Greece, and especially among the atomical, peripatetic, and skeptical philosophers; and hence some have ascribed the origin of Atheism to the philosophy of Greece. This is true, if they mean that species of refined Atheism, which contrives any impious scheme of principles to account for the origin of the world, without a divine being. For though there may have been in former ages, and in other countries, some persons irreligious in principle as well as in practice, yet we know of none who, forming a philosophical scheme of impiety, became a sect, and erected colleges of Atheistical learning, till the arrogant and enterprising genius of Greece undertook that detestable work. Carrying their presumptuous and ungoverned speculations into the very essence of the divinity, at first they doubted, and at length denied, the existence of a first cause independent of nature and of a providence that superintends its laws, and governs the concerns of mankind. These principles, with the other improvements of Greece, were transferred to Rome; and, excepting in Italy, we hear little of Atheism, for many ages after the Christian æra. “For some ages before the Reformation,” says Archbishop Tillotson, “Atheism was confined to Italy, and had its chief residence at Rome. But, in this last age, Atheism has travelled over the Alps and infected France, and now of late it hath crossed the seas, and invaded our nation, and hath prevailed to amazement.” However, to Tillotson, and other able writers, we owe its suppression in this country; for they pressed it down with a weight of sound argument, from which it has never been able to raise itself. For although in our time, in France and Germany a subtle Atheism was revived, and spread its unhallowed and destructive influence for many years throughout the Continent, it made but little progress in this better-instructed nation.

Atheism, in its primary sense, comprehends, or at least goes beyond, every heresy in the world; for it professes to acknowledge no religion, true or false. The two leading hypotheses which have prevailed, among Atheists, respecting this world and its origin, are, that of Ocellus Lucanus, adopted and improved by Aristotle, that it was eternal; and that of Epicurus, that it

was formed by a fortuitous concourse of atoms. "That the soul is material and mortal, Christianity an imposture, the Scripture a forgery, the worship of God superstition, hell a fable, and heaven a dream, our life without providence, and our death without hope, like that of asses and dogs, are part of the glorious gospel of our modern Atheists."

The being of a God may be proved from the marks of design, and from the order and beauty visible in the world; from universal consent; from the relation of cause and effect; from internal consciousness; and from the necessity of a final as well as an efficient cause.

Of all the false doctrines and foolish opinions that ever infested the mind of man, nothing can possibly equal that of Atheism, which is such a monstrous contradiction of all evidence, to all the powers of understanding, and the dictates of common sense, that it may be well questioned whether any man can really fall into it by a deliberate use of his judgment. All nature so clearly points out, and so loudly proclaims, a Creator of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, that whoever hears not its voice, and sees not its proofs, may well be thought wilfully deaf, and obstinately blind. If it be evident, self-evident to every man of thought, that there can be no effect without a cause, what shall we say of that manifold combination of effects, that series of operations, that system of wonders, which fill the universe, which present themselves to all our perceptions, and strike our minds and our senses on every side? Every faculty, every object of every faculty, demonstrates a Deity. The meanest insect we can see, the minutest and most contemptible weed we can tread upon, is really sufficient to confound Atheism, and baffle all its pretensions. How much more that astonishing variety and multiplicity of God's works with which we are continually surrounded! Let any man survey the face of the earth, or lift up his eyes to the firmament; let him consider the nature and instincts of brute animals, and afterward look into the operations of his own mind, and will he presume to say or suppose that all the objects he meets with are nothing more than the result of unaccountable accidents and blind chance? Can he possibly conceive that such wonderful order should spring out of confusion? or that such perfect beauty should be ever formed by the fortuitous operations of unconscious, unactive particles of matter? As well, nay better, and more easily, might he suppose that an earthquake might happen to build towns and cities; or the materials carried down by a flood fit themselves up without hands into a regular fleet. For what are towns, cities, or fleets, in comparison of the vast and amazing fabric of the universe! In short, Atheism offers such violence to all our faculties, that it seems scarce credible it should ever really find any place in the human understanding. Atheism is unreasonable, because it gives no tolerable account of the existence of the world. This is one of the greatest difficulties

with which the Atheist has to contend. For he must suppose either that the world is eternal, or that it was formed by chance and a fortuitous concourse of the parts of matter. That the world had a beginning, is evident from universal tradition, and the most ancient history that exists; from there being no memorials of any actions performed previously to the time assigned in that history as the æra of the creation; from the origin of learning and arts, and the liability of the parts of matter to decay. That the world was not produced by chance, is also evident. Nothing can be more unreasonable than to ascribe to chance an effect which appears with all the characters of a wise design and contrivance. Will chance fit means to ends, even in ten thousand instances, and not fail in a single one? How often might a man, after shaking a set of letters in a bag, throw them on the ground, before they would become an exact poem, or form a good discourse in prose? In short, the arguments in proof of Deity are so numerous, and at the same time so obvious to a thinking mind, that to waste time in disputing with an Atheist, is approaching too much toward that irrationality, which may be considered as one of the most striking characteristics of the sect.

The more noted Atheist, since the Reformation, are Machiavel, Spinoza, Hobbes, Blount, and Vanini. To these may be added Hume, 107 and Voltaire the corypheus of the sect, and the great nursing father of that swarm of them which has appeared in these last days.

Dr. Samuel Clarke, in his "Demonstration of the Being of a God," says, that Atheism arises either from stupid ignorance, or from corruption of principles and manners, or from the reasonings of false philosophy; and he adds, that the latter, who are the only Atheistical persons capable of being reasoned with at all, must of necessity own that, supposing it cannot be proved to be true, yet it is a thing very desirable, and which any wise man would wish to be true, for the great benefit and happiness of man, that there was a God, an intelligent and wise, a just and good Being, to govern the world. Whatever hypothesis these men can possibly frame, whatever argument they can invent, by which they would exclude God and providence out of the world; that very argument or hypothesis, will of necessity lead them to this concession. If they argue, that our notion of God arises not from nature and reason, but from the art and contrivance of politicians; that argument itself forces them to confess, that it is manifestly for the interest of human society, that it should be believed there is a God. If they suppose that the world was made by chance, and is every moment subject to be destroyed by chance again; no man can be so absurd as to contend, that it is as comfortable and desirable to live in such an uncertain state of things, and so continually liable to ruin, without any hope of renovation, as in a world that is under the preservation and conduct of a

powerful, wise, and good God. If they argue against the being of God, from the faults and defects which they imagine they can find in the frame and constitution of the visible and material world; this supposition obliges them to acknowledge that it would have been better the world had been made by an intelligent and wise Being, who might have prevented all faults and imperfections. If they argue against providence, from the faultiness and inequality which they think they discover in the management of the moral world; this is a plain confession, that it is a thing more fit and desirable in itself, that the world should be governed by a just and good Being, than by mere chance or unintelligent necessity. Lastly, if they suppose the world to be eternally and necessarily self-existent, and consequently that every thing in it is established by a blind and eternal fatality; no rational man can at the same time deny, but that liberty and choice, or a free power of acting, is a more eligible state, than to be determined thus in all our actions, as a stone is to move, downward, by an absolute and inevitable fate. In a word, which way soever they turn themselves, and whatever hypothesis they make, concerning the original and frame of things, nothing is so certain and undeniable, as that man, considered without the protection and conduct of a superior Being, is in a far worse case than upon supposition of the being and government of God, and of men's being under his peculiar conduct, protection, and favour.

ATHENS, a celebrated city of Greece, too well known to be here described. St. Paul's celebrated sermon, Acts xvii, was preached on the Areopagus, or Hill of Mars, where a celebrated court was held which took cognizance of matters of religion, blasphemies against the gods, the building of temples, &c. (See Areopagus.) The inscription on the altar, "to the unknown God," which St. Paul so appropriately made the text of his discourse, was adopted on the occasion of the city having been relieved from a pestilence; and they erected altars to "the God unknown," either as not knowing to which of their divinities they were indebted for the favour, or, which is more probable, because there was something in the circumstances of this deliverance, which led them to refer it to a higher power than their own gods, even to the supreme God, who was not unfrequently styled, the "unknown," by the wiser Heathens. The existence of such altars is expressly mentioned by Lucian. On the place where the great Apostle bore his noble testimony against idols, and declared to them the God whom they ignorantly worshipped, Dr. E. D. Clarke, the traveller, remarks, "It is not possible to conceive a situation of greater peril, or one more calculated to prove the sincerity of a preacher, than that in which the Apostle was here placed; and the truth of this, perhaps, will never be better felt than by a spectator, who from this eminence actually beholds the monuments of Pagan pomp and superstition by which he, whom the Athenians considered as the setter forth of strange gods, was then surrounded: representing to the

imagination the disciples of Socrates and of Plato, the dogmatist of the porch, and the skeptic of the academy, addressed by a poor and lowly man, who, 'rude in speech,' without the 'enticing words of man's wisdom,' enjoined precepts contrary to their taste, and very hostile to their prejudices. One of the peculiar privileges of the Areopagitæ seems to have been set at defiance by the zeal of St. Paul on this occasion; namely, that of inflicting extreme and exemplary punishment upon any person who should slight the celebration of the holy mysteries, or blaspheme the gods of Greece. We ascended to the summit by means of steps cut in the natural stone. The sublime scene here exhibited is so striking, that a brief description of it may prove how truly it offers to us a commentary upon the Apostle's words, as they were delivered upon the spot. He stood upon the top of the rock, and beneath the canopy of heaven. Before him there was spread a glorious prospect of mountains, islands, seas, and skies; behind him towered the lofty Acropolis, crowned with all its marble temples. Thus every object, whether in the face of nature, or among the works of art, conspired to elevate the mind, and to fill it with reverence toward that Being who made and governs the world, Acts xvii, 24, 28; who sitteth in that light which no mortal eye can approach, and yet is nigh unto the meanest of his creatures; in whom we live, and move, and have our being."

108ATONEMENT, the satisfaction offered to divine justice by the death of Christ for the sins of mankind, by virtue of which all true penitents who believe in Christ are personally reconciled to God, are freed from the penalty of their sins, and entitled to eternal life. The atonement for sin made by the death of Christ, is represented in the Christian system as the means by which mankind may be delivered from the awful catastrophe of eternal death; from judicial inflictions of the displeasure of a Governor, whose authority has been contemned, and whose will has been resisted, which shall know no mitigation in their degree, nor bound to their duration. This end it professes to accomplish by means which, with respect to the Supreme Governor himself, preserve his character from mistake, and maintain the authority of his government; and with respect to man, give him the strongest possible reason for hope, and render more favourable the condition of his earthly probation. These are considerations which so manifestly show, from its own internal constitution, the superlative importance and excellence of Christianity, that it would be exceedingly criminal to overlook them.

How sin may be forgiven without leading to such misconceptions of the divine character as would encourage disobedience, and thereby weaken the influence of the divine government, must be considered as a problem of very difficult solution. A government which admitted no forgiveness, would sink the guilty to despair; a government which never punishes

offence, is a contradiction,--it cannot exist. Not to punish the guilty, is to dissolve authority; to punish without mercy, is to destroy, and where all are guilty, to make the destruction universal. That we cannot sin with impunity, is a matter determined. The Ruler of the world is not careless of the conduct of his creatures; for that penal consequences are attached to the offence, is not a subject of argument, but is matter of fact evident by daily observation of the events and circumstances of the present life. It is a principle therefore already laid down, that the authority of God must be preserved; but it ought to be remarked, that in that kind of administration which restrains evil by penalty, and encourages obedience by favour and hope, we and all moral creatures are the interested parties, and not the divine Governor himself, whom, because of his independent and all-sufficient nature, our transgressions cannot injure. The reasons, therefore, which compel him to maintain his authority do not terminate in himself. If he treats offenders with severity, it is for our sake, and for the sake of the moral order of the universe, to which sin, if encouraged by a negligent administration, or by entire or frequent impunity, would be the source of endless disorder and misery; and if the granting of pardon to offence be strongly and even severely guarded, so that no less a satisfaction could be accepted than the death of God's own Son, we are to refer this to the moral necessity of the case as arising out of the general welfare of accountable creatures, liable to the deep evil of sin, and not to any reluctance on the part of our Maker to forgive, much less to any thing vindictive in his nature,--charges which have been most inconsiderately and unfairly said to be implied in the doctrine of Christ's vicarious sufferings. If it then be true, that the release of offending man from future punishment, and his restoration to the divine favour, ought, for the interests of mankind themselves, and for the instruction and caution of other beings, to be so bestowed, that no license shall be given to offence;--that God himself, whilst he manifests his compassion, should not appear less just, less holy, than he really is;--that his authority should be felt to be as compelling, and that disobedience should as truly, though not unconditionally, subject us to the deserved penalty, as though no hope of forgiveness had been exhibited;--we ask, On what scheme, save that which is developed in the New Testament, are these necessary conditions provided for? Necessary they are, unless we contend for a license and an impunity which shall annul all good government in the universe, a point for which no reasonable man will contend; and if so, then we must allow that there is strong internal evidence of the truth of the doctrine of Scripture, when it makes the offer of pardon consequent only upon the securities we have before mentioned. If it be said, that sin may be pardoned in the exercise of the divine prerogative, the reply is, that if this prerogative were exercised toward a part of mankind only, the passing by of the rest would be with difficulty reconciled to the divine character; and if the benefit were extended to all, government would be at an end. This

scheme of bringing men within the exercise of a merciful prerogative, does not therefore meet the obvious difficulty of the case; nor is it improved by confining the act of grace only to repentant criminals. For in the immediate view of danger, what offender, surrounded with the wreck of former enjoyments, feeling the vanity of guilty pleasures, now past for ever, and beholding the approach of the delayed penal visitation, but would repent? Were the principle of granting pardon to repentance to regulate human governments, every criminal would escape, and judicial forms would become a subject for ridicule. Nor is it recognised by the divine Being in his conduct to men in the present state, although in this world punishments are not final and absolute. Repentance does not restore health injured by intemperance; property, wasted by profusion; or character, once stained by dishonourable practices. If repentance alone could secure pardon, then all must be pardoned, and government dissolved, as in the case of forgiveness by the exercise of mere prerogative; but if an arbitrary selection be made, then different and discordant principles of government are introduced into the divine administration, which is a derogatory supposition.

The question proposed abstractedly, How may mercy be extended to offending creatures, the subjects of the divine government, without encouraging vice, by lowering the righteous and holy character of God, and the authority of his government, in the maintenance of which the whole universe of beings are interested? is, therefore, at once one of the most important and one of the most difficult that can employ the human mind. None of the theories which have been opposed to Christianity affords a satisfactory solution of the problem. They assume principles either destructive of moral government, or which cannot, in the circumstances of man, be acted upon. The only answer is found in the Holy Scriptures. They alone show, and, indeed, they alone profess to show, how God may be “just,” and yet the “justifier” of the ungodly. Other schemes show how he may be merciful; but the difficulty does not lie there. The Gospel meets it, by declaring “the righteousness of God,” at the same time that it proclaims his mercy. The voluntary sufferings of the Divine Son of God “for us,” that is, in our room and stead, magnify the justice of God; display his hatred to sin; proclaim “the exceeding sinfulness” of transgression, by the deep and painful manner in which they were inflicted upon the Substitute; warn the persevering offender of the terribleness, as well as the certainty, of his punishment; and open the gates of salvation to every penitent. It is a part of the same divine plan also to engage the influence of the Holy Spirit, to awaken penitence in man, and to lead the wanderer back to himself; to renew our fallen nature in righteousness, at the moment we are justified through faith, and to place us in circumstances in which we may henceforth “walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” All the ends of government are here answered--no license is given to offence--the moral law is



unrepealed,--a day of judgment is still appointed,--future and eternal punishments still display their awful sanctions,--a new and singular display of the awful purity of the divine character is afforded,--yet pardon is offered to all who seek it; and the whole world may be saved.

With such evidence of suitableness to the case of mankind, under such lofty views of connection with the principles and ends of moral government, does the doctrine of the atonement present itself. But other important considerations are not wanting to mark the united wisdom and goodness of that method of extending mercy to the guilty, which Christianity teaches us to have been actually and exclusively adopted. It is rendered, indeed, "worthy of all acceptance," by the circumstance of its meeting the difficulties we have just dwelt upon,--difficulties which could not otherwise have failed to make a gloomy impression upon every offender awakened to a sense of his spiritual danger; but it must be very inattentively considered, if it does not farther commend itself to us, by not only removing the apprehensions we might feel as to the severity of the divine Lawgiver, but as exalting him in our esteem as "the righteous Lord, who loveth righteousness," who surrendered his beloved Son to suffering and death, that the influence of moral goodness might not be weakened in the hearts of his creatures; and as a God of love, affording in this instance a view of the tenderness and benignity of his nature infinitely more impressive and affecting than any abstract description could convey, or than any act of creating and providential power and grace could exhibit, and, therefore, most suitable to subdue that enmity which had unnaturally grown up in the hearts of his creatures, and which, when corrupt, they so easily transfer from a law which restrains their inclination to the Lawgiver himself. If it be important to us to know the extent and reality of our danger, by the death of Christ it is displayed, not in description, but in the most impressive action; if it be important that we should have an assurance of the divine placability toward us, it here receives a demonstration incapable of being heightened; if gratitude be the most powerful motive of future obedience, and one which renders command on the one part, and active service on the other, "not grievous but joyous," the recollection of such obligations as those which the "love of Christ" has laid us under, is a perpetual spring to this energetic affection, and will be the means of raising it to higher and more delightful activity for ever. All that can most powerfully illustrate the united tenderness and awful majesty of God, and the odiousness of sin; all that can win back the heart of man to his Maker and Lord, and render future obedience a matter of affection and delight as well as duty; all that can extinguish the angry and malignant passions of man to man; all that can inspire a mutual benevolence, and dispose to a self-denying charity for the benefit of others; all that can arouse by hope,

or tranquillize by faith; is to be found in the vicarious death of Christ, and the principles and purposes for which it was endured.

The first declaration, on this subject, after the appearance of Christ, is that of John the Baptist, when he saw Jesus coming unto him, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world;" where it is obvious, that when John called our Lord, "the Lamb of God," he spoke of him under a sacrificial character, and of the effect of that sacrifice as an atonement for the sins of mankind. This was said of our Lord, even before he entered on his public office; but if any doubt should exist respecting the meaning of the Baptist's expression, it is removed by other passages, in which a similar allusion is adopted, and in which it is specifically applied to the death of Christ, as an atonement for sin. In the Acts of the Apostles, the following words of Isaiah are, by Philip the evangelist, distinctly applied to Christ, and to his death: "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth. in his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth." This particular part of the prophecy being applied to our Lord's death, the whole must relate to the same subject; for it is undoubtedly one entire prophecy, and the other expressions in it are still stronger: "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed: the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." In the First Epistle of Peter, is also a strong and very apposite text, in which the application of the term "lamb" to our Lord, and the sense in which it is applied, can admit of no doubt: "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," 1 Peter i, 18, 19. It is therefore evident that the Prophet Isaiah, six hundred years before the birth of Jesus; that John the Baptist, on the commencement of his ministry; and that St. Peter, his friend, companion and Apostle, subsequent to the transaction; speak of Christ's death as an atonement for sin, under the figure of a lamb sacrificed.

The passages that follow, plainly and distinctly declare the atoning efficacy of Christ's death: "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation," Heb. ix, 26, 28. "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sin, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; for by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," Heb. x, 12. It is observable, that nothing similar is said of the death of any other person, and that no such efficacy is imputed to any other martyrdom. "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us; much more

then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him: for if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life," Rom. v, 8–10. The words, "reconciled to God by the death of his Son," show that his death had an efficacy in our reconciliation; but reconciliation is only preparatory to salvation. "He has reconciled us to his Father in his cross, and in the body of his flesh through death," Col. i, 20, 22. What is said of reconciliation in these texts, is in some others spoken of sanctification, which is also preparatory to salvation. "We are sanctified,"--how? "by the offering of the body of Christ once for all," Heb. x, 10. In the same epistle, the blood of Jesus is called "the blood of the covenant by which we are sanctified." In these and many other passages that occur in different parts of the New Testament, it is therefore asserted that the death of Christ had an efficacy in the procuring of human salvation. Such expressions are used concerning no other person, and the death of no other person; and it is therefore evident, that Christ's death included something more than a confirmation of his preaching; something more than a pattern of a holy and patient martyrdom; something more than a necessary antecedent to his resurrection, by which he gave a grand and clear proof of our resurrection from the dead. Christ's death was all these, but it was something more. It was an atonement for the sins of mankind; and in this way only it became the accomplishment of our eternal redemption. See Day of Expiation.

AUGSBURGH, or AUGUSTAN CONFESSION. In 1530, a diet of the German princes was convened by the emperor Charles V, to meet at Augsburg, for the express purpose of composing the religious troubles which then distracted Germany. On this occasion Melancthon was employed to draw up this famous confession of faith which may be considered as the creed of the German reformers, especially of the more temperate among them. It consisted of twenty-one articles, including the following points:--The Trinity, original sin, the incarnation, justification by faith, the word and sacraments, necessity of good works, the perpetuity of the church, infant baptism, the Lord's Supper, repentance and confession, the proper use of the sacraments, church order, rites and ceremonies, the magistracy, a future judgment, free will, the worship of saints, &c. It then proceeds to state the abuses of which the reformers chiefly complained, as the denial of the sacramental cup to the laity, the celibacy of the clergy, the mass, auricular confession, forced abstinence from meats, monastic vows, and the enormous power of the church of Rome. The confession was read at a full meeting of the diet, and signed by the elector of Saxony, and three other princes of the German empire.

John Faber, afterward archbishop of Vienna, and two other Catholic divines, were employed to draw up an answer to this confession, which was replied to by Melancthon in his "Apology for the Augsburg Confession" in 1531. This confession and defence; the articles of Smalcald, drawn up by Luther; his catechisms, &c, form the symbolical books of the Lutheran church; and it must be owned that they contain concessions in favour of some parts of popery, particularly the real presence, that few Protestants in this country would admit.

AUGUSTINE, or, as he is sometimes called in the court style of the middle ages, St. Austin, one of the ancient fathers of the church, whose writings for many centuries had almost as potent an influence on the religious opinions of Christendom as those of Aristotle exercised over philosophy. Indeed, it has often been mentioned as a fact, with expressions of regret, that the writings of no man, those of the Stagirite excepted, contributed more than those of St. Augustine to encourage that spirit of subtle disquisition which subsequently distinguished the era of the Schoolmen. He was born, November 13th, A. D. 354, at Tagasta, an episcopal city of Numidia in Africa. His parents, Patricius and Monica, were Christians of respectable rank in life, who afforded their son all the means of instruction which his excellent genius and wonderful aptitude for learning seemed to require. He studied grammar and rhetoric at Madura, until he was sixteen years old; and 111 afterward removed to Carthage, to complete his studies. In both these cities, in all the fervour of unregenerate youth, he entered eagerly into the seducing scenes of dissipation and folly with which he was surrounded, and became not only depraved but infamous in his conduct. In this respect he was not improved by his subsequent connection with the Manichees, whose unhallowed principles afforded an excuse for his immorality, and threw a veil over the vilest of his actions. The simplicity and minuteness with which he has narrated the numerous incidents of his childhood, youth, and mature age, in his celebrated book of "Confessions," have afforded abundant matter of ridicule to the profane and infidel wits of this and the last age. The reflections, however, which accompany his narrative, are generally important and judicious, and furnish to the moral philosopher copious materials for a history of the varieties of the human heart, and are of superior value to the humble Christian for the investigation and better knowledge of his own. With a strange though not uncommon inconsistency, few books have been more frequently quoted as authority on matters relating to general literature and philosophy by infidels themselves, than St. Augustine's otherwise despised "Confessions," and his "City of God." But, whatever else is taught in this remarkable piece of autobiography, every pious reader will be delighted with the additional proofs which it contains of the ultimate prevalence of faithful prayer, especially on the part of Christian parents. Monica's

importunate prayers to heaven followed the aberrations of her graceless son,--when he settled at Carthage as a teacher of rhetoric; when he removed to Rome, and lodged with a Manichee;--and when he finally settled at Milan as professor of rhetoric. St. Ambrose was at that time, A. D. 384, bishop of Milan, and to his public discourses Augustine began to pay much attention. His heart became gradually prepared for the reception of divine truth, and for that important change of heart and principles which constitutes "conversion." The circumstances attending this change, though often related, are not unworthy of being repeated, if only to show that the mode of the Holy Spirit's operations was in substance the same in those early days as they are now; and time was when some of the soundest divines and most worthy dignitaries of the church of England were in the habit of referring with approbation to this well attested instance of change of heart. One of his Christian countrymen, Pontinius, who held a high situation at court, having perceived a copy of St. Paul's Epistles lying on the table, entered one day into conversation with him and his friend Alipius about the nature of faith and the happiness of those who lived in the enjoyment of religion. Augustine was deeply affected at the close of this visit; and when Pontinius had retired, giving vent to his feelings he addressed Alipius in a most animated strain: "How is this? What shall we do? Ignorant people come, and seize upon heaven; and we, with our learning, (senseless wretches that we are!) behold we are immersed in flesh and blood! Are we ashamed to follow them? Yet is it not a still greater shame, not even to be able to follow them?" Full of remorse and contrition Augustine left the house and retired to a secret part of the garden, followed by his friend, who seemed on this occasion to be a partaker of his grief only because he saw him grieved in spirit. Unwilling to unman himself, as he accounted it, before Alipius, he left him; and throwing himself down under the branches of a large fig tree he poured out a torrent of tears which he was unable any longer to restrain, and exclaimed in bitterness of soul, "When, O Lord, when will thy anger cease? Why tomorrow? Why not at this time?" He instantly heard what he considered to be the voice of a child, saying Tolle, lege, "Take and read." These two Latin words were repeated several times; Augustine reflected upon them, checked his tears, received them as the voice of God, and running into the house, opened, according to the divine direction, the Epistles of St. Paul which he had left on the table, and attentively read the first passage which he found. It was Romans xiii, 13, 14; a passage peculiarly applicable to him, in reference to his former habits and present state of mind: "Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying: but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof." He shut up the book, and was amazed that all his doubts and fears had vanished. Alipius was speedily informed of this wonderful change in his feelings and views; and after having desired to see the two verses, in

the spirit of a true seeker he pointed out to Augustine the passage which immediately follows, and which he considered as peculiarly adapted to his own case: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye," &c, Rom. xiv, 1. The two friends then ran to acquaint Monica with these circumstances, the knowledge of which transported her with joy.

In a frame of mind not unfamiliar to those who have themselves had "much forgiven," Augustine wished to retire at once from so wicked a world as that in which he had passed the first thirty-two years of his dissolute life. His secession, however, was only a temporary one; for he and Alipius were, a few months afterward, received by baptism into the Christian church. After having composed several religious treatises in his retreat near Tagasta, especially against the errors of the Manichees, from which he had been so recently reclaimed, he was, in the year 392, ordained priest by Valerius, bishop of Hippo, now a part of the Barbary States on the coast of Africa. He there held a public disputation with Fortunatus, a celebrated priest among the Manichees, and acquitted himself with great spirit and success, he also wrote and preached largely and to great effect against the Donatists and Manichees. His reputation as a divine increased; and he was, at the close of the year 395, ordained bishop of Hippo, in which high station he continued with great advantage to wage war against various orders of heretics.

112Augustine had hitherto directed his theological artillery principally against the predestinarian errors of the Manichees; but he was soon called upon to change his weapons and his mode of warfare, in attacking a new and not less dangerous class of heretics. In the year 412 he began to write against the injurious doctrines of Pelagias, a native of Britain, who had resided for a considerable time at Rome, and acquired universal esteem by the purity of his manners, his piety, and his erudition. Alarmed at the consequences which seemed to him obviously to result from allowing that Adam's sin is transmitted to all his posterity, and fortified in his sentiments on this subject by those of Origen and Ruffinus, with the latter of whom he had associated, he boldly denied tenets which he did not believe. In the defence of his opinions, Pelagius, was seconded by Celestius, a man equally eminent for his talents and his virtues. Their principles were propagated at first rather by hints and intimations, than by open avowal and plain declarations; but this reserve was laid aside when they perceived the ready reception which their doctrines obtained; and Celestius began zealously to disseminate them in Africa, while Pelagius sowed the same tares in Palestine, whence they were speedily transplanted to almost every corner of Christendom. If the brief notices, which have come down to us respecting their tenets, in the writings of their adversaries, be correct, they affirmed, "It is not free will if it requires the aid of God; because every one

has it within the power of his own will to do any thing, or not to do it. Our victory over sin and Satan proceeds not from the help which God affords, but is owing to our own free will. The prayers which the church offers up either for the conversion of unbelievers and other sinners, or for the perseverance of believers, are poured forth in vain. The unrestricted capability of men's own free will is amply sufficient for all these things, and therefore no necessity exists for asking of God those things which we are able of ourselves to obtain; the gifts of grace being only necessary to enable men to do that more easily and completely which yet they could do themselves though more slowly and with greater difficulty; and that they are perfectly free creatures," in opposition to all the current notions of predestination and reprobation. These novel opinions were refuted by St. Augustine and St. Jerom, as well as by Orosius a Spanish presbyter, and they were condemned as heresies in the council of Carthage and in that of Milevum. The discussions which then arose have been warmly agitated in various subsequent periods of the Christian church, though little new light has been thrown upon them from that age to the present. In his eagerness to confute these opponents St. Augustine employed language so strong as made it susceptible of an interpretation wholly at variance with the accountability of man. This led to farther explanations and modifications of his sentiments, which were multiplied when the Semi-Pelagians arose, who thought that the truth lay between his doctrines and those of the Pelagians. Concerning original sin, he maintained that it was derived from our first parents; and he believed he had ascertained in what the original sin conveyed by Adam to his posterity consisted. In his sentiments, however, upon the latter point he was rather inconsistent, at one time asserting that the essence of original sin was concupiscence, and at another expressing doubts respecting his own position. This subject was bequeathed as a legacy to the schoolmen of a subsequent age, who exercised their subtle wits upon all its ramifications down to the period of the council of Trent. On the consequences of the fall of our first parents, St. Augustine taught that by it human nature was totally corrupted, and deprived of all inclination and ability to do good. Before the age in which he lived, the early fathers held what, in the language of systematic theology, is termed the synergistic system, or the needfulness of human coöperation in the works of holiness; but though the freedom of the will was not considered by them as excluding or rendering unnecessary the grace of God, yet much vagueness is perceptible in the manner in which they express themselves, because they had not examined the subject with the same attention as the theologians by whom they were succeeded. Those early divines generally used the language of Scripture, the fertile invention of controversial writers, not having as yet displayed itself, except on the divine nature of Jesus Christ, and subsidiary terms and learned distinctions not being then required by any great differences of opinion. But as soon as

Pelagius broached his errors, the attention of Christians was naturally turned to the investigation of the doctrine of grace. The opinions of St. Augustine on this subject, which soon became those of the great body of the Christian church, admitted the necessity of divine grace, or the influence of the Holy Spirit, for our obedience to the law of God. He ascribed the renovation of our moral constitution wholly to this grace, denied all coöperation of man with it for answering the end to be accomplished, and represented it as irresistible. He farther affirmed that it was given only to a certain portion of the human race, to those who showed the fruits of it in their sanctification, and that it secured the perseverance of all upon whom it was bestowed. Plaifere in his "Appello Evangelium" has given the following as the substance of that opinion of the order of predestination of which "many do say that St. Austin was the first author: 1. That God from all eternity decreed to create mankind holy and good. 2. That he foresaw man, being tempted by Satan, would fall into sin, if God did not hinder it; he decreed not to hinder. 3. That out of mankind, seen fallen into sin and misery, he chose a certain number to raise to righteousness and to eternal life, and rejected the rest, leaving them in their sins. 4. That for these his chosen he decreed to send his Son to redeem them, and his Spirit to call them and sanctify them; the rest he decreed to forsake, leaving them to Satan and themselves, and to punish them for their sins."

After St. Augustine had thus in a great degree new moulded the science of theology, and had combined with it as an essential part of divine truth, that the fate of mankind was determined by the divine decree independently of their own efforts and conduct, and that they were thus divided into the elect and reprobate, it became necessary, in order to preserve consistency, to introduce into his system a limitation with respect to baptism, and to prevent the opinions concerning it from interfering with those which flowed from the doctrine of predestination. He accordingly taught, that baptism brings with it the forgiveness of sins; that it is so essential, that the omission of it will expose us to condemnation; and that it is attended with regeneration. He also affirmed that the virtue of baptism is not in the water; that the ministers of Christ perform the external ceremony, but that Christ accompanies it with invisible grace; that baptism is common to all, whilst, grace is not so; and that the same external rite may be death to some, and life to others. By this distinction he rids himself of the difficulty which would have pressed upon his scheme of theology, had pardon, regeneration, and salvation been necessarily connected with the outward ordinance of baptism; and limits its proper efficacy to those who are comprehended, as the heirs of eternal life, in the decree of the Almighty. Many, however, of those who strictly adhere to him in other parts of his doctrinal system, desert him at this point. Bishop Bedell speaks



thus in disparagement of his baptismal views, in a letter to Dr. Ward: “This I do yield to my Lord of Sarum most willingly, that the justification, sanctification, and adoption which children have in baptism, is not univoçè [univocally] the same with that which adulti [adults] have. I think the emphatical speeches of Augustine against the Pelagians, and of Prosper, are not so much to be regarded (who say the like of the eucharist also) touching the necessity and efficacy in the case of infants; and they are very like the speeches of Lanfranc and Guitmund of Christ’s presence in the sacrament, opposing veracitèr, [truly] and veré [truly] to sacramentalitèr; [sacramentally;] which is a false and absurd contraposition. The opinion of the Franciscans out of Scotus and Bernard, mentioned in the council of Trent, seems to be the true opinion; for they make the sacraments to be effectual, ‘because God gives them effectus regularitèr concomitantes,’ [regularly accompanying effects,] and to contain grace no otherwise than as an effectual sign; and that grace is received by them as an investiture by a ring or staff, which is obsignando, [by signation.] Consider that if you will aver, that baptism washes away otherwise than sacramentally, that is, obsignatorily, original sin; yet you must allow that manner of washing for future actual sins; and you must make two sorts of justification, one for children, another for adulti; [adults;] and (which passes all the rest) you must find some promise in God’s covenant wherein he binds himself to wash away sin without faith or repentance. By this doctrine, you must also maintain that children do spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood, if they receive the eucharist, as for ages they did, and by the analogy of the passover they may; and sith [if] the use of this sacrament toties quoties [as often as it is used] must needs confer grace, it seems it were necessary to let them communicate, and the oftener the better, to the intent they might be stronger in grace: which opinion, though St. Austin and many more of the ancients do maintain, I believe you will not easily condescend unto, or that children dying without baptism are damned.” These remarks are important, as proceeding from the pen of the personal friend of Father Paul, who wrote the History of the council of Trent.

In the various discussions which have arisen concerning predestination and the doctrines with which it is connected, some modern divines have quoted the arguments of St. Augustine against the Manichees, and others those which he employed against the Pelagians, according to the discordant views which the combatants severally entertain on these controverted points. One of them has thus expressed himself, in his endeavour to reconcile St Augustine with himself:--“The heresy of Pelagius being suppressed, the catholic doctrine in that point became more settled and confirmed by the opposition; such freedom being left to the will of man, as was subservient unto grace, coöperating in some measure with those heavenly influences. And so much is confessed by St. Augustine himself,

where he asks this question, ‘Doth any man affirm that free will is perished utterly from man by the fall of Adam?’ And thereunto he makes this answer: ‘Freedom is perished by sin; but it is that freedom only which we had in paradise, of having perfect righteousness with immortality.’ For, otherwise, it appears to be his opinion, that man was not merely passive in all the acts of grace which conduced to glory, according to the memorable saying of his, so common in the mouths of all men, ‘He who first made us without our help will not vouchsafe to save us at last without our concurrence.’ If any harsher expressions have escaped his pen, (as commonly it happeneth in the heats of a disputation,) they are to be qualified by this last rule, and by that before, in which it was affirmed, that ‘God could not with justice judge and condemn the world, if all men’s sins proceeded not from their own free will, but from some overruling providence which inforced them to it.” Another admirer of this father offers the following as an attempt at reconciliation: “St. Augustine denied that the coöperation of man is at all exerted to produce the renewal of our nature; but, when the renewal had been produced, he admitted that there was an exercise of the will combined with the workings of grace. In the tenth chapter of his work against the Manichæans, the bishop of Hippo thus expresses himself: ‘Who is it that will not exclaim, How foolish it is to deliver precepts to that man who is not at liberty to perform what is commanded! And how unjust it is to condemn him who had not power to fulfil the commands! 114 Yet these unhappy persons [the Manichees] do not perceive that they are ascribing such injustice and want of equity to God. But what greater truth is there than this, that God has delivered precepts, and that human spirits have freedom of will?’ Elsewhere he says, ‘Nothing is more within our power than our own will. The will is that by which we commit sin, and by which we live righteously.’ Nothing can be plainer than that the writer of these passages admitted the liberty of the human will, and the necessity of our own exertions in conjunction with divine grace. How this is to be reconciled with his general doctrine, is perhaps indicated in the following passage from his book *De Gratiâ et lib. Arbitrio*, c. 17. Speaking of grace he says, ‘That we may will God works without us; but when we will, and so will as to do, he co-works with us; yet unless he either works that we may will, or co-works when we do will, we are utterly incapable of doing any thing in the good works of piety.” These are but very slight specimens of the mode in which learned and ingenious men have tried to give a kind of symmetrical proportion to this father’s doctrinal system. Several large treatises have been published with the same praiseworthy intention; the pious authors of them either entirely forgetting, or having never read, the rather latitudinarian indulgence of opinion which St. Augustine claims for himself in his “Retractions,” in which he has qualified the harshness of his previous assertions on many subjects. If, however, an estimate may be formed of what this father

intended in his various pacificatory doctrinal explanations from what he has actually admitted and expressed, it may be safely affirmed that no systematic writer of theology seems so completely to have entered into the last and best views of the bishop of Hippo, or so nearly reconciled the apparent discordances in them, as Arminius has done; and few other authors have rendered more ample justice to his sentiments, talents, and character, than the famous Dutch Professor.

Many were the theological labours to which he was invited by the most eminent of his contemporaries; and hastily as some of his lucubrations were executed, it is not surprising that among two hundred and seventy-two treatises on different subjects, some are of inferior value and unworthy of the fame which he had acquired in the church. After a life of various changes, and of a mixed character, he died A. D. 430, in the seventy-sixth year of his age; having been harassed at the close of life by seeing his country invaded by the Vandals, and the city of which he was the bishop besieged. Though those barbarians took Hippo and burned it, they saved his library, which contained his voluminous writings.

St. Augustine was a diligent man in the sacred calling; and that the office of a bishop even in that age of the church was no sinecure, is evident from several notices in his letters. At the close of one addressed to Marcellinus he gives the subjoined account: "If I were able to give you a narrative of the manner in which I spend my time, you would be both surprised and distressed on account of the great number of affairs which oppress me without my being able to suspend them. For when some little leisure is allowed me by those who daily attend upon me about business, and who are so urgent with me that I can neither shun them nor ought to despise them, I have always some other writings to compose, which indeed ought to be preferred, [to those which Marcellinus requested,] because the present juncture will not permit them to be postponed. For the rule of charity is, not to consider the greatness of the friendship, but the necessity of the affair. Thus I have continually something or other to compose which diverts me from writing what would be more agreeable to my inclinations, daring the little intervals in that multiplicity of business with which I am burdened either through the wants or the passions of others." He frequently complains of this oppressive weight of occupation in which his love of his flock had engaged him, by obeying the Apostolical precept, which forbids Christians from going to law before Pagan tribunals. In reference to this employment his biographer, Posidonius, says: "At the desire of Christians, or of men belonging to any sect whatever, he would hear causes with patience and attention, sometimes till the usual hour of eating, and sometimes the whole day without eating at all, observing the dispositions of the parties, and how much they advanced or decreased in faith and good

works; and when he had opportunity he instructed them in the law of God, and gave them suitable advice, requiring nothing of them except Christian obedience. He sometimes wrote letters, when desired, on temporal subjects; but looked upon all this as unprofitable occupation, which drew him aside from that which was better and more agreeable to himself.”

The character of this eminent father has been much misrepresented both as a man and as a writer. Whoever looks into his writings for accurate and enlarged views of Christian doctrine, looks for that which could not be expected in the very infancy of Biblical criticism. He was a rhetorician by profession, and the degenerate taste of that age must be blamed, rather than the individual who wrote in the style which then prevailed. The learning of St. Augustine, and particularly his knowledge of Greek, have been disputed; and hence the importance of his Biblical criticisms has been depreciated. In the account of the early part of his life he confesses his great aversion to the study of that language; and as he tells us, in his maturer age, that he read the Platonists in a Latin version, it has perhaps been too hastily concluded that he never made any great proficiency in it. But though it be allowed that his comments on Scripture consist chiefly of popular reflections, spiritual and moral, or allegorical and mystical perversions of the literal meaning; yet the works of this father are not wholly destitute of remarks and critical interpretations, that are pertinent and judicious: to such, after a series of extracts from his 115 writings, Dr. Lardner has referred his readers. With regard to his knowledge of Greek, this impartial and candid author is of opinion, that he understood that language better than some have supposed; and he has cited several passages from which it may be perceived, that St. Augustine frequently compared his copies of the Latin version with those of the Greek original. Le Clerc himself allows that he sometimes explains Greek words and phrases in a very felicitous manner. Indeed, the commencement of his correspondence with St. Jerom proves him to have been no contemptible critic. In this he besought him, in the name of all the African churches, to apply himself to the translation into Latin of the Greek interpreters of Scripture, rather than to enter upon a new translation from the original Hebrew; and to point out those passages in which the Hebrew differed from the Septuagint, as he had previously done in the book of Job. Voltaire and other profane wits have, in the exercise of their buffoonery, impeached his moral conduct; but their charges, when impartially examined, will be seen to be founded in ignorance or in malice. They resemble those which the same parties prefer against Prophets, Apostles, and against Christ himself. Mosheim observes that Augustine’s high reputation filled the Christian world; and “not without reason, as a variety of great and shining qualities were united in the character of that illustrious man. A sublime genius, an uninterrupted and zealous pursuit of truth, an indefatigable application, an invincible patience, a sincere piety,

and a subtle and lively wit, conspired to establish his fame upon the most lasting foundations.” Such a testimony as this far outweighs the vituperative remarks and petty sneers of a thousand infidels. See Pelagians and Synods.

AUGUSTUS, emperor of Rome, and successor of Julius Cæsar. The battle of Actium, which he fought with Mark Antony, and which made him master of the empire, happened fifteen years before the birth of Christ. This is the emperor who appointed the enrolment mentioned Luke ii, 1, which obliged Joseph and the Virgin Mary to go to Bethlehem, the place where Jesus Christ was born. Augustus procured the crown of Judea for Herod, from the Roman senate. After the defeat of Mark Antony, Herod adhered to Augustus, and was always faithful to him; so that Augustus loaded him with honours and riches.

AVEN, a city of Egypt, afterward called Heliopolis, and On, Ezek. xxx, 17. Herodotus informs us that in this city there was an annual assembly in honour of the sun, and a temple dedicated to him. It appears, however, highly probable, by the behaviour of Pharaoh to Joseph and Jacob, and especially by Joseph’s care to preserve the land to the priests, Gen. xlvii, 22, 26, that the true religion prevailed in Egypt in his time; and it is incredible that Joseph should have married the daughter of the priest of On, had that name among the Egyptians denoted only the material light; which, however, no doubt they, like all the rest of the world, idolized in after times, and to which we find a temple dedicated among the Canaanites, under this name, Joshua vii, 2.

AVENGER OF BLOOD. He who prosecuted the man-slayer under the law was called the avenger of blood, and had a right to slay the person, if he found him without a city of refuge. See Goel.

AVIMS, a people descended from Hevus, the son of Canaan. They dwelt at first in the country which was afterward possessed by the Caphtorims, or Philistines. The Scripture says expressly, that the Caphtorims drove out the Avims, who dwelt in Hazerim, even unto Azzah, Deut. ii, 23. There were also Avims, or Hivites, at Shechem, or Gibeon, Joshua xi, 19; for the inhabitants of Shechem were Hivites. Lastly, there were some of them beyond Jordan, at the foot of Mount Hermon. Bochart thinks, that Cadmus, who conducted a colony of the Phœnicians into Greece, was a Hivite. His name, Cadmus, comes from the Hebrew Kedem, “the east,” because he came from the eastern parts of the land of Canaan. The name of his wife Hermione was taken from Mount Hermon, at the foot whereof the Hivites dwelt. The metamorphoses of the companions of Cadmus into serpents is

founded upon the signification of the name of Hivites, which, in the Phœnician language, signifies serpents.

AZARIAH, or UZZIAH, king of Judah, son of Amaziah. He began to reign at the age of sixteen years, and reigned fifty-two years in Jerusalem; his mother's name being Jeholiah, 2 Kings xv. Azariah did that which was right in the sight of the Lord; nevertheless he did not destroy the high places; and, against the express prohibition of God, the people continued to sacrifice there. Having taken upon him to offer incense in the temple, which office belonged entirely to the priests, he was struck with a leprosy, and continued without the city, separated from other men until the day of his death, 2 Chron. xxvi. Josephus says, that upon this occasion a great earthquake happened; and that the temple opening at the top, a ray of light darted upon the king's forehead, the very moment he took the censer into his hand, and he instantly became a leper; nay, that the earthquake was so very violent, that it tore in sunder a mountain west of Jerusalem, and rolled one half of it over and over to the distance of four furlongs, till at length it was stopped by another mountain which stood over against it; but choked up the highway, and covered the king's gardens with dust. This is what Josephus adds to the history related in the Chronicles; but the truth of it may be justly suspected. We know, indeed, that there was a very great earthquake in the reign of Uzziah; for Amos, chap. i, 1, and Zechariah, chap. xiv, 5, make mention of it: however, it is not certain that it happened at the very time that Uzziah took upon him to offer incense.

During the time that Uzziah was a leper, his son Jotham, as his father's viceroy, took the public administration upon himself, and succeeded him after his death, which happened in the fifty-second year of his reign, A. M. 3246. 116He was not buried in the royal sepulchre; but in the same field, at some distance, on account of his leprosy.

The first part of Uzziah's reign was very successful: he obtained great advantages over the Philistines, Ammonites, and Arabians. He made additions to the fortifications at Jerusalem, and always kept an army on foot of three hundred and seven thousand men, and upwards, 2 Chron. xxvi; and he had great magazines, well stored with all sorts of arms, as well offensive as defensive; and he was a great lover of agriculture.

BAAL, BEL, or BELUS, denoting lord, a divinity among several ancient nations; as the Canaanites, Phœnicians, Sidonians, Carthaginians, Babylonians, Chaldeans, and Assyrians. The term Baal, which is itself an appellative, served at first to denote the true God, among those who adhered to the true religion. Accordingly, the Phœnicians, being originally Canaanites, having once had, as well as the rest of their kindred, the

knowledge of the true God, probably called him Baal, or lord. But they, as well as other nations, gradually degenerating into idolatry, applied this appellation to their respective idols; and thus were introduced a variety of divinities, called Baalim, or Baal, with some epithet annexed to it, as Baal Berith, Baal Gad, Baal Moloch, Baal Peor, Baal Zebub, &c. Some have supposed that the descendants of Ham first worshipped the sun under the title of Baal, 2 Kings xxiii, 5, 11; and that they afterward ascribed it to the patriarch who was the head of their line; making the sun only an emblem of his influence or power. It is certain, however, that when the custom prevailed of deifying and worshipping those who were in any respect distinguished among mankind, the appellation of Baal was not restricted to the sun, but extended to those eminent persons who were deified, and who became objects of worship in different nations. The Phœnicians had several divinities of this kind, who were not intended to represent the sun. It is probable that Baal, Belus, or Bel, the great god of the Carthaginians, and also of the Sidonians, Babylonians, and Assyrians, who, from the testimony of Scripture, appears to have been delighted with human sacrifices, was the Moloch of the Ammonites; the Chronus of the Greeks, who was the chief object of adoration in Italy, Crete, Cyprus, and Rhodes, and all other countries where divine honours were paid him; and the Saturn of the Latins. In process of time, many other deities, beside the principal ones just mentioned, were distinguished by the title of Baal among the Phœnicians, particularly those of Tyre, and of course among the Carthaginians, and other nations. Such were Jupiter, Mars, Bacchus, and Apollo, or the sun.

The temples and altars of Baal were generally placed on eminences: they were places inclosed by walls, within which was maintained a perpetual fire; and some of them had statues or images, called in Scripture "Chamanim." Maundrell, in his journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, observed, some remains of these enclosures in Syria. Baal had his prophets and his priests in great numbers; accordingly, we read of four hundred and fifty of them that were fed at the table of Jezebel only; and they conducted the worship of this deity, by offering sacrifices, by dancing round his altar with violent gesticulations and exclamations, by cutting their bodies with knives and lancets, and by raving and pretending to prophesy, as if they were possessed by some invisible power.

It is remarkable that we do not find the name Baal so much in popular use east of Babylonia; but it was general west of Babylonia, and to the very extremity of western Europe, including the British isles. The worship of Bel, Belus, Belenus, or Belinus, was general throughout the British islands; and certain of its rites and observances are still maintained among us, notwithstanding the establishment of Christianity during so many ages. A

town in Perthshire, on the borders of the Highlands, is called Tilliebeltane or Tulliebeltane; that is, the eminence, or rising ground, of the fire of Baal. In the neighbourhood is a Druidical temple of eight upright stones, where it is supposed the fire was kindled. At some distance from this is another temple of the same kind, but smaller; and near it a well still held in great veneration. On Beltane morning, superstitious people go to this well, and drink of it; then they make a procession round it nine times. After this they in like manner go round the temple. So deep-rooted is this Heathenish superstition in the minds of many who reckon themselves good Protestants, that they will not neglect these rites, even when Beltane falls on the Sabbath.

In Ireland, Bel-tein is celebrated on the twenty-first of June, at the time of the solstice. There, as they make fires on the tops of hills, every member of the family is made to pass through the fire; as they reckon this ceremony necessary to ensure good fortune through the succeeding year. This resembles the rites used by the Romans in the Palilia. Bel-tein is also observed in Lancashire.

In Wales, this annual fire is kindled in autumn, on the first day of November; which being neither at the solstice nor equinox, deserves attention. It may be accounted for by supposing that the lapse of ages has removed it from its ancient station, and that the observance is kept on the same day, nominally, though that be now removed some weeks backward from its true station. However that may be, in North Wales especially, this fire is attended by many ceremonies; such as running through the fire and smoke, each participator casting a stone into the fire.

The Hebrews often imitated the idolatry of the Canaanites in adoring Baal. They offered human sacrifices to him in groves, upon high places, and upon the terraces of houses. Baal had priests and prophets consecrated to his service. All sorts of infamous and immodest actions were committed in the festivals of Baal and Astarte. See Jer. xxxii, 35; 2 Kings xvii, 11716; xxiii, 4, 5, 12; 1 Kings xviii, 22; 2 Kings x, 19; 1 Kings xiv, 24; xv, 12; 2 Kings xxiii, 7; Hosea iv, 14. This false deity is frequently mentioned in Scripture in the plural number, Baalim, which may intimate that the name Baal was given to several different deities.

There were many cities in Palestine, whose names were compounded of Baal and some other word: whether it was that the god Baal was adored in them, or that these places were looked upon as the capital cities,--lords of their respective provinces,--is uncertain.

BAAL BERITH, the god of the Shechemites, Judges viii, 33; ix, 4, 46.



BAAL PEOR. Peor is supposed to have been a part of Mount Abarim; and Baal was the great idol or chief god of the Phœnicians, and was known and worshipped under a similar name, with tumultuous and obscene rites, all over Asia. He is the same as the Bel of the Babylonians. Baal, by itself, signifies lord, and was a name of the solar or principal god. But it was also variously compounded, in allusion to the different characters and attributes of the particular or local deities who were known by it, as Baal Peor, Baal Zebub, Baal Zephon, &c. Baal Peor, then, was probably the temple of an idol belonging to the Moabites, on Mount Abarim, which the Israelites worshipped when encamped at Shittim; this brought a plague upon them, of which twenty-four thousand died, Num. xxxv. Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, to whom Solomon erected an altar, 1 Kings xi, 7, is supposed to have been the same deity. Baal Peor has been farther supposed by some to have been Priapus; by others, Saturn; by others, Pluto; and by others again, Adonis. Mr. Faber agrees with Calmet in making Baal Peor the same with Adonis; a part of whose worship consisted in bewailing him with funeral rites, as one lost or dead, and afterward welcoming, with extravagant joy, his fictitious return to life. He was in an eminent degree the god of impurity. Hosea, speaking of the worship of this idol, emphatically calls it “that shame,” Hos. ix, 10. Yet in the rites of this deity the Moabite and Midianite women seduced the Israelites to join.

BAAL ZEBUB, BEELZEBUB, or BEL-ZEBUB, signifies the god of flies, and was an idol of the Ekronites. It is not easy to discover how this false deity obtained its name. Some commentators think that he was called Baal Samin, or the lord of heaven; but that the Jews, from contempt, gave him the name of Baal-zebub. Others with greater reason believe that he was denominated “the god of flies” by his votaries, because he defended them from flies, which are extremely troublesome in hot countries; in the same manner as the Eleans worshipped Hercules under the appellation of *Ἀπόμνιος*, the fly chaser. Pliny is of opinion, that the name of Achor, the god invoked at Cyrene against flies, is derived from Accaron, or Ekron, where Baal-zebub was worshipped, and where he had a famous temple and oracle. Winkelman has given the figures of two heads, “both of them images of Jupiter, called by the Greeks *Ἀπόμνιος*, and by the Romans Muscarius; that is to say, fly driver; for to this Jupiter was attributed the function of driving away flies.”

It is evident that Beelzebub was considered as the patron deity of medicine; for this is plainly implied in the conduct of Ahaziah, 2 Kings i. The Greek mythology considered Apollo as the god of medicine, and attributed also to him those possessions by a pythonic spirit which occasionally perplexed spectators, and of which we have an instance in Acts xvi, 19. Apollo, too,

was the sun. Hence we probably see the reason why Ahaziah sent to Beelzebub to inquire the issue of his accident; since Beelzebub was Apollo, and Apollo was the god of physic. The Jews, who changed Beelzebub into Beelzebul, "god of a dunghill," perhaps had a reference to the Greek of pytho, which signifies putrefied. In Scripture Beelzebub is called "the prince of devils," Matt. xii, 24; Luke xi, 15; merely, it would seem, through the application of the name of the chief idol of the Heathen world to the prince of evil spirits. This was natural, since the Jews were taught in their own Scriptures to consider all the idols of the Heathens "devils." Those commentators who think that the idol of Ekron himself is intended, have indulged in an improbable fancy. See Hornet.

BAAL ZEPHON, or the god of the watch tower, was probably the temple of some idol, which served at the same time for a place of observation for the neighbouring sea and country, and a beacon to the travellers by either. It was situated on a cape or promontory on the eastern side of the western or Heroopolitan branch of the Red Sea, near its northern extremity, over against Pihahiroth, or the opening in the mountains which led from the desert, on the side of Egypt, to the Red Sea.

BAASHA, the son of Ahijah, commander-in-chief of the armies belonging to Nadab, the son of Jeroboam, king of Israel. Baasha killed his master treacherously at the siege of Gibbethon, a city of the Philistines, A. M. 3051, and usurped the crown, which he possessed twenty-four years, 1 Kings xv, 27, &c. And, to secure himself in his usurpation, he massacred all the relatives of his predecessor; which barbarous action proved the accomplishment of the prophecy denounced against the house of Jeroboam by Ahijah, the prophet, 1 Kings xiv, 1, &c.

BABEL, the tower and city founded by the descendants of Noah in the plain of Shinar. The different tribes descended from Noah were here collected, and from this point were dispersed, through the confusion of their language. The time when this tower was built is differently stated in the Hebrew and Samaritan chronologies. The former fixes it in the year 101 after the flood, which Mr. Faber thinks encumbered with insuperable difficulties. This writer then goes on to show, that the chronology of the Samaritan Pentateuch reconciles every date, and surmounts every difficulty. It represents Shem as dying nearly a century and a half before the death of Peleg, instead of more than that number of years afterward, and 118 almost four centuries and a half before the death of Abraham; whom, in accordance with the history, it makes to survive his father Terah precisely a hundred years. It removes the difficulties with which the Hebrew chronology invests the whole history, by giving time, while it allows the dispersion to have taken place in the latter part of Peleg's life,

for the thirteen sons of his younger brother Joktan to have become heads of families; for Noah and his sons to have died, as it is proved they must have done, prior to the emigration from Armenia; for Nimrod, instead of being a boy, to have been of an age suitable to his exploits, and to have acquired the sovereign command, not, in the face of all probability, while the four great patriarchs were living, but after their decease; and for the families of mankind to have multiplied sufficiently to undertake the stupendous work of the tower. It explains also the silence respecting Shem in the history of Abraham, by making the former die in Armenia four hundred and forty years before the latter was born, instead of surviving him thirty-five years; and, lastly, it makes sacred history accord with profane; the Babylonian history of Berosus, and the old records consulted by Epiphanius, both placing the death of Noah and his sons before the emigration from Armenia.

The sum of the whole is as follows: All the descendants of Noah remained in Armenia in peaceable subjection to the patriarchal religion and government during the lifetime of the four royal patriarchs, or till about the beginning of the sixth century after the flood; when, gradually falling off from the pure worship of God, and from their allegiance to the respective heads of families, and seduced by the schemes of the ambitious Nimrod, and farther actuated by a restless disposition, or a desire for a more fertile country, they migrated in a body southwards, till they reached the plains of Shinar, probably about sixty years after the death of Shem. Here, under the command of their new leader, and his dominant military and sacerdotal Cuthites, by whom the original scheme of idolatry, the groundwork of which was probably laid in Armenia, was now perfected; and, with the express view to counteract the designs of the Almighty in their dispersion into different countries, they began to build the city and tower, and set up a banner which should serve as a mark of national union, and concentrate them in one unbroken empire; when they were defeated and dispersed by the miraculous confusion of tongues. All this probably occupied the farther space of twenty or twenty-one years; making eighty-one from the death of Shem, and five hundred and eighty-three after the flood. All of which also will come within the life of Peleg, who, according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, died in the year 640. The tower of Belus in Babylon, mentioned by Herodotus, was probably either the original tower of Babel repaired, or it was constructed upon its massive foundations. The remains of this tower are still to be seen, and are thus described by Captain Mignan, in his Travels in Chaldea:--

“At day light I departed for the ruins, with a mind absorbed by the objects which I had seen yesterday. An hour’s walk, indulged in intense reflection, brought me to the grandest and most gigantic northern mass, on the eastern

bank of the Euphrates, and distant about four miles and a half from the eastern suburb of Hillah. It is called by the natives, El Mujelibah, 'the overturned;' also Haroot and Maroot, from a tradition handed down, with little deviation, from time immemorial, that near the foot of the ruin there is a well, invisible to mortals, in which those rebellious angels were condemned by God to be hung with their heels upward, until the day of judgment, as a punishment for their wickedness. This solid mound, which I consider, from its situation and magnitude, to be the remains of the Tower of Babel, (an opinion likewise adopted by that venerable and highly distinguished geographer, Major Rennell,) is a vast oblong square, composed of kiln-burnt and sun-dried bricks, rising irregularly to the height of one hundred and thirty-nine feet, at the south-west; whence it slopes toward the north-east to a depth of one hundred and ten feet. Its sides face the four cardinal points. I measured them carefully, and the following is the full extent of each face: that to the north, along the visible face, is two hundred and seventy-four yards; to the south, two hundred and fifty-six yards; to the east, two hundred and twenty-six yards; and to the west, two hundred and forty yards. The summit is an uneven flat, strewn with broken and unbroken bricks, the perfect ones measuring thirteen inches square, by three thick. Many exhibited the arrow-headed character, which appeared remarkably fresh. Pottery, bitumen, vitrified and petrified brick, shells, and glass, were all equally abundant. The principal materials composing this ruin are, doubtless, mud bricks baked in the sun, and mixed up with straw. It is not difficult to trace brick work along each front, particularly at the south-west angle, which is faced by a wall, composed partly of kiln-burnt brick, that in shape exactly resembles a watch tower or small turret. On its summit there are still considerable traces of erect building; at the western end is a circular mass of sold brick work, sloping toward the top, and rising from a confused heap of rubbish. The chief material forming this fabric appeared similar to that composing the ruin called Akercouff, a mixture of chopped straw, with slime used as cement; and regular layers of unbroken reeds between the horizontal courses of the bricks. The base is greatly injured by time and the elements; particularly to the south-east, where it is cloven into a deep furrow from top to bottom. The sides of the ruin exhibit hollows worn partly by the weather, but more generally formed by the Arabs, who are incessantly digging for bricks, and hunting for antiquities."

BABYLON, 2 Kings xxiv, 1. The capital of Chaldea, built by Nimrod, Gen. x, 10. It was under Nebuchadnezzar that Babylon, then become the seat of universal empire, is supposed to have acquired that extent and magnificence, and that those stupendous works were completed which rendered it the wonder of the world and of posterity: and accordingly, this prince, then the most potent on the earth, arrogated to himself the whole

glory of its erection; and in the pride of his heart exclaimed, "Is not this great Babylon that I have built?" The city at this period stood on both sides of the river, which intersected it in the middle. It was, according to the least computation, that of Diodorus Siculus, 45 miles in circumference; and according to Herodotus, the older author of the two, 60 miles. Its shape was that of a square, traversed each way by 25 principal streets; which of course intersected each other, dividing the city into 626 squares. These streets were terminated at each end by gates of brass, of prodigious size and strength, with a smaller one opening toward the river. The walls, from the most moderate accounts, were 75 feet in height and 32 in breadth; while Herodotus makes them 300 in height and 75 in breadth: which last measurement, incredible as it may seem, is worthy of credit, as Herodotus is much the oldest author who describes them, and who gives their original height; whereas, those who follow him in their accounts of these stupendous walls, describe them as they were after they had been taken down to the less elevation by Darius Hystaspes. They were built of brick, cemented with bitumen instead of mortar; and were encompassed by a broad and deep ditch, lined with the same materials, as were also the banks of the river in its course through the city: the inhabitants descending to the water by steps through the smaller brazen gates before mentioned. The houses were three or four stories high, separated from each other by small courts or gardens, with open spaces and even fields interspersed over the immense area enclosed within the walls. Over the river was a bridge, connecting the two halves of the city, which stood, the one on its eastern, and the other on its western, bank; the river running nearly north and south. The bridge was 5 furlongs in length, and 30 feet in breadth, and had a palace at each end, with, it is said, a subterraneous passage beneath the river, from one to the other: the work of Semiramis. Within the city was the temple of Belus, or Jupiter, which Herodotus describes as a square of two stadia, or a quarter of a mile: in the midst of which arose the celebrated tower, to which both the same writer, and Strabo, give an elevation of one stadium, or 660 feet; and the same measure at its base; the whole being divided into eight separate towers, one above another, of decreasing dimensions to the summit; where stood a chapel, containing a couch, table, and other things of gold. Here the principal devotions were performed; and over this, on the highest platform of all, was the observatory, by the help of which the Babylonians arrived to such perfection in astronomy, that Calisthenes the philosopher, who accompanied Alexander to Babylon, found astronomical observations for 1903 years backwards from that time; which reach as high as the 115th year after the flood. On either side of the river, according to Diodorus, adjoining to the bridge, was a palace; that on the western bank being by much the larger. This palace was eight miles in circumference, and strongly fortified with three walls one within another. Within it were the celebrated pensile or hanging gardens, enclosed in a

square of 400 feet. These gardens were raised on terraces, supported by arches, or rather by piers, laid over with broad flat stones; the arch appearing to be unknown to the Babylonians: which courses of piers rose above one another, till they reached the level of the top of the city walls. On each terrace or platform, a deep layer of mould was laid, in which flowers, shrubs and trees were planted; some of which are said to have reached the height of 50 feet. On the highest level was a reservoir, with an engine to draw water up from the river by which the whole was watered. This novel and astonishing structure, the work of a monarch who knew not how to create food for his own pampered fancy, or labour for his debased subjects or unhappy captives, was undertaken to please his wife Amyitis; that she might see an imitation of the hills and woods of her native country, Media.

Yet, while in the plenitude of its power, and, according to the most accurate chronologers, 160 years before the foot of an enemy had entered it, the voice of an enemy had entered it, the voice of prophecy pronounced the doom of the mighty and unconquered Babylon. A succession of ages brought it gradually to the dust; and the gradation of its fall is marked till it sinks at last into utter desolation. At a time when nothing but magnificence was around this city, emphatically called the great, fallen Babylon was delineated by the pencil of inspiration exactly as every traveller now describes its ruins.

The immense fertility of Chaldea, which retained also the name of Babylonia till after the Christian æra, corresponded with the greatness of Babylon. It was the most fertile region of the whole east. Babylonia was one vast plain, adorned and enriched by the Euphrates and the Tigris, from which, and from the numerous canals that intersected the country from the one river to the other, water was distributed over the fields by manual labour and by hydraulic machines, giving rise, in that warm climate and rich exhaustless soil, to an exuberance of produce without a known parallel, over so extensive a region, either in ancient or modern times. Herodotus states, that he knew not how to speak of its wonderful fertility, which none but eye witnesses would credit; and, though writing in the language of Greece, itself a fertile country, he expresses his own consciousness that his description of what he actually saw would appear to be improbable, and to exceed belief. Such was the “Chaldees’ excellency,” that it departed not on the first conquest, nor on the final extinction of its capital, but one metropolis of Assyria arose after another in the land of Chaldea, when Babylon had ceased to be “the glory of kingdoms.”

2. Manifold are the prophecies respecting Babylon and the land of the Chaldeans; and the long lapse of ages has served to confirm their fulfilment

in every particular, and to render it at last complete. The judgments of Heaven are not casual, but sure; they are not arbitrary, but righteous. And they were denounced against the Babylonians, and the inhabitants of Chaldea, expressly because of their idolatry, tyranny, oppression, pride, covetousness, drunkenness, falsehood, and other wickedness. The burden of Babylon, which Isaiah the son of Amos did see: "The noise of a multitude in the mountains, like as of a great people: a tumultuous noise of the kingdoms of nations gathered together: the Lord of Hosts mustereth the host of the battle. They come from a far country, from the end of heaven, even the Lord and the weapons of his indignation, to destroy the whole land. Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate: and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there: neither shall the shepherds make their fold there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there: and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there. And the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant palaces." "Thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased! Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee. Thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. Thou art cast out of the grave like an abominable branch.--I will cut off from Babylon the name, and remnant, the son, and nephew, saith the Lord. I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water: and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord of Hosts." "Babylon is fallen, is fallen; and all the graven images of her gods he hath broken unto the ground." "Thus saith the Lord, that saith unto the deep, Be dry; and I will dry up thy rivers: that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure,--and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." "Bel boweth down," &c. "Come down, and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon: sit on the ground, there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans. Sit thou silent, and get thee into darkness, O daughter of the Chaldeans; for thou shalt no more be called the lady of kingdoms."

Many other prophecies against Babylon, and the whole land of Chaldea, are found in the Old Testament; and though the limits of this article will only allow a reference to be made to the exact fulfilment of a few, there is not one of the great number of predictions on record, the accomplishment of which has not been remarked by numerous writers, and more especially by those who have visited the spot. For, though for many centuries the site

of Babylon was unknown, or the ruins of other Chaldean cities mistaken for its remains, its true situation and present condition have been, within a few years, satisfactorily ascertained, and accurately described, by several most intelligent and enterprising travellers.

When in the plenitude of its greatness, splendour and strength, Babylon first yielded to the arms of Cyrus, whose name, and the manœuvre by which the city was taken, were mentioned by Isaiah nearly two hundred years before the event; which was also predicted by Jeremiah: "Go up, O Elam, (or Persia,) besiege, O Media. The Lord hath raised up the spirit of the kings of the Medes, for his device is against Babylon, to destroy it." The kings of Persia and Media, prompted by a common interest, freely entered into a league against Babylon, and with one accord entrusted the command of their united armies to Cyrus, the relative and eventually the successor of them both.--But the taking of Babylon was not reserved for these kingdoms alone: other nations had to be "prepared against her." "Set up a standard in the land; blow the trumpet among the nations, prepare the nations against her, call together against her the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Aschenaz: Lo, I will raise and cause to come up against Babylon an assembly of great nations from the north country," &c. Cyrus subdued the Armenians, who had revolted against Media, spared their king, bound them over anew to their allegiance, by kindness rather than by force, and incorporated their army with his own.--"The mighty men of Babylon have foreborne to fight. They have remained in their holds; their might hath failed, they became as women." So dispirited became its people, that Babylon, which had made the world to tremble, was long besieged, without making any effort to drive off the enemy. But, possessed of provisions for twenty years, which in their timid caution they had plentifully stored, they derided Cyrus from their impregnable walls, within which they remained. Their profligacy, their wickedness and false confidence were unabated; they continued to live carelessly in pleasures: and Babylon the great, unlike to many a small fortress and unwall'd town, made not one struggle to regain its freedom or to be rid of the foe.--Much time having been lost, and no progress being made in the siege, the anxiety of Cyrus was strongly excited, and he was reduced to great perplexity, when at last it was suggested and immediately determined to divert the course of the Euphrates. And while the unconscious and reckless citizens were engaged in dancing and merriment, the river was suddenly turned into the lake, the trench, and the canals; and the Persians, both foot and horse, so soon as the subsiding 121 of the water permitted, entered by its channel, and were followed by the allies in array, along the dry part of the river. "I will dry up thy sea, and make thy springs dry. That saith to the deep, Be dry, I will dry up thy rivers."--One detachment was placed where the river first enters the city, and another where it leaves it. And "one post did run to meet another,



and one messenger to meet another, to show the king of Babylon that his city is taken at the end, and that the passages are shut.” “They were taken,” says Herodotus, “by surprise; and such is the extent of the city, that, as the inhabitants themselves affirm, they who lived in the extremities were made prisoners before any alarm was communicated to the centre of the place,” where the palace stood. Thus a “snare was laid for Babylon, it was taken, and it was not aware; it was found and also caught; for it had sinned against the Lord. How is the praise of the whole earth surprised!”--“In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord. I will bring them down like lambs to the slaughter,” &c. “I will make drunken her princes and her wise men, her captains and her rulers, and her mighty men, and they shall sleep a perpetual sleep,” &c. Cyrus, as the night drew on, stimulated his assembled troops to enter the city, because in that night of general revel within the walls, many of them were asleep, many drunk, and confusion universally prevailed. On passing, without obstruction or hinderance, into the city, the Persians, slaying some, putting others to flight, and joining with the revellers, as if slaughter had been merriment, hastened by the shortest way to the palace, and reached it ere yet a messenger had told the king that his city was taken. The gates of the palace, which was strongly fortified, were shut. The guards stationed before them, were drinking beside a blazing light, when the Persians rushed impetuously upon them. A louder and altered clamour, no longer joyous, caught the ear of the inmates of the palace, and the bright light showed them the work of destruction, without revealing its cause. And not aware of the presence of an enemy in the midst of Babylon, the king himself, (who had been roused from his revelry by the hand writing on the wall,) excited by the warlike tumult at the gates, commanded those within to examine from whence it arose; and according to the same word, by which “the gates” (leading from the river to the city) “were not shut, the loins of kings were loosed to open before Cyrus the two-leaved gates” of the palace. The eager Persians sprang in. “The king of Babylon heard the report of them; anguish took hold of him;” he and all who were about him perished; God had “numbered” his kingdom and finished it; it was “divided,” and given to the Medes and Persians; the lives of the Babylonian princes, and lords, and rulers, and captains, closed with that night’s festival; the drunken slept “a perpetual sleep, and did not wake.”--“I will fill thee with men as with caterpillars.” Not only did the Persian army enter with ease as caterpillars, together with all the nations that had come up against Babylon, but they seemed also as numerous. Cyrus, after the capture of the city, made a great display of his cavalry in the presence of the Babylonians, and in the midst of Babylon. Four thousand guards stood before the palace gates, and two thousand on each side. These advanced as Cyrus approached; two thousand spearmen followed them. These were succeeded by four square masses of

Persian cavalry, each consisting of ten thousand men: and to these again were added, in their order, the Median, Armenian, Hyrcanian, Caducian, and Sacian horsemen,--all, as before, "riding upon horses, every man in array,"--with lines of chariots, four abreast, concluding the train of the numerous hosts. Cyrus afterward reviewed, at Babylon, the whole of his army, consisting of one hundred and twenty thousand horse, two thousand chariots, and six hundred thousand foot. Babylon, which was taken when not aware, and within whose walls no enemy, except a captive, had been ever seen, was thus "filled with men as with caterpillars," as if there had not been a wall around it. The Scriptures do not relate the manner in which Babylon was taken, nor do they ever allude to the exact fulfilment of the prophecies. But there is, in every particular, a strict coincidence between the predictions of the prophets and the historical narratives, both of Herodotus and Xenophon.

3. Every step in the progress of the decline of Babylon was the accomplishment of a prophecy. Conquered, for the first time, by Cyrus, it was afterward reduced from an imperial to a tributary city. "Come down and sit in the dust, O daughter of Babylon: sit on the ground, there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans." After the Babylonians rebelled against Darius, the walls were reduced in height, and all the gates destroyed. "The wall of Babylon shall fall, her walls are thrown down."--Xerxes, after his ignominious retreat from Greece, rifled the temples of Babylon, the golden images alone of which were estimated at 20,000,000, beside treasures of vast amount. "I will punish Bel in Babylon, and I will bring forth out of his mouth that which he has swallowed up; I will do judgment upon the graven images of Babylon."--Alexander the Great attempted to restore it to its former glory, and designed to make it the metropolis of a universal empire. But while the building of the temple of Belus, and the reparation of the embankments of the Euphrates, were actually carrying on, the conqueror of the world died, at the commencement of this his last undertaking, in the height of his power, and in the flower of his age. "Take balm for her pain, if so be that she may be healed. We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed." The building of the neighbouring city of Seleucia was the chief cause of the decline of Babylon, and drained it of a great part of its population. And at a later period, or about 130 years before the birth of Christ, Humerus, a Parthian governor, who was noted as excelling all tyrants in cruelty, exercised great severities on the Babylonians; and having burned the forum and some of the temples, and destroyed the fairest parts of the city, reduced many of the inhabitants to slavery on the slightest pretexts, and caused them, together with all their households, to be sent into Media. "They shall remove, they shall depart, both man and beast." The "golden city" thus gradually verged, for centuries, toward poverty and desolation.

Notwithstanding that Cyrus resided chiefly at Babylon, and sought to reform the government, and remodel the manners of the Babylonians, the succeeding kings of Persia preferred, as the seat of empire, Susa, Persepolis, or Ecbatana, situated in their own country: and in like manner the successors of Alexander did not attempt to complete his purpose of restoring Babylon to its preeminence and glory; but, after the subdivision of his mighty empire, the very kings of Assyria, during their temporary residence even in Chaldea, deserted Babylon, and dwelt in Seleucia. And thus the foreign inhabitants, first Persians and afterward Greeks, imitating their sovereigns by deserting Babylon, acted as if they verily had said, "Forsake her, and let us go every man unto his own country; for her judgment is reached unto heaven, and is lifted up even to the skies."

4. But kindred judgments, the issue of common crimes, rested on the land of Chaldea, as well as on its doomed metropolis. "They come from a far country, from the end of the earth, to destroy the whole land. Many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of thee also," &c. The Persians, the Macedonians, the Parthians, the Romans, the Saracens, and the Turks, are the chief of the many nations who have unscrupulously and unsparingly "served themselves" of the land of the Chaldeans: and Cyrus and Darius, kings of Persia; Alexander the Great; and Seleucus, king of Assyria; Demetrius and Antiochus the Great; Trajan, Severus, Julian, and Heraclius, emperors of Rome; the victorious Omar, the successor of Mohammed; Holagou, and Tamerlane,--are "great kings" who successively subdued or desolated Chaldea, or exacted from it tribute to such an extent, as scarcely any other country ever paid to a single conqueror. And though the names of some of these nations were unknown to the Babylonians, and unheard of in the world at the time of the prophecy, most of these "many nations and great kings" need now but to be named, to show that, in local relation to Chaldea, "they came from the utmost border, from the coasts of the earth."--"I will punish the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations; cut off the sower from Babylon, and him that handleth the sickle in the time of harvest. A drought is on her waters, and they shall be dried up. Behold the hinder-most of the nations, a dry land and a desert." The land of the Chaldeans was indeed made--perpetual, or long continued, desolation. Ravaged and spoiled for ages, the Chaldees' excellency finally disappeared, and the land became desolate, as still it remains. Rauwolff, who passed through it in 1574, describes the country as bare, and "so dry and barren that it cannot be tilled." And the most recent travellers all concur in describing it in similar terms. On the one side, near to the site of Opis, "the country all around," says Mr. Buckingham, "appears to be one wide desert, of sandy and barren soil, thinly scattered over with brushwood and tufts of reedy grass." On the other, between Bussorah and Bagdad, "immediately on either bank of the

Tigris,” observes Mignan, “is the untrodden desert. The absence of all cultivation, the sterile, arid, and wild character of the whole scene, formed a contrast to the rich and delightful accounts delineated in Scripture. The natives, in travelling over these pathless deserts, are compelled to explore their way by the stars.” “The whole country between Bagdad and Hillah is a perfectly flat and (with the exception of a few spots as you approach the latter place) uncultivated waste. That it was at some former period in a far different state, is evident from the number of canals by which it is traversed, now dry and neglected; and the quantity of heaps of earth covered with fragments of brick and broken tiles, which are seen in every direction, the indisputable traces of former population. At present the only inhabitants of the tract are the Sobeide Arabs. Around, as far as the eye can reach is a trackless desert.”--“Her cities are desolations.” The course of the Tigris through Babylonia, instead of being adorned with cities, is marked with the sites of “ancient ruins.” Sitace, Sabata, Narisa, Fuchera, Sendia, “no longer exist.” A succession of longitudinal mounds, crossed at right angles by others, mark the supposed site of Artemita, or Destagered. Its once luxuriant gardens are covered with grass; and a higher mound distinguishes “the royal residence” from the ancient streets. “Extensive ridges and mountains, (near to Houmania,) varying in height and extent, are seen branching in every direction.” A wall, with sixteen bastions, is the only memorial of Apollonia. The once magnificent Seleucia is now a scene of desolation. There is not a single entire edifice, but the country is strewn for miles with fragments of decayed buildings. “As far,” says Major Keppel, “as the eye could reach, the horizon presented a broken line of mounds; the whole of this place was a desert flat.” On the opposite bank of the Tigris, where Ctesiphon its rival stood, beside fragments of walls and broken masses of brick work, and remains of vast structures encumbered with heaps of earth, there is one magnificent monument of antiquity “in a remarkably perfect state of preservation,” “a large and noble pile of building, the front of which presents to view a wall three hundred feet in length, adorned with four rows of arched recesses, with a central arch, in span eighty-six feet, and above a hundred feet high, supported by walls sixteen feet thick, and leading to a hall which extends to the depth of a hundred and fifty-six feet,” the width of the building. A great part of the back wall, and of the roof, is broken down; but that which remains “still appears much larger than Westminster 123Abbey.” It is supposed to have been the lofty palace of Chosroes; but there desolation now reigns. “On the site of Ctesiphon,” says Mignan, “the smallest insect under heaven would not find a single blade of grass wherein to hide itself, nor one drop of water to allay its thirst.” In the rear of the palace, and attached to it, are mounds two miles in circumference, indicating the utter desolation of buildings, formed to minister to luxury.

5. But let us come to the fulfilment of these wonderful prophecies in the present condition of Babylon itself, as described by those who have most recently visited it.

“Babylon shall become heaps.” Babylon the glory of kingdoms is now the greatest of ruins. “Immense tumuli of temples, palaces, and habitations of every description,” are every where seen, and form “long and varied lines of ruins,” which, in some places, says Sir R. K. Porter, “rather resemble natural hills than mounds which cover the remains of great and splendid edifices.” These buildings, which were once the labour of slaves and the pride of kings, are now misshapen heaps of rubbish. “The whole face of the country,” observes Rich, “is covered with vestiges of building, in some places consisting of brick walls surprisingly fresh, in others, merely a vast succession of mounds of rubbish, of such indeterminate figures, variety, and extent, as to involve the person who should have formed any theory in inextricable confusion.”--“Let nothing of her be left.” “Vast heaps constitute all that now remains of ancient Babylon,” says Rich. All its grandeur is departed; all its treasures have been spoiled; all its excellence has utterly vanished; the very heaps are searched for bricks, when nothing else can be found; even these are not left, wherever they can be taken away; and Babylon has for ages been “a quarry above ground,” ready to the hand of every successive despoiler. Without the most remote allusion to this prophecy, Captain Mignan describes a mound attached to the palace, ninety yards in breadth by half that height, the whole of which is deeply furrowed, in the same manner as the generality of the mounds. “The ground is extremely soft, and tiresome to walk over, and appears completely exhausted of all its building materials; nothing now is left, save one towering hill, the earth of which is mixed with fragments of broken brick, red varnished pottery, tile, bitumen, mortar, glass, shells, and pieces of mother of pearl,”--worthless fragments, of no value to the poorest. “From thence shall she be taken, let nothing of her be left.” While the workmen “cast her up as heaps” while excavating for bricks, that they may “take” them “from thence,” and that “nothing may be left;” they labour more than trebly in the fulfilment of prophecy: for the numerous and deep excavations form pools of water, on the over-flowing of the Euphrates, and, annually filled, they are not dried up throughout the year. “Deep cavities are also formed by the Arabs, when digging for hidden treasure.” Thus “the ground,” says Buckingham, “is sometimes covered with pools of water in the hollows.”

“Sit in the dust, sit on the ground, O daughter of the Chaldeans.” The surface of the mounds which form all that remains of Babylon, consists of decomposed buildings, reduced to dust; and over all the ancient streets and habitations, there is literally nothing but the dust of the ground on which to

sit.--"Thy nakedness shall be uncovered." "Our path," says Captain Mignan, "lay through the great mass of ruined heaps on the site of 'shrunken Babylon;' and I am perfectly incapable of conveying an adequate idea of the dreary, lonely nakedness that appeared before me."--"Sit thou silent, and get thee into darkness." "There reigns throughout the ruins," says Sir R. K. Porter, "a silence profound as the grave." "Babylon is now a silent scene, a sublime solitude."--"It shall never be inhabited, nor dwelt in from generation to generation." From Rauwolff's testimony it appears that, in the sixteenth century, "there was not a house to be seen." And now "the eye wanders over a barren desert, in which the ruins are nearly the only indication that it had ever been inhabited." "It is impossible," adds Major Keppel, "to behold this scene and not to be reminded how exactly the predictions of Isaiah and Jeremiah have been fulfilled, even in the appearance Babylon was doomed to present, that 'she should never be inhabited;' that 'the Arabian should not pitch his tent there;' that she should 'become heaps;' that her cities should be 'a desolation, a dry land, and a wilderness.'" "Babylon is spurned alike by the heel of the Ottomans, the Israelites, and the sons of Ishmael." It is "a tenantless and desolate metropolis," remarks Mignan. "It shall not be inhabited, but be wholly desolate. Neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there, neither shall the shepherds make their folds there." It was prophesied of Ammon that it should be a stable for camels and a couching place for flocks; and of Philistia, that it should be cottages for shepherds, and a pasture of flocks. But Babylon was to be visited with a far greater desolation, and to become unfit or unsuited even for such a purpose; and that neither a tent would be pitched there, even by an Arab, nor a fold made by a shepherd, implies the last degree of solitude and desolation. "It is common in these parts for shepherds to make use of ruined edifices to shelter their flocks in." But Babylon is an exception. Instead of taking the bricks from thence, the shepherd might very readily erect a defence from wild beasts, and make a fold for his flock amidst the heaps of Babylon; and the Arab who fearlessly traverses it by day, might pitch his tent by night. But neither the one nor the other could now be persuaded to remain a single night among the ruins. The superstitious dread of evil spirits, far more than the natural terror of the wild beasts, effectually prevents them. Captain Mignan was accompanied by six Arabs, completely armed; but he "could not induce them to remain toward night, from the apprehension of evil spirits. It is impossible to eradicate this idea from the minds of this people, who are very deeply imbued with superstition."

124"Wild beasts of the deserts shall lie there, and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs (goats) shall dance there," &c. "There are many dens of wild beasts in various parts. And while the lower excavations are often pools of water, in most of the

cavities are numbers of bats and owls.” The king of the forest now ranges over the site of that Babylon which Nebuchadnezzar built for his own glory. And the temple of Belus, the greatest work of man, is now like unto a natural den of lions. Two or three majestic lions were seen upon its heights by Sir Robert Ker Porter, as he was approaching it; and “the broad prints of their feet were left plain in the clayey soil.” Major Keppel saw there a similar foot-print of a lion. It is also the unmolested retreat of jackalls, hyenas, and other noxious animals. Wild beasts are numerous at the Mujelibé, as well as on Birs Nimrood. “The mound,” says Kinneir, “was full of large holes: we entered some of them, and found them strewed with the carcasses and skeletons of animals recently killed. The ordure of wild beasts was so strong, that prudence got the better of curiosity; for we had no doubt as to the savage nature of the inhabitants. Our guides, indeed, told us, that all the ruins abounded in lions, and other wild beasts: so literally has the divine prediction been fulfilled, that wild beasts of the deserts should lie there, and their houses be full of doleful creatures; that the wild beasts of the islands should cry in their desolate houses.”

“The sea is come upon Babylon. She is covered with the multitude of the waves thereof.” The traces of the western bank of the Euphrates are now no longer discernible. The river overflows unrestrained; and the very ruins, with “every appearance of the embankment,” have been swept away. “The ground there is low and marshy, and presents not the slightest vestige of former buildings, of any description whatever.” “Morasses and ponds,” says Porter, “tracked the ground in various parts. For a long time after the general subsiding of the Euphrates, great part of this plain is little better than a swamp,” &c. “The ruins of Babylon are then inundated, so as to render many parts of them inaccessible, by converting the valleys among them into morasses.” But while Babylon is thus “covered with the multitude of waves, and the waters come upon it;” yet, in striking contrast and seeming contradiction to such a feature of desolation, (like the formation of “pools of water,” from the “casting up of heaps,”) are the elevated sunburnt ruins, which the waters do not overflow, and the “dry waste” and “parched and burning plain,” on which the heaps of Babylon lie, equally prove that it is “a desert, a dry land, and a wilderness.” One part, even on the western side of the river, is “low and marshy, and another,” says Mignan, “an arid desert.”

Many other striking particulars might be collected; and we may conclude in the words of Mr. Keith, from whose work on the prophecies several of the above particulars have been extracted:--“Is it possible that there can be any attestation of the truth of prophecy, if it be not witnessed here? Is there any spot on earth which has undergone a more complete transformation? ‘The records of the human race,’ it has been said with truth, ‘do not present

a contrast more striking than that between the primeval magnificence of Babylon and its long desolation.' Its ruins have of late been carefully and scrupulously examined by different natives of Britain, of unimpeached veracity; and the result of every research is a more striking demonstration of the literal accomplishment of every prediction. How few spots are there on earth of which we have so clear and faithful a picture as prophecy gave to fallen Babylon at a time when no spot on earth resembled it less than its present desolate solitary site! or could any prophecies respecting any single place have been more precise, or wonderful, or numerous, or true, or more gradually accomplished throughout many generations? And when they look at what Babylon was, and what it is, and perceive the minute realization of them all, may not nations learn wisdom, may not tyrants tremble, and may not skeptics think?"

The reasons why prophecies so numerous and particular were recorded concerning Babylon, appear to have been, 1. That Babylon was the great oppressor of the Jews. 2. That it was the type of all the powerful persecuting enemies of the church of God, especially of Rome; and in its fate they may read their own. 3. That the accomplishment of prophecy in the destruction of so eminent an empire might give a solemn testimony to the truth of the Scriptures to the whole earth, and to all ages.

**BACKSLIDING**, a falling off, or defection in matters of religion; an apostasy, Acts xxi, 21; 2 Thess. ii, 3; 1 Tim. iv, 1. This may be either partial or complete: partial, when it is in the heart, as Prov. xiv, 14; complete, as that described in Heb. vi, 4, &c; x, 6, &c. On the latter passage Chrysostom observes, "When a house has a strong foundation, suppose an arch fall, some of the beams break, or a wall decline, while the foundation is good, these breaches may be repaired; so in religion, whilst a person maintains the true doctrines, and remains on the firm rock, though he fall, true repentance may restore him to the favour and image of God: but as in a house, when the foundation is bad, nothing can save the building from ruin; so when heretical doctrines are admitted for a foundation, nothing can save the professor from destruction." It is important in interpreting these passages to keep it steadfastly in mind, that the apostasy they speak of is not only moral but doctrinal.

**BADGER**, תהש. This word in a plural form occurs, Exod. xxv, 5; xxvi, 14; xxxv, 7, 23; xxxvi, 19; xxxix, 34; Num. iv, 6, 8, 10–12, 14, 25; Ezek. xvi, 10; and is joined with ערת, skins used for the covering of the tabernacle in the wilderness. The Jewish interpreters are agreed as to its being some animal. Jarchi says it was a beast of many colours, which no more exists. Kimchi holds the same opinion. Aben Ezra thinks it some animal of the 125bovine kind, of whose skins shoes are made; alluding to Ezek. xvi, 10.



Most modern interpreters have taken it to be the badger, and among these our English translators; but, in the first place, the badger is not an inhabitant of Arabia; and there is nothing in its skin peculiarly proper either for covering a tabernacle or making shoes. Hasæus, Michaelis, and others, have laboured to prove that it is the mermaid, or homo marinus, the trichokus of Linnæus. Faber, Dathe, and Rosenmuller, think that it is the seal, or sea calf, vitulus marinus, the skin of which is both strong and pliable, and was accounted by the ancients as a most proper outer covering for tents, and was also made into shoes, as Rau has clearly shown. Niebuhr says, "A merchant of Abushahr called dahash that fish which the captains in English vessels call porpoise, and the Germans, sea hog. In my voyage from Maskat to Abushahr, I saw a prodigious quantity together near Ras Mussendom, that were all going the same way, and seemed to swim with great vehemence." Bochart thinks that not an animal, but a colour, was intended, Exodus xxv, 5; so that the covering of the tabernacle was to be azure, or sky blue.

BAG, a purse or pouch, Deut. xxv, 13; 1 Sam. xvii, 40; Luke xii, 33; Job xiv, 17. The money collected in the treasuries of eastern princes was reckoned up in certain equal sums, put into bags and sealed. These are, in some parts of the Levant, called purses, where they estimate great expenses by so many purses. The money collected in the temple in the time of Joash, for its reparation, seems, in like manner, to have been told up in bags of equal value; and these were probably delivered sealed to those who paid the workmen, 2 Kings xii, 10. In the east, in the present day, a bag of money passes, for some time at least, currently from hand to hand, under the authority of a banker's seal, without any examination of its contents. See Tobit ix, 5; xi, 16.

BAKING BREAD. Abraham directed Sarah to bake cakes upon the hearth, for the use of the strangers who had visited him, Genesis xviii, 6. Elijah requests the same of the widow of Zarephath, 1 Kings xvii, 13. Amnon the son of David requests Tamar his sister to come and make cakes in his sight, that he might eat at her hand, 2 Sam. xiii, 6. These and other allusions to the preparation of bread will be explained by referring to eastern customs. Rauwolff observes that travellers frequently bake bread in the deserts of Arabia, on the ground heated for that purpose by fire, covering their cakes of bread with ashes and coals, and turning them several times till they are enough. The eastern bread is made in small thin cakes, and is generally eaten new. Sometimes it was however made to keep several days, as the shew bread; and a sort of rusks, or bread for travelling, Joshua ix, 12. The eastern ladies of rank often prepare cakes, pastry, &c, in their own apartments.

BALAAM, a prophet of the city of Pethor, or Bosor, upon the Euphrates, whose intercourse with Balak, king of the Moabites, who sent for him to curse the Israelites, is recorded at large by Moses, Num. xxii-xxiv. It has been a subject of controversy, whether Balaam was a true prophet or a mere diviner, magician, or fortune teller. Origen says that his whole power consisted in magic and cursing. Theodoret is of opinion that Balaam did not consult the Lord, but that he was supernaturally inspired, and constrained to speak against his own inclination. Cyril says that he was a magician, an idolater, and a false prophet, who spoke truth against his will; and St. Ambrose compares him to Caiaphas, who prophesied without being aware of the import of what he said. Jerom seems to have adopted the opinion of the Hebrews; which was, that Balaam knew the true God, erected altars to him, and that he was a true prophet, though corrupted by avarice, Num. xxii, 18. St. Austin and other commentators have inclined to this opinion. Dr. Jortin supposes that Balaam was a worshipper of the true God, and a priest and prophet of great reputation; and that he was sent for by Balak from a notion which generally prevailed, that priests and prophets could sometimes, by prayers and sacrifices duly and skilfully applied, obtain favours from God, and that their imprecations were efficacious. He conceives that the prophet had been accustomed to revelations, and that he used to receive them in visions, or in dreams of the night. It cannot be denied that the Scripture expressly calls him a prophet, 2 Pet. ii, 15, and therefore those are probably right who think that he had once been a good man and a true prophet, till, loving the wages of unrighteousness, and prostituting the honour of his office to covetousness, he apostatized from God, and, betaking himself to idolatrous practices, fell under the delusion of the devil, of whom he learned all his magical enchantments; though at this juncture, when the preservation of his people was concerned, it might be consistent with God's wisdom to appear to him and overrule his mind by the impulse of real revelations. As to what passed between him and his ass, when that animal was miraculously enabled to speak to its master, commentators are divided in their opinions; whether it really and literally happened as Moses relates it, or whether it be an allegory only, or was the mere imagination or vision of Balaam. But St. Peter evidently mentions it as a fact literally and certainly occurring: "the dumb ass, speaking with man's voice, when she forbade the madness of the prophet," 2 Pet. ii, 16. This, it is true, has frequently been made the subject of profane banter by those whose skepticism leads them to scoff at all prodigies. But how absurd is it to subject a miraculous event to the ordinary rules of reasoning! "Say what you will of the formation of the tongue and jaws being unfit for speaking," says Bishop Newton, "yet an adequate cause is assigned for this wonderful event; for it is expressly said that 'the Lord opened the mouth of the ass;' and who that believes a God, can doubt his power to do this and much more? The miracle was by no means needless or superfluous; it was

well adapted to convince Balaam that the mouth and tongue were under God's direction, and that the same divine power which caused the dumb ass to speak contrary to its nature, could, in like manner, make him utter blessings contrary to his inclination. And, accordingly, he was overruled to bless the people, though he came prepared and disposed to curse them; which was the greater miracle of the two; for the ass was merely passive, but Balaam resisted the good motions of God." The prophecy which Balaam delivered concerning Israel on this remarkable occasion, and which is contained in Numbers xxiv, 5–9, has been greatly admired by critics. Bishop Lowth, in particular, remarks that he knows nothing in the whole scope of the Hebrew poetry more exquisite or perfect. "It abounds," says he, "in splendid imagery, copied immediately from the tablet of nature; and is chiefly conspicuous for the glowing elegance of the style, and the form and diversity of the figures."

After his predictions, Balaam returned into his own country; but before he left the land of Moab, as if vexed with his own disappointment in missing the promised reward, and with a purpose of revenging himself on the Israelites, as the cause of it, he instructed the Moabites and Midianites in a wicked scheme, which was to send their daughters into the camp of the Israelites, in order to draw them first into lewdness, and then into idolatry, the certain means of depriving them of the help of that God who protected them. This artifice succeeded; for as the Israelites lay encamped at Shittim, many of them were deluded by these strange women, not only to commit whoredom with them, but to assist at their sacrifices, and worship their god Baal-Peor, Num. xxv, 1–3; xxxi, 16; Mic. vi, 5; 2 Pet. ii, 15; Jude 11; Rev. ii, 14; Deut. xxiii, 4, 5; Joshua xxiv, 9, 10; Neh. xiii, 2. God commanded Moses to avenge this crime. He therefore declared war against the Midianites, killed five of their princes, and a great number of other persons without distinction of age or sex, among whom was Balaam himself.

Moses says that Balaam consulted the Lord, and calls the Lord his God: "I cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord my God," Num. xxii, 18. The reason why Balaam calls Jehovah, "my God" may be, because he was of the posterity of Shem, who maintained the worship of Jehovah, not only in his own person, but among his descendants; so that while the posterity of Ham fell into idolatry, and the posterity of Japhet were settled at a distance in Europe, the Shemites generally, though not universally, retained the worship of God.

BALDNESS is a natural effect of old age, in which period of life the hair of the head, wanting nourishment, falls off, and leaves the head naked. Artificial baldness was used as a token of mourning; it is threatened to the voluptuous daughters of Israel, instead of well set hair, Isaiah iii, 24. See

Mic. i, 16; and instances of it occur, Isaiah xv, 2; Jer. xlvi, 5. See Ezek, vii, 18; Amos viii, 10.

The insult offered to Elisha by the young people of Bethel, improperly rendered “little children,” who cried out after him, “Go up, thou bald head,” may here be noticed. The town of Bethel was one of the principal nurseries of Ahab’s idolatry, and the contempt was offered to Elisha in his public character as a prophet of the Lord. If in the expression, “Go up,” there was also a reference to the translation of Elijah, as turning it into jest, this was another aggravation of the sin, to which these young people were probably instigated by their parents. The malediction laid upon them by the prophet was not an act of private resentment, but evidently proceeded from prophetic impulse.

BALM, צַרִי, Gen. xxxvii, 25; xliii, 11; Jer. viii, 22; xlvi, 11; li, 8; Ezek. xxvii, 17. Balm, or balsam, is used with us as a common name for many of those oily resinous substances, which flow spontaneously or by incision, from certain trees or plants, and are of considerable use in medicine and surgery. It serves therefore very properly to express the Hebrew word צַרִי, which the LXX have rendered ῥητίνη, and the ancients have interpreted resin indiscriminately.

BALSAM TREE, בַּעֲלֵ-שֶׁמֶן, in Arabic, abusshâm, that is, “father of scent,” sweet-scented. According to Mr. Bruce, the balessan, balsam, or balm, is an evergreen shrub, or tree, which grows to about fourteen feet high, spontaneously and without culture in its native country, Azab, and all along the coast to Babelmandel. There were three kinds of balsam extracted from this tree. The first was called opobalsamum, and was most highly esteemed. It was that which flowed spontaneously, or by means of incision, from the trunk or branches of the tree in summer time. The second was carpobalsamum, made by expressing the fruit when in maturity. The third, and least esteemed of all, was hylobalsamum, made by a decoction of the buds and small young twigs. The great value set upon this drug in the east is traced to the earliest ages. The Ishmaelites, or Arabian carriers and merchants, trafficking with the Arabian commodities into Egypt, brought with them צַרִי as a part of their cargo, Gen. xxxvii, 25; xliii, 11. Josephus, in the history of the antiquities of his country, says that a tree of this balsam was brought to Jerusalem by the queen of Saba, and given among other presents to Solomon, who, as we know from Scripture, was very studious of all sorts of plants, and skilful in the description and distinction of them. And here, indeed, it seems to have been cultivated and to have thriven; so that the place of its origin, through length of time, combined with other reasons, came to be forgotten. Notwithstanding the positive authority of Josephus, and the great probability that attends it, we cannot put it in

competition with what we have been told in Scripture, as we have just now seen that the place where it grew, and was sold to merchants, was Gilead in Judea, more than 1730 years before Christ, or 1000 before the queen of Saba; so that in reading the verse, nothing can be plainer than that it had been transplanted into Judea, flourished, and had become an article of commerce in Gilead, long 127 before the period he mentions. "A company of Ishmaelites came from Gilead with their camels, bearing spicery and balm, and myrrh, going to carry it down to Egypt," Gen. xxxvii, 25. Theophrastus, Dioscorides, Pliny, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Tacitus, Justin, Solinus, and Serapion, speaking of its costliness and medicinal virtues, all say that this balsam came from Judea. The words of Pliny are, "But to all other odours whatever, the balsam is preferred, produced in no other part but the land of Judea, and even there in two gardens only; both of them belonging to the king, one no more than twenty acres, the other still smaller." The whole valley of Jericho was once esteemed the most fruitful in Judea; and the obstinacy with which the Jews fought here to prevent the balsam trees from falling into the possession of the Romans, attests the importance which was attached to them. This tree Pliny describes as peculiar to the vale of Jericho, and as "more like a vine than a myrtle." It was esteemed so precious a rarity, that both Pompey and Titus carried a specimen to Rome in triumph; and the balsam, owing to its scarcity, sold for double its weight in silver, till its high price led to the practice of adulteration. Justin makes it the chief source of the national wealth. He describes the country in which it grew, as a valley like a garden, environed with continual hills, and, as it were, enclosed with a wall. "The space of the valley contains 200,000 acres, and is called Jericho. In that valley, there is wood as admirable for its fruitfulness as for its delight, for it is intermingled with palm trees and opobalsamum. The trees of the opobalsamum have a resemblance to fir trees; but they are lower, and are planted and husbanded after the manner of vines. On a set season of the year they sweat balsam. The darkness of the place is beside as wonderful as the fruitfulness of it; for although the sun shines no where hotter in the world, there is naturally a moderate and perpetual gloominess of the air." According to Mr. Buckingham, this description is most accurate. "Both the heat and the gloominess," he says, "were observed by us, though darkness would be an improper term to apply to this gloom."

**BANGORIAN CONTROVERSY**, a controversy that arose with Dr. Hoadly, bishop of Bangor. That prelate, in a sermon preached before George I, asserted that Christ was supreme in his own kingdom; that he had not delegated his power, like temporal lawgivers during their absence, to any persons as his vicegerents or deputies; and that the church of England, as all other national churches, was merely a civil or human institution, established for the purpose of diffusing and perpetuating the

knowledge and belief of Christianity. On the meeting of the convocation, a committee was appointed to examine this publication. A heavy censure was passed against it, as tending to subvert all government and discipline in the church of Christ, to reduce his kingdom to a state of anarchy and confusion, and to impugn and impeach the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, and the authority of the legislature to enforce obedience in matters of religion, by severe sanction. To these proceedings a sudden stop was put by proroguing the convocation; but the controversy which had been commenced was continued for several years.

BANNER, an ensign, or standard, used by armies or caravans on their journeys in the eastern countries. The original לָגַד, is rendered by lexicographers and translators under this word, as a noun, in which form it often occurs, a standard, banner; as a verb, once, to set up a banner; Psalm xx, 5; as a participle pahul, vexillatus, one distinguished by a banner, the chief; as a participle niphah, bannered, or with banners. The meaning of the root is illustrated by the very ingenious and sensible author of "Observations on Divers Passages of Scripture," who shows, from Pitts and Pocke, that, "as in Arabia and the neighbouring countries, on account of the intense heat of the sun by day, people generally choose to travel in the night; so, to prevent confusion in their large caravans, particularly in the annual one to Mecca, each company, of which the caravan consists, has its distinct portable beacon, which is carried on the top of a pole, and consists of several lights, which are somewhat like iron stoves, into which they put short dry wood, with which some of the camels are loaded. Every company has one of these poles belonging to it; some of which have ten, some twelve, of these lights on their tops, more or less; and they are likewise of different figures, as well as numbers; one, perhaps, in an oval shape; another, triangular, or in the form of an M, or N, &c, so that by these every one knows his respective company. They are carried in the front, and set up in the place where the caravan is to pitch, before that comes up, at some distance from one another. As travelling then in the night must be, generally speaking, more agreeable to a great multitude in that desert, we may believe a compassionate God, for the most part, directed Israel to move in the night. And in consequence, must we not rather suppose the standards of the tribes were movable beacons, like those of the Mecca pilgrims, than flags or any thing of that kind?" This ingenious author seems, however, to forget, 1. That the pillar of fire was with the Israelites to direct their marches. 2. That the Israelites were not a mere caravan, but an army; and, as such, for order, required standards as well by day as by night. See Armies.

BANQUET. The hospitality of the present day in the east exactly resembles that of the remotest antiquity. The parable of the "great supper" is in those

countries literally realized. And such was the hospitality of ancient Greece and Rome. When a person provided an entertainment for his friends or neighbours, he sent round a number of servants to invite the guests; these were called vocatores by the Romans, and κλητώρες by the Greeks. The day when the entertainment is to be given is fixed some considerable time before; and in the evening of the day appointed, a messenger comes to bid the guests to the feast. The custom is thus introduced in Luke: "A certain man made a great supper, and bade many; and sent his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come, for all things are now ready." They were not now asked for the first time; but had already accepted the invitation, when the day was appointed, and were therefore already pledged to attend at the hour when they might be summoned. They were not taken unprepared, and could not in consistency and decency plead any prior engagement. They could not now refuse, without violating their word, and insulting the master of the feast, and, therefore, justly subjected themselves to punishment. The terms of the parable exactly accord with established custom. The Jews did not always follow the same method; sometimes they sent a number of servants different ways among the friends they meant to invite; and at other times, a single male domestic.

The Persians send a deputation to meet their guests: this deputation are called openers of the way; and the more distinguished the persons sent, and the greater the distance to which they go, so much greater is the honour. So it is proclaimed, "Go forth and behold king Solomon, with the crown wherewith his mother crowned him." "The bridegroom cometh, go ye forth to meet him." The names of the persons to be invited were inscribed upon tablets, and the gate was set open to receive those who had obtained them; but to prevent any getting in that had no ticket, only one leaf of the door was left open; and that was strictly guarded by the servants of the family. Those who were admitted had to go along a narrow passage to the room; and after all who had received tickets of admission were assembled, the master of the house rose and shut to the door; and then the entertainment began. The first ceremony, after the guests arrived at the house of entertainment, was the salutation performed by the master of the house, or one appointed in his place. Among the Greeks, this was sometimes done by embracing with arms around; but the most common salutation was by the conjunction of their right hands, the right hand being reckoned a pledge of fidelity and friendship. Sometimes they kissed the lips, hands, knees, or feet, as the person deserved more or less respect. The Jews welcomed a stranger to their house in the same way; for our Lord complains to Simon, that he had given him no kiss, had welcomed him to his table with none of the accustomed tokens of respect.

The custom of reclining was introduced from the nations of the east, and particularly from Persia, where it seems to have been adopted at a very remote period. The Old Testament Scriptures allude to both customs; but they furnish undeniable proofs of the antiquity of sitting. As this is undoubtedly the most natural and dignified posture, so it seems to have been universally adopted by the first generations of men; and it was not till after the lapse of many ages, and when degenerate man had lost much of the firmness of his primitive character, that he began to recline.

The tables were constructed of three different parts or separate tables, making but one in the whole. One was placed at the upper end crossways, and the two others joined to its ends, one on each side, so as to leave an open space between, by which the attendants could readily wait at all the three. Round these tables were placed beds or couches, one to each table; each of these beds was called *clinium*; and three of these being united, to surround the three tables, made the *triclinium*. At the end of each *clinium* was a footstool, for the convenience of mounting up to it. These beds were formed of mattresses, and supported on frames of wood, often highly ornamented; the mattresses were covered with cloth or tapestry, according to the quality of the entertainer. At the splendid feast which Ahasuerus made for the nobles of his kingdom, beds of silver and gold were placed round the tables; according to a custom in the east of naming a thing from its principal ornament, these must have been couches profusely ornamented with the precious metals. Each guest inclined the superior part of his body upon his left arm, the lower part being stretched out at length, or a little bent; his head was raised up, and his back sometimes supported with pillows. In conversation, those who spoke raised themselves almost upright, supported by cushions. When they ate, they raised themselves on their elbow, and made use of the right hand; which is the reason our Lord mentions the hand of Judas in the singular number: "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me," Matt. xxvi, 23. See *Accubation*.

When a Persian comes into an assembly, and has saluted the house, he then measures with his eye the place to which his degree of rank entitles him; he straightway wedges himself into the line of guests, without offering any apology for the general disturbance which he produces. It often happens that persons take a higher seat than that to which they are entitled. The Persian scribes are remarkable for their arrogance in this respect, in which they seem to bear a striking resemblance to the Jews of the same profession in the days of our Lord. The master of the entertainment has, however, the privilege of placing any one as high in the rank of the assembly as he may choose. And Mr. Morier saw an instance of it at a public entertainment to which he was invited. When the assembly was nearly full, the governor of



Kashan, a man of humble mien, although of considerable rank, came in and seated himself at the lowest place; when the master of the house, after numerous expressions of welcome, pointed with his hand to an upper seat in the assembly, to which he desired him to move, and which he accordingly did. These circumstances furnish a beautiful and striking illustration of the parable which our Lord uttered, when he saw how those that were invited chose the highest places.

Before the Greeks went to an entertainment, they washed and anointed themselves; for it was thought very indecent to appear on such an occasion, defiled with sweat and dust; but they who came off a journey were washed, and clothed with suitable apparel, in the house of the entertainer, before they were admitted to the feast. When Telemachus and Pisistratus arrived at the palace of Menelaus, in the course of their wanderings, they were immediately supplied with water to wash, and with oil to anoint, themselves, before they took their seats by the side of the king. The oil used on such occasions, in the palaces of nobles and princes, was perfumed with roses and other odoriferous herbs. They also washed their hands before they sat down to meat. To these customary marks of respect, to which a traveller, or one who had no house of his own, was entitled, our Lord alludes in his defence of Mary: "And he turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house; thou gavest me no water for my feet, but she hath washed my feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head. Thou gavest me no kiss; but this woman, since the time I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not anoint; but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment," Luke vii, 44. Homer mentions it as a custom quite common in those days, for daughters to wash and afterward to anoint the feet of their parents. Our Saviour was in the circumstances of a traveller; he had no home to wash and anoint himself in, before he went to Simon's house; and, therefore, had a right to complain that his entertainer had failed in the respect that was due to him as a stranger, at a distance from the usual place of his residence. The Jews regularly washed their hands and their feet before dinner; they considered this ceremony as essential, which discovers the reason of their astonishment, when they observed the disciples of Christ sit down at table without having observed this ceremony: "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread," Matt. xv, 2. After meals they wash them again; for, says the evangelist, "the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders," Mark vii, 3, 4. When they washed their hands themselves, they plunged them into the water up to the wrists; but when others performed this office for them, it was done by pouring it upon their hands. The same custom prevailed in Greece, for Homer says, the attendants poured water on the hands of their chiefs. This

was a part of the service which Elisha performed for his master Elijah; and in every instance under the law where water was applied to the body by another, it was done, not by plunging, but by pouring or sprinkling. To wash the feet was a mean and servile office, and, therefore, generally performed by the female servants of the family. It was occasionally performed, however, by females of the highest rank; for the daughter of Cleobulus, one of the Grecian sages, and king of Lindus, a city on the south-east part of Rhodes, was not ashamed to wash the feet of her father's guests. And it was customary for them to kiss the feet of those to whom they thought a more than common respect was due; for the daughter of Philocleon, in Aristophanes, washed her father, anointed his feet, and, stooping down, kissed them. The towel which was used to wipe the feet after washing, was considered through all the east as a badge of servitude. Suetonius mentions it as a sure mark of the intolerable pride of Caligula, the Roman emperor, that when at supper he suffered senators of the highest rank, sometimes to stand by his couch, sometimes at his feet, girt with a towel. Hence it appears that this honour was a token of humiliation, which was not, however, absolutely degrading and inconsistent with all regard to rank. Yet our blessed Redeemer did not refuse to give his disciples, and Judas Iscariot himself, that proof of his love and humility.

The entertainment was conducted by a symposiarch, or governor of the feast. He was, says Plutarch, one chosen among the guests, the most pleasant and diverting in the company, that would not get drunk, and yet would drink freely; he was to rule over the rest, to forbid any disorder, but to encourage their mirth. He observed the temper of the guests, and how the wine worked upon them; how every one could bear his wine, and to endeavour accordingly to keep them all in harmony, and in an even composure, that there might be no disquiet nor disturbance. To do this effectually, he first proclaimed liberty to every one to drink what he thought proper, and then observing who among them was most ready to be disordered, mixed more water with his wine, to keep him equally sober with the rest of the company; so that this officer took care that none should be forced to drink, and that none, though left to their own choice, should get intoxicated. Such, we have reason to believe, was the governor of the feast at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, which our Lord honoured with his presence. The term ἀρχιτρίκλινοϛ literally signifies the governor of a place furnished with three beds; and he acted as one having authority; for he tasted the wine before he distributed it to the company, which, it is universally admitted, was one of the duties of a symposiarch. Neither the name nor the act accords with the character and situation of a guest; he must, therefore, have been the symposiarch, or governor of the feast. The existence of such an officer among the Jews is placed beyond a doubt, by a passage in the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, where his office is thus

described: "If thou be made the master of a feast, lift not thyself up, but be among them as one of the rest; take diligent care of them, and so sit down. And when thou hast done all thine office, take thy place, that thou mayest be merry with them, and receive a crown for the well-ordering of the feast," Ecclesiasticus xxxii, 1. See Architriclinus.

BAPTISM, from the Greek word βαπτίζω, is a rite or ceremony by which persons are initiated into the profession of the Christian religion; or, it is the appointed mode by which a person assumes the profession of Christianity, or is admitted to a participation of the privileges belonging to the disciples of Christ. It was by this mode that those who believed the Gospel were to be separated from unbelievers, and joined to the visible Christian church; and the rite accompanying it, or washing with water, was probably intended to represent the washing away, or renouncing, the impurities of some former state, viz. the sins that had been committed, and the vicious habits that had been contracted; and to this purpose it may be observed, that the profession of repentance always accompanied, or was understood to accompany, the profession of faith in Christ. That our Lord instituted such an ordinance as baptism, is plain from the commission given to the Apostles after his resurrection, and recorded in Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. To this rite there is also an allusion in Mark xvi, 16; John iii, 5; Acts ii, 41; viii, 12, 36–38; xxii, 16. The design of this institution, which was to express faith in Christ on the part of those who were baptized, and to declare their resolution of openly professing his religion, and cultivating real and universal holiness, appears from Rom. vi, 3, 4; 1 Peter iii, 21; Ephes. v, 26; and Titus iii, 5. We find no account of baptism as a distinct religious rite, before the mission of John, the forerunner of Christ, who was called the "Baptist," on account of his being commanded by God to baptize with water all who should hearken to his invitation to repent. Washing, however, accompanied many of the Jewish rites, and, indeed, was required after contracting any kind of uncleanness. Also, soon after the time of our Saviour, we find it to have been the custom of the Jews solemnly to baptize, as well as to circumcise, all their proselytes. As their writers treat largely of the reasons for this rite, and give no hint of its being a novel institution, it is probable that this had always been the custom antecedent to the time of Moses, whose account of the rite of circumcision, and of the manner of performing it, is by no means circumstantial. Or, baptism, after circumcision, might have come into use gradually from the natural propriety of the thing, and its easy conformity to other Jewish customs. For if no Jew could approach the tabernacle, or temple, after the most trifling uncleanness, without washing, much less would it be thought proper to admit a proselyte from a state so impure and unclean as Heathenism was conceived to be, without the same mode of purification. The antiquity of this practice of proselyte baptism among the Jews, has been a subject of

considerable debate among divines. It is strenuously maintained by Lightfoot. Dr. John Owen considers the opinion, that Christian baptism came from the Jews, as destitute of all probability. On the other hand, Mr. Wall has made it highly probable, to say the least, from many testimonies of the Jewish writers, who without one dissenting voice allow the fact, that the practice of Jewish baptism obtained before and at, as well as after, our Saviour's time. There is also a strong intimation, even in the Gospel itself, of such a known practice among the Jews in the time of John the Baptist, John i, 25. The testimonies of the Jewish writers are of the greater weight, because the practice, reported by them to have been of so ancient a date, did still remain among them; for if it had not been of that antiquity to which it pretends, viz. before the time of Christ, it is not likely that it would ever have become a custom among the Jews afterward. Would they begin to proselyte persons to their religion by baptism in imitation of the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they held accursed? And yet if this proselyte baptism were adopted by the Jews since the time of Christ, it must have been a mere innovation in imitation of Christians, which is not very likely. This ceremony is performed by immersion in the oriental churches. The practice of the western churches is, to sprinkle the water on the head or face of the person to be baptized, except in the church of Milan, in whose ritual it is ordered, that the head of the infant be plunged three times into the water; the minister at the same time pronouncing the words, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;" importing that by this ceremony the person baptized is received among the professors of that religion which God, the Father of all, revealed to mankind by the ministry of his Son, and confirmed by the miracles of his Spirit.

2. It is observable that the baptismal form, above cited from St. Matthew, never occurs in the same words, either in the book of the Acts, or in any of the Epistles. But though the form in St. Matthew never appears elsewhere, the thing intended thereby is always implied. There are many ceremonies delivered by ecclesiastical writers, as used in baptism, which were introduced after the age of Justin Martyr, but which are now disused; as the giving milk and honey to the baptized, in the east; wine and milk, in the west, &c. They also added unction and the imposition of hands. Tertullian is the first who mentions the signing with the sign of the cross, but only as used in private, and not in public worship; and he particularly describes the custom of baptizing without it. Indeed, it does not appear to have been used in baptism till the latter end of the fourth or fifth century; at which time great virtue was ascribed to it. Lactantius, who lived in the beginning of the fourth century, says the devil cannot approach those who have the heavenly mark of the cross upon them as an impregnable fortress to defend them; but he does not say it was used in baptism. After the council of Nice, Christians added to baptism the ceremonies of exorcism and adjuration, to

make evil spirits depart from the persons to be baptized. They made several signings with the cross, they used lighted candles, they gave salt to the baptized person to taste, and the priest touched his mouth and ears with spittle, and also blew and spat upon his face. At that time also baptized persons wore white garments till the Sunday following. They had also various other ceremonies; some of which are now abolished, though others of them remain in the church of Rome to this day.

3. The Quakers assert, that water baptism was never intended to continue in the church 131 of Christ any longer than while Jewish prejudices made such an external ceremony necessary. They argue from Eph. iv, 5, in which one baptism is spoken of as necessary to Christians, that this must be a baptism of the Spirit. But from comparing the texts that relate to this institution, it will plainly appear that water baptism was instituted by Christ in more general terms than will agree with this explication. That it was administered to all the Gentile converts, and not confined to the Jews, appears from Matt. xxviii, 19, 20, compared with Acts x, 47; and that the baptism of the Spirit did not supersede water baptism appears to have been the judgment of Peter and of those that were with him; so that the one baptism spoken of seems to have been that of water; the communication of the Holy Spirit being only called baptism in a figurative sense. As for any objection which may be drawn from 1 Cor. i, 17, it is sufficiently answered by the preceding verses, and all the numerous texts, in which, in epistles written long after this, the Apostle speaks of all Christians as baptized; and argues from the obligation of baptism, in such a manner as we can never imagine he would have done, if he had apprehended it to have been the will of God that it should be discontinued in the church. Compare Rom. vi, 3, &c; Col. ii, 12; Gal. iii, 27.

4. Baptism, in early times, was only administered at Easter and Whitsuntide, except in cases of necessity. Adult persons were prepared for baptism by abstinence, prayer, and other pious exercises. It was to answer for them, says Mosheim, that sponsors, or godfathers, were first instituted in the second century, though they were afterward admitted also in the baptism of infants. This, according to M. Daillé, was not done till the fourth century. Wall refers the origin of sponsors, or godfathers, on the authority of Tertullian, to the commencement of the second century; who were used in the baptism of infants that could not answer for themselves. The catechumens were not forward in coming to baptism. St. Ambrose was not baptized before he was elected bishop of Milan; and some of the fathers not till the time of their death. Some deferred it out of a tender conscience; and others out of too much attachment to the world; it being the prevailing opinion of the primitive times, that baptism, whenever conferred, washed away all antecedent stains and sins. Accordingly they deferred this

sanctifying rite as long as possible, even till they apprehended they were at the point of death. Cases of this kind occur at the beginning of the third century. Constantine the Great was not baptized till he was at the last gasp, and in this he was followed by his son Constantius; and two of his other sons, Constantine and Constans, were killed before they were baptized. As to the necessity of baptism, we may observe, however, that, though some seem to have laid too great stress upon it, as if it were indispensably necessary in order to salvation; it must be allowed, that for any person to omit baptism, when he acknowledges it to be an institution of Christ, and that it is the will of Christ that he should submit to it, is an act of disobedience to his authority, which is inconsistent with true faith.

5. The word baptism is frequently taken for sufferings, Mark x, 38; Luke xii, 50; Matt. xx, 22, 23. Of expressions like these we find some traces in the Old Testament also, where waters often denote tribulations, Psalm lxix, 1, 15; cxxiv, 4, 5; and where to be swallowed up by the waters, and to pass through the great waters, signify to be overwhelmed with miseries and calamities.

6. St. Paul, endeavouring to prove the resurrection of the dead, among several other reasons in support of the doctrine, says, "If the dead rise not at all, what shall they do who are baptized for the dead?" 1 Cor. xv, 29. Of this phrase various interpretations have been given; three of which only shall be here mentioned. "It means," say some, "baptized in the room of the dead just fallen in the cause of Christ, and who are thus supported by a succession of new converts, immediately offering themselves to fill up their places, as ranks of soldiers who advance to combat in the room of their companions, who have just been slain in their sight." Others think it signifies, "In hope of blessings to be received after they are numbered with the dead." Dr. Macknight supplies the words, τῆς ἀναζύσεως, and reads the clause, "Who are baptized for the resurrection of the dead;" or in consequence of their believing in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead; on account of which faith, and their profession of it, they are exposed to great sufferings, for which they can have no recompense, if there be no resurrection of the dead, nor any future life at all.

7. As to the subjects of baptism, the anti-pædobaptists hold that believing adults only are proper subjects, because the commission of Christ to baptize appears to them to restrict this ordinance to such only as are taught, or made disciples; and that, consequently, infants, who cannot be thus taught, ought to be excluded. "It does not appear," say they, "that the Apostles, in executing the commission of Christ, ever baptized any but those who were first instructed in the Christian faith, and professed their belief of it." They contend that infants can receive no benefit from baptism,

and are not capable of faith and repentance, which are to be considered as prerequisites.

8. As to the mode, they observe that the meaning of the word βαπτίζω signifies to immerse or dip, and that only; that John baptized in Jordan; that he chose a place where there was much water; that Jesus came up out of the water; that Philip and the eunuch went down both into the water; that the terms, washing, purifying, burying in baptism, so often mentioned in the Scriptures, allude to this mode; that immersion only was the practice of the Apostles and the first Christians; and that it was only laid aside from the love of novelty, and the coldness of climate. These positions, they think, are so clear from Scripture, and the history of the church, that they stand in need of but little argument for their support. Farther, they also insist that all positive institutions depend entirely upon the will and declaration of the institutor; and that, therefore, reasoning by analogy from previously abrogated rites is to be rejected, and the express command of Christ respecting baptism ought to be our rule.

9. The Pædobaptists, however, are of a different opinion. As to the subjects of baptism, they believe that qualified adults, who have not been baptized before, are certainly proper subjects; but then they think, also, that infants ought not to be excluded. They believe that, as the Abrahamic and Christian covenants are the same, Gen. xvii, 7; Heb. viii, 12; that as children were admitted under the former; and that as baptism is now a sign, seal, or confirmation of this covenant, infants have as great a right to it as the children of the Israelites had to the seal of circumcision under the law, Acts ii, 39; Rom. iv, 11. Farther, if children are not to be baptized because there is no positive command for it, for the same reason they say that women should not come to the Lord's Supper; nor ought we to keep holy the first day of the week; neither of these being expressly commanded. If baptizing infants had been a human invention, they also ask, how such a practice could have been so universal in the first three hundred years of the church, and yet no record have remained when it was introduced, nor any dispute or controversy about it have taken place? Some reduce the matter to a narrower compass; urging, (1.) That God constituted in his church the membership of infants, and admitted them to that privilege by a religious ordinance, Gen. xvii; Gal. iii, 14, 17. (2.) That this right of infants to church membership was never taken away: and this being the case, they argue, that infants must be received, because God has appointed it; and, since they must be received, it must be either with baptism or without it; but none must be received without baptism; therefore, infants must of necessity be baptized. Hence it is clear that, under the Gospel, infants are still continued exactly in the same relation to God and his church in which they were originally placed under former dispensations. That infants are to be

received into the church, and as such baptized, is also inferred from the following passages of Scripture: Gen. xvii; Isa. xlv, 3; Matt. xix, 13; Luke ix, 47, 48; Acts ii, 38, 39; Rom. xi, 17, 21; 1 Cor. vii, 14.

10. Though there are no express examples in the New Testament of Christ and his Apostles baptizing infants, yet there is no proof that they were excluded. Jesus Christ actually blessed little children; and it is difficult to believe that such received his blessing, and yet were not to be members of the Gospel church. If Christ received them, and would have us “receive” them, how can we keep them out of the visible church? Beside, if children were not to be baptized, it is reasonable to expect that they would have been expressly forbidden. As whole households were baptized, it is also probable there were children among them. From the year 400 to 1150, no society of men, in all that period of seven hundred and fifty years, ever pretended to say it was unlawful to baptize infants: and still nearer the time of our Saviour there appears to have been scarcely any one who advised the delay of infant baptism. Irenæus, who lived in the second century, and was well acquainted with Polycarp, who was John’s disciple, declares expressly, that the church learned from the Apostles to baptize children. Origen, in the third century, affirms, that the custom of baptizing infants was received from Christ and his Apostles. Cyprian, and a council of ministers, held about the year 254, no less than sixty-six in number, unanimously agreed that children might be baptized as soon as they were born. Ambrose, who wrote about 274 years from the Apostles, declares that the baptism of infants had been practised by the Apostles themselves, and by the church down to that time. “The catholic church every where declares,” says Chrysostom, in the fifth century, “that infants should be baptized;” and Augustine affirmed, that he never heard or read of any Christian, catholic or sectarian, but who always held that infants were to be baptized. They farther believe that there needed no mention in the New Testament of receiving infants into the church, as it had been once appointed and never repealed. So far from confining baptism to adults, it must be remembered that there is not a single instance recorded in the New Testament, in which the descendants of Christian parents were baptized in adult years. The objection that infants are not proper subjects for baptism, because they cannot profess faith and repentance, falls with as much weight upon the institution of circumcision as infant baptism; since they are as capable or are as fit subjects for the one as the other. Finally, it is generally acknowledged, that if infants die, (and a great part of the human race die in their infancy,) they are saved: if this be the case then why refuse them the sign of union with Christ, if they be capable of enjoying the thing signified?



11. As to the mode, the Pædobaptists deny that the term βαπτίζω, which is a derivative of βάπτω, and, consequently, must be something less in its signification, is invariably used in the New Testament to express plunging. It is denied, therefore, that dipping is its only meaning; that Christ absolutely enjoined immersion; and that it is his positive will that no other mode should be used. As the word βαπτίζω is used to express the various ablutions among the Jews, such as sprinkling, pouring, &c, Heb. ix, 10, for the custom of washing before meals, and the washing of household furniture, pots, &c, it is evident from hence that it does not express the manner of doing a thing, whether by immersion or effusion, but only the thing done; that is, washing; or the application of water in some form or other. It no where signifies to dip, but in denoting a mode of, and in order to, washing or cleansing; and the mode or use is only the ceremonial part of a positive institute; just as in the Lord's Supper, the time of day, the number and posture of the communicants, the quantity and quality of bread and wine, are circumstances not accounted essential by any part of Christians. If in baptism there be an expressive emblem of the descending influence of the Spirit, pouring must be the mode of administration; for that is the Scriptural term most commonly and properly used for the communication of divine influences, Matt. iii, 11; Mark i, 8, 10; Luke iii, 16–22; John i, 33; Acts i, 5; ii, 38, 39; viii, 12, 17; xi, 15, 16. The term sprinkling, also, is made use of in reference to the act of purification, Isa. lii, 15; Ezek. xxxvi, 25; Heb. ix, 13, 14; and therefore cannot be inapplicable to baptismal purification. But, it is observed, that John baptized "in Jordan:" to this it is replied, To infer always a plunging of the whole body in water from this particle, would, in many instances, be false and absurd. The same Greek preposition, ἐν, is used when it is said they should be "baptized with fire;" but few will assert that they should be plunged into it. The Apostle, speaking of Christ, says, he came not, ἐν, "by water only;" but, ἐν, "by water and blood." There the same word, ἐν, is translated by; and with justice and propriety; for we know no good sense in which we could say he came in water. It has been remarked that ἐν is, more than a hundred times, in the New Testament, rendered at; and in a hundred and fifty others it is translated with. If it be rendered so here, John baptized at Jordan, or with the water of Jordan, there is no proof that he plunged his disciples in it.

Jesus, it is said, came up out of the water; but this is no proof that he was immersed, as the Greek term, ἀπὸ, often signifies from: for instance, "Who hath warned you to flee from," not out of, "the wrath to come?" with many others that might be mentioned. Again: it is urged that Philip and the eunuch went down both into the water. To this it is answered, that here also is no proof of immersion: for, if the expression of their going down into the water necessarily includes dipping, then Philip was dipped, as well as the

eunuch. The preposition εἰς, translated into, often signifies no more than to, or unto: see Matt. xv, 24; Rom. x, 10; Acts xxviii, 14; Matt. iii, 11; xvii, 27: so that from none of these circumstances can it be proved that there was one person of all the baptized, who went into the water ankle deep. As to the Apostle's expression, "buried with him in baptism," that has no force in the argument for immersion, since it does not allude to a custom of dipping, any more than our baptismal crucifixion and death has any such reference. It is not the sign, but the thing signified, that is here alluded to. As Christ was buried, and rose again to a heavenly life, so we by baptism signify that we are separated from sin, that we may live a new life of faith and love.

To conclude: it is urged, against the mode of immersion, that, as it carries with it too much of the appearance of a burdensome rite for the Gospel dispensation; as it is too indecent for so solemn an ordinance; as it has a tendency to agitate the spirits, often rendering the subject unfit for the exercise of proper thoughts and affections, and indeed utterly incapable of them; as in many cases the immersion of the body would, in all probability, be instant death; as in other situations it would be impracticable, for want of water; it cannot be considered as necessary to the ordinance of baptism, and there is the strongest improbability that it was ever practised in the times of the New Testament, or in the earliest periods of the Christian church.

BAPTISTS, or ANTIPÆDOBAPTISTS, so called from their rejecting the baptism of infants. The Baptists in England form one of "the three denominations of Protestant Dissenters." The constitution of their churches, and their modes of worship, are congregational, or independent. They bore a considerable share in the sufferings of the seventeenth and preceding centuries: for there were many among the Lollards and Wickliffites who disapproved of infant baptism. There were also many of this faith among the Protestants and Reformers abroad. In Holland, Germany, and the north, they went by the names of Anabaptists and Mennonites; and in Piedmont and the south, they were found among the Albigenses and Waldenses. The Baptists subsist chiefly under two denominations,--the Particular or Calvinistical, and the General or Arminian. The former is by far the most numerous. Some of both denominations, General and Particular, allow of free or mixed communion; admitting to the Lord's table pious persons who have not been immersed, while others consider that as an essential requisite to communion. These are sometimes called Strict Baptists. Other societies of this denomination observe the seventh day of the week as their Sabbath, apprehending the original law of the Sabbath to remain in force, unaltered and unrepealed. These are called Seventh-day Baptists. A considerable number of the

General Baptists have gone into Unitarianism; in consequence of which, those who maintained the doctrines of the Trinity and atonement, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, formed themselves into what is called "The New Connection," or Association. These preserve a friendly correspondence with their other brethren in things which concern the general interests of the denomination, but hold no religious communion with them. Some congregations of General Baptists admit three distinct orders of church officers: messengers or ministers, elders, and deacons. The Baptists in America, and in the East and West Indies, are chiefly Calvinists; but most of them admit of free communion. The Scottish Baptists form a distinct denomination, and are distinguished by several peculiarities of church government. "No trace can be found of a Baptist church in Scotland," says Mr. Jones, "excepting one which appears to have been formed out of Cromwell's army, previous to 1765, when a church was settled at Edinburgh, under the pastoral care of Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Archibald 134M'Lean. Others have since been formed at Dundee, Glasgow, and in most of the principal towns of Scotland:" also at London, and in various parts of England. They think that the order of public worship, which uniformly obtained in the Apostolic churches, is clearly set forth in Acts ii, 42-47; and therefore they endeavour to follow it out to the utmost of their power. They require a plurality of elders in every church, administer the Lord's Supper, and make contributions for the poor every first day of the week. The prayers and exhortations of the brethren form a part of their church order, under the direction and control of the elders, to whom it exclusively belongs to preside in conducting the worship, to rule in cases of discipline, and to labour in the word and doctrine, in distinction from the brethren exhorting one another. The elders are all laymen, generally chosen from among the brethren; but, when circumstances require, are supported by their contributions. They approve also of persons who are properly qualified for it, being appointed by the church to preach the Gospel and baptize, though not vested with any pastoral charge. The discipline and government of the Scottish Baptists are strictly congregational.

BARACHIAS, the father of Zacharias, mentioned Matt. xxiii, 35, as slain between the temple and the altar. There is a great diversity of opinions concerning the person of this Zacharias, the son of Barachias. Some think him to be Zacharias, the son of Jehoiada, who was killed by the orders of Joash, between the temple and the altar, 2 Chron. xxiv, 21. Campbell thinks, with Father Simon, that Jehoiada had two names, Barachias and Jehoiada. See Zacharias.

BARAK, son of Abinoam, chosen by God to deliver the Hebrews from that bondage under which they were held by Jabin, king of the Canaanites,

Judges iv, 4, 5, &c. He refused to obey the Lord's commands, signified to him by Deborah, the prophetess, unless she consented to go with him. Deborah accompanied Barak toward Kedesh of Naphtali; and, having assembled ten thousand men, they advanced to mount Tabor. Sisera, being informed of this movement, marched with nine hundred chariots of war, and encamped near the river Kishon. Barak rapidly descended from mount Tabor, and the Lord having spread terror through Sisera's army Barak easily obtained a complete victory. Sisera was killed by Jael. Barak and Deborah composed a hymn of thanksgiving; and the land had peace forty years from A. M. 2719 to 2759, B. C. 1245.

BARBARIAN. The word לֵוִי (rendered barbarian; LXX, βάρβαρος,) in the Hebrew sense of it, signifies a stranger; one who knows neither the holy language nor the law. According to the notions of the Greeks, all nations who were not Greeks, or not governed by laws like the Greeks, were barbarians. The Persians, Egyptians, Hebrews, Arabians, Gauls, Germans, and even the Romans, were, in their phraseology, barbarians, however learned or polite they might be in themselves. St. Paul comprehends all mankind under the names of Greeks and barbarians: "I am a debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians; to the wise and to the unwise," Rom. i, 14. St. Luke calls the inhabitants of the island of Malta barbarians, Acts xxviii, 2, 4. St. Paul, writing to the Colossians, uses the terms barbarian and Scythian almost in the same signification. In 1 Cor. xiv, 11, he says, that if he who speaks a foreign language in an assembly be not understood by those to whom he discourses, with respect to them he is a barbarian; and, reciprocally, if he understand not those who speak to him, they are to him barbarians. Barbarian, therefore, is used for every stranger or foreigner who does not speak our native language, and includes no implication whatever of savage nature or manners in those respecting whom it is used. It is most probably derived from berbir, "a shepherd;" whence Barbary, the country of wandering shepherds; Bedouins, Sceni, Scythei, as if, wanderers in tents; therefore barbarians.

BAR-JESUS, or, according to some copies, BAR-JEU, was a Jewish magician in the island of Crete, Acts xiii, 6. St. Luke calls him Elymas. He was with the pro-consul Sergius Paulus, who, sending for Paul and Barnabas, desired to hear the word of God. Bar-Jesus endeavouring to hinder the pro-consul from embracing Christianity, Paul, filled with the Holy Ghost, "set his eyes upon him, and said, O full of all subtilty and mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? Behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season;" which took place immediately. The pro-consul, who saw this miracle, was

converted. Origen and Chrysostom think that Elymas, or Bar-Jesus, was converted likewise; and that St. Paul speedily restored his sight.

BARLEY, שַׁבְּרָה, *Exod. ix, 31; Lev. xxvii, 16, &c;*; a well-known kind of grain. It derives its Hebrew name from the long hairy beard which grows upon the ear. Pliny, on the testimony of Menander, says that barley was the most ancient aliment of mankind. In Palestine the barley was sown about October, and reaped in the end of March, just after the passover. In Egypt the barley harvest was later; for when the hail fell there, *Exodus ix, 31*, a few days before the passover, the flax and barley were bruised and destroyed: for the flax was at its full growth, and the barley began to form its green ears; but the wheat, and more backward grain, were not damaged, because they were only in the blade, and the hail bruised the young shoots which produce the ears.

The rabbins sometimes called barley the food of beasts, because in reality they fed their cattle with it, *1 Kings iv, 28*; and from Homer and other ancient writers we learn, that barley was given to horses. The Hebrews, however, frequently used barley bread, as we find by several passages of Scripture: for example, David's friends brought to him in his flight wheat, barley, flour, &c, *2 Sam. xvii, 28*. Solomon sent wheat, barley, oil, and wine, to the labourers King Hiram had furnished him, *2 Chron. ii, 15*. Elijah had a present made him, of twenty barley loaves, and corn in the husk, *2 Kings iv, 22*. And, by miraculously increasing the five barley loaves, Christ fed a multitude of about five thousand, *John vi, 8–10*. The jealousy-offering, in the Levitical institution, was to be barley meal, *Num. v, 15*. The common *mincha*, or offering, was of fine wheat flour, *Lev. ii, 1*; but this was of barley, a meaner grain, probably to denote the vile condition of the person in whose behalf it was offered. For which reason, also, there was no oil or frankincense permitted to be offered with it. Sometimes barley is put for a low, contemptible reward or price. So the false prophets are charged with seducing the people for handfuls of barley, and morsels of bread, *Ezek. xiii, 19*. Hosea bought his emblematic bride for fifteen pieces of silver, and a homer and a half of barley, *Hosea iii, 2*.

BARNABAS, a disciple of Jesus Christ, and companion of St. Paul in his labours. He was a Levite, born in the isle of Cyprus. His proper name was Joses, to which the Apostles added Barnabas, signifying the son of consolation. He is generally considered one of the seventy disciples, chosen by our Saviour. He was brought up with Paul at the feet of Gamaliel. When that Apostle came to Jerusalem, three years after his conversion, Barnabas introduced him to the other Apostles, *Acts ix, 26, 27*, about A. D. 37. Five years afterward, the church at Jerusalem, being informed of the progress of the Gospel at Antioch, sent Barnabas thither, who beheld with

great joy the wonders of the grace of God, Acts xi, 22, 24. He exhorted the faithful to perseverance. Some time afterward, he went to Tarsus, to seek Paul, and bring him to Antioch, where they jointly laboured two years, and converted great numbers; and here the disciples were first called Christians. They left Antioch A. D. 44, to convey alms from this church to that at Jerusalem. At their return they brought John Mark, the cousin of Barnabas. While they were at Antioch, the Holy Ghost directed that they should be separated for those labours among the Gentiles to which he had appointed them. They departed into Cyprus, where they converted Sergius Paulus, the pro-consul. They preached at Perga in Pamphylia without much success, by reason of the obstinacy and malice of the Jews; but being come to Iconium, they made many converts. Here the Jews stirred up a sedition, and obliged them to retire to Derbe and Lystra, in Lycaonia, where St. Paul curing one Æneas, who had been lame from his birth, the people of Lystra regarded them as gods; calling Barnabas, Jupiter; and Paul, Mercury; and would have sacrificed to them, which the two Apostles with great difficulty hindered: nevertheless, soon afterward, they were persecuted in this very city. Having revisited the cities through which they had passed, and where they had preached the Gospel, they returned to Antioch in Syria.

In A. D. 51, Barnabas was sent with Paul from Antioch to Jerusalem, on occasion of disputes concerning the observance of legal rites, to which the Jews wished to subject the Gentiles. Paul and Barnabas were present in the council at Jerusalem, and returned immediately to Antioch. Peter, arriving there soon afterward, was led to countenance, in some degree, by his conduct, the observance of the Mosaic distinctions. Barnabas, too, (who, being by descent a Levite, might retain some former notions,) used the like dissimulation: but Paul reprov'd Peter and Barnabas with great freedom. Paul afterward determining to visit the churches in the isle of Cyprus, and in Asia Minor, Barnabas desired that John Mark might accompany them: but Paul objected, because Mark had left them on the first journey. Hereupon the two Apostles separated: Paul went toward Asia; and Barnabas, with Mark, to Cyprus. This is all we know certainly concerning Barnabas.

There is extant among the writings of the fathers an epistle which is attributed to Barnabas; though, being without an inscription, it is not known to whom it professes to have been addressed. It was first published by Archbishop Usher, in Greek and Latin, and translated by Archbishop Wake, in his "Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers," and has often been reprinted. That it is not the production of Barnabas, the companion of Paul, may be safely concluded from internal evidence; though it may have been written by some other person of the same name. There is also a tract which goes by the name of, "The Gospel of Barnabas," still extant; from

which Dr. White, at the end of his Bampton Lectures, has given extracts sufficiently copious to satisfy any impartial mind that it is spurious.

BARRENNESS. This was looked upon as reproachful among the Greeks and Romans, but more particularly so among the Jews; which may be accounted for by the constant expectation of Messiah, and the hope that every woman had, that she might be the mother of the promised seed. This constant hope of the speedy coming of the great "Seed of the woman" serves also to account for many circumstances in the Old Testament history. "Couple it," says the Rev. J. J. Blunt, "with this consideration, and I see the scheme of revelation, like the physical scheme, proceeding with beautiful uniformity: a unity of plan 'connecting,' as it has been well said by Paley, 'the chicken roosting upon its perch with the spheres revolving in the firmament;' and a unity of plan connecting in like manner the meanest accidents of a household with the most illustrious visions of a prophet. Abstracted from this consideration, I see in the history of Moses details of actions, some trifling, some even offensive, pursued at a length (when compared with the whole) singularly disproportionate; while things which the angels would desire to look into are passed over and forgotten. But this principle once admitted, all is consecrated; all assumes a new aspect; trifles, that seem at first not bigger than a man's hand, occupy the heavens; and wherefore Sarah laughed, for instance, at the prospect of a son, and wherefore that laugh was rendered immortal in his name; and wherefore the sacred historian dwells on a matter so trivial, whilst the world and its vast concerns were lying at his feet, I can fully understand. For then I see the hand of God shaping every thing to his own ends, and in an event thus casual, thus easy, thus unimportant, telling forth his mighty design of salvation to the world, and working it up into the web of his noble prospective counsels, Gen. xxi, 6. I see that nothing is great or little before Him who can bend to his purposes whatever he willeth, and convert the light-hearted and thoughtless mockery of an aged woman into an instrument of his glory, effectual as the tongue of the seer which he touched with living coals from the altar. Bearing this master-key in my hand, I can interpret the scenes of domestic mirth, of domestic stratagem, or of domestic wickedness, with which the history of Moses abounds. The Seed of the woman, that was to bruise the serpent's head, Gen. iii, 15, however indistinctly understood, (and probably it was understood very indistinctly,) was the one thing longed for in the families of old; was 'the desire of all nations,' as the Prophet Haggai expressly calls it, Hag. ii, 7; and, provided they could accomplish this desire, they (like others, when urged by an overpowering motive) were often reckless of the means, and rushed upon deeds which they could not defend. Then did the wife forget her jealousy, and provoke, instead of resenting, the faithlessness of her husband, Gen. xvi, 2; xxx, 3, 9; then did the mother forget a parent's part, and teach her

own child treachery and deceit, Gen. xxv, 23; xxvii, 13; then did daughters turn the instincts of nature backward, and deliberately work their own and their father's shame, Gen. xix, 31; then did the daughter-in-law veil her face, and court the incestuous bed, Gen. xxxviii, 14; and to be childless, was to be a by-word, Gen. xvi, 5; xxx, 1; and to refuse to raise up seed to a brother, was to be spit upon, Gen. xxxviii, 26; Deut. xxv, 9; and the prospect of the promise, like the fulfilment of it, did not send peace into families, but a sword; and three were set against two, and two against three, Gen. xxvii, 41; and the elder, who would be promoted unto honour, was set against the younger, whom God would promote, Gen. iv, 5; xxvii, 41; and national differences were engendered by it, as individuals grew into nations, Gen. xix, 37; xxvi, 35; and even the foulest of idolatries may be traced, perhaps, to this hallowed source; for the corruption of the best is the worst corruption of all, Num. xxv, 1, 2, 3. It is upon this principle of interpretation, and I know not upon what other so well, that we may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men, who have made those parts of the Mosaic history a stumbling-block to many, which, if rightly understood, are the very testimony of the covenant; and a principle which is thus extensive in its application and successful in its results; which explains so much that is difficult, and answers so much that is objected against, has, from this circumstance alone, strong presumption in its favour, strong claims upon our sober regard."

**BAR SABAS.** Joseph Barsabas, surnamed Justus, was one of the first disciples of Jesus Christ, and probably one of the seventy. When St. Peter proposed to the disciples to fill up the place of Judas the traitor, by choosing another Apostle, Acts i, 21, Barsabas was nominated along with Matthias; but the lot fell on Matthias, who was therefore numbered with the eleven Apostles. We know nothing farther of the life of this Barsabas.

2. Barsabas was also the surname of Judas, one of the principal disciples mentioned, Acts xv, 22, &c. Barsabas and some others were sent by the Apostles, with Paul and Barnabas, to Antioch, and carried a letter with them from the Apostles, signifying what the council at Jerusalem had decreed. After the reading of the letter to the brethren, which was received with joy, Barsabas and Silas continued here some time longer, instructing and confirming the brethren; after which Silas and Barsabas returned to Jerusalem. This is all we know of Barsabas Judas.

**BARTHOLOMEW,** one of the twelve Apostles, Matt. x, 3, is supposed to be the same person who is called Nathanael, one of the first of Christ's disciples. This opinion is founded on the circumstance, that as the evangelist John never mentions Bartholomew in the number of the Apostles, so the other evangelists never mention Nathanael. And as in John



i, 45, Philip and Nathanael are mentioned together as coming to Jesus, so in the other evangelists Philip and Bartholomew are constantly associated together. The supposition also acquires additional probability from considering, that Nathanael is particularly mentioned among the Apostles to whom Christ appeared at the sea of Tiberias, after his resurrection; Simon Peter, Thomas, and Nathanael, of Cana in Galilee; the sons of Zebedee, namely, James and John; with two other of his disciples, probably Andrew and Philip, John xxi, 2. It is an early tradition, that Bartholomew propagated the faith as far as India, and also in the more northern and western parts of Asia, and that he finally suffered martyrdom. But all the particulars respecting the life and labours of the Apostles, not mentioned in the New Testament, are exceedingly uncertain.

BARUCH, the son of Neriah, and grandson of Maaseiah, was of illustrious birth, and of the tribe of Judah. He had a brother of the name of Seraiah, who occupied an important station in the court of King Zedekiah; but he himself adhered to the person of the Prophet Jeremiah, and was his most steady friend, though his attachment to him drew on himself several persecutions and much ill treatment. He appears to have acted as his secretary during a great part of his life, and never left him till they were parted by death. In the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, A. M. 3398, Jeremiah having been thrown into prison, the Lord commanded him to commit to writing all the 137 prophecies that he had delivered until that time. He accordingly sent for Baruch, and dictated them to him by word of mouth. Some time afterward he instructed the latter to go and read them to the people, who were then assembled in the temple; on which Michaiah, who happened to be present, and heard them, instantly gave notice of them to the king's counsellors. The latter immediately sent for Baruch, and commanded him to repeat to them what he had been reading to the people in the temple; which he accordingly did, to their great astonishment: and, finding that they contained some very unwelcome tidings respecting the fate of the kingdom, they inquired how he came into possession of them; intimating that their duty to the king required that they should make him acquainted therewith. Baruch was at the same time advised to consult his own safety, and to let no man know where he was to be found; after which they took from him the roll of his prophecies, and deposited it in the chamber of Elishama, the scribe. They next waited on the king, and told him what had passed. The latter sent Jehudi to fetch the book; which being brought, Jehoiakim commanded it to be read in his presence, and in the presence of his nobles who surrounded him. But Jehudi had not proceeded far before the king took the book, cut it with his secretary's penknife, and threw it into the fire, where it was consumed before their faces. He at the same time gave orders to have both Baruch and Jeremiah seized; but the hand of Providence concealed them from his fury.

Jeremiah was instructed a second time to commit his prophecies to writing; and Baruch wrote them as before, with the addition of several others which were not contained in the former book. In the fourth year of the reign of Zedekiah, Baruch went to Babylon, carrying with him a long letter from Jeremiah, in which the Prophet foretold the judgments that should come upon Babylon, and promised the Jews, who were then captives in that country, that they should again be restored to their own land. The latter were exceedingly affected at hearing Jeremiah's letter read to them, and returned an answer to their brethren at Jerusalem. After his return to Jerusalem, Baruch continued his constant attendance on Jeremiah; and when Jerusalem was besieged by Nebuchadnezzar, and Jeremiah thrown into prison, Baruch also was confined with him: but when the city had surrendered, Nebuzaraddan showed him much kindness, granted him his liberty, and permitted him to go with Jeremiah wherever he chose.

The remnant of the people who had been left in Judea under the care of Gedaliah, having adopted the resolution of going into Egypt, and finding that Jeremiah opposed their taking that journey, threw the blame upon Baruch; insinuating that the latter had influenced the Prophet to declare against it. They were, however, both of them at last compelled to follow the people into Egypt, where Jeremiah soon afterward died; on which Baruch retired to Babylon, where the rabbins say he also died in the twelfth year of the captivity, Jer. xxxvi; xliii. The book of Baruch is justly placed among the apocryphal writings. Grotius thinks it a fiction written by some Hellenistic Jew; and St. Jerome gives as the reason why he did not write a commentary upon it, that the Jews themselves did not deem it canonical.

BASHAN, or BASAN, one of the most fertile cantons of Canaan, which was bounded on the west by the river Jordan, on the east by the mountains of Gilead, on the south by the brook of Jabbok, and on the north by the land of Geshur. The whole kingdom took its name from the hill of Bashan, which is situated in the middle of it, and by the Greeks is called *Batanæa*. It had no less than sixty walled towns in it, beside villages. It afforded an excellent breed of cattle, and stately oaks, and was, in short, a plentiful and populous country. Og, king of the Amorites, possessed this country when Moses made the conquest thereof. In the division of the Holy Land, it was assigned to the half tribe of Manasseh. Of the present state of this portion of the ancient possessions of the Israelites, Mr. Buckingham, in his *Travels*, gives the following account: "We ascended the steep on the north side of the Zerkah, or Jabbok; and, on reaching the summit, came again on a beautiful plain, of an elevated level, and still covered with a very rich soil. We had now quitted the land of Sihon, king of the Amorites, and entered into that of Og, the king of Bashan, both of them well known to all the

readers of the early Scriptures. We had quitted too, the districts apportioned to the tribes of Reuben and of Gad, and entered that part which was allotted to the half tribe of Manasseh, beyond Jordan eastward, leaving the land of the children of Ammon on our right, or to the east of the Jabbok, which, according to the authority before quoted, divided Ammon, or Philadelphia, from Gerasa. The mountains here are called the land of Gilead in the Scriptures, and in Josephus; and, according to the Roman division, this was the country of the Decapolis, so often spoken of in the New Testament, or the province of Gaulonitis, from the city of Gaulon, its early capital. We continued our way over this elevated tract, continuing to behold, with surprise and admiration, a beautiful country on all sides of us: its plains covered with a fertile soil, its hills clothed with forests; at every new turn presenting the most magnificent landscapes that could be imagined. Among the trees, the oak was frequently seen; and we know that this territory produced them of old. In enumerating the sources from which the supplies of Tyre were drawn in the time of her great wealth and naval splendour, the Prophet says, 'Of the oaks of Bashan have they made thine oars,' Ezek. xxvii, 6. Some learned commentators indeed, believing that no oaks grew in these supposed desert regions, have translated the word by 'alders,' to prevent the appearance of inaccuracy in the inspired writer. The expression of 'the fat bulls of Bashan,' which occurs more than once in the Scriptures, seemed to us equally inconsistent, as applied to the beasts of a country generally thought to be a desert, in common with the whole tract which is laid down in our modern maps as such between the Jordan and the Euphrates; but we could now fully comprehend, not only that the bulls of this luxuriant country might be proverbially fat, but that its possessors, too, might be a race renowned for strength and comeliness of person. The general face of this region improved as we advanced farther in it; and every new direction of our path opened upon us views which surprised and charmed us by their grandeur and their beauty. Lofty mountains gave an outline of the most magnificent character; flowing beds of secondary hills softened the romantic wildness of the picture; gentle slopes, clothed with wood, gave a rich variety of tints, hardly to be imitated by the pencil; deep valleys, filled with murmuring streams and verdant meadows, offered all the luxuriance of cultivation; and herds and flocks gave life and animation to scenes as grand, as beautiful, and as highly picturesque as the genius or taste of a Claude could either invent or desire."

**BASILIDEANS**, the followers of Basilides of Alexandria, a gnostic leader of the early part of the second century. See Gnostics.

**BASTARD**, one born out of wedlock. A bastard among the Greeks was despised, and exposed to public scorn, on account of his spurious origin. In Persia the son of a concubine is never placed on a footing with the

legitimate offspring; any attempt made by parental fondness to do so would be resented by the relations of the legitimate wife, and outrage the feelings of a whole tribe. The Jewish father bestowed as little attention on the education of his natural children as the Greek: he seems to have resigned them, in a great measure, to their own inclinations; he neither checked their passions, nor corrected their faults, nor stored their minds with useful knowledge. This is evidently implied in these words of the Apostle: "If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons," Heb. xii, 7, 8. To restrain the licentious desires of the heart, Jehovah by an express law fixed a stigma upon the bastard, which was not to be removed till the tenth generation; and to show that the precept was on no account to be violated, or suffered to fall into disuse, it is emphatically repeated, "A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the Lord," Deut. xxiii, 2.

**BASTINADO**, the punishment of beating with sticks. It is also called *tympanum*, [a drum,] because the patient was beaten like a drum. Upwards of a hundred blows were often inflicted, and sometimes the beating was unto death. St. Paul, Heb. xi, 35, says that some of the saints were tortured, *τυμπανίζω*, suffered the *tympanum*, that is, were stretched on an instrument of torture, and beaten to death.

**BAT**, *עטלע*, Lev. xi, 19; Deut. xiv, 18; Isaiah ii, 20; Baruch vi, 22. The Jewish legislator, having enumerated the animals legally unclean, as well beasts as birds, closes his catalogue with a creature whose equivocal properties seem to exclude it from both those classes: it is too much a bird to be properly a mouse, and too much a mouse to be properly a bird. The bat is therefore well described in Deut. xiv, 18, 19, as the passage should be read, "Moreover the othelaph, and every creeping thing that flieth, is unclean to you: they shall not be eaten." This character is very descriptive, and places this creature at the head of a class of which he is a clear and well-known instance. It has feet or claws growing out of its pinions, and contradicts the general order of nature, by creeping with the instruments of its flight. The Hebrew name of the bat is from *עטל* darkness, and *עף* to fly, as if it described "the flier in darkness." So the Greeks called the creature *νυκτερίς*, from *νύξ*, night; and the Latins, *vespertilio*, from *vesper*, "evening." It is prophesied, Isaiah ii, 20, "In that day shall they cast away their idols to the moles and to the bats;" that is, they shall carry them into the dark caverns, old ruins, or desolate places, to which they shall fly for refuge, and so shall give them up, and relinquish them to the filthy animals that frequent such places, and have taken possession of them as their proper habitation.

BATH, a measure of capacity for things liquid, being the same with the ephah, Ezek. xlvi, 11, and containing ten homers, or seven gallons and four pints.

BATH-KOL, בַּת־קוֹל, daughter of the voice. By this name the Jewish writers distinguish what they called a revelation from God, after verbal prophecy had ceased in Israel; that is, after the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. The generality of their traditions and customs are founded on this Bath-Kol. They pretend that God revealed them to their elders, not by prophecy, but by the daughter of the voice. The Bath-Kol, as Dr. Prideaux shows, was a fantastical way of divination, invented by the Jews, like the Sortes Virgilianæ [divination by the works of Virgil] among the Heathen. For, as with them, the words first opened upon in the works of that poet, was the oracle whereby they prognosticated those future events which they desired to be informed of; so with the Jews when they appealed to Bath-Kol, the next words which they should hear drop from any one's mouth were taken as the desired oracle. With some it is probable that Bath-Kol, the daughter of the voice, was only an elegant personification of tradition. Others, however, more bold, said that it was a voice from heaven, sometimes attended by a clap of thunder.

BATTLE. See Armies.

BAXTERIANISM, a modification of the Calvinistic doctrine of election advocated by the celebrated Baxter in his treatise of "Universal Redemption," and in his "Methodus Theologiæ." The real author of the scheme, at least in a systematized form, was Camero, who taught divinity at Saumur, and it was unfolded 139 and defended by his disciple Amyraldus, whom Curcellæus refuted. Baxter says, in his preface to his "Saint's Rest," "The middle way which Camero, Crocius, Martinius, Amyraldus, Davenant, with all the divines of Britain and Bremen in the synod of Dort, go, I think is nearest the truth of any that I know who have written on these points." Baxter first differs from the majority of Calvinists, though not from all, in his statement of the doctrine of satisfaction:--

"Christ's sufferings were not a fulfilling of the law's threatening; (though he bore its curse materially;) but a satisfaction for our not fulfilling the precept, and to prevent God's fulfilling the threatening on us. Christ paid not, therefore, the idem, but the tantundem, or æquivalens; not the very debt which we owed and the law required, but the value: (else it were not strictly satisfaction, which is redditio æquivalentis: [the rendering of an equivalent:]) and (it being improperly called the paying of a debt, but properly a suffering for the guilty) the idem is nothing but supplicium

delinquentis. [The punishment of the guilty individual.] In criminals, dum alius solvet simul aliud solvitur. [When another suffers, it is another thing also that is suffered.] The law knoweth no vicarius pœnæ; [substitute in punishment;] though the law maker may admit it, as he is above law; else there were no place for pardon, if the proper debt be paid and the law not relaxed, but fulfilled. Christ did neither obey nor suffer in any man's stead, by a strict, proper representation of his person in point of law; so as that the law should take it, as done or suffered by the party himself. But only as a third person, as a mediator, he voluntarily bore what else the sinner should have borne. To assert the contrary (especially as to particular persons considered in actual sin) is to overthrow all Scripture theology, and to introduce all Antinomianism; to overthrow all possibility of pardon, and assert justification before we sinned or were born, and to make ourselves to have satisfied God. Therefore, we must not say that Christ died nostro loco, [in our stead,] so as to personate us, or represent our persons in law sense; but only to bear what else we must have borne."

This system explicitly asserts, that Christ made a satisfaction by his death equally for the sins of every man; and thus Baxter essentially differs both from the higher Calvinists, and, also, from the Sublapsarians, who, though they may allow that the reprobate derive some benefits from Christ's death, so that there is a vague sense in which he may be said to have died for all men, yet they, of course, deny to such the benefit of Christ's satisfaction or atonement which Baxter contends for:--

"Neither the law, whose curse Christ bore, nor God, as the legislator to be satisfied, did distinguish between men as elect and reprobate, or as believers and unbelievers, de presenti vel de futuro; [with regard to the present or the future;] and to impose upon Christ, or require from him satisfaction for the sins of one sort more than of another, but for mankind in general. God the Father, and Christ the Mediator, now dealeth with no man upon the mere rigorous terms of the first law; (obey perfectly and live, else thou shalt die;) but giveth to all much mercy, which, according to the tenor of that violated law, they could not receive, and calleth them to repentance, in order to their receiving farther mercy offered them. And accordingly he will not judge any at last according to the mere law of works, but as they have obeyed or not obeyed his conditions or terms of grace. It was not the sins of the elect only, but of all mankind fallen, which lay upon Christ satisfying. And to assert the contrary, injuriously diminisheth the honour of his sufferings; and hath other desperate ill consequences."

The benefits derived to all men equally, from the satisfaction of Christ, he thus states:--

“All mankind, immediately upon Christ’s satisfaction, are redeemed and delivered from that legal necessity of perishing which they were under, (not by remitting sin or punishment directly to them, but by giving up God’s *jus puniendi* [right of punishing] into the hands of the Redeemer; nor by giving any right directly to them, but *per meram resultantiam* [by mere consequence] this happy change is made for them in their relation, upon the said remitting of God’s right and advantage of justice against them,) and they are given up to the Redeemer as their owner and ruler, to be dealt with upon terms of mercy which have a tendency to their recovery. God the Father and Christ the Mediator hath freely, without any prerequisite condition on man’s part, enacted a law of grace of universal extent, in regard of its tenor, by which he giveth, as a deed or gift, Christ himself, with all his following benefits which he bestoweth; (as benefactor and legislator;) and this to all alike, without excluding any; upon condition they believe and accept the offer. By this law, testament, or covenant, all men are conditionally pardoned, justified, and reconciled to God already, and no man absolutely; nor doth it make a difference, nor take notice of any, till men’s performance or non-performance of the condition makes a difference. In the new law Christ hath truly given himself with a conditional pardon, justification, and conditional right to salvation, to all men in the world, without exception.”

But the peculiarity of Baxter’s scheme will be seen from the following farther extracts:--

“Though Christ died equally for all men, in the aforesaid law sense, as he satisfied the offended legislator, and as giving himself to all alike in the conditional covenant; yet he never properly intended or purposed the actual justifying and saving of all, nor of any but those that come to be justified and saved; he did not, therefore, die for all, nor for any that perish, with a decree or resolution to save them, much less did he die for all alike, as to this intent. Christ hath given faith to none by his law or testament, though he hath revealed, that to some he will, as benefactor and *Dominus Absolutus*, [absolute Lord,] give that grace which shall infallibly produce it; and God hath given some to Christ that he might prevail with them accordingly; yet this is no giving it to the person, nor hath he in himself ever the more title to it, nor can any lay claim to it as their due. It belongeth not to Christ as satisfier, nor yet as legislator, to make wicked refusers to become willing, and receive him and the benefits which he offers; therefore he may do all for them that is fore-expressed, though he cure not their unbelief. Faith is a fruit of the death of Christ, (and so is all the good which we do enjoy,) but not directly, as it is satisfaction to justice; but only remotely, as it proceedeth from that *jus dominii* [right of dominion] which

Christ has received to send the Spirit in what measure and TO WHOM HE WILL, and to succeed it accordingly; and as it is necessary to the attainment of the farther ends of his death in the certain gathering and saving of THE ELECT.”

Thus the whole theory amounts to this, that, although a conditional salvation has been purchased by Christ for all men, and is offered to them, and all legal difficulties are removed out of the way of their pardon as sinners by the atonement, yet Christ hath not purchased for any man the gift of FAITH, or the power of performing the condition of salvation required; but gives this to some, and does not give it to others, by virtue of that absolute dominion over men which he has purchased for himself, so that, as the Calvinists refer the decree of election to the sovereignty of the Father, Baxter refers it to the sovereignty of the Son; one makes the decree of reprobation to issue from the Creator and Judge, the other, from the Redeemer himself.

If, however, any one expects to find something in the form of system in Baxter’s opinions on the five disputed points, he will be much disappointed. The parties to whom he refers as the authors of this supposed “middle way,” differ as much among themselves as Baxter occasionally does from himself. Bishop Davenant and Dr. S. Ward differed from Amyraut, Martinius, and others of that school, on the topic of baptismal regeneration; and, as the subjects of baptism, according to the sentiments of the two former, are invested with invisible grace, and are regenerated in virtue of the ordinance when canonically performed, such divines far more easily disposed of their baptized converts in the ranks of strict predestination, than the others could who did not hold those sentiments. But they exhibited much ingenuity in not suffering it to “intrench upon the question of perseverance.” Their friend Bishop Bedell, however, maintained, that “reprobates coming to years of discretion, after baptism, shall be condemned for original sin; for their absolution and washing in baptism was but conditional and expectative; which doth truly interest them in all the promises of God, but under the condition of repenting, believing and obeying, which they never perform, and therefore never attain the promise.” Bishop Overall has also been claimed as a patron of this diversified “middle system;” but it will be evident to every one who peruses his productions, that his chief endeavour was to display the doctrines of the English church as identical with those of St. Augustine, yet basing them upon the antecedent will of God and conditional decrees. After all the refined distinctions which Baxter employed to render the theory of common and special grace plausible and popular, the real meaning of the inventors was frequently elicited when such a question as this was asked, “Have any men in the world grace sufficient to repent and believe savingly



who do not?" After asserting that he knows nothing about the matter, the reply of Baxter is, "If we may conjecture upon probabilities, it seemeth most likely that there is such a sufficient grace, or power, to repent and believe savingly, in some that use it not, but perish." "This," says one of Baxter's apologists, "seems to me very inexplicable!" and in the same light it will be viewed by all who recollect that this "sufficient grace or power" is that "portion of special grace which never fails to accomplish its design,-the salvation of the individual on whom it is bestowed!" Baxter's celebrated "Aphorisms of Justification," published in 1649, afforded employment to himself and his theological critics till near the close of his life; and in the many modifications, concessions, and alterations which were extorted from him by men of different religious tenets, he sometimes incautiously proved himself to be more Calvinistic than Calvin, and at others more Arminian than Arminius. The following observations, from "Orme's Life of Baxter," are on the whole just and instructive:--

"Thus did Baxter, at a very early period of his life, launch into the ocean of controversy, on some of the most interesting subjects that can engage the human mind. The manner in which he began to treat them was little favourable to arriving at correct and satisfactory conclusions. Possessed of a mind uncommonly penetrating, he yet seems not to have had the faculty of compressing within narrow limits his own views, or the accounts he was disposed to give of the views of others. All this arose, not from any indisposition to be explicit, but from the peculiar character of his mind. He is perpetually distinguishing things into physical and moral, real and nominal, material and formal. However important these distinctions are, they often render his writings tiresome to the reader, and his reasonings more frequently perplexing than satisfactory. Baxter is generally understood to have pursued a middle course between Calvinism and Arminianism. That he tried to hold and adjust the balance between the two parties, and that he was most anxious to reconcile them, are very certain. But it seems scarcely less evident, that he was much more a Calvinist than he was an Arminian. While this seems to me very apparent, it must be acknowledged, that if certain views which have often been given of Calvinism are necessary to constitute a Calvinist, Richard Baxter was no believer in that creed.

"While satisfied that among Baxter's sentiments, no important or vital error will be found, yet in the style and method in which he too generally advocated or defended them, there is much to censure. The wrangling and disputatious manner in which he presented many of his views, was calculated to gender an unsanctified state of mind in persons who either abetted or opposed his sentiments. His scholastic and metaphysical style of arguing is unbecoming the simplicity of the Gospel, and cannot fail to injure

it wherever such is employed. It not only savours too much of the spirit of the schools, and the philosophy of this world; but places the truths of revelation on a level with the rudiments of human science. I am not sure whether certain effects which began early in the last century to appear among the Presbyterian part of the Nonconformists, may not be traced, in some degree, to the speculative and argumentative writings of Baxter. His influence over this class of his brethren was evidently very great. He contributed more than any other man to mitigate the harsh and forbidding aspect which the Presbyterians presented during the civil wars and the commonwealth. This was well, but he did not stop here. He was inimical to all the existing systems of doctrine and discipline then contended for, or ever before known in the world; while he did not present any precisely defined system as his own. He opposed Calvinism; he opposed Arminianism; he would not allow himself to be considered an Episcopalian, in the ordinary acceptance of the word; he denied that he was a Presbyterian, and scorned to be thought an Independent. He held something in common with them all, and yet he was somewhat different from all. He contended for a system more general, and more liberal, than was then approved; and, as we have stated, wished to place a variety of theological truths on grounds belonging rather to philosophy or metaphysics, than to revelation.

“On himself, this species of latitudinarianism produced little injurious effect, but I fear it had a baneful influence on others. The rejection of all human authority and influence in religion, requires to be balanced by a very strong sense of the divine authority, to prevent its generating a state of mind more characterized by pride of intellect, and independence of spirit, than by the humility and diffidence which are essential features in the Christian character. It is a singular fact, that the Presbyterians, though at first more rigid in their doctrinal views, and more exclusive in their spirit and system of church government, than the Independents, became before the death of Baxter the more liberal party. High views began to be ascribed by them to their now moderate brethren; and, to avoid the charge of Antinomianism, which Baxter was too ready to prefer against such as differed from some of his views, the Presbyterians seem gradually to have sunk into a state of low, moderate orthodoxy, in which there was little of the warmth or vitality of evangelical religion.

“In farther illustration of the influence now adverted to, it must be remarked, that the first stage in that process of deterioration which took place among the Presbyterian Dissenters, was generally characterized by the term Baxterianism; a word to which it is difficult to attach a definite meaning. It denotes no separate sect or party, but rather a system of opinions on doctrinal points, verging toward Arminianism, and which

ultimately passed to Arianism and Socinianism. Even during Baxter's own life, while the Presbyterians taxed the Independents with Antinomianism, the latter retorted the charge of Socinianism, or at least of a tendency toward it, in some of the opinions maintained both by Baxter and others of that party. To whatever cause it is to be attributed, it is a melancholy fact, that the declension which began even at this early period in the Presbyterian body, went on slowly, but surely, till, from the most fervid orthodoxy, it finally arrived at the frigid zone of Unitarianism.

“I wish not to be understood as stating that Baxter either held any opinions of this description, or was conscious of a tendency in his sentiments toward such a fearful consummation; but, that there was an injurious tendency in his manner of discussing certain important subjects. It was subtle, and full of logomachy; it tended to unsettle, rather than to fix and determine; it gendered strife, rather than godly edifying. It is not possible to study such books as his ‘Methodus,’ and his ‘Catholic Theology,’ without experiencing that we are brought into a different region from Apostolic Christianity; a region of fierce debate and altercation about words, and names, and opinions; in which all that can be said for error is largely dwelt upon, as well as what can be said for truth. The ambiguities of language, the diversities of sects, the uncertainties of human perception and argument are urged, till the force of revealed truth is considerably weakened, and confidence in our own judgment of its meaning greatly impaired. Erroneous language is maintained to be capable of sound meaning, and the most Scriptural phrases to be susceptible of unscriptural interpretation, till truth and error almost change places, and the mind is bewildered, confounded, and paralyzed. Into this mode of discussing such subjects, was this most excellent man led, partly by the natural constitution of his mind, which has often been adverted to; partly by his ardent desire of putting an end to the divisions of the Christian world, and producing universal concord and harmony. He failed where success was impossible, however plausible might have been the means which he employed. He understood the causes of difference and contention better than their remedies; hence the measures which he used frequently aggravated instead of curing the disease. While a portion of evil, however, probably resulted from Baxter's mode of conducting controversy, and no great light was thrown by him on some of the dark and difficult subjects which he so keenly discussed, I have no doubt he contributed considerably to produce a more moderate spirit toward each other, between Calvinists and Arminians, than had long prevailed. Though he satisfied neither party, he must have convinced both, that great difficulties exist on the subjects in debate, if pursued beyond a certain length; that allowance ought to be made by each, for the weakness or prejudices of the other; and that genuine religion is compatible with some diversity of opinion respecting one or all of the five points.” A similar

effect as that which Mr. Orme ascribes to Baxter's writings on the English Presbyterians, followed also, on the continent among the reformed churches. It was the same middle system with its philosophical subtleties, which Camero and Amyraut taught abroad, and which produced in them those effects that have been falsely ascribed, both in England and abroad, to Arminianism. See Amyraut and Cameron.

**BAY-TREE.** אֹרֵרָה. It is mentioned only in Psalm xxxvii, 35, 36: "I have seen the ungodly in great power, and flourishing like a green bay-tree. Yet he passed away, and lo, he was not. Yea, I sought him, but he could not be found." Aben Ezra, Jarchi, Kimchi, Jerom, and some others say that the original may mean only a native tree; a tree growing in its native soil, not having suffered by transplantation. Such a tree spreads itself luxuriantly. The Septuagint and Vulgate render it cedars; but the high Dutch of Luther's Bible, the old Saxon, the French, the Spanish, the Italian of Diodati, and the version of Ainsworth, make it the laurel.

**BDELLIUM,** בַּדְלֵה, occurs Gen. ii, 12, and Num. xi, 7. Interpreters seem at a loss to know what to do with this word, and have rendered it variously. Many suppose it a mineral production. The Septuagint translates in the first place, ἀνθράκω, a carbuncle, and in the second, κρύσταλλον, a crystal. The rabbins are followed by Reland in calling it a crystal; but some, instead of bedolah, read berolah, changing the ב into ר, which are not always easily distinguished, and are often mistaken by transcribers; and so render it the beryl, which, say they, is the prime kind of crystal. The bedoleh, in Genesis, is undoubtedly some precious stone; and its colour, mentioned in Numbers, where the manna is spoken of as of the colour of bdellium, is explained by a reference to Exod. xvi, 14, 31, where it is likened to hoar frost, which being like little fragments of ice, may confirm the opinion that the bdellium is the beryl, perhaps that pellucid kind, called by Dr. Hill the ellipomocrostyla, or beryl crystal.

**BEAN,** פֶּאָל, occurs 2 Sam. xvii, 28, and Ezek. iv, 9. A common legume. Those most usually cultivated in Syria are the white horse-bean, *faba rotunda oblonga*, and the kidney-bean, *phaseolis minimus*, fructu viridi ovato, called by the natives masch. The Arabic ban, the name of the coffee berry, corresponds with our bean, and is probably its etymon.

**BEAR.** That bears were common in Palestine appears from several passages of the Old Testament. Their strength, rapacity, and fierceness, furnish many expressive metaphors to the Hebrew poets. The Hebrew name of this animal is taken from his growling; so Varro deduces his Latin name *ursus* by an onomatopœia from the noise which he makes: "*ursi Lucana origo, vel unde illi, nostri ab ipsius voce:*" [the origin of the term

ursus (bear) is Lucanian, (whence also the bears themselves,) from the noise made by the animal.] David had to defend his flock against bears as well as lions, 1 Sam. xvii, 34. And Dr. Shaw gives us to understand that these rugged animals are not peculiar to the bleak regions of the north, being found in Barbary; and Thevenot informs us that they inhabit the wilderness adjoining the Holy Land, and that he saw one near the northern extremities of the Red Sea. The ferocity of the bear, especially when hungry or robbed of its whelps, has been mentioned by many authors. The Scripture alludes in three places to this furious disposition. The first is, 2 Sam. xvii, 8, "They be mighty men, and they be chafed in their minds as a bear robbed of her whelps in the field." The second, Prov. xvii, 12, "Let a bear robbed of her whelps meet a man rather than a fool in his folly." And the third, Hosea xiii, 8, "I will meet them as a bear that is bereaved of her whelps, and will rend the caul of their heart."

BEARD. The Hebrews wore their beards, but had, doubtless, in common with other Asiatic nations, several fashions in this, as in all other parts of dress. Moses forbids them, Lev. xix, 27, "to cut off entirely the angle, or extremity of their beard;" that is, to avoid the manner of the Egyptians, who left only a little tuft of beard at the extremity of their chins. The Jews, in some places, at this day suffer a little fillet of hair to grow from below the ears to the chin: where, as well as upon their lower lips, their beards are long. When they mourned, they entirely shaved the hair of their heads and beards, and neglected to trim their beards, to regulate them into neat order, or to remove what grew on their upper lips and cheeks, Jer. xli, 5; xlvi, 37. In times of grief and affliction, they plucked away the hair of their heads and beards, a mode of expression common to other nations under great calamities. The king of the Ammonites, designing to insult David in the person of his ambassadors, cut away half of their beards, and half of their clothes; that is, he cut off all their beard on one side of their faces, 2 Sam. x, 4, 5; 1 Chron. xix, 5. To avoid ridicule, David did not wish them to appear at his court till their beards were grown again. When a leper was cured of his leprosy, he washed himself in a bath, and shaved off all the hair of his body; after which, he returned into the camp, or city; seven days afterward, he washed himself and his clothes again, shaved off all his hair, and offered the sacrifices appointed for his purification, Lev. xiv, 9. The Levites, at their consecration, were purified by bathing, and washing their bodies and clothes; after which, they shaved off all the hair of their bodies, and then offered the sacrifices appointed for their consecration, Num. viii, 7.

Nothing has been more fluctuating in the different ages of the world and countries than the fashion of wearing the beard. Some have cultivated one part and some another; some have endeavoured to extirpate it entirely,

while others have almost idolized it; the revolutions of countries have scarcely been more famous than the revolutions of beards. It is a great mark of infamy among the Arabs to cut off the beard. Many people would prefer death to this kind of treatment. As they would think it a grievous punishment to lose it, they carry things so far as to beg for the sake of it: "By your beard, by the life of your beard, God preserve your blessed beard." When they would express their value for any thing, they say, "It is worth more than a man's beard." And hence we may easily learn the magnitude of the offence of the Ammonites in their treatment of David's ambassadors, as above mentioned; and also the force of the emblem used Ezek. v, 1–5, where the inhabitants of Jerusalem are compared to the hair of his head and beard. Though they had been dear to God as the hair of an eastern beard to its owner, they should be taken away and consumed, one part by pestilence and famine, another by the sword, another by the calamities incident on exile.

BEASTS. When this word is used in opposition to man, as Psalm xxxvi, 5, any brute creature is signified; when to creeping things, as Lev. xi, 2, 7; xxix, 30, four-footed animals, from the size of the hare and upward, are intended; and when to wild creatures, as Gen. i, 25, cattle, or tame animals, are spoken of. In Isaiah xiii, 21, several wild animals are mentioned as dwelling among the ruins of Babylon: "Wild beasts of the desert," ציִים, those of the dry wilderness, as the root of the word implies, "shall dwell there. Their houses shall be full of doleful creatures," אהִים, marsh animals. "Owls shall dwell there," ostriches, "and satyrs," שעִירִים, shaggy ones, "shall dance there. And the wild beasts of the islands," אִיִּים, oases of the desert, "shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons," תַּנִּינִים, crocodiles, or amphibious animals, "shall be in their desolate places." St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv, 32, speaks of fighting with beasts, &c: by which he does not mean his having been exposed in the amphitheatre to fight as a gladiator, as some have conjectured, but that he had to contend at Ephesus with the fierce uproar of Demetrius and his associates. Ignatius uses the same figure in his Epistle to the Romans: "From Syria even unto Rome I fight with wild beasts, both by sea and land, both night and day, being bound to ten leopards;" that is, to a band of soldiers. So Lucian, in like manner, says, "For I am not to fight with ordinary wild beasts, but with men, insolent and hard to be convinced." In Rev. iv, v, vi, mention is made of four beasts, or rather, as the word ζῶα signifies, living creatures, as in Ezek. i; and so the word might have been less harshly translated. Wild beasts are used in Scripture as emblems of tyrannical and persecuting powers. The most illustrious conquerors of antiquity also have not a more honourable emblem.

BED. Mattresses, or thick cotton quilts folded, were used for sleeping upon. These were laid upon the duan, or divan, a part of the room elevated above the level of the rest, covered with a carpet in winter, and a fine mat in summer. (See Accubation and Banquets.) A divan cushion serves for a pillow and bolster. They do not keep their beds made; the mattresses are rolled up, carried away, and placed in a cupboard till they are wanted at night. And hence the propriety of our Lord's address to the paralytic, "Arise, take up thy bed," or mattress, "and walk," Matt. ix, 6. The duan on which these mattresses are placed, is at the end of the chamber, and has an ascent of several steps. Hence Hezekiah is said to turn his face to the wall when he prayed, that is, from his attendants. In the day the duan was used as a seat, and the place of honour was the corner, Amos iii, 12.

BEELZEBUB, Matt. x, 25. See Baalzebub.

BEERSHEBA, or the well of the oath; so named from a well which Abraham dug in this place, and the covenant which he here made with Abimelech, king of Gerar, Gen. xx, 31. Here also he planted a grove, as it would appear, for the purpose of retirement for religious worship. In process of time, a considerable town was built on the same spot, which retained the same name. Beersheba was given by Joshua to the tribe of Judah, and afterward transferred to Simeon, Joshua xv, 28. It was situated twenty miles south of Hebron, in the extreme south of the land of Israel, as Dan was on the north. The two places are frequently thus mentioned in Scripture, as "from Dan to Beersheba," to denote the whole length of the country.

דבורה BEE, דבורה, occurs Deut. i, 44; Judges xiv, 8; Psalm cviii, 12; Isa. vii, 18. A well known, small, industrious insect; whose form, propagation, economy, and singular instinct and ingenuity, have attracted the attention of the most inquisitive and laborious inquirers into nature. Bees were very numerous in the east. Serid, or Seriad, means "the land of the hive;" and Canaan was celebrated as "a land flowing with milk and honey." The wild bees formed their comb in the crevices of the rocks, and in the hollows of decayed trees. The passage in Isa. vii, 8, which mentions the "hissing for the bee," is supposed to involve an allusion to the practice of calling out the bees from their hives, by a hissing or whistling sound, to their labour in the fields, and summoning them again to return when the heavens begin to lower, or the shadows of evening to fall. In this manner Jehovah threatens to rouse the enemies of Judah, and lead them to the prey. However widely scattered, or far remote from the scene of action, they should hear his voice, and with as much promptitude as the bee that has been taught to recognise the signal of its owner and obey his call, they should assemble their forces; and although weak and insignificant as a

swarm of bees, in the estimation of a proud and infatuated people, they should come, with irresistible might, and take possession of the rich and beautiful region which had been abandoned by its terrified inhabitants.

The bee is represented by the ancients as a vexatious and even a formidable enemy; and the experience of every person who turns his attention to the temper and habits of this insect attests the truth of their assertion. The allusion, therefore, of Moses to their fierce hostility, Deut. i, 44, is both just and beautiful: "The Amorites, which dwelt in that mountain, 144 came out against you, and chased you as bees do, and destroyed you in Seir even unto Hormah." The Amorites, it appears, were the most bitter adversaries to Israel of all the nations of Canaan. Like bees that are easily irritated, that attack with great fury and increasing numbers the person that dares to molest their hive, and persecute him in his flight to a considerable distance, the incensed Amorites had collected their hostile bands, and chased the Israelites from their territory. The Psalmist also complains that his enemies compassed him about like bees; fiercely attacking him on every side. From these allusions it would however appear, that the bees of the east were of a more quarrelsome temper than ours, which exist chiefly in a domesticated state.

BEETLE. **הרגל**. It occurs only Lev. xi, 22. A species of locust is thought to be there spoken of. The word still remains in the Arabic, and is derived from an original, alluding to the vast number of their swarms. Golius explains it of the locust without wings. The Egyptians paid a superstitious worship to the beetle. Mr. Molyneux, in the "Philosophical Transactions," says, "It is more than probable that this destructive beetle we are speaking of was that very kind of scarabæus, which the idolatrous Egyptians of old had in such high veneration as to pay divine worship unto it, and so frequently engrave its image upon their obelisks, &c, as we see at this day. For nothing can be supposed more natural than to imagine a nation, addicted to polytheism, as the Egyptians were, in a country frequently suffering great mischief and scarcity from swarms of devouring insects, should, from a strange sense and fear of evil to come, (the common principle of superstition and idolatry,) give sacred worship to the visible authors of these their sufferings, in hopes to render them more propitious for the future. See Fly and Locust.

BEHEMOTH. **בהמות**. This term has greatly tried the ingenuity of the critics. By some, among whom are Bythner and Reiske, it is regarded in Job xl, 16, as a plural noun for beasts in general: the peculiar name of the animal immediately described not being mentioned, as unnecessary, on account of the description itself being so easily applied at the time. In this sense it is translated in various passages in the Psalms. Thus, l, 10, in which it is



usually rendered cattle, as the plural of בהמה it means unquestionably a beast or brute, in the general signification of these words: "For every beast of the field is mine, and the cattle," behemoth, "upon a thousand hills." So again, Isa. lxxiii, 22: "So foolish was I, and ignorant; I was as a beast," behemoth, "before thee." It is also used in the same sense in chap. xxxv, 11, of the book of Job: "Who teacheth us more than the beasts," behemoth, "of the earth." The greater number of critics, however, have understood the word behemoth, in the singular number, as the peculiar name of the quadruped described, Job xl, of whatever kind or nature it may be; although they have materially differed upon this last point, some regarding it as the hippopotamus, or river horse, and others as the elephant. The evidence in favour of the hippopotamus appears, however, to predominate. The hippopotamus is nearly as large as the rhinoceros. The male has been found seventeen feet in length, fifteen in circumference, and seven in height. The head is enormously large, and the jaws extend upwards two feet, and are armed with four cutting teeth, each of which is twelve inches in length. The body is of a lightish colour, thinly covered with hair. The legs are three feet long. Though amphibious, the hoofs, which are quadrifid, are not connected by membranes. The hide is so thick and tough as to resist the edge of a sword or sabre. Although an inhabitant of the waters, the hippopotamus is well known to breathe air like land animals. On land, indeed, he finds the chief part of his food. It has been pretended that he devours vast quantities of fish; but it appears with the fullest evidence, both from the relations of many travellers, and from the structure of the stomach, in specimens that have been dissected, that he is nourished solely, or almost solely, on vegetable food. Though he feeds upon aquatic plants, yet he very often leaves the waters, and commits wide devastations through all the cultivated fields adjacent to the river. Unless when accidentally provoked, or wounded, he is never offensive; but when he is assaulted or hurt, his fury against the assailants is terrible. He will attack a boat, break it in pieces with his teeth; or, where the river is not too deep, he will raise it on his back and upset it. If he be irritated when on shore, he will immediately betake himself to the water; and there, in his native element, shows all his strength and resolution.

BEHMENISTS, a name given to those mystics who adopted the explication of the mysteries of nature and grace, as given by Jacob Behmen. This writer was born in the year 1575, at Old Siedenburg, near Gorlitz, in Upper Lusatia. He was a shoemaker by trade, and is described as having been thoughtful and religious from his youth up, taking peculiar pleasure in frequenting the public worship. At length, seriously considering within himself that speech of our Saviour, "Your heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him," he was thereby awakened to desire that promised Comforter; and, continuing in that earnestness, he was at

last, to use his own expression, “surrounded with a divine light for seven days, and stood in the highest contemplation and kingdom of joys!” After this, about the year 1600, he was again surrounded with a divine light and replenished with the heavenly knowledge; insomuch as, going abroad into the fields, and viewing the herbs and grass, by his inward light, he saw into their essences, uses, and properties, which were discovered to him by their lineaments, figures, and signatures. In the year 1610, he had a third special illumination, wherein still farther mysteries were revealed to him; but it was not till the year 1612 that Behmen committed these revelations to writing. His first treatise is entitled, “Aurora,” which was seized by the 145senate of Gorlitz before it was completed. His next production is called, “The Three Principles,” by which he means the dark world, or hell; the light world, or heaven; and the external, or visible world, which we inhabit. In this work he more fully illustrates the subjects treated of in the former, and supplies what is wanting in that work, showing, 1. How all things came from a working will of the holy, triune, incomprehensible God, manifesting himself as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, through an outward, perceptible, working, triune power of fire, light, and spirit, in the kingdom of heaven. 2. How and what angels and men were in their creation; that they are in and from God, his real offspring; that their life begun in and from this divine fire, which is the Father of Light, generating a birth of light in their souls; from both which proceeds the Holy Spirit, or breath of divine love, in the triune creature, as it does in the triune Creator. 3. How some angels, and all men, are fallen from God, and their first state of a divine triune life in him; what they are in their fallen state, and the difference between the fall of angels and that of man. 4. How the earth, stars, and elements were created in consequence of the fall of angels. 5. Whence there is good and evil in all this temporal world; and what is meant by the curse that dwells in it. 6. Of the kingdom of Christ, how it is set in opposition to the kingdom of hell. 7. How man, through faith in Christ, is able to overcome the kingdom of hell, and thereby obtain eternal salvation. 8. How and why sin and misery shall only reign for a time, until God shall, in a supernatural way, make fallen man rise to the glory of angels, and this material system shake off its curse, and enter into an everlasting union with that heaven from whence it fell.

The next year, Behmen produced his “Three-fold Life of Man,” according to the three principles above mentioned. In this work he treats more largely of the state of man in this world: that he has, 1. That immortal spark of life, which is common to angels and devils. 2. That divine life of the light and Spirit of God, which makes the essential difference between an angel and a devil; and, 3. The life of this external and visible world. The first and last are common to all men; but the second only to a true Christian, or child of God. Behmen wrote several other treatises; but these are the basis of all his

other writings. His conceptions are often clothed under allegorical symbols; and, in his later works, he frequently adopted chemical and Latin phrases, which he borrowed from conversation with learned men. But as to the matter contained in his writings, he disclaims having borrowed it either from men or books. He died in the year 1624; and his last words were, "Now I go hence into paradise!" Behmen's principles were adopted by Mr. Law, who clothed them in a more modern dress, and in a style less obscure. The essential obscurity of the subjects indeed he could not remedy. If they were understood by the author himself, he is probably the only one who ever made that attainment.

BEL, or Belus, a name by which many Heathens, and particularly the Babylonians, called their chief idol. But whether under this appellation they worshipped Nimrod, their first Baal, or lord, or Pul, king of Assyria, or some other monarch, or the sun, or all in one, is uncertain. It is, however, probable, that Bel is the same as the Phenician Baal, and that the worship of the same deity passed over to the Carthaginians, who were a colony of Phenicians. Hence the names Hannibal, Asdrubal, &c, compounded with Bel or Baal, according to the custom of the east, where great men added the names of the gods to their own. Bel had a temple erected to him in the city of Babylon, on the very uppermost range of the famous tower of Babel, wherein were many statues of this pretended deity; and one, among the rest, of massy gold, forty feet high. The whole furniture of this magnificent temple was of the same metal, and valued at eight hundred talents of gold. This temple, with its riches, was in being till the time of Xerxes, who, returning from his unfortunate expedition into Greece, demolished it, and carried off the immense wealth which it contained. It was, probably, the statue of this god which Nebuchadnezzar, being returned to Babylon after the end of the Jewish war, set up and dedicated in the plain of Dura; the story of which is related at large, Dan. iii. See Babel.

Bel and the Dragon, an apocryphal and uncanonical book. It was always rejected by the Jewish church, and is extant neither in the Hebrew, nor in the Chaldee languages; nor is there any proof that it ever was so, although the council of Trent allowed it to be part of the canonical book of Daniel, in which it stands in the Latin Vulgate. There are two Greek texts of this fragment, that of the Septuagint, and that found in Theodotion's Greek version of Daniel. The Latin and Arabic versions are from the text of Theodotion. Daniel probably, by detecting the mercenary contrivances of the idolatrous priests of Babylon, and by opening the eyes of the people to the follies of superstition, might furnish some foundation for the story; but the whole is evidently charged with fiction, though introduced with a pious intent. St. Jerom gives it no better title than, "The fable of Bel and the Dragon." Selden thinks that this history ought rather to be considered as a

poem or fiction, than a true account: as to the dragon, he observes, that serpents, dracones, made a part of the hidden mysteries of the Pagan religion, as appears from Clemens Alexandrinus, Julius Firmicus, Justin Martyr, and others. See Serpent.

**BELIAL.** The phrase, “sons of Belial,” signifies wicked, worthless men. It was given to the inhabitants of Gibeah, who abused the Levite’s wife, Judges xix, 22; and to Hophni and Phineas, the wicked and profane sons of Eli, 1 Samuel ii, 12. In later times the name Belial denoted the devil: “What concord hath Christ with Belial?” 2 Cor. vi, 15; for as the word literally imports “one who will do no one good,” the positive sense of a doer of evil was applied to Satan, who is the author of evil, and, eminently, “the Evil One.”

**BELLS.** Moses ordered that the lower part of the blue robe, which the high priest wore in religious ceremonies, should be adorned with pomegranates and bells, intermixed alternately, at equal distances. The pomegranates were of wool, and in colour, blue purple, and crimson; the bells were of gold. Moses adds, “And it shall be upon Aaron to minister; and his sound shall be heard when he goeth in unto the holy place before the Lord, and when he cometh out; that he die not.” Some of the Hebrews believe that these little bells are round; others, that they were such as were commonly in use. The ancient kings of Persia are said to have had the hem of their robes adorned like that of the Jewish high priest, with pomegranates and golden bells. The Arabian ladies, who are about the king’s person, have little gold bells fastened to their legs, their neck, and elbows, which, when they dance, make a very agreeable harmony. The Arabian women of rank, generally, wear on their legs large hollow gold rings, containing small flints, that sound like little bells when they walk; or they are large circles, with little rings hung all round, which produce the same effect. These, when they walk, give notice that the mistress of the house is passing, that so the servants of the family may behave themselves respectfully, and strangers may retire, to avoid seeing the person who advances. It was, in all probability, with some such design of giving notice that the high priest was passing, that he also wore little bells at the hem of his robe. Their sound intimated also when he was about to enter the sanctuary, and served to keep up the attention of the people. A reverential respect for the Divine Inhabitant was also indicated. The palace of kings was not to be entered without due notice, by striking some sonorous body, much less the sanctuary of God; and the high priest did, by the sound of his bells at the bottom of his robe, ask leave to enter. “And his sound shall be heard when he goeth into the holy place before the Lord, and when he cometh out; that he die not.”

Bells were a part of the martial furniture of horses employed in war. The Jewish warrior adorned his charger with these ornaments; and the prophet foretels that these in future times should be consecrated to the service of God: "In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, Holiness unto the Lord." Chardin observes that something like this is seen in several places of the east; in Persia, and in Turkey, the reins of their bridles are of silk, of the thickness of a finger, on which are wrought the name of God, or other inscriptions. A horse which had not been trained was by the Greeks called, "one that had never heard the noise of bells."

BELLY is used in Scripture for gluttony, Titus i, 12; Philip iii, 16; Rom. xvi, 18. For the heart, or the secrets of the mind, Prov. xx, 27, 30; xxii, 18. The "belly of hell" signifies the grave, or some imminent danger, or deep distress, Jonah ii, 2; Eccus. ii, 5.

BELSHAZZAR, the last king of Babylon, and, according to Hales and others, the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. v, 18. During the period that the Jews were in captivity at Babylon, a variety of singular events concurred to prove that the sins which brought desolation on their country, and subjected them for a period of seventy years to the Babylonish yoke, had not dissolved that covenant relation which, as the God of Abraham, Jehovah had entered into with them; and that any act of indignity perpetrated against an afflicted people, or any insult cast upon the service of their temple, would be regarded as an affront to the Majesty of heaven, and not suffered to pass with impunity, though the perpetrators were the princes and potentates of the earth. Belshazzar was a remarkable instance of this. He had an opportunity of seeing, in the case of his ancestor, how hateful pride is, even in royalty itself; how instantly God can blast the dignity of the brightest crown, and reduce him that wears it to a level with the beasts of the field; and consequently how much the prosperity of kings and the stability of their thrones depend upon acknowledging that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." But all these awful lessons were lost upon Belshazzar.

The only circumstances of his reign, recorded, are the visions of the Prophet Daniel, in the first and third years, Dan. vii, 1; viii, 1; and his sacrilegious feast and violent death, Dan. v, 1–30. Isaiah, who represents the Babylonian dynasty as "the scourge of Palestine," styles Nebuchadnezzar "a serpent," Evil Merodach "a cockatrice," and Belshazzar "a fiery flying serpent," the worst of all, Isaiah xiv, 4–29. And Xenophon confirms this prophetic character by two atrocious instances of cruelty and barbarity, exercised by Belshazzar upon some of his chief and most deserving nobles. He slew the only son of Gobryas, in a transport of rage, because at a hunting match he hit with his spear a bear, and afterward

a lion, when the king had missed both; and in a fit of jealousy, he brutally castrated Gadatus, because one of his concubines had commended him as a handsome man. His last and most heinous offence was the profanation of the sacred vessels belonging to the temple of Jerusalem, which his wise grandfather, and even his foolish father Evil Merodach, had respected. Having made a great feast for a thousand of his lords, he ordered those vessels to be brought during the banquet, that he, his princes, his wives, and his concubines, might drink out of them, which they did; and to aggravate sacrilege by apostasy and rebellion, and ingratitude against the Supreme Author of all their enjoyments, “they praised the gods of gold, silver, brass, iron, and stone, but the God in whose hand was their breath, and whose were all their ways, they praised or glorified not.” For these complicated crimes his doom was denounced in the midst of the entertainment; a divine hand appeared, which wrote on the plaister of the wall, opposite to the king, and full in his view, a mysterious inscription. This tremendous apparition struck Belshazzar with the greatest terror and agony: “his countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote against each other.” This is one of the liveliest and finest amplifications of dismay to be found throughout the sacred classics, and infinitely exceeds, both in accuracy and force, the most admired of the Heathen; such as “*et corde et genibus tremit,*” of Horace, and “*tarda trementi genua labant,*” of Virgil.

Unable himself to decypher the writing, Belshazzar cried aloud to bring in the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers, promising that whosoever should read the writing, and explain to him its meaning, should be clothed with scarlet, have a chain of gold about his neck, and be the third ruler in his kingdom. But the writing was too difficult for the Magi; at which the king was still more greatly troubled. In this crisis, and at the instance of the queen mother, the Prophet Daniel was sent for, to whom honours were promised, on condition of his explaining the writing. Daniel refused the honours held out to him; but having with great faithfulness pointedly reproved the monarch for his ingratitude to God who had conferred on him such dignity, and particularly for his profanation of the vessels which were consecrated to his service, he proceeded to the interpretation of the words which had been written, and still stood visible on the wall. They were, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin. “This is the interpretation of the thing, Mene, ‘God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it;’ Tekel, ‘thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting;’ Peres, ‘thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians.’” In that very night, in the midst of their mirth and revelling, the city was taken by surprise, Belshazzar himself put to death, and the kingdom transferred to Darius the Mede. If the character of the hand-writing was known to the Magi of Babylon, the meaning could not be conjectured. Perhaps, however,

the character was that of the ancient Hebrew, or what we now call the Samaritan; and in that case it would be familiar to Daniel, though rude and unintelligible to the Chaldeans. But even if Daniel could read the words, the import of this solemn graphic message to the proud and impious monarch could only have been made known to the prophet by God. All the ideas the three words convey, are numbering, weighing, and dividing. It was only for the power which sent the omen to unfold, not in equivocal terms, like the responses of Heathen oracles, but in explicit language, the decision of the righteous Judge, the termination of his long suffering, and the instant visitation of judgment. See Babylon.

BELUS, a river of Palestine. On leaving Acre, and turning toward the south-east, the traveller crosses the river Belus, near its mouth, where the stream is shallow enough to be easily forded on horseback. This river rises out of a lake, computed to be about six miles distant, toward the south-east, called by the ancients Palus Cendovia. Of the sand of this river, according to Pliny, glass was first made; and ships from Italy continued to convey it to the glass houses of Venice and Genoa, so late as the middle of the seventeenth century.

BENEDICTION, in a general sense, the act of blessing in the name of God, or of giving praise to God, or returning thanks for his favours. Hence benediction is the act of saying grace before or after meals. Neither the ancient Jews, nor Christians, ever ate without a short prayer. The Jews are obliged to rehearse a hundred benedictions every day; of which, eighty are to be spoken in the morning. Rabbi Nehemiah Baruch, in 1688, published a discourse on the manner wherein the sacerdotal benediction is to be pronounced. In the synagogue of Ferrara, it is rather sung than spoken. Among the ancient Jews, as well as Christians, benedictions were attended with the imposition of hands; and Christians, in process of time, added the sign of the cross, which was made with the same hand, elevated or extended. Hence, in the Romish church, benediction was used to denote the sign of the cross, made by a bishop or prelate, from an idea that it conferred some grace on the people. The custom of receiving benediction by bowing the head before the bishops, is very ancient; and was so universal, that emperors themselves did not decline this mark of submission. Under the name benediction the Hebrews also frequently understood the presents which friends made to one another; in all probability because they were generally attended with blessings and prayers, both from those who gave and those who received them. The solemn blessing pronounced by the Jewish high priest upon the people, is recorded Num. vi, 22, &c: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: the Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." The great Christian

benediction is, “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God the Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you always.” See Blessing.

BENHADAD, the son of Tibrimon, king of Syria, came to the assistance of Asa, king of Judah, against Baasha, king of Israel, obliging the latter to return home and succour his own country, and to abandon Ramah, which he had undertaken to fortify, 1 Kings xv, 18. This Benhadad is thought by some to have been the same person with Hadad the Edomite, who rebelled against Solomon toward the end of that prince’s reign, 1 Kings xi, 25.

2. Benhadad, king of Syria, son of the preceding, made war upon Ahab, king of Israel, but was defeated. In the following year, however, he came with a most powerful army to Aphek, where Ahab again engaged him, killed a hundred thousand of his men, and the remainder endeavouring to take refuge in Aphek, the walls of the city fell upon them, and killed twenty-seven thousand more. Thus completely defeated, Benhadad submitted to beg his life of the king of Israel, who not only granted his request, but gave him his liberty, and restored him to his crown upon certain conditions, 1 Kings xx. Twelve years afterward, A. M. 3115, Benhadad declared war against Jehoram, the son and successor of Ahab, 2 Kings vi, 8; but his designs were made known to Jehoram by the Prophet Elisha, and they were accordingly frustrated. Suspecting some treachery in this affair, Benhadad was informed that all his projects were revealed to his enemy by Elisha, and getting intelligence that the latter was at Dothan, he sent a detachment of his best troops to invest the city and apprehend the prophet; but they were struck with blindness at Elisha’s prayer, so that they were unable to distinguish him, when he was in the midst of them and held a conversation with them. He then led them into the city of Samaria, and having conducted them safely there, he prayed to God again to open their eyes, and induced Jehoram to dismiss them without violence. Generous as this conduct was, it produced no salutary effect on the infatuated Benhadad; for about four years afterward, he laid close siege to Samaria, and reduced the city to such distress that the head of an ass, which the Israelites considered to be an unclean animal, was sold for fourscore pieces of silver, about 2l. 9s. sterling; and the fourth part of a cab of dove’s dung, or rather three quarters of a pint of chick pease, as Bochart understands the word, for five pieces of silver. In fact, such was the pressure of the famine at this time in Samaria, that mothers were constrained to eat their own children. Jehoram, hearing of these calamities, attributed them to Elisha, and sent orders to have him put to death; but before his messengers could reach the prophet’s house, he came thither himself. Elisha predicted that the next day, about the same hour, a measure of fine flour would be sold at the gate of Samaria for a shekel, which, however incredible at the moment,



proved to be the case; for in the night, a general panic, supernaturally induced, pervaded the Syrian camp; they imagined that Jehoram had procured an army of Egyptians to come to his assistance, and, abandoning their horses, tents, and provisions, they all took to flight. Four lepers, whose disease did not permit them to live within the city, and being ready to perish with hunger, ventured into the Syrian camp; and finding it deserted, and at the same time abounding with all sorts of provisions, communicated the information to Jehoram. The king immediately rose, though in the middle of the night; but reflecting that probably it was only a stratagem of Benhadad to draw his people out of the town, he first sent parties to reconnoitre. They, however, speedily returned, and informed him that the enemy was fled, and that the roads were every where strewed with arms and garments, which the Syrians had abandoned to facilitate their flight. As soon as the news was confirmed, the Samaritans went out, pillaged the Syrian camp, and brought in such quantities of provisions, that a measure of fine flour was, at the time specified by Elisha, sold at the gate of Samaria for a shekel, 2 Kings vii.

The following year, A. M. 3120, Benhadad fell sick, and sent Hazael, one of his officers, with forty camels, loaded with valuable presents, to the Prophet Elisha, to interrogate him, whether or not he should recover of his indisposition. Elisha fixed his eyes steadfastly on Hazael, and then burst into tears: "Go," said he, "and tell Benhadad, Thou mayest certainly recover; though the Lord hath showed me that he shall assuredly die." He at the same time apprised Hazael that he himself would reign in Syria, and do infinite mischief to Israel. Hazael on this returned and told Benhadad that his health should be restored. But on the next day he took a thick cloth, which, having dipped in water, he spread over the king's face and stifled him. He then took possession of the kingdom of Syria, according to the prediction of Elisha, 2 Kings viii.

3. Benhadad, the son of Hazael, mentioned in the preceding article, succeeded his father as king of Syria, 2 Kings xiii, 24. During his reign, Jehoash, king of Israel, recovered from him all that his father Hazael had taken from Jehoahaz his predecessor. He defeated him in three several engagements, and compelled him to surrender all the country beyond Jordan, 2 Kings xiii, 25.

BENI KHAIBIR, sons of Keber, the descendants of the Rechabites, to whom it was promised, Jer. xxxv, 19, "Thus saith the Lord, Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me for ever." They were first brought into notice in modern times by Mr. Samuel Brett, who wrote a narrative of the proceedings of the great council of the Jews in Hungary, A. D. 1650. He says of the sect of the Rechabites, "that they

observe their old rules and customs, and neither sow, nor plant, nor build houses; but live in tents, and often remove from one place to another with their whole property and families.” They are also mentioned in Neibuhr’s travels. Mr. Wolff, a converted Jew, gives the following account in a late journal. He inquired of the rabbins at Jerusalem, relative to these wandering Jews, and received the following information: “Rabbi Mose Secot is quite certain that the Beni Khaibir are descendants of the Rechabites; at this present moment they drink no wine, and have neither vineyard, nor field, nor seed; but dwell, like Arabs, in tents, and are wandering nomades. They receive and observe the law of Moses by tradition, for they are not in possession of the written law.” Mr. Wolff afterward himself visited this people, who have remained, amidst all the changes of nations, a most remarkable monument of the exact fulfilment of a minute, and apparently at first sight an unimportant, prophecy. So true is it, that not one jot or tittle of the word of God shall pass away! See Rechabites.

**BENJAMIN**, the youngest son of Jacob and Rachel, who was born, A. M. 2272. Jacob, being on his journey from Mesopotamia, as he was proceeding southward with Rachel in the company, Gen. xxxv, 16, 17, &c, the pains of child-bearing came upon her, about a quarter of a league from Bethlehem, and she died after the delivery of a son, whom, with her last breath, she named Benoni, that is, “the son of my sorrow;” but soon afterward Jacob changed his name, and called him Benjamin, that is, “the son of my right hand.” See Joseph.

**BEREA**, a city of Macedonia, where St. Paul preached the Gospel with great success, and where his hearers were careful to compare what they heard with the scriptures of the Old Testament, Acts, xvii, 10; for which they are commended, and held out to us as an example of subjecting every doctrine to the sole test of the word of God.

**BERNICE**, the daughter of Agrippa, surnamed the Great, king of the Jews, and sister to young Agrippa, also king of the Jews. This lady was first betrothed to Mark, the son of Alexander Lysimachus, albarach of Alexandria; afterward she married Herod, king of Chalcis, her own uncle by the father’s side. After the death of Herod, which happened A. D. 48, she was married to Polemon, king of Pontus, but did not long continue with him. She returned to her brother Agrippa, and with him heard the discourse which Paul delivered before Festus, Acts xxv.

**BERYL**, **תְּרִשִׁי**, a pellucid gem of a bluish green colour, whence it is called by the lapidaries, aqua marina. Its Hebrew name is a word also for the same reason given to the sea, Psalm xlvi, 7. It is found in the East Indies, Peru,

Siberia, and Tartary. It has a brilliant appearance, and is generally transparent. It was the tenth stone belonging to the high priest's pectoral, Exod. xxviii, 10, 20; Rev. xxi, 20.

BETHABARA, or BETHBARAH, signifies in the Hebrew a place of passage, because of its ford over the river Jordan, on the east bank of which river it stood over against Jericho, Joshua ii, 7; iii, 15, 16. To this place Gideon sent a party to secure the passage of the river, previous to his attack on the Midianites, Judges vii, 24. Here John commenced his baptizing, and here Christ himself was baptized, John i, 28. To this place, also, Jesus retired, when the Jews sought to take him at the feast of dedication; and many who resorted there to him believed on him, John x, 39–42.

BETHANY, a considerable place, situated on the ascent of the mount of Olives, about two miles from Jerusalem, John xi, 18; Matt. xxi, 17; xxvi, 6, &c. Here it was that Martha and Mary lived, with their brother Lazarus, whom Jesus raised from the dead; and it was here that Mary poured the perfume on our Saviour's head. Bethany at present is but a very small village. One of our modern travellers tells us, that, at the entrance into it, there is an old ruin, called the castle of Lazarus, supposed to have been the mansion house where he and his sisters resided. At the bottom of a descent, not far from the castle, you see his sepulchre, which the Turks hold in great veneration, and use it for an oratory, or place for prayer. Here going down by twenty-five steps, you come at first into a small square room, and from thence creep into another that is smaller, about a yard and a half deep, in which the body is said to have been laid. About a bow-shot from hence you pass by the place which they say was Mary Magdalene's house; and thence descending a steep hill, you come to the fountain of the Apostles, which is so called because, as the tradition goes, these holy persons were wont to refresh themselves there between Jerusalem and Jericho,—as it is very probable they might, because the fountain is close to the road side, and is inviting to the thirsty traveller. Bethany is now a poor village, but pleasantly situated, says Dr. Richardson, on the shady side of the mount of Olives, and abounds in trees and long grass.

BETHAVEN, the same with Bethel. This city, upon the revolt of the ten tribes, belonged to the kingdom of Israel, and was therefore one of the cities in which Jeroboam set up his golden calves. Whence the prophet in derision calls it, "Bethaven," the house of vanity or idols, Hosea iv, 15, instead of "Bethel," the house of God, the name which Jacob formerly gave it, when he had the vision of the mysterious ladder, reaching from earth to heaven, Gen. xxviii, 19.

BETHEL, a city which lay to the west of Ai, about eight miles to the north of Jerusalem, in the confines of the tribe of Ephraim and Benjamin. Here Jacob slept and had his vision. The name of this city had formerly been Luz, which signifies an almond, and was probably so called from the number of almond trees which grew in those parts. See Jacob.

BETHESDA. This word signifies the house of mercy, and was the name of a pool, or public bath, at Jerusalem, which had five porticos, piazzas, or covered walks around it. This bath was called Bethesda, because, as some observe, the erecting of baths was an act of great kindness to the common people, whose infirmities in hot countries required frequent bathing; but the generality of expositors think it had this name rather from the great goodness of God manifested to his people, in bestowing healing virtues upon its waters. The account of the evangelist is, "Now there was at Jerusalem, by the sheep market, a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue, Bethesda, having five porches. In these lay a multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water; for an angel went down at a certain season into the pool: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had," John v, 2-4. The genuineness of the fourth verse has been disputed, because it is wanting in some ancient MSS, and is written in the margin of another as a scholion; but even were the spuriousness of this verse allowed, for which, however, the evidence is by no means satisfactory, the supernatural character of the account, as it is indicated by the other parts of the narrative, remains unaffected. The agitation of the water; its suddenly healing virtue as to all diseases; and the limitation to the first that should go in, are all miraculous circumstances. Commentators have however resorted to various hypotheses to account for the whole without divine agency. Dr. Hammond says, "The sacrifices were exceedingly numerous at the 150<sup>th</sup> passover, κατὰ καιρὸν, (once a year, Chrysostom,) when the pool being warm from the immediate washing of the blood and entrails, and thus adapted to the cure of the blind, the withered, the lame, and perhaps the paralytic, was yet farther troubled, and the congelations and grosser parts stirred up by an officer or messenger, ἄγγελος, to give it the full effect." To this hypothesis Whitby acutely replies, 1. How could this natural virtue be adapted to, and cure, all kinds of diseases? 2. How could the virtue only extend to the cure of one man, several probably entering at the same instant? 3. How unlikely is it, if natural, to take place only at one certain time, at the passover? for there was a multitude of sacrifices slain at other of the feasts. 4. Lastly, and decisively, Lightfoot shows that there was a laver in the temple for washing the entrails; therefore they were not washed in this pool at all.

Others, however, suppose that the blood of the victims was conveyed from the temple to this pool by pipes; and Kuinoel thinks that it cannot be denied that the blood of animals recently slaughtered may impart a medicinal property to water; and he refers to Richter's "Dissertat. de Balneo Animali," and Michaelis in loc. But he admits that it cannot be proved whether the pool was situated out of the city at the sheep gate, or in the city, and in the vicinity of the temple; nor that the blood of the victims was ever conveyed thither by canals. Kuinoel justly observes, that though in Josephus no mention is made of the baths here described, yet this silence ought not to induce us to question the truth of this transaction; since the historian omits to record many other circumstances which cannot be doubted; as, for instance, the census of Augustus, and the murder of the infants. This critic also supposes that St. John only acts the part of an historian, and gives the account as it was current among the Jews, without vouching for its truth, or interposing his own judgment. Mede follows in the track of absurdly attempting to account for the phenomenon on natural principles:--"I think the water of this pool acquired a medicinal property from the mud at its bottom, which was heavy with metallic salts,--sulphur perhaps, or alum, or nitre. Now this would, from the water being perturbed from the bottom by some natural cause, perhaps subterranean heat, or storms, rise upward and be mingled with it, and so impart a sanative property to those who bathed in it before the metallic particles had subsided to the bottom. That it should have done so, κατὰ καιρὸν, is not strange, since Bartholin has, by many examples, shown, that it is usual with many medicinal baths, to exert a singular force and sanative power at stated times, and at periodical, but uncertain, intervals." Doddridge combines the common hypothesis with that of Mede; namely, that the water had at all times more or less of a medicinal property; but at some period, not far distant from that in which the transaction here recorded took place, it was endued with a miraculous power; an extraordinary commotion being probably observed in the water, and Providence so ordering it, that the next person who accidentally bathed here, being under some great disorder, found an immediate and unexpected cure: the like phenomenon in some other desperate case, was probably observed on a second commotion: and these commotions and cures might happen periodically.

All those hypotheses which exclude miracle in this case are very unsatisfactory, nor is there any reason whatever to resort to them; for, when rightly viewed, there appears a mercy and a wisdom in this miracle which must strike every one who attentively considers the account, unless he be a determined unbeliever in miraculous interposition. For, 1. The miracle occurred κατὰ καιρὸν, from time to time, that is, occasionally, perhaps frequently. 2. Though but one at a time was healed, yet, as this might often occur, a singularly gracious provision was made for the relief of the sick

inhabitants of Jerusalem in desperate cases. 3. The angel probably acted invisibly, but the commotion in the waters was so strong and peculiar as to mark a supernatural agent. 4. There is great probability in what Doddridge, following Tertullian, supposes, that the waters obtained their healing property not long before the ministry of Christ, and lost it after his rejection and crucifixion by the Jews. In this case a connection was established between the healing virtue of the pool and the presence of Christ on earth, indicating HIM to be the source of this benefit, and the true agent in conferring it; and thus it became, afterward at least, a confirmation of his mission. 5. The whole might also be emblematical, "intended," says Macknight, "to show that Ezekiel's vision of waters issuing out of the sanctuary was about to be fulfilled, of which waters it is said, They shall be healed, and every thing shall live where the river cometh." It cannot be objected that this was not an age of miracles; and if miracles be allowed, we see in this particular supernatural visitation obvious reasons of fitness, as well as a divine compassion. If however the ends to be accomplished by so public and notable a miraculous interposition were less obvious, still we must admit the fact, or either force absurd interpretations upon the text, or make the evangelist carelessly give his sanction to an instance of vulgar credulity and superstition.

Maundrell and Chateaubriand both describe a bason or reservoir, near St. Stephen's gate, and bounding the temple on the north, as the identical pool of Bethesda; which, if it really be what it is represented to be, is all that now remains of the primitive architecture of the Jews at Jerusalem. The latter says, "It is a reservoir, a hundred and fifty feet long and forty wide. The sides are walled, and these walls are composed of a bed of large stones joined together by iron cramps; a wall of mixed materials runs up on these large stones; a layer of flints is stuck upon the surface of this wall; and a coating is laid over these flints. The four beds are perpendicular with the bottom, and not horizontal: the coating was on the side next to the water; and the large stones rested, as they still do, against the ground. This pool is now dry, and half filled up. Here grow some pomegranate trees, and a species of wild tamarind of a bluish colour: the western angle is quite full of nopals. On the west side may also be seen two arches, which probably led to an aqueduct that carried the water into the interior of the temple."

BETH-HORON. About twelve miles from Jerusalem, lies the Arab village of Bethoor, where Dr. E. D. Clarke was by accident compelled to pass a night. It is noticed by no other traveller; and yet, there is the highest probability that this is the Beth-horon of the Scriptures. St. Jerom associates it with Rama, in the remark that they were in his time, together with other noble cities built by Solomon, only poor villages. Beth-horon stood on the confines of Ephraim and Benjamin; which, according to the

learned traveller, exactly answers to the situation of Bethoor. He supposes it, from its situation on a hill, to be Beth-horon the upper, the Beth-horon superior of Eusebius, of which frequent notice occurs in the apocryphal writings. Josephus mentions that Cestius, the Roman general, marched upon Jerusalem by way of Lydda and Beth-horon.

BETHLEHEM, a city in the tribe of Judah, Judges xvii, 7; and likewise called Ephrath, Gen. xlviii, 7; or Ephratah, Micah v, 2; and the inhabitants of it, Ephrathites, Ruth i, 2; 1 Sam. xvii, 12. Here David was born, and spent his early years as a shepherd. And here also the scene of the beautiful narrative of Ruth is supposed to be laid. But its highest honour is, that here our divine Lord condescended to be born of woman:--“And thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting.” Travellers describe the first view of Bethlehem as imposing. The town appears covering the ridge of a hill on the southern side of a deep and extensive valley, and reaching from east to west. The most conspicuous object is the monastery erected over the supposed “Cave of the Nativity;” its walls and battlements have the air of a large fortress. From this same point, the Dead Sea is seen below on the left, seemingly very near, “but,” says Sandys, “not so found by the traveller; for these high, declining mountains are not to be directly descended.” The road winds round the top of a valley which tradition has fixed on as the scene of the angelic vision which announced the birth of our Lord to the shepherds; but different spots have been selected, the Romish authorities not being agreed on this head. Bethlehem (called in the New Testament Bethlehem Ephrata and Bethlehem of Judea, to distinguish it from Bethlehem of Zabulon) is situated on a rising ground, about two hours’ distance, or not quite six miles from Jerusalem. Here the traveller meets with a repetition of the same puerilities and disgusting mummery which he has witnessed at the church of the sepulchre. “The stable,” to use the words of Pococke, “in which our Lord was born, is a grotto cut out of the rock, according to the eastern custom.” It is astonishing to find so intelligent a writer as Dr. E. D. Clarke gravely citing St. Jerom, who wrote in the fifth century, as an authority for the truth of the absurd legend by which the cave of the nativity is supposed to be identified. The ancient tombs and excavations are occasionally used by the Arabs as places of shelter; but the Gospel narrative affords no countenance to the notion that the Virgin took refuge in any cave of this description. On the contrary, it was evidently a manger belonging to the inn or khan: in other words, the upper rooms being wholly occupied, the holy family were compelled to take up their abode in the court allotted to the mules and horses, or other animals. But the New Testament was not the guide which was followed by the mother of Constantine, to whom the original church owed its

foundation. The present edifice is represented by Chateaubriand as of undoubtedly high antiquity; yet Doubdan, an old traveller, says that the monastery was destroyed in the year 1263 by the Moslems; and in its present state, at all events, it cannot lay claim to a higher date. The convent is divided among the Greek, Roman, and Armenian Christians, to each of whom separate parts are assigned as places of worship and habitations for the monks; but, on certain days, all may perform their devotions at the altars erected over the consecrated spots. The church is built in the form of a cross; the nave being adorned with forty-eight Corinthian columns in four rows, each column being two feet six inches in diameter, and eighteen feet high, including the base and the capital. The nave, which is in possession of the Armenians, is separated from the three other branches of the cross by a wall, so that the unity of the edifice is destroyed. The top of the cross is occupied by the choir, which belongs to the Greeks. Here is an altar dedicated to the wise men of the east, at the foot of which is a marble star, corresponding, as the monks say, to the point of the heavens where the miraculous meteor became stationary, and directly over the spot where the Saviour was born in the subterranean church below! A flight of fifteen steps, and a long narrow passage, conduct to the sacred crypt or grotto of the nativity, which is thirty-seven feet six inches long, by eleven feet three inches in breadth, and nine feet high. It is lined and floored with marble, and provided on each side with five oratories, "answering precisely to the ten cribs or stalls for horses that the stable in which our Saviour was born contained!" The precise spot of the birth is marked by a glory in the floor, composed of marble and jasper encircled with silver, around which are inscribed the words, *Hic de Virgine Mariâ Jesus Christus natus est.* [Here Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary.] Over it is a marble table or altar, which rests against the side of the rock, here cut into an arcade. The manger is at the distance of seven paces from the altar; it is in a low recess hewn out of the rock, to which you descend by two steps, and consists of a block of marble, raised about a foot and a half above the floor, and hollowed out in the form of a manger. Before it is the altar of the Magi. The chapel is illuminated by thirty-two lamps, presented by different princes of Christendom. Chateaubriand has described the scene in his usual florid and imaginative style: "Nothing can be more pleasing, or better calculated to excite devotional sentiments, than this subterraneous church. It is adorned with pictures of the Italian and Spanish schools, which represent the mysteries of the place. The usual ornaments of the manger are of blue satin, embroidered with silver. Incense is continually burning before the cradle of our Saviour. I have heard an organ, touched by no ordinary hand, play, during mass, the sweetest and most tender tunes of the best Italian composers. These concerts charm the Christian Arab, who, leaving his camels to feed, repairs, like the shepherds of old, to Bethlehem, to adore the King of kings in the manger. I have seen this inhabitant of the



desert communicate at the altar of the Magi, with a fervour, a piety, a devotion, unknown among the Christians of the west. The continual arrival of caravans from all the nations of Christendom; the public prayers; the prostrations; nay, even the richness of the presents sent here by the Christian princes, altogether produce feelings in the soul, which it is much easier to conceive than to describe.”

Such are the illusions which the Roman superstition casts over this extraordinary scene! In another subterraneous chapel, tradition places the sepulchre of the Innocents. From this, the pilgrim is conducted to the grotto of St. Jerom, where they show the tomb of that father, who passed great part of his life in this place; and who, in the grotto shown as his oratory, is said to have translated that version of the Bible which has been adopted by the church of Rome, and is called the Vulgate. He died at the advanced age of ninety-one, A. D. 422. The village of Bethlehem contains about three hundred inhabitants, the greater part of whom gain their livelihood by making beads, carving mother-of-pearl shells with sacred subjects, and manufacturing small tables and crucifixes, all which are eagerly purchased by the pilgrims.

Bethlehem has been visited by many modern travellers. The following notice of it by Dr. E. D. Clarke will be read with interest: “After travelling for about an hour from the time of our leaving Jerusalem, we came in view of Bethlehem, and halted to enjoy the interesting sight. The town appeared covering the ridge of a hill on the southern side of a deep and extensive valley, and reaching from east to west; the most conspicuous object being the monastery, erected over the cave of the nativity, in the suburbs, and upon the eastern side. The battlements and walls of this building seemed like those of a vast fortress. The Dead Sea below, upon our left, appeared so near to us that we thought we could have rode thither in a very short space of time. Still nearer stood a mountain upon its western shore, resembling in its form the cone of Vesuvius near Naples, and having also a crater upon its top which was plainly discernible. The distance, however, is much greater than it appears to be; the magnitude of the objects beheld in this fine prospect causing them to appear less remote than they really are. The atmosphere was remarkably clear and serene; but we saw none of those clouds of smoke, which, by some writers, are said to exhale from the surface of the lake, nor from any neighbouring mountain. Every thing about it was in the highest degree grand and awful. Bethlehem is six miles from Jerusalem. Josephus describes the interval between the two cities as equal only to twenty stadia; and in the passage referred to, he makes an allusion to a celebrated well, which, both from the account given by him of its situation, and more especially from the text of the sacred Scriptures, 2 Sam. xxiii, 15, seems to have contained the identical fountain, of whose

pure and delicious water we were now drinking. Considered merely in point of interest, the narrative is not likely to be surpassed by any circumstance of Pagan history. David, being a native of Bethlehem, calls to mind, during the sultry days of harvest, verse 13, a well near the gate of the town, the delicious waters of which he had often tasted; and expresses an earnest desire to assuage his thirst by drinking of that limpid spring. 'And David longed, and said, O that one would give me to drink of the water of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate!' The exclamation is overheard by 'three of the mighty men whom David had,' namely, Adino, Eleazar, and Shamnah, verses 8, 9, 11. These men sallied forth, and having fought their way through the garrison of the Philistines at Bethlehem, verse 14, 'drew water from the well that was by the gate,' on the other side of the town, and brought it to David. Coming into his presence, they present to him the surprising testimony of their valour and affection. The aged monarch receives from their hands a pledge they had so dearly earned, but refuses to drink of water every drop of which had been purchased with blood, 2 Sam. xxiii, 17. He returns thanks to the Almighty, who had vouchsafed the deliverance of his warriors from the jeopardy they had encountered; and pouring out the water as a libation on the ground, makes an offering of it to the Lord. The well still retains its pristine renown; and many an expatriated Bethlehemite has made it the theme of his longing and regret."

BETHPHAGE, so called from its producing figs, a small village situated in Mount Olivet, and, as it seems, somewhat nearer Jerusalem than Bethany. Jesus being come from Bethany to Bethphage, commanded his disciples to seek out an ass for him that he might ride, in his triumphant entrance into Jerusalem, Matt. xxi, 1, &c. The distance between Bethphage and Jerusalem is about fifteen furlongs.

BETHSAIDA, a city whose name in Hebrew imports a place of fishing or of hunting, and for both of these exercises it was well situated. As it belonged to the tribe of Naphtali, it was in a country remarkable for plenty of deer; and as it lay on the north end of the lake Gennesareth, just where the river Jordan runs into it, it became the residence of fishermen. Three of the Apostles, Philip, Andrew, and Peter, were born in this city. It is not mentioned in the Old Testament, though it frequently occurs in the New: the reason is, that it was but a village, as Josephus tells us, till Philip the tetrarch enlarged it, making it a magnificent city, and gave it the name of Julias, out of respect to Julia, the daughter of Augustus Cæsar.

The evangelists speak of Bethsaida; and yet it then possessed that name no longer: it was enlarged and beautified nearly at the same time as Cæsarea, and called Julias. Thus was it called in the days of our Lord, and so would

the sacred historians have been accustomed to call it. But if they knew nothing of this, what shall we say of their age? In other respects they evince the most accurate knowledge of the circumstances of the time. The solution is, that, though Philip had exalted it to the rank of a city, to which he gave the name of Julias, yet, not long afterward, this Julia, in whose honour the city received its name, was banished from the country by her own father. The deeply wounded honour of Augustus was even anxious that the world might forget that she was his daughter. Tiberius, whose wife she had been, consigned the unfortunate princess, after the death of Augustus, to the most abject poverty, under which she sank without assistance. Thus adulation must under two reigns have suppressed a name, from which otherwise the city might have wished to derive benefit to itself; and for some time it was called by its ancient name Bethsaida instead of Julias. At a later period this name again came into circulation, and appears in the catalogue of Jewish cities by Pliny. By such incidents, which are so easily overlooked, and the knowledge of which is afterward lost, do those who are really acquainted with an age disclose their authenticity. "But it is strange," some one will say, "that John reckons this Bethsaida, or Julias, where he was born, in Galilee, John xii, 21. Should he not know to what province his birthplace belonged?" Philip only governed the eastern districts by the sea of Tiberias; but Galilee was the portion of his brother Antipas. Bethsaida or Julias could therefore not have been built by Philip, as the case is; or it did not belong to Galilee, as John alleges. In fact, such an error were sufficient to prove that this Gospel was not written by John. Julias, however, was situated in Gaulonitis, which district was, for deep political reasons, divided from Galilee; but the ordinary language of the time asserted its own opinion, and still reckoned the Gaulonitish province in Galilee. When, therefore, John does the same, he proves, that the peculiarity of those days was not unknown to him; for he expresses himself after the ordinary manner of the period. Thus Josephus informs us of Judas the Gaulonite from Gamala, and also calls him in the following chapters, the Galilean; and then in another work he applies the same expression to him; from whence we may be convinced that the custom of those days paid respect to a more ancient division of the country, and bade defiance, in the present case, to the then existing political geography. Is it possible that historians who, as it is evident from such examples, discover throughout so nice a knowledge of geographical arrangements and local and even temporary circumstances, should have written at a time when the theatre of events was unknown to them, when not only their native country was destroyed, but their nation scattered, and the national existence of the Jews extinguished and extirpated? On the contrary, all this is in proof that they wrote at the very period which they profess, and it also proves the usual antiquity assigned to the Gospels.

BETHSHAN, a city belonging to the half tribe of Manasseh, on the west of Jordan, and not far from the river. It was a considerable city in the time of Eusebius and St. Jerom, and was then, as it had been for several ages before, called Scythopolis, or the city of the Scythians, from some remarkable occurrence when the Scythians made an irruption into Syria. It is said to be six hundred furlongs from Jerusalem, 2 Macc. xii, 29. After the battle of Mount Gilboa, the Philistines took the body of Saul, and hung it against the wall of Bethshan, 1 Sam. xxxi, 10. Bethshan is now called Bysan, and is described by Burckhardt as situated on rising ground on the west of the Ghor, or valley of Jordan.

BETHSHEMESH, a city of the tribe of Judah, belonging to the priests, Joshua xxi, 16. The Philistines having sent back the ark of the Lord, it was brought to Bethshemesh, 1 Sam. vi, 12, where some of the people out of curiosity having looked into it, the Lord destroyed seventy of the principal men belonging to the city, and fifty thousand of the common people, verse 19. It is here to be observed that it was solemnly enjoined, Num. iv, 20, that not only the common people but that even the Levites themselves should not dare to look into the ark, upon pain of death. "It is a fearful thing," says Bishop Hall, "to use the holy ordinances of God with an irreverent boldness; fear and trembling become us in our access to the majesty of the Almighty."

BETHUEL, the son of Nahor and Milcah. He was Abraham's nephew, and father to Laban and Rebekah, the wife of Isaac, Genesis xxii, 20, 23.

BETROTHMENT, a mutual promise or compact between two parties for a future marriage. The word imports as much as giving one's troth; that is, true faith, or promise. Among the ancient Jews, the betrothing was performed either by a writing, or by a piece of silver given to the bride. After the marriage was contracted, the young people had the liberty of seeing each other, which was not allowed them before. If, after the betrothment, the bride should trespass against that fidelity she owed to her bridegroom she was treated as an adulteress. See Marriage.

BEZER, or Bozra, or Bostra, a city beyond Jordan, given by Moses to Reuben: this town was designed by Joshua to be a city of refuge; it was given to the Levites of Gershom's family, Deut. iv, 43. When Scripture mentions Bezer, it adds, "in the wilderness," because it lay in Arabia Deserta, and the eastern part of Edom, encompassed with deserts. Eusebius places Bozra twenty-four miles from Adraa, or Edrai. This city is sometimes said to belong to Reuben, sometimes to Moab, and sometimes again to Edom; because, as it was a frontier town to these three provinces,

it was occasionally in the hands of one party, and then was taken by another. The bishops of Bostra subscribed the decrees of several councils.

BIBLE, the book, by way of eminence so called, as containing the sacred Scriptures, that is, the inspired writings of the Old and New Testament; or the whole collection of those which are received among Christians as of divine authority. The word Bible comes from the Greek Βίβλος, or Βιβλίον, and is used to denote any book; but is emphatically applied to the book of inspired Scripture, which is “the book” as being superior in excellence to all other books. Βιβλίον again comes from Βίβλος, the Egyptian reed, from which the ancient paper was procured. The word Bible seems to be used in the particular sense just given by Chrysostom: “I therefore exhort all of you to procure to yourselves Bibles, Βιβλία. If you have nothing else, take care to have the New Testament, particularly the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospels, for your constant instructors.” And Jerome says, “that the Scriptures being all written by one Spirit, are one book.” Augustine also informs us, “that some called all the canonical Scriptures one book, on account of their wonderful harmony and unity of design throughout.” It is not improbable that this mode of speaking gradually introduced the general use of the word Bible for the whole collection of the Scriptures, or the books of the Old and New Testament. By the Jews the Bible, that is, the Old Testament, is called Mikra, that is, “lecture, or reading.” By Christians the Bible, comprehending the Old and New Testament, is usually denominated “Scripture;” sometimes also the “Sacred Canon,” which signifies the rule of faith and practice. These, and similar appellations, are derived from the divine original and authority of the Bible. As it contains an authentic and connected history of the divine dispensations with regard to mankind; as it was given by divine inspiration; as its chief subject is religion; and as the doctrines it teaches, and the duties it inculcates, pertain to the conduct of men, as rational, moral, and accountable beings, and conduce by a divine constitution and promise, to their present and future happiness; the Bible deserves to be held in the highest estimation, and amply justifies the sentiments of veneration with which it has been regarded, and the peculiar and honourable appellations by which it has been denominated.

2. The list of the books contained in the Bible constitutes what is called the canon of Scripture. Those books that are contained in the catalogue to which the name of canon has been appropriated, are called canonical, by way of contradistinction from others called deuterocanonical, apocryphal, pseudo-apocryphal, &c, which either are not acknowledged as divine books, or are rejected as heretical and spurious. (See Apocrypha.) The first canon or catalogue of the sacred books was made by the Jews; but the original author of it is not satisfactorily ascertained. It is certain, however,

that the five books of Moses, called the Pentateuch, were collected into one body within a short time after his death; since Deuteronomy, which is, as it were, the abridgment and recapitulation of the other four, was laid in the tabernacle near the ark, according to the order which he gave to the Levites, Deut. xxxi, 24. Hence the first canon of the sacred writings consisted of the five books of Moses: for a farther account of which see Pentateuch. It does not appear that any other books were added to these, till the division of the ten tribes, as the Samaritans acknowledged no others. However, after the time of Moses, several prophets, and other writers divinely inspired, composed either the history of their own times, or prophetic books and divine writings, or psalms appropriated to the praise of God. But these books do not seem to have been collected into one body, or comprised under one and the same canon, before the Babylonish captivity. This was not done till after their return from the captivity, about which time the Jews had a certain number of books digested into a canon, which comprehended none of those books that were written since the time of Nehemiah. The book of Ecclesiasticus affords sufficient evidence that the canon of the sacred books was completed when that tract was composed; for that author, in chapter xlix, having mentioned among the famous men and sacred writers, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, adds the twelve minor prophets who follow those three in the Jewish canon; and from this circumstance we may infer that the prophecies of these twelve were already collected and digested into one body. It is farther evident, that in the time of our Saviour the canon of the Holy Scriptures was drawn up, since he cites the law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, which are the three kinds of books of which that canon is composed, and which he often styles, "the Scriptures," or, "the Holy Scripture," Matt. xxi, 42; xxii, 29; xxvi, 54; John v, 39; and by him therefore the Jewish canon, as it existed in his day, was fully authenticated, by whomsoever or at what time it had been formed.

3. The person who compiled this canon is generally allowed to be Ezra. According to the invariable tradition of Jews and Christians, the honour is ascribed to him of having collected together and perfected a complete edition of the Holy Scriptures. The original of the Pentateuch had been carefully preserved in the side of the ark, and had been probably introduced with the ark into the temple at Jerusalem. 155After having been concealed in the dangerous days of the idolatrous kings of Judah, and particularly in the impious reigns of Manasseh and Amon, it was found in the days of Josiah, the succeeding prince, by Hilkiyah the priest, in the temple. Prideaux thinks, that during the preceding reigns the book of the law was so destroyed and lost, that, beside this copy of it, there was then no other to be obtained. To this purpose he adds, that the surprise manifested by Hilkiyah, on the discovery of it, and the grief expressed by Josiah when he heard it read, plainly show that neither of them had seen it before. On the

other hand, Dr. Kennicott, with better reason, supposes, that long before this time there were several copies of the law in Israel, during the separation of the ten tribes, and that there were some copies of it also among the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, particularly in the hands of the prophets, priests, and Levites; and that by the instruction and authority of these MSS, the various services in the temple were regulated, during the reigns of the good kings of Judah. He adds, that the surprise expressed by Josiah and the people, at his reading the copy found by Hilkiah, may be accounted for by adverting to the history of the preceding reigns, and by recollecting how idolatrous a king Manasseh had been for fifty-five years, and that he wanted neither power nor inclination to destroy the copies of the law, if they had not been secreted by the servants of God. The law, after being so long concealed, would be unknown almost to all the Jews; and thus the solemn reading of it by Josiah would awaken his own and the people's earnest attention; more especially, as the copy produced was probably the original written by Moses. From this time copies of the law were extensively multiplied among the people; and though, within a few years, the autograph, or original copy of the law, was burnt with the city and temple by the Babylonians, yet many copies of the law and the prophets, and of all the other sacred writings, were circulated in the hands of private persons, who carried them with them into their captivity. It is certain that Daniel had a copy of the Holy Scriptures with him at Babylon; for he quotes the law, and mentions the prophecies of Jeremiah, Dan. ix, 2, 11, 13. It appears also, from the sixth chap. of Ezra, and from the ninth chap. of Nehemiah, that copies of the law were dispersed among the people. The whole which Ezra did may be comprised in the following particulars: He collected as many copies of the sacred writings as he could find, and compared them together, and, out of them all, formed one complete copy, adjusted the various readings, and corrected the errors of transcribers. He likewise made additions in several parts of the different books, which appeared to be necessary for the illustration, correction, and completion of them. To this class of additions we may refer the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which, as it gives an account of the death and burial of Moses, and of the succession of Joshua after him, could not have been written by Moses himself. Under the same head have also been included some other interpolations in the Bible, which create difficulties that can only be solved by allowing them; as in Gen. xii, 6; xxii, 14; xxxvi, 3; Exodus xvi, 35; Deut. ii, 12; iii, 11, 14; Prov. xxv, 1. The interpolations in these passages are ascribed by Prideaux to Ezra; and others which were afterward added, he attributes to Simon the Just. Ezra also changed the old names of several places that were become obsolete, putting instead of them the new names by which they were at that time called; instances of which occur in Genesis xiv, 4, where Dan is substituted for Laish, and in several places in Genesis, and also in Numbers, where Hebron is put for Kirjath

Arba, &c. He likewise wrote out the whole in the Chaldee character, changing for it the old Hebrew character, which has since that time been retained only by the Samaritans, and among whom it is preserved even to this day. The canon of the whole Hebrew Bible seems, says Kennicott, to have been closed by Malachi, the latest of the Jewish prophets, about fifty years after Ezra had collected together all the sacred books which had been composed before and during his time. Prideaux supposes the canon was completed by Simon the Just, about one hundred and fifty years after Malachi: but, as his opinion is founded merely on a few proper names at the end of the two genealogies, 1 Chron. iii, 19; Nehem. xii, 22, which few names might very easily be added by a transcriber afterward, it is more probable, as Kennicott thinks, that the canon was finished by the last of the prophets, about four hundred years before Christ.

4. It is an inquiry of considerable importance, in its relation to the subject of this article, what books were contained in the canon of the Jews. The Old Testament, according to our Bibles, comprises thirty-nine books, viz. the Pentateuch or five books of Moses, called Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 & 2 Samuel, 1 & 2 Kings, 1 & 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah with his Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. But, among the ancient Jews, they formed only twenty-two books, according to the letters of their alphabet, which were twenty-two in number; reckoning Judges and Ruth, Ezra and Nehemiah, Jeremiah and his Lamentations, and the twelve minor prophets, (so called from the comparative brevity of their compositions,) respectively as one book. Josephus says, "We have not thousands of books, discordant, and contradicting each other: but we have only twenty-two, which comprehend the history of all former ages, and are justly regarded as divine. Five of them proceed from Moses; they include as well the laws, as an account of the creation of man, extending to the time of his (Moses) death. This period comprehends nearly three thousand years. From the death of Moses to that of Artaxerxes, who was king of Persia after Xerxes, the prophets, 156 who succeeded Moses, committed to writing, in thirteen books, what was done in their days. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, (the Psalms,) and instructions of life for man." The threefold division of the Old Testament into the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, mentioned by Josephus, was expressly recognised before his time by Jesus Christ, as well as by the subsequent writers of the New Testament. We have therefore sufficient evidence that the Old Testament existed at that time; and if it be only allowed that Jesus Christ was a teacher of a fearless and irreproachable character, it must be acknowledged that we draw a fair



conclusion, when we assert that the Scriptures were not corrupted in his time: for, when he accused the Pharisees of making the law of no effect by their traditions, and, when he enjoined his hearers to search the Scriptures, he could not have failed to mention the corruptions or forgeries of Scripture, if any had existed in that age. About fifty years before the time of Christ were written the Targums of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, and of Jonathan Ben-Uzziel on the Prophets; (according to the Jewish classification of the books of the Old Testament;) which are evidence of the genuineness of those books at that time. We have, however, unquestionable testimony of the genuineness of the Old Testament, in the fact that its canon was fixed some centuries before the birth of Jesus Christ. Jesus the son of Sirach, author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, makes evident references to the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and mentions these prophets by name: he speaks also of the twelve minor prophets. It likewise appears from the prologue to that book, that the law and the prophets, and other ancient books, were extant at the same period. The book of Ecclesiasticus, according to the best chronologers, was written in the Syro-Chaldaic dialect A. M. 3772, that is, two hundred and thirty-two years before the Christian æra, and was translated by the grandson of Jesus into Greek, for the use of the Alexandrian Jews. The prologue was added by the translator; but this circumstance does not diminish the evidence for the antiquity of the Old Testament: for he informs us, that the law and the prophets, and the other books of their fathers, were studied by his grandfather; a sufficient proof that they were extant in his time. Fifty years, indeed, before the age of the author of Ecclesiasticus, or two hundred and eighty-two years before the Christian æra, the Greek version of the Old Testament, usually called the Septuagint, was executed at Alexandria, the books of which are the same as in our Bibles; whence it is evident that we still have those identical books, which the most ancient Jews attested to be genuine. The Christian fathers too, Origen, Athanasius, Hilary, Gregory, Nazianzen, Epiphanius, and Jerom, speaking of the books that are allowed by the Jews as sacred and canonical, agree in saying that they are the same in number with the letters in the Hebrew alphabet, that is, twenty-two, and reckon particularly those books which we have already mentioned. Nothing can be more satisfactory and conclusive than all the parts of the evidence for the authenticity and integrity of the canon of the Old Testament scriptures. The Jews, to whom they were first committed, never varied respecting them; while they were fully recognised by our Lord and his Apostles; and, consequently, their authenticity is established by express revelation. And that we now possess them as thus delivered and authenticated, we have the concurrent testimony of the whole succession of the most distinguished early Christian writers, as well as of the Jews to this day, who, in every age, and in all countries, the most remote from one

another, have constantly been in the habit of reading them in their synagogues.

5. The five books of the law are divided into fifty-four sections, which division is attributed to Ezra, and was intended for the use of their synagogues, and for the better instruction of the people in the law of God. For, one of these sections was read every Sabbath in their synagogues. They ended the last section with the last words of Deuteronomy on the Sabbath of the feast of the tabernacles, and then began anew with the first section from the beginning of Genesis the next Sabbath after, and so went round in this circle every year. The number of these sections was fifty-four, because in their intercalated years (a month being then added) there were fifty-four Sabbaths. On other years they reduced them to the number of the Sabbaths which were in those years, by joining two short ones several times into one. For they held themselves obliged to have the whole law thus read over in their synagogues every year. Till the time of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, they read only the law; but being then prohibited from reading it any more, they substituted in the room of the fifty-four sections of the law, fifty-four sections out of the prophets, the reading of which they ever after continued. Thus, when the reading of the law was restored by the Maccabees, the section which was read every Sabbath out of the law served for their first lesson, and the section out of the prophets for their second lesson; and this practice was continued to the times of the Apostles, Acts xiii, 15, 27. These sections were divided into verses, called by the Jews *pesukim*, and they are marked out in the Hebrew Bible by two great points at the end of them, called from hence, *soph-pasuk*, that is, the end of the verse. This division, if not made by Ezra, is very ancient; for when the Chaldee came into use in the room of the Hebrew language, after the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon, the law was read to the people first in the Hebrew language, and then rendered by an interpreter into the Chaldee language; and this was done period by period. The division of the Holy Scriptures into chapters is of a much later date. The Psalms, indeed, appear to have been always divided as they are at present, Acts xiii, 33; but as to the rest of the Bible, the present division into chapters was unknown to the ancients.

6. From the time when the Old Testament was completed by Malachi, the last of the prophets, till the publication of the New Testament, about four hundred and sixty years elapsed. During the life of Jesus Christ, and for some time after his ascension, nothing on the subject of his mission was committed to writing. The period of his remaining upon earth may be regarded as an intermediate state between the old and new dispensations. His personal ministry was confined to the land of Judea; and, by means of his miracles and discourses, together with those of his disciples, the

attention of men, in that country, was sufficiently directed to his doctrine. They were also in possession of the Old Testament scriptures; which, at that season, it was of the greatest importance they should consult, in order to compare the ancient predictions with what was then taking place. Immediately after the resurrection of Jesus Christ, his disciples, in the most public manner, and in the place where he had been crucified, proclaimed that event, and the whole of the doctrine which he had commanded them to preach. In this service they continued personally to labour for a considerable time, first among their countrymen the Jews, and then among the other nations. During the period between the resurrection and the publication of the New Testament, the churches possessed miraculous gifts, and the prophets were enabled to explain the predictions of the Old Testament, and to show their fulfilment. After their doctrine had every where attracted attention, and, in spite of the most violent opposition, had forced its way through the civilized world; and when churches or societies of Christians were collected, not only in Judea, but in the most celebrated cities of Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor, the scriptures of the New Testament were written by the Apostles, and other inspired men, and intrusted to the keeping of these churches.

The whole of the New Testament was not written at once, but in different parts, and on various occasions. Six of the Apostles, and two inspired disciples who accompanied them in their journeys, were employed in this work. The histories which it contains of the life of Christ, known by the name of the Gospels, were composed by four of his contemporaries, two of whom had been constant attendants on his public ministry. The first of these was published within a few years after his death, in that very country where he had lived, and among the people who had seen him and observed his conduct. The history called the Acts of the Apostles, which contains an account of their proceedings, and of the progress of the Gospel, from Jerusalem, among the Gentile nations, was published about the year 64, being thirty years after our Lord's crucifixion, by one who, though not an Apostle, declares that he had "perfect understanding of all things, from the very first," and who had written one of the Gospels. This book, commencing with a detail of proceedings, from the resurrection of Jesus Christ, carries down the evangelical history till the arrival of Paul as a prisoner at Rome. The Epistles, addressed to churches in particular places, to believers scattered up and down in different countries, or to individuals, in all twenty-one in number, were separately written, by five of the Apostles, from seventeen, to twenty, thirty, and thirty-five years after the death of Christ. Four of these writers had accompanied the Lord Jesus during his life, and had been "eye witnesses of his majesty." The fifth was the Apostle Paul, who, as he expresses it, was "one born out of due time," but who had likewise seen Jesus Christ, and had been empowered by him

to work miracles, which were “the signs of an Apostle.” One of these five also wrote the book of Revelation, about the year A. D. 96, addressed to seven churches in Asia, containing Epistles to these churches from Jesus Christ himself, with various instructions for the immediate use of all Christians, together with a prophetic view of the kingdom of God till the end of time. These several pieces, which compose the scriptures of the New Testament, were received by the churches with the highest veneration; and, as the instructions they contain, though partially addressed, were equally intended for all, they were immediately copied, and handed about from one church to another, till each was in possession of the whole. The volume of the New Testament was thus completed before the death of the last of the Apostles, most of whom had sealed their testimony with their blood. From the manner in which these scriptures were at first circulated, some of their parts were necessarily longer in reaching certain places than others. These, of course, could not be so soon received into the canon as the rest. Owing to this circumstance, and to that of a few of the books being addressed to individual believers, or to their not having the names of their writers affixed, or the designation of Apostle added, a doubt for a time existed among some respecting the genuineness of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the book of Revelation. These, however, though not universally, were generally acknowledged; while all the other books of the New Testament were without dispute received from the beginning. This discrimination proves the scrupulous care of the first churches on this highly important subject.

At length these books, which had not at first been admitted, were, like the rest, universally received, not by the votes of a council, as is sometimes asserted, but after deliberate and free inquiry by many separate churches, under the superintending providence of God, in different parts of the world. It is at the same time a certain fact, that no other books beside those which at present compose the volume of the New Testament, were admitted by the churches. Several apocryphal writings were published under the name of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, which are mentioned by the writers of the first four centuries, most of which have perished, though some are still extant. Few or none of them were composed before the second century, and several of them were forged as late as the third century. But they were not acknowledged as authentic by the first Christians; and were rejected by those who have noticed them, as spurious and heretical. Histories, too, as might have been expected, were written of the life of Christ; and one forgery was attempted, of a letter said to have been written by Jesus himself to Abgarus, king of Edessa; but of the first, none were received as of any authority, and the last was universally rejected. “Beside our Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles,” says Paley, “no Christian history claiming to be

written by an Apostle, or Apostolical man, is quoted within three hundred years after the birth of Christ, by any writer now extant or known, or, if quoted, is quoted with marks of censure and rejection.” This agreement of Christians respecting the Scriptures, when we consider their many differences in other respects, is the more remarkable, since it took place without any public authority being interposed. “We have no knowledge” says the above author, “of any interference of authority in the question before the council of Laodicea, in the year 363. Probably the decree of this council rather declared than regulated the public judgment, or, more properly speaking, the judgment of some neighbouring churches, the council itself consisting of no more than thirty or forty bishops of Lydia and the adjoining countries. Nor does its authority seem to have extended farther.” But the fact, that no public authority was interposed, does not require to be supported by the above reasoning. The churches at the beginning, being widely separated from each other, necessarily judged for themselves in this matter, and the decree of the council was founded on the coincidence of their judgment. In delivering this part of his written revelation, God proceeded as he had done in the publication of the Old Testament scriptures. For a considerable time, his will was declared to mankind through the medium of oral tradition. At length he saw meet, in his wisdom, to give it a more permanent form. But this did not take place till a nation, separated from all others, was provided for its reception. In the same manner, when Jesus Christ set up his kingdom in the world, of which the nation of Israel was a type, he first made known his will by means of verbal communication, through his servants whom he commissioned and sent out for that purpose; and when, through their means, he had prepared his subjects and collected them into churches, to be the depositaries of his word, he caused it to be delivered to them in writing. His kingdom was not to consist of any particular nation, like that of Israel, but of all those individuals, in every part of the world, who should believe in his name. It was to be ruled, not by means of human authority, or compulsion of any kind, but solely by his authority. These sacred writings were thus intrusted to a people prepared for their reception,--a nation among the nations, but singularly distinct from all the rest, who guarded and preserved them with the same inviolable attachment as the Old Testament scriptures had experienced from the Jews.

7. Respecting the lateness of the time when the scriptures of the New Testament were written, no objection can be offered, since they were published before that generation passed away which had witnessed the transactions they record. The dates of these writings fall within the period of the lives of many who were in full manhood when the Lord Jesus was upon earth; and the facts detailed in the histories, and referred to in the Epistles, being of the most public nature, were still open to full

investigation. It must also be recollected, that the Apostles and disciples, during the whole intermediate period, were publicly proclaiming to the world the same things which were afterward recorded in their writings. Thus were the Scriptures, as we now possess them, delivered to the first churches. By the concurrent testimony of all antiquity, both of friends and foes, they were received by Christians of different sects, and were constantly appealed to on all hands, in the controversies that arose among them. Commentaries upon them were written at a very early period, and translations made into different languages. Formal catalogues of them were published, and they were attacked by the adversaries of Christianity, who not only did not question, but expressly admitted, the facts they contained, and that they were the genuine productions of the persons whose names they bore. In this manner the Scriptures were also secured from the danger of being in any respect altered or vitiated. "The books of Scripture," says Augustine, "could not have been corrupted. If such an attempt had been made by any one, his design would have been prevented and defeated. His alterations would have been immediately detected by many and more ancient copies." The difficulty of succeeding in such an attempt is apparent hence, that the Scriptures were early translated into divers languages, and copies of them were numerous. The alterations which any one attempted to make would have been soon perceived; just even as now, in fact, lesser faults in some copies are amended by comparing ancient copies or those of the original. "If any one," continues Augustine, "should charge you with having interpolated some texts alleged by you as favourable to your cause, what would you say? Would you not immediately answer that it is impossible for you to do such a thing in books read by all Christians; and that if any such attempt had been made--by you, it would have been presently discerned and defeated by comparing the ancient copies? Well, then, for the same reason that the Scriptures cannot be corrupted by you, neither could they be corrupted by any other people." Accordingly, the uniformity of the manuscripts of the Holy Scriptures that are extant, which are incomparably more numerous than those of any ancient author, and which are dispersed through so many countries, and in so great a variety of languages, is truly astonishing. It demonstrates both the veneration in which the Scriptures have been always held, and the singular care that has been taken in transcribing them. The number of various readings, that by the most minute and laborious investigation and collations of manuscripts have been discovered in them, are said to amount to one hundred and fifty thousand; though at first sight they may seem calculated to diminish confidence in the sacred text, yet in no degree whatever do they affect its credit and integrity. They consist almost wholly in palpable errors in transcription, grammatical and verbal differences, such as the insertion or omission of a letter or article, the substitution of a word for its equivalent, or the transposition of a word or two in a sentence. Taken

altogether, they neither change nor affect a single doctrine or duty announced or enjoined in the word of God. When, therefore, we consider the great antiquity of the sacred books, the almost infinite number of copies, of versions, and of editions, which have been made of them in all languages, in languages which have not any analogy one with another, among nations differing so much in their customs and their religious opinions,--when we consider these things, it is truly astonishing, and can only be ascribed to the watchful providence of God over his own word, that, among the various readings, nothing truly essential can be discerned, which relates to either precept or doctrine, or which breaks that connection, that unity which subsists in all the various parts of divine revelation, and which demonstrates the whole to be the work of one and the same Spirit.

8. Having considered the appellations by which the Bible is distinguished, the books of which it consists, the time and manner in which they were collected, it may not be improper to subjoin a few observations on the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures, on their high original and divine authority, and on their great importance and utility.

It should here be considered, that the genuineness of the Scriptures proves the truth of the principal facts contained in them; to which purpose we may observe that it is very rare to meet with any genuine writings of the historical kind, in which the principal facts are not true, unless it be in instances where both the motives which engaged the author to falsify, and the circumstances which gave some plausibility to the fiction, are apparent; neither of which can be alleged in the present case with any colour of reason. As this is rare in general, it is more rare when the writer treats of things that happened in his own time, and under his own cognizance and direction, and communicates his history to persons under the same circumstances; all which may be said of the writers of the Scripture history. Beside, the great importance of the facts mentioned in the Scriptures makes it more improbable, that the several authors should either have attempted to falsify, or have succeeded in such an attempt. The same observation may be applied to the great number of particular circumstances of time, place, persons, &c, mentioned in the Scriptures, and to the harmony of the books with themselves, and with each other. These are arguments both for the genuineness of the books, and truth of the facts distinctly considered, and also arguments for deducing the truth from the genuineness. Moreover, if the books of the Old and New Testaments were written by the persons to whom they have been ascribed, that is, if they be genuine, the moral characters of these writers afford the strongest assurance, that the facts asserted by them are true. The sufferings which several of the writers underwent both in life and in death, in attestation of the facts delivered by them, furnish a particular argument in favour of these facts. Again, the

arguments here alleged for proving the truth of the Scripture history from the genuineness of the books, are as conclusive in respect of the miraculous facts, as of the common ones. It may also be observed, that if we allow the genuineness of the books to be a sufficient evidence of the common facts which they record, the miraculous facts must also be allowed from their close connection with the others. It is necessary to admit both or neither. We cannot conceive that Moses should have delivered the Israelites from their slavery in Egypt, or conducted them through the wilderness for forty years, at all in such manner as the common history represents, unless we suppose the miraculous facts intermixed with it to be true also. In like manner, the fame of Christ's miracles, the multitudes which followed him, the adherence of his disciples, the jealousy and hatred of the chief priests, scribes, and Pharisees, with many other facts of a common nature, are impossible to be accounted for, unless we allow that he did really work miracles. And the same observations hold, in general, of the other parts of the Scripture history. We might urge that a particular argument in favour of the miraculous part of the Scripture history, may be deduced from the reluctance of mankind to receive miraculous facts; which would put the writers and readers very much upon their guard, and would operate as a strong check upon the publication of a miraculous history at or near the time when the miracles were said to be performed; and thus it would serve as a strong confirmation of such a history, if its genuineness be previously granted.

9. In connection with the preceding proposition we may observe, that the genuineness of the Scriptures proves their divine authority. Porphyry in effect acknowledges the truth of this proposition, in its reference to the book of Daniel, by being unable to devise a method of invalidating its divine authority implied in the accomplishment of the prophecies which it contains, without asserting that they were written after the event, or that they were forgeries. Many of the other books of the Old and New Testaments have unquestionable evidences of the divine foreknowledge, if they be allowed genuine; such are those supplied by Moses's prophecy concerning the captivity of the Israelites, or of a state not yet erected; Isaiah's concerning Cyrus; Jeremiah's concerning the duration of the Babylonish captivity; Christ's concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and 160th captivity that was to follow; St. John's concerning the great corruption of the Christian church; and Daniel's concerning the fourth empire in its declension; which last was extant in the time of Porphyry, at least; that is, before the events which it represents. The truth of the proposition might also be argued from the sublimity and excellence of the doctrines contained in the Scriptures; in no respect suiting the supposed authors, or the ages in which they lived, their education or occupation; so that, if they were the real authors, we are under the necessity of admitting



the divine assistance. The converse of this proposition, namely, that the divine authority of the Scriptures infers their genuineness, will be readily and universally acknowledged. Moreover, the truth of the principal facts contained in the Scriptures proves their divine authority. Such is the frame of the human mind, that the Scripture history, allowed to be true, must convince us that Christ, the Prophets, and the Apostles, were endued with a power greater than human, and acted by the authority of a Being of the highest wisdom and goodness. By such mode of reasoning it is shown that the genuineness of the Scriptures, the truth of the principal facts contained in them, and their divine authority, appear to be so connected with each other, that, any one being established upon independent principles, the other two may be inferred from it. On the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures, see Inspiration.

10. Another argument in favour of the genuineness of the books of the Old and New Testaments, and of the truth of the principal facts contained in them, may be deduced from the manner in which they have been transmitted down from one age to another; resembling that in which all other genuine books and true histories have been conveyed down to posterity. As the works of the Greek and Roman writers were considered by these nations as having been transmitted to them by their ancestors in a continued succession from the times when the respective authors lived, so have the books of the Old Testament been accounted by the Jews, and those of the New by the Christians; and it is an additional evidence in the last case, that the primitive Christians were not a distinct nation, but a great multitude of people dispersed through all the nations of the Roman empire, and even extending itself beyond the bounds of that empire. As the Greeks and Romans always believed the principal facts of their historical books, so the Jews and Christians did more, and never seem to have doubted of the truth of any part of theirs. In short--whatever can be said of the traditional authority due to the Greek and Roman writers--something analogous to this, and for the most part of greater weight, may be urged for the Jewish and Christian. Now, as all sober minded persons admit the books usually ascribed to the Greek and Roman historians, philosophers, &c, to be genuine, and the principal facts related or alluded to in them to be true, and that one chief evidence for this is the general traditionary one here recited, they ought, therefore, to pay the same regard to the books of the Old and New Testaments, since there are the same, or even greater, reasons for it. Beside, these traditionary evidences are sufficient; and we thus obtain a real argument, as well as one ad hominem, for receiving books thus handed down to us. For it is not conceivable, that whole nations should either be imposed upon themselves, or concur to deceive others by forgeries of books or of facts. These books and facts must therefore, in

general, be genuine and true; and it is a strong additional evidence of this, that all nations must be jealous of forgeries for the same reasons as we are.

11. We may proceed to state farther, that the great importance of the histories, precepts, promises, threatenings, and prophecies contained in the Scriptures, is in evidence both of their genuineness, and of the truth of the principal facts mentioned in them. The history of the creation, fall, deluge, longevity of the patriarchs, dispersion of mankind, calling of Abraham, descent of Jacob with his family into Egypt, and the precepts of abstaining from blood, and of circumcision, were of such concern, either to mankind in general, or to the Israelites in particular, and some of them of so extraordinary a nature, as that it could not be a matter of indifference to the people among whom the account given of them in Genesis was first published, whether they received them or not. On the supposition that this account was first published among the Israelites by Moses, and then confirmed by clear, universal, uninterrupted tradition, it will be easy to conceive how it should be handed down from age to age among the Jews, and received by them as indubitable. But, supposing the account to be false, or that there were no such vestiges and evidences of these histories and precepts, it will be difficult to conceive how this could have happened, let the time of publication be what it may. If early, the people would reject at once the account, for want of a clear tradition; if late, it would be natural to inquire how the author was informed of things never known before to others. As to other cosmogonies and theogonies current among Pagans, which are evident fictions, they furnish no just objection against the Mosaic history, because they were generally regarded merely as amusing fictions; and yet they concealed in figures, or expressed in plain words, some truths which agree with the book of Genesis, and afford a strong presumptive evidence in favour of this book. With respect to the law of Moses, this was extremely burdensome, expensive, and severe, particularly in its reference to the crime of idolatry, to which mankind were then extravagantly prone; and it was absurd, according to human judgment, in the instances of prohibiting their furnishing themselves with horses for war, and of commanding all the males of the whole nation to appear at Jerusalem three times a year. Nevertheless, it claims a divine authority, and appeals to facts of the most notorious kind, and to customs and ceremonies of the most peculiar nature, as the memorials of these facts. Can we then conceive that any nation, with such motives to reject, and such opportunities of detecting, the forgery of the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, should yet receive them, and submit to this heavy yoke? That the Jews did submit to the law of Moses in these circumstances, is evident from the books of the Old and New Testaments, if we allow them the least truth and genuineness, or even from profane writers, and from the present observance of it by the Jews scattered through

all the kingdoms of the world. Should it be said that other nations have ascribed divine authority to their lawgivers, and submitted to very severe laws, it may be alleged in reply to this, that the pretences of lawgivers among the Pagans to inspiration, and the submission of the people, may be accounted for from their peculiar circumstances at the time, without recurring to real inspiration; and more especially if we admit the patriarchal revelations related by Moses, and his own divine legation, as Heathen lawgivers copied after these, and hence we derive a strong argument in their favour. Beside, no instance occurs among the Pagans of a body of laws framed at once and remaining invariable; whereas the body politic of the Israelites assumed a complete form at once, and has preserved it, with little variation, to the present time, and under many external disadvantages; thus supplying us with an instance altogether without parallel, and showing the high opinion which they entertained of the great importance of their law. In short, of all the fictions or forgeries that can happen among any people, the most improbable is that of the Jewish body of civil laws, and seems to be utterly impossible.

12. If we farther examine the history contained in the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, and extending from the death of Moses to the reestablishment of the Jews after the Babylonish captivity by Ezra and Nehemiah, we shall find a variety of important facts, most of which must be supposed to leave such vestiges of themselves, either external and visible, or internal in the minds and memories of the people, as would verify them if true, or cause them to be rejected if false. The conquest of the land of Canaan, the division of it, and the appointment of cities for the priests and Levites by Joshua; the frequent slaveries of the Israelites to the neighbouring kings, and their deliverance by the judges; the creation of a kingdom by Samuel; the translation of this kingdom from Saul's family to David, with his conquests; the glory of Solomon's kingdom; the building of the temple; the division of the kingdom; the idolatrous worship set up at Dan and Bethel; the captivity of the Israelites by the kings of Assyria; the captivity of the Jews by Nebuchadnezzar; the destruction of their temple; their return under Cyrus, rebuilding the temple under Darius Hystaspes, and reestablishment under Artaxerxes Longimanus, by Ezra and Nehemiah:--these events are some of them the most glorious, and some of them the most reproachful, that can happen to any people. How can we reconcile forgeries of such opposite kinds, and especially as they are interwoven together by various complicated and necessary connections, which do not admit of separation? The facts, indeed, are of such importance, notoriety, and permanency in their effects, that no particular persons among the Israelites could first project the design of feigning them, that their own people would not concur with such a design, and that neighbouring nations would not permit the

fiction to pass. Nothing but the invincible evidence of the facts here alleged, could induce a jealous multitude among the Israelites or neighbouring nations to acquiesce. This must be acknowledged upon the supposition that the several books were published in or near the times when the facts that are recorded in them happened. But suppose all these historical books forged by Ezra; the hypothesis is evidently impossible. Things so important and notorious, so honourable and so reproachful to the people for whose sake they were forged, would have been rejected with the utmost indignation, unless there were the strongest and most genuine traces of these things already among the people. They must therefore, in part at least, be true. If it be said that additions were made by Ezra, these additions must have been either of important or trivial matters. On the first supposition, the difficulty already stated recurs; and if the important facts are true, what possible motive could have induced Ezra to make additions of no importance? Beside, if any ancient writings were extant, Ezra must either copy after them, which destroys the present supposition, or differ from and oppose them, which would betray him. If there were no such ancient writings, the people would be led to inquire with regard to matters of importance, for what reason Ezra was so particular in things of which there was neither any memory, nor account in writing. Should it be said that the people did not regard what Ezra had thus forged, this reduces the subject in question to matters of small or of no importance. Beside, why should Ezra write if no one would read or regard? Farther: Ezra must have had, like other men, friends, enemies, and rivals; and some, or all of these, would have been a check upon him, and a security against him, in matters of importance. If we suppose these books, instead of having been forged at once, to have been forged successively, at the interval of one, two, or three centuries after the facts related, we shall involve ourselves in the same or similar difficulties. Upon the whole, then, we may conclude, that the forgery of the annals of the Israelites appears to be impossible, as well as that of the body of their civil laws. It is needless to examine the books of Esther, Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles; and we might proceed to the Prophecies; but this will be resumed under the article Prophecy. For the subjects comprehended in the books of the New Testament. See Gospel:GOSPEL, and #Christianity.

13. We shall here subjoin some general evidences in attestation of the truth of the books of Scripture. That Jews and Christians have thought their sacred books very highly important, most genuine, and true, appears from the persecutions and sufferings which they have undergone on account of their attachment to them, and because they would not be prevailed upon to surrender them. The preservation of the law of Moses, probably the first book written in any language, whilst many others of a later date have been lost, shows the great regard that has been paid to it; and from this

circumstance we may infer that this and the other books of the Old Testament have been preserved on account of their importance, or from some other cause, equally evincing their genuineness and truth. The great value set upon these books appears also from the many early translations and paraphrases of them; and these translations and paraphrases serve to correct errors that are unavoidable in the lapse of time, and to secure their integrity and purity. The hesitation and difficulty with which some few books of the New Testament were received into the canon, show the great care and concern of the primitive Christians about the canon, and the high importance of the books admitted into it; and afford a strong evidence of their genuineness and truth. The same observation is in a degree applicable to the Jewish canon. Moreover, the religious hatred and animosity which subsisted between the Jews and Samaritans, and between several of the ancient sects among the Christians, convince us of what importance they all thought their sacred books, and disposed them to watch over one another with a jealous eye. Farther: the genuineness of the books of the Old and New Testaments may be evinced from the language, style, and manner of writing used in them. The Hebrew language, in which the Old Testament was written, being the language of an ancient people, who had little intercourse with their neighbours, would not change so fast as modern languages have done, since different nations have been variously blended with one another by the extension of trade, arts, and sciences; and yet some changes must have occurred in the interval that elapsed between the time of Moses and that of Malachi. The biblical Hebrew corresponds so exactly to this criterion, as to afford a considerable argument in favour of the genuineness of the books of the Old Testament. Beside, these books have too great a diversity of style to be the work of either one Jew, or of any set of contemporary Jews. If they be forgeries, there must have been a succession of impostors in different ages, who concurred in the same iniquitous design. Again: the Hebrew language ceased to be spoken, as a living language, soon after the time of the Babylonish captivity; and it would be difficult or impossible to forge any thing in it after it became a dead language. Hence it appears, that all the books of the Old Testament must at least be nearly as ancient as the Babylonish captivity; and as they could not all be written in the same age, some must be much more ancient, and this would reduce us to the necessity of supposing a succession of conspiring impostors. Moreover, there is, as we have already observed, a simplicity of style, and an unaffected manner of writing, in all the books of the Old Testament, which is a strong evidence of their genuineness. The style of the New Testament, in particular, is not only simple and unaffected, but is Greek influenced by the Hebrew idiom, and exactly answers to the circumstances of time, places, and persons. To which we may add, that the narrations and precepts of both the Old and New Testament are delivered without hesitation; the writers teaching as having authority: and this

circumstance is peculiar to those who unite, with a clear knowledge of what they deliver, a perfect integrity of heart. But a farther argument for the genuineness and truth of the Scriptures is supplied by the very great number of particular circumstances of time, place, persons, &c, mentioned in them. It is needless to recount these; but they are incompatible with forged and false accounts, that do not abound in such particularities, and the want of which furnishes a suspicion to their discredit. Compare, in this respect, Manetho's account of the dynasties of Egypt, Ctesias's of the Assyrian kings, and those which the technical chronologers have given of the ancient kingdoms of Greece, which are defective in such particulars, with the history by Thucydides of the Peloponnesian war, and with Cæsar's of the war in Gaul, and the difference will be sufficiently apparent. Dr. Paley's admirable treatise, entitled, "Horæ Paulinæ," affords very valuable illustrations of this argument as it respects the genuineness of the books of the New Testament. The agreement of the Scriptures with history, natural and civil, is a farther proof of their genuineness and truth. The history of the fall agrees in an eminent manner both with the obvious facts of labour, sorrow, pain, and death, with what we see and feel every day, and with all our philosophical inquiries into the frame of the human mind, the nature of social life, and the origin of evil. Natural history bears a strong testimony to Moses's account of the deluge. Civil history affords many evidences which corroborate the same account. (See Deluge.) The Mosaic account of the confusion of languages, of the dispersion of Noah's sons, and of the state of religion in the ancient postdiluvian world, is not only rendered probable, but is in a very high degree established, by many collateral arguments. See Confusion of Languages, and Division of the Earth.

14. The agreement of the books of the Old and New Testaments with themselves and with each other, affords another argument both of their genuineness and truth. The laws of the Israelites are contained in the Pentateuch, and referred to, in a great variety of ways, direct and indirect, in the historical books, in the Psalms, and in the Prophecies. The historical facts also in the preceding books are often referred to in those that succeed, and in the Psalms and Prophecies. In like manner, the Gospels have the greatest harmony with each other, and the Epistles of St. Paul with 163<sup>the</sup> Acts of the Apostles; and, indeed, there is scarcely any book of either the Old or New Testament, which may not be shown to refer to many of the rest, in one way or other. For the illustration of this argument, let us suppose that no more remained of the Roman writers than Livy, Tully, and Horace; would they not, by their references to the same facts and customs, by the sameness of style in the same writer, and difference in the different ones, and numberless other such like circumstances of critical consideration, prove themselves, and one another to be genuine, and the principal facts related, or alluded to, to be true? Whoever will apply this reasoning to the

present case will perceive, that the numberless minute, direct, and indirect agreements and coincidences, that present themselves to all diligent readers of the Scriptures, prove their truth and genuineness beyond all contradiction.

The harmony and agreement of the several writers of the Old and New Testament appear the more remarkable, when it is considered that their various parts were penned by several hands in very different conditions of life, from the throne and sceptre down to the lowest degree, and in very distant ages, through a long interval of time; which would naturally have led a spirit of imposture to have varied its schemes, and to have adapted them to different stations in the world, and to the different vicissitudes of every age. David wrote about four hundred years after Moses, and Isaiah about two hundred and fifty after David, and Matthew more than seven hundred years after Isaiah; and yet these authors, with all the other Prophets and Apostles, write in perfect harmony, confirming the authority of their predecessors, labouring to reduce the people to the observance of their instructions, and loudly exclaiming against the neglect and contempt of them, and denouncing the severest judgments against such as continued disobedient. Consequently, as the writers of the Holy Scriptures, though they all claim a divine authority, yet write in perfect connection and harmony, mutually confirming the doctrine and testimony of each other, and concurring to establish the very same religious truths and principles, it is a strong proof that they all derived their instructions from the same fountain, the wisdom of God, and were indeed under the direction and illumination of the same Spirit. This leads us to add, that the unity of design, which appears in the dispensations recorded in the Scriptures, is an argument not only of their truth and genuineness, but also of their divine authority. In order to perceive the force of this argument, it is only necessary to inquire what this design is, and how it is pursued by the series of events and divine interpositions recorded in the Scriptures. (See Dispensation.) It should also be considered, that the historical evidences in favour of the genuineness, truth, and divine authority of the Scriptures, do not become less from age to age; but, on the contrary, it may rather be presumed that they increase. Since the three great concurring events of printing, the reformation of religion in these western parts, and the restoration of letters, so many more evidences and coincidences have been discovered in favour of the Jewish and Christian histories, as may serve, in some measure, to supply the want of those that have been lost in the preceding times; and as this accumulation of evidences is likely to continue, there is great reason to hope that it will at length become irresistible to all and silence even every gainsayer.

15. The moral characters of the Prophets, and the Apostles, prove the truth and divine authority of the Scriptures. The characters of the persons who are said in the Scriptures to have had divine communications, and a divine mission, are so much superior to the characters that occur in common life, that we can scarcely account for the more eminent individuals, and much less so for so large a succession of them, continued through so many ages, without allowing the divine communications and assistance which they allege. Notwithstanding considerable imperfections that pertained to many of these eminent persons, and the occasional offences chargeable upon one or two of them, yet the impartial reader should consider whether the Prophets, Apostles, &c, were not so much superior, not only to mankind at an average, but even to the best men among the Greeks and Romans, as is not fairly to be accounted for by the mere powers of human nature. If this statement should not be conceded, their characters, however, are too good to allow the supposition of an impious fraud and imposture, which must have been the case if they had not divine authority. Beside, it should be recollected, that the undisguised and impartial manner in which the imperfections and faults of the eminent persons mentioned in Scripture are related, furnishes a remarkable additional evidence for the truth of those parts of the Scripture history in which such relations occur, beside such evidences as extend to the whole.

16. The excellence of the doctrine contained in the Scriptures is an additional evidence of their authority. This argument has great force independently of all other considerations. Suppose, for instance, that the author of the Gospel, which goes under the name of St. Matthew, was not known, and that it was unsupported by the writers of the primitive times; yet such are the unaffected simplicity of the narrations, the purity of the doctrine, and the sincere piety and goodness of the sentiments, that it carries its own authority with it. The same observation is applicable in general to all the books of the Old and New Testaments; so that if there was no other book in the world beside the Bible, a man could not reasonably doubt of the truth of revealed religion. If all other arguments were set aside, we may conclude from this single consideration, that the authors of the books of the Old and New Testaments, whoever they were, cannot have made a false claim to divine authority. The Scriptures contain doctrines concerning God, providence, a future state, the duty of man, &c, far more pure and sublime than can in any way be accounted for from the natural powers of men, so circumstanced as the sacred writers were. Let the reader consider whether it can be reasonably supposed, that Jewish shepherds, fishermen, &c, should, both before and after the rise of the Heathen philosophy, so far exceed men of the greatest abilities and accomplishments in other nations, by any other means than divine communications. Indeed, no writers, from the invention of letters to the



present times, are equal to the penmen of the books of the Old and New Testaments in true excellence, utility and dignity; and this is surely such an internal criterion of their divine authority, as ought not to be resisted.

17. The many and great advantages which have accrued to the world from the patriarchal, Judaical, and Christian revelations, confirm the whole. These advantages relate partly to the knowledge, and partly to the practice, of religion. The internal worth and excellence of the Scriptures, as containing the best principles of knowledge, holiness, consolation, and hope, and their consequent utility and importance in a moral and practical view, fully and directly demonstrate their divine original. For an enlarged view of this branch of evidence see Christianity.

BIBLISTS, or BIBLICI, a term applied to certain doctors in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, who expounded the sacred writings in their public schools, and endeavoured to establish their doctrines by the authority of Scripture, in opposition to uncertain traditions, or the speculations of the schools. Upon the same principle, the Pietists of the seventeenth century formed what they called Biblical colleges, for expounding the Scriptures.

BIER. See Burial.

BILDAD, the Shuhite, one of Job's friends, thought by some to have descended from Shuah, the son of Abraham, by Keturah, Job ii, 11; viii, xviii, xxv.

BILHAH, Rachel's handmaid, given by her to Jacob her husband, as a concubinary wife, that, through her she might have a son, Gen. xxx, 3, 4, &c. See Barrenness.

BIND. To bind and loose are taken for condemning and absolving: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," Matt. xvi, 19. By binding and loosing, in the language of the Jews, is understood, likewise, permitting and forbidding; or declaring any thing in a judicial manner to be permitted or forbidden; and on the promotion of their doctors, they put the keys into their hands with these words, "Receive the power of binding and loosing." So our Lord says, "I am not come to destroy," to unloose or dissolve, "the law, but to fulfil," that is, to confirm and establish it, Matt. v, 17. See Keys.

BIRD, צפור, a common name for all birds, but is sometimes used for the sparrow in particular.

Birds are distinguished by the Jewish legislator into clean and unclean. Such as fed upon grain and seeds were allowed for food, and such as devoured flesh and carrion were prohibited.

Moses, to inspire the Israelites with sentiments of tenderness toward the brute creation, commands them, if they find a bird's nest, not to take the dam with the young, but to suffer the old one to fly away, and to take the young only, Deut. xxii, 6. This is one of those merciful constitutions in the law of Moses which respect the animal creation, and tended to humanize the heart of that people, to excite in them a sense of the divine providence extending itself to all creatures, and to teach them to exercise their dominion over them with gentleness. Beside, the young never knew the sweets of liberty; the dam did: they might be taken and used for any lawful purpose; but the dam must not be brought into a state of captivity. The poet Phocylides has a maxim, in his admonitory poem, very similar to that in the sacred texts:--

Μηδέ τις ὄρνιθας καλιῆς ἅμα πάντας ἐλέσθω,  
Μητέρα δ' ἐκπρολίπης, ἴν' ἔχῃς πάλι τῆσδε νεοττούς.  
Nor from a nest take all the birds away,  
The mother spare, she'll breed a future day.

It appears that the ancients hunted birds. Baruch, iii, 17, speaking of the kings of Babylon, says, "They had their pastime with the fowls of the air;" and Daniel, iii, 38, tells Nebuchadnezzar that God had made the fowls of the air subject to him.

Birds were offered in sacrifice on many occasions. In the sacrifices for sin, he who had not a lamb, or a kid, "might offer two turtles, or two young pigeons; one for a sin-offering, the other for a burnt-offering. These he presented to the priest, who offered that first which was for the sin-offering, and wrung off the head from the neck, but did not divide it asunder: the other he was to offer for a burnt-offering," Lev. v, 7, 8. When a man who had been smitten with a leprosy was healed, he came to the entrance of the camp of Israel, and the priest went out to inspect him, whether he were entirely cured, Lev. xiv, 5, 6. After this inspection, the leprous person came to the door of the tabernacle, and offered two living sparrows, or two birds; (pure birds, those of which it was lawful to eat;) he made a wisp with branches of cedar and hyssop, tied together with a thread, or scarlet ribbon; he filled an earthen pot with running water, that the blood of the bird might be mingled with it; then the priest, dipping the bunch of hyssop and cedar into the water, sprinkled with it the leper who was healed; after which he let loose the living bird, to fly where it would. In Palestine dead bodies were sometimes left exposed to birds of prey, as appears from Scripture;

but, generally, they were buried in the evening: even criminals were taken down from the gallows.

**BIRTHRIGHT**, or **PRIMOGENITURE**, the right of the first-born or eldest son. The birthright, or right of primogeniture, had many privileges annexed to it. The first-born was consecrated to the Lord, Exod. xxii, 29; had a double portion of the estate allotted him, Deut. xxi, 17; had a dignity and authority over his brethren, Gen. xlix, 3; succeeded in the government of the family or kingdom, 2 Chron. xxi, 3; and, as some with good reason suppose, in ancient times to the priesthood or chief government in matters ecclesiastical. Jacob, having bought Esau's birthright, acquired a title to the particular blessing of his dying father; and, accordingly, he had consigned to him the privilege of the covenant which God made with Abraham, that from his loins the Messiah should spring: a prerogative which descended to his posterity. Reuben forfeited the blessings of his birthright, as we see by the express declaration of his father Jacob, in his benediction of his children, Gen. xlix, 1, &c, for the crime of incest with his father's concubine, on account of which his tribe continued all along in obscurity; while the priesthood was conferred on Levi, the government on Judah, and the double portion on Joseph, to descend to their respective tribes. And this preëminence of the first-born took place from the beginning, and as much belonged to Cain, before his forfeiture of it, as it did to Reuben before his. See Genesis iv, 7; xlix, 3. Thus the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, offered sacrifices, and were priests as well as kings in their respective families, Gen. xii, 7, 8; xiii, 18; xvii, 7; xxvi, 25; xxxi, 54; xxxv, 7. Job, in Arabia, acted in the same capacity, Job, i, 5; and it is highly probable that, among the ancient Heathen nations in general, the first-born were entitled not only to the civil authority, but also to the priesthood. This seems to have been the case in Egypt, in the time of Moses: and hence Jehovah's destroying their first-born, as it was the last miracle wrought in that country before the Exodus, so was it the most dreadful, and most effectual in prevailing on Pharaoh and the Egyptians to dismiss the Israelites.

**BISHOP**, פקיד, ἐπίσκοπος, signifies an overseer, or one who has the inspection and direction of any thing. Nehemiah speaks of the overseer of the Levites at Jerusalem, Neh. xi, 22. The most common acceptation of the word bishop is that in Acts xx, 28, and in St. Paul's Epistles, Philip, i, 1, where it signifies the pastor of a church. St. Peter calls Jesus Christ "the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls," 1 Peter ii, 25; and St. Paul describes the qualities requisite in a bishop, 1 Tim. iii, 2; Titus 1, 2, &c. It is not improbable that the overseers of Christ's church are in the New Testament called ἐπισκόποι, from the following passage in Isaiah: "I will also make thy officers peace, and thine overseers" (ἐπισκόπους), "righteousness," Isa. lx, 17. The word, as used by the Apostolic writers, when referring to the

pastors of Christian churches, is evidently of the same import as presbyter or elder; for the terms, as they occur in the New Testament, appear to be synonymous, and are used indifferently. Thus the same persons that are called ἐπισκόποι, bishops are also called πρεσβύτεροι, elders. Hence, when St. Paul came to Miletus, he sent to Ephesus for the presbyters of the church, and thus addressed them: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you" (the presbyters) "ἐπισκόπους, bishops," or overseers, Acts xx, 17. "Here," says Dr. Campbell, "there can be no question that the same persons are denominated presbyters and bishops." Nor is this the only passage in which we find the terms used convertibly. In Titus i, 5, it is said, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders" (Greek, πρεσβυτέρους) "in every city;" and then it follows in verse 7, "For a bishop" (ἐπίσκοπον) "must be blameless." In like manner, the Apostle Peter, 1 Peter v, 1: "The elders" (πρεσβυτέρους) "which are among you I exhort; feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof; ἐπισκοποῦντες, that is, discharging the office of bishops." See Episcopacy.

BITHYNIA, a country of Asia Minor, stretching along the shore of the Pontus Euxinus, or Black Sea, from Mysia to Paphlagonia; having Phrygia and Galatia on the south. In it are the two cities of Nicæa, or Nice, and Chalcedon: both celebrated in ecclesiastical history, on account of the general councils held in them, and called after their names. The former city is at present called Is-Nick, and the latter Kadi-Keni. Within this country, also, are the celebrated mountains of Olympus. St. Peter addressed his first Epistle to the Hebrew Christians who were scattered through this and the neighbouring countries.

BITTER HERBS. מרורים. Exod. xii, 8, and Num. ix, 11. The Jews were commanded to eat their passover with a salad of bitter herbs; but whether one particular plant was intended, or any kind of bitter herbs, has been made a question. By the Septuagint it is rendered ἐπι σακκιδῶν; by Jerom, "cum lactucis agrestibus;" and by the Gr. Venet., ἐπι σακκισιν. Dr. Geddes remarks, that "it is highly probable that the succory or wild lettuce is meant." The Mischna in Pesachim, cap. 2, reckons five species of these bitter herbs: 1. Chazareth, taken for lettuce: 2. Ulsin, supposed to be endive or succory: 3. Tamca, probably tansy: 4. Charubbinim, which Bochart thought might be the nettle, but Scheuchzer shows to be the camomile: 5. Meror, the sow-thistle, or dent-de-lion, or wild lettuce. Mr. Forskal says, "the Jews in Sana and in Egypt eat the lettuce with the paschal lamb." He also remarks, that moru is centaury, of which the young stems are eaten in February and March.

BITTERN. *דקפ*. Isa. xiv, 23; xxxiv, 11; and Zephaniah ii, 14. Interpreters have rendered this word variously: an owl, an osprey, a tortoise, a porcupine, and even an otter. "How unhappy," says Mr. Harmer, "that a word which occurs but three times in the Hebrew Bible should be translated by three different words, and that one of them should be otter!" Isaiah, prophesying the destruction of Babylon, says that "the Lord will make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water;" and Zephaniah, ii, 14, prophesying against Nineveh, says that "the cormorant and bittern shall lodge in the upper lintels of it: their voice shall sing in the windows." The Arabic version reads "al-houbara." 166 According to Dr. Shaw, the houbara is "of the bigness of a capon, but of a longer body. It feeds on little shrubs and insects, like the graab el Sahara; frequenting, in like manner, the confines of the desert." Golius interprets it the bustard; and Dr. Russel says that the Arabic name of the bustard is "houbry."

BITTERNESS, waters of. See Adultery.

BLASPHEMY, *βλασφημία*, properly denotes calumny, detraction, reproachful or abusive language, against whomsoever it be vented. That *βλασφημία* and its conjugates are very often applied, says Dr. Campbell, to reproaches not aimed against God, is evident from the following passages: Matt. xii, 31, 32; xxvii, 39; Mark xv, 29; Luke xxii, 65; xxiii, 39; Rom. iii, 8; xiv, 16; 1 Cor. iv, 13; x, 30; Eph. iv, 31; 1 Tim. vi, 4; Titus iii, 2; 1 Pet. iv, 14; Jude 9, 10; Acts vi, 11, 13; 2 Pet. ii, 10, 11; in the much greater part of which the English translators, sensible that they could admit no such application, have not used the words blaspheme or blasphemy, but rail, revile, speak evil, &c. In one of the passages quoted, a reproachful charge brought even against the devil is called *κρισις βλασφημίας*, Jude 9; and rendered by them, "railing accusation." The import of the word *βλασφημία* is maledicentia, in the largest acceptation; comprehending all sorts of verbal abuse, imprecation, reviling, and calumny. And let it be observed, that when such abuse is mentioned as uttered against God, there is properly no change made in the signification of the word: the change is only in the application; that is, in the reference to a different object. The idea conveyed in the explanation now given is always included, against whomsoever the crime be committed. In this manner every term is understood that is applicable to both God and man. Thus the meaning of the word disobey is the same, whether we speak of disobeying God or of disobeying man. The same may be said of believe, honour, fear, &c. As, therefore, the sense of the term is the same, though differently applied, what is essential to constitute the crime of detraction in the one case, is essential also in the other. But it is essential to this crime, as commonly understood, when committed by one man against another, that there be in the injurious person the will or disposition to detract from the person

abused. Mere mistake in regard to character, especially when the mistake is not conceived by him who entertains it to lessen the character, nay, is supposed, however erroneously, to exalt it, is never construed by any into the crime of defamation. Now, as blasphemy is in its essence the same crime, but immensely aggravated by being committed against an object infinitely superior to man, what is fundamental to the very existence of the crime will be found in this, as in every other species which comes under the general name. There can be no blasphemy, therefore, where there is not an impious purpose to derogate from the Divine Majesty, and to alienate the minds of others from the love and reverence of God. The blasphemer is no other than the calumniator of Almighty God. To constitute the crime, it is as necessary that this species of calumny be intentional. He must be one, therefore, who by his impious talk endeavours to inspire others with the same irreverence toward the Deity, or perhaps, abhorrence of him, which he indulges in himself. And though, for the honour of human nature, it is to be hoped that very few arrive at this enormous guilt, it ought not to be dissembled, that the habitual profanation of the name and attributes of God by common swearing, is but too manifest an approach toward it. There is not an entire coincidence: the latter of these vices may be considered as resulting solely from the defect of what is good in principle and disposition; the former from the acquisition of what is evil in the extreme: but there is a close connection between them, and an insensible gradation from the one to the other. To accustom one's self to treat the Sovereign of the universe with irreverent familiarity, is the first step; malignly to arraign his attributes, and revile his providence, is the last. The first divine law published against it, "He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord" (or Jehovah, as it is in the Hebrew) "shall be put to death," Lev. xxiv, 16, when considered along with the incident that occasioned it, suggests a very atrocious offence in words, no less than abuse or imprecations vented against the Deity. For, in what way soever the crime of the man there mentioned be interpreted,--whether as committed against the true God, the God of Israel, or against any of the false gods whom his Egyptian father worshipped,--the law in the words now quoted is sufficiently explicit; and the circumstances of the story plainly show, that the words which he had used were derogatory from the Godhead, and shocking to the hearers. And if we add to this the only other memorable instance in sacred history, namely, that of Rabshakeh, it will lead us to conclude that it is solely a malignant attempt, in words, to lessen men's reverence of the true God, and, by vilifying his perfections, to prevent their placing confidence in him, which is called in Scripture blasphemy, when the word is employed to denote a sin committed directly against God. This was manifestly the attempt of Rabshakeh, when he said, "Neither let Hezekiah make you trust in the Lord," (the word is Jehovah,) "saying, Jehovah will surely deliver us. Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered his land out of the hand

of the king of Assyria? Where are the gods of Hamath and of Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Iva? Have they delivered Samaria out of my hand? Who are they, among all the gods of the countries, that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that Jehovah should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand?" 2 Kings xviii, 30, 33–35.

2. It will naturally occur to inquire, what that is, in particular, which our Lord denominates "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," Matt. xii, 31, 32; Mark iii, 28, 29; Luke xii, 10. But without entering minutely into the discussion of this question, it may suffice here to observe, that this blasphemy is certainly not of the constructive kind, but direct, manifest, and malignant. First, it is mentioned as comprehended under the same genus with abuse against men, and contradistinguished only by the object. Secondly, it is farther explained by being called speaking against in both cases: ὃς ἂν εἶπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,--ὃς δ' ἂν εἶπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man."--"Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost." The expressions are the same, in effect, in all the Evangelists who mention it, and imply such an opposition as is both intentional and malevolent. This cannot have been the case of all who disbelieved the mission of Jesus, and even decried his miracles; many of whom, we have reason to think, were afterward converted by the Apostles. But it was the wretched case of some who, instigated by worldly ambition and avarice, slandered what they knew to be the cause of God; and, against conviction, reviled his work as the operation of evil spirits. This view of the sin against the Holy Ghost is confirmed by the circumstances under which our Lord spoke.

If we consider the Scripture account of this sin, nothing can be plainer than that it is to be understood of the Pharisees' imputing the miracles wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost to the power of the devil; for our Lord had just healed one possessed of a devil, and upon this the Pharisees gave this malicious turn to the miracle. This led our Saviour to discourse on the sin of blasphemy. The Pharisees were the persons charged with the crime: the sin itself manifestly consisted in ascribing what was done by the finger of God to the agency of the devil; and the reason, therefore, why our Lord pronounced it unpardonable, is plain; because, by withstanding the evidence of miracles, they resisted the strongest means of conviction, and that wilfully and malignantly; and, giving way to their passions, opprobriously treated that Holy Spirit whom they ought to have adored. From all which it will probably follow, that no person can now be guilty of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, in the sense in which our Saviour originally intended it; but there may be sins which bear a very near resemblance to it. This appears from the case of the apostates mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to whom "no more sacrifice for sins" is said

to remain; whose defection, however, is not represented so much as a direct sin against the Holy Ghost as against Christ, whom the apostate Jews blasphemed in the synagogues. It implied, however, a high offence against the Holy Spirit also, with whose gifts they had, probably, been endowed, and their conduct must be considered, if not the same sin as that committed by the Pharisees, yet as a consenting with it, and thus as placing them in nearly, if not altogether, the same desperate condition. Even apostasy in the present day, although a most aggravated and perilous offence, cannot be committed with circumstances of equal aggravation to those which were found in the case of the persons mentioned by St. Paul; and it may be laid down as certain, for the relief of those who may be tempted to think that they have committed the unpardonable sin, that their horror of it, and the trouble which the very apprehension causes them, are the sure proofs that they are mistaken. But although there may be now fearful approaches to the unpardonable offence, it is to be remembered that there may be many dangerous and fatal sins against the Holy Ghost, which are not the sin against him, which has no forgiveness.

**BLEMISH**, whatever renders a person or thing imperfect or uncomely. The Jewish law required the priests to be free from blemishes of person, Lev. xxi, 17–23; xxii, 20–24. Scandalous professors are blemishes to the church of God, 2 Peter ii, 13; Jude 12, and therefore ought to be put away from it, in the exercise of a godly discipline.

**BLESS, BLESSING**. There are three points of view in which the acts of blessing may be considered. The first is, when men are said to bless God, as in Psalm ciii, 1, 2. We are then not to suppose that the divine Being, who is over all, and, in himself, blessed for evermore, is capable of receiving any augmentation of his happiness, from all the creatures which he has made: such a supposition, as it would imply something of imperfection in the divine nature, must ever be rejected with abhorrence; and, therefore, when the creatures bless the adorable Creator, they only ascribe to him that praise and dominion, and honour, and glory, and blessing, which it is equally the duty and joy of his creatures to render. But when God is said to bless his people, Gen. i, 22; Eph. i, 3; the meaning is, that he confers benefits upon them, either temporal or spiritual, and so communicates to them some portion of that blessedness which, in infinite fulness, dwells in himself, James i, 17; Psalm civ, 24, 28; Luke xi, 9–13. In the third place men are said to bless their fellow creatures. From the time that God entered into covenant with Abraham, and promised extraordinary blessings to his posterity, it appears to have been customary for the father of each family, in the direct line, or line of promise, previous to his death, to call his children around him, and to inform them, according to the knowledge which it pleased God then to give him, how, and in what manner, the divine



blessing conferred upon Abraham was to descend among them. Upon these occasions, the patriarchs enjoyed a divine illumination; and under its influence, their benediction was deemed a prophetic oracle, foretelling events with the utmost certainty, and extending to the remotest period of time. Thus Jacob blessed his sons, Gen. xlix; and Moses, the children of Israel, Deut. xxxiii. When Melchizedeck blessed Abraham, the act of benediction included in it not merely the pronouncing solemn good wishes, but also a petitionary address to God that he would be pleased to ratify the benediction by his concurrence with what was prayed for. Thus Moses instructed Aaron, 168 and his descendants, to bless the congregation, "In this wise shall ye bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord make his face to shine upon thee; the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace," Num. iv, 23. David says, "I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord," Psalm cxvi, 13. This phrase appears to be taken from the practice of the Jews in their thank-offerings, in which a feast was made of the remainder of their sacrifices, and the offerers, together with the priests, did eat and drink before the Lord; when, among other rites, the master of the feast took a cup of wine in his hand and solemnly blessed God for it, and for the mercies which were then acknowledged, and gave it to all the guests, every one of whom drank in his turn. To this custom it is supposed our blessed Lord alludes in the institution of the cup, which also is called, 1 Cor. x, 16, "the cup of blessing." At the family feasts also, and especially that of the passover, both wine and bread were in this solemn and religious manner distributed, and God was blessed, and his mercies acknowledged. They blessed God for their present refreshment, for their deliverance out of Egypt, for the covenant of circumcision, and for the law given by Moses; and prayed that God would be merciful to his people Israel, that he would send the Prophet Elijah, and that he would render them worthy of the kingdom of the Messiah. See also 1 Chron. xvi, 2, 3. In the Mosaic law, the manner of blessing is appointed by the lifting up of hands. Our Lord lifted up his hands, and blessed his disciples. It is probable that this action was constantly used on such occasions. The palm of the hand held up was precatory; and the palm turned outward or downward was benedictory. See Benediction and Lord's Supper.

**BLINDFOLDING.** This is the treatment which Christ received from his enemies. It refers to a sport which was common among children, called  $\mu\upsilon\tilde{\nu}\delta\alpha$ , in which it was the manner first to blindfold, then to strike, and to ask who gave the blow, and not to let the person go till he had named the right man who had struck him. It was used in reproach of our blessed Lord as a Prophet, or divine instructor, and to expose him to ridicule, Luke xxii, 63, 64.

BLINDNESS is often used in Scripture to express ignorance or want of discernment in divine things, as well as the being destitute of natural sight. See Isa. xlii, 18, 19; vi, 10; Matt. xv, 14. "Blindness of heart" is the want of understanding arising from the influence of vicious passions. "Hardness of heart" is stubbornness of will, and destitution of moral feeling. Moses says, "Thou shalt not put a stumbling block before the blind," Lev. xix, 14, which may be understood literally; or figuratively, as if Moses recommended that charity and instruction should be shown to them who want light and counsel, or to those who are in danger of going wrong through their ignorance. Moses says also, "Cursed be he who maketh the blind to wander out of his way," Deut. xxvii, 18, which may also be taken in the same manner. An ignorant or erring teacher is compared by our Lord to a blind man leading a blind man;--a strong representation of the presumption of him that professes to teach the way of salvation without due qualifications, and of the danger of that implicit faith which is often placed by the people in the authority of man, to the neglect of the Holy Scriptures.

BLOOD. Beside its proper sense, the fluid of the veins of men and animals, the term in Scripture is used, 1. For life. "God will require the blood of a man," he will punish murder in what manner soever committed. "His blood be upon us," let the guilt of his death be imputed to us. "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth;" the murder committed on him crieth for vengeance. "The avenger of blood;" he who is to avenge the death of his relative, Num. xxxv, 24, 27. 2. Blood means relationship, or consanguinity. 3. Flesh and blood are placed in opposition to a superior nature: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven," Matt. xvi, 17. 4. They are also opposed to the glorified body: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," 1 Cor. xv, 50. 5. They are opposed also to evil spirits: "We wrestle not against flesh and blood," against visible enemies composed of flesh and blood, "but against principalities and powers," &c, Eph. vi, 12. 6. Wine is called the pure blood of the grape: "Judah shall wash his garments in the blood of the grape," Gen. xlix, 11; Deut. xxxii. 14. 7. The priests were established by God to judge between blood and blood; that is, in criminal matters, and where the life of man is at stake;--to determine whether the murder be casual, or voluntary; whether a crime deserve death, or admit of remission, &c. 8. In its most eminent sense blood is used for the sacrificial death of Christ; whose blood or death is the price of our salvation. His blood has "purchased the church," Acts xx, 28. "We are justified by his blood," Rom. v, 9. "We have redemption through his blood," Eph. i, 7, &c. See Atonement.

That singular and emphatic prohibition of blood for food from the earliest times, which we find in the Holy Scriptures, deserves particular attention.

God expressly forbade the eating of blood alone, or of blood mixed with the flesh of animals, as when any creature was suffocated, or strangled, or killed without drawing its blood from the carcass. For when the grant of animal food was made to Noah, in those comprehensive words, "Even as the green herb have I given you all things," it was added, "but flesh with the life thereof, namely, its blood, ye shall not eat," Gen. ix, 4. And when the law was given to the children of Israel, we find the prohibition against the eating of blood still more explicitly enforced, both upon Jews and Gentiles, in the following words, "Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people: for the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul," Lev. xvii, 10, 11. And to cut off all possibility of mistake upon this particular point, it is added: "Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul of you shall eat blood, neither shall any stranger that sojourneth among you eat blood; and whatsoever man there be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, which hunteth and catcheth any beast or fowl that may be eaten; he shall even pour out the blood thereof and cover it with dust, for it is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life thereof; therefore I said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh: for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof; whosoever eateth it shall be cut off," verses 12–14. This restraint, than which nothing can be more express, was also, under the new covenant, enjoined upon believing Gentiles, as "a burden" which "it seemed necessary to the Holy Spirit to impose upon them," Acts xv, 28, 29. For this prohibition no moral reason seems capable of being offered; nor does it clearly appear that blood is an unwholesome aliment, which some think was the physical reason of its being inhibited; and if, in fact, blood is deleterious as food, there seems no greater reason why this should be pointed out by special revelation to man, to guard him against injury, than many other unwholesome aliments. There is little force in the remark, that the eating of blood produces a ferocious disposition; for those nations that eat strangled things, or blood cooked with other aliments, do not exhibit more ferocity than others. The true reason was, no doubt, a sacrificial one. When animals were granted to Noah for food, the blood was reserved; and when the same law was reenacted among the Israelites, the original prohibition is repeated with an explanation which at once shows the original ground upon which it rested: "I have given it upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls." From this "additional reason," as it has been called, it has been argued, that the doctrine of the atoning power of blood was new, and was, then, for the first time, announced by Moses, or the same cause for the prohibition would have been assigned to Noah. To this we may reply, 1. That unless the same

reason be supposed as the ground of the prohibition of blood to Noah, as that given by Moses to the Jews, no reason at all can be conceived for this restraint being put upon the appetite of mankind from Noah to Moses; and yet we have a prohibition of a most solemn kind, which in itself could have no reason, enjoined without any external reason being either given or conceivable. 2. That it is a mistake to suppose that the declaration of Moses to the Jews, that God had “given them the blood for an atonement,” is an “additional reason” for the interdict, not to be found in the original prohibition to Noah. The whole passage occurs in Lev. xvii; and the great reason there given of the prohibition of blood is, that it is “the life;” and what follows respecting “atonement,” is exegetical of this reason;--the life is in the blood, and the blood or life is given as an atonement. Now, by turning to the original prohibition in Genesis we find that precisely the same reason is given: “But the flesh with the blood, which is the life thereof, shall ye not eat.” The reason, then, being the same, the question is, whether the exegesis added by Moses must not necessarily be understood in the general reason given for the restraint to Noah. Blood is prohibited because it is the life; and Moses adds, that it is “the blood,” or life, “which makes atonement.” Let any one attempt to discover any reason for the prohibition of blood to Noah, in the mere circumstance that it is “the life,” and he will find it impossible. It is no reason at all, moral or instituted, except that as it was LIFE SUBSTITUTED FOR LIFE, the life of the animal in sacrifice for the life of man, and that, therefore, blood had a sacred appropriation. The manner, too, in which Moses introduces the subject, is indicative that, though he was renewing a prohibition, he was not publishing a new doctrine; he does not teach his people that God had then given, or appointed, blood to make atonement; but he prohibits them from eating it, because he had already made this appointment, without reference to time, and as a subject with which they were familiar. Because the blood was the life, it was sprinkled upon, and poured out at, the altar: and we have in the sacrifice of the paschal lamb, and the sprinkling of its blood, a sufficient proof that, before the giving of the law, not only was blood not eaten, but was appropriated to a sacred sacrificial purpose. Nor was this confined to the Jews; it was customary with the Romans and Greeks, who, in like manner, poured out and sprinkled the blood of victims at their altars; a rite derived, probably, from the Egyptians, who deduced it, not from Moses, but from the sons of Noah. The notion, indeed, that the blood of the victims was peculiarly sacred to the gods, is impressed upon all ancient Pagan mythology.

**BOANERGES.** This word is neither Hebrew nor Syriac, and some have thought that the transcribers have not exactly copied it, and that the word was *benereen*, βενερεέν, which expresses the sound of the Hebrew of the phrase, “sons of thunder.” Parkhurst judges the word to be the Galilean

pronunciation of the Hebrew בַּיִרְעַשׁ expressed in Greek letters. Now, רעש properly signifies a violent trembling or commotion, and may therefore be well rendered by βροντή, thunder, which is a violent commotion in the air; so, vice versâ, any violent commotion is figuratively, and not unusually, in all languages, called thunder. When our Saviour named the sons of Zebedee, Boanerges, he perhaps had an eye to that prophecy of Haggai, "Yet once, and I will shake the heavens and the earth," ii, 6; which is by the Apostle to the Hebrews, xii, 26, applied to the great alteration made in the economy of the Jews by the publication of the Gospel. The name Boanerges, therefore, given to James and John, imports that they should be eminent instruments in accomplishing the wondrous change, and should, like an earthquake or thunder, mightily bear down all opposition, by their inspired preaching and miraculous powers. That it does not relate to their mode of preaching is certain; for that clearly appears to have been calmly argumentative, and sweetly persuasive--the very reverse of what is usually called a thundering ministry.

BOAR, חזיר. The wild boar is considered as the parent stock of our domestic hog. He is smaller, but at the same time stronger and more undaunted, than the hog. In his own defence, he will turn on men or dogs; and scarcely shuns any denizen of the forests, in the haunts where he ranges. His colour is always an iron grey, inclining to black. His snout is longer than that of the common breed, and his ears are comparatively short. His tusks are very formidable, and all his habits are fierce and savage. It should seem, from the accounts of ancient authors, that the ravages of the wild boar were considered as more formidable than those of other savage animals. The conquest of the Erymanthian boar was one of the fated labours of Hercules; and the story of the Calydonian boar is one of the most beautiful in Ovid. The destructive ravages of these animals are mentioned in Psalm lxxx, 14. Dr. Pococke observed very large herds of wild boars on the side of Jordan, where it flows out of the sea of Tiberias; and saw several of them on the other side lying among the reeds by the sea. The wild boars of other countries delight in the like moist retreats. These shady marshes then, it should seem, are called in the Scripture, "woods;" for it calls these animals, "the wild boars of the woods."

BOHEMIAN BRETHREN, a sect of heretics, according to the church of Rome; but, in truth, a race of early reformers, who preceded Luther. At first they were charged with so many heresies, that the great reformer was shy of them; but, upon receiving from themselves an account of their tenets, in 1522, he readily acknowledged them as brethren, and received them into communion. Some time after this, they were driven by persecution from their native country, and entered into communion with the Swiss church,

as reformed by Zuinglius; and from thence sprang the church of the United Brethren.

BONDS were of two kinds, public and private; the former were employed to secure a prisoner in the public jail, after confession or conviction; the latter when he was delivered to a magistrate, or even to private persons, to be kept at their houses till he should be tried. The Apostle Paul was subjected to private bonds by Felix, the Roman governor, who “commanded a centurion to keep him, and to let him have liberty, and that he should forbid none of his acquaintance to minister, or come unto him,” Acts xxiv, 23. And after he was carried prisoner to Rome, he “dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him,” xxviii, 30.

BONNET was a covering for the head, worn by the Jewish priests. Josephus says, that the bonnet worn by the private priests was composed of several rounds of linen cloth, turned in and sewed together, so as to appear like a thick linen crown. The whole was entirely covered with another piece of linen, which came down as low as their forehead, and concealed the deformity of the seams. See Exodus xxviii, 40. The high priest’s bonnet was not much different from that which has been described.

BOOK, a writing composed on some point of knowledge by a person intelligent therein, for the instruction or amusement of the reader. The word is formed from the Gothic *boka*, or Saxon *boc*, which comes from the Northern *buech*, of *buechaus*, a beech or service tree, on the bark of which our ancestors used to write. Book is distinguished from pamphlet, or single paper, by its greater length; and from tome or volume, by its containing the whole writing on the subject. Isidore makes this distinction between *liber* and *codex*; that the former denotes a single book, the latter a collection of several; though, according to Scipio Maffei, *codex* signifies a book in the square form; *liber*, a book in the roll form. The primary distinction between *liber* and *codex* seems to have been derived, as Dr. Heylin has observed, from the different materials used for writing, among the ancients: from the innerside of the bark of a tree, used for this purpose, and called in Latin *liber*, the name of *liber* applied to a book was deduced; and from that tablet, formed from the main body of a tree, called *caudex*, was derived the appellation of *codex*.

2. Several sorts of materials were formerly used in making books: stone and wood were the first materials employed to engrave such things upon as men were desirous of having transmitted to posterity. Porphyry makes mention of some pillars preserved in Crete, on which the ceremonies observed by the Corybantes in their sacrifices were recorded. The works

of Hesiod were originally written on tables of lead, and deposited in the temple of the Muses in Bœotia. The laws of Jehovah were written on tables of stone, and those of Solon on wooden planks. Tables of wood and ivory were common among the ancients: those of wood, were very frequently covered with wax, that persons might write on them with more ease, or blot out what they had written. And the instrument used to write with was a piece of iron, called a style; and hence the word “style” came to be taken for the composition of the writing. The leaves of the palm-tree were afterward used instead of wooden planks, and the finest and thinnest part of the bark of such trees as the lime, ash, maple, and elm; and especially the tilio, or phillyrea, and Egyptian papyrus. Hence came the word *liber*, (a book,) which signifies the inner bark of the trees. And as these barks were rolled up in order to be removed with greater ease, each roll was called *volumen*, a volume; a name afterward given to the like rolls of paper or parchment. From the Egyptian papyrus the 171 word paper is derived. After this, leather was introduced, especially the skins of goats and sheep. For the king of Pergamus, in collecting his library, was led to the invention of parchment made of those skins. The ancients likewise wrote upon linen. Pliny says, the Parthians, even in his time, wrote upon their clothes; and Livy speaks of certain books made of linen, *linthei libri*, upon which the names of magistrates, and the history of the Roman commonwealth, were written, and preserved in the temple of the goddess *Moneta*.

3. The materials generally used by the ancients for their books, were liable to be easily destroyed by the damp, when hidden in the earth; and in times of war, devastation, and rapacity, it was necessary to bury in the earth whatever they wished to preserve from the attacks of fraud and violence. With this view, Jeremiah ordered the writings, which he delivered to Baruch, to be put in an earthen vessel, *Jer. xxxii*. In the same manner the ancient Egyptians made use of earthen urns, or pots of a proper shape, for containing whatever they wanted to inter in the earth, and which, without such care, would have been soon destroyed. We need not wonder then, that the Prophet Jeremiah should think it necessary to inclose those writings in an earthen pot, which were to be buried in Judea, in some place where they might be found without much difficulty on the return of the Jews from captivity. Accordingly two different writings, or small rolls of writing, called books in the original Hebrew, were designed to be inclosed in such an earthen vessel; but commentators have been much embarrassed in giving any probable account of the necessity of two writings, one sealed, the other open; or, as the passage has been commonly understood, the one sealed up, the other left open for any one to read; more especially, as both were to be alike buried in the earth and concealed from every eye, and both were to be examined at the return from the captivity. But the word translated open, in reference to the evidence, or book which was open, (1

Sam. iii, 7, 21; Dan. ii, 19, 30; x, 1,) signifies the revealing of future events to the minds of men by a divine agency; and it is particularly used in the book of Esther, viii, 13, to express a book's making known the decree of an earthly king. Consequently the open book of Jeremiah seems to signify, not its being then lying open or unrolled before them, while the other was sealed up; but the book that had revealed the will of God, to bring back Israel into their own country, and to cause buying and selling of houses and lands again to take place among them. This was a book of prophecy, opening and revealing the future return of Israel, and the other little book, which was ordered to be buried along with it, was the purchase deed.

4. By adverting to the different modes of writing in eastern countries, we obtain a satisfactory interpretation of a passage in the book of Job, xix, 23, 24, and a distinct view of the beautiful gradation which is lost in our translation: "O that my words were now written! O that they were printed (written) in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever!" In the east there is a mode of writing, which is designed to fix words in the memory, but the writing is not intended for duration. Accordingly we are informed by Dr. Shaw, that children learn to write in Barbary by means of a smooth thin board, slightly covered with whiting, which may be wiped off or renewed at pleasure. Job expresses his wish not only that his words were written, but also written in a book, from which they should not be blotted out, nay, still farther, graven in a rock, the most permanent mode of recording them, and especially if the engraved letters were filled with lead; or the rock was made to receive leaden tablets, the use of which was known among the ancients. So Pliny, "At first men wrote on the leaves of palm, and the bark of certain trees, but afterward public documents were preserved on leaden plates, and those of a private nature on wax, or linen."

5. The first books were in the form of blocks and tables, of which we find frequent mention in Scripture, under the appellation *sepher*, which the Septuagint render *ἀξίνες*, that is, square tables: of which form the book of the covenant, book of the law, book, or bill of divorce, book of curses, &c, appear to have been. As flexible matters came to be written on, they found it more convenient to make their books in form of rolls, called by the Greeks *κοντάκια*, by the Latins *volumina*, which appear to have been in use among the ancient Jews as well as the Grecians, Romans, Persians, and even Indians; and of such did the libraries chiefly consist, till some centuries after Christ. The form which obtains among us is the square, composed of separate leaves; which was also known, though little used, among the ancients; having been invented by Attalus, king of Pergamus, the same who also invented parchment: but it has now been so long in possession, that the oldest manuscripts are found in it. Montfaucon assures



us, that of all the ancient Greek manuscripts he has seen, there are but two in the roll form; the rest being made up much after the manner of the modern books. The rolls, or volumes, were composed of several sheets, fastened to each other, and rolled upon a stick, or umbilicus; the whole making a kind of column, or cylinder, which was to be managed by the umbilicus, as a handle; it being reputed a kind of crime to take hold of the roll itself. The outside of the volume was called frons; the ends of the umbilicus were called cornua, "horns;" which were usually carved and adorned likewise with silver, ivory, or even gold and precious stones. Whilst the Egyptian papyrus was in common use, its brittle nature made it proper to roll up what they wrote; and as this had been a customary practice, many continued it when they used other materials, which might very safely have been treated in a different manner. To the form of books belongs the economy of the inside, or the order and arrangement of points and letters into lines and pages, with margins and other appurtenances. 172This has undergone many varieties: at first, the letters were only divided into lines, then into separate words; which, by degrees, were noted with accents, and distributed by points and stops into periods, paragraphs, chapters, and other divisions. In some countries, as among the orientals, the lines began from the right, and ran to the left; in others, as in northern and western nations, from the left to the right; others, as the Grecians, followed both directions alternately, going in the one and returning in the other, called boustrophedon, because it was after the manner of oxen turning when at plough. In the Chinese books, the lines ran from top to bottom. Again: the page in some is entire, and uniform; in others, divided into columns; in others distinguished into texts and notes, either marginal, or at the bottom: usually it is furnished with signatures and catch words; also with a register to discover whether the book be complete. To these are occasionally added the apparatus of summaries, or side notes; the embellishments of red, gold, or figured initial letters, head pieces, tail pieces, effigies, schemes, maps, and the like. The end of the book now denoted by finis, was anciently marked with a <, called coronis, and the whole frequently washed with an oil drawn from cedar, or citron chips, strewed between the leaves to preserve it from rotting. There also occur certain formulæ at the beginning and end of books; as among the Jews, the word הוּק, esto fortis, which we find at the end of the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Ezekiel, &c, to exhort the reader to be courageous, and proceed on to the following book. The conclusions were also often guarded with imprecations against such as should falsify them; of which we have an instance in the Apocalypse. The Mohammedans, for the like reason, place the name of God at the beginning of all their books, which cannot fail to procure them protection, on account of the infinite regard which they pay to that name, wherever found. For the like reason it is, that divers of the laws of the ancient emperors begin with the formula, In

nomine Dei. [In the name of God.] At the end of each book the Jews also added the number of verses contained in it, and at the end of the Pentateuch the number of sections; that, it might be transmitted to posterity entire. The Masorites and Mohammedan doctors have gone farther; so as to number the several words and letters in each book, chapter, verse, &c, of the Old Testament and the Alcoran. The scarcity and high price of books in former ages, ought to render us the more grateful for the discovery of the great art of printing, as especially by that means the Holy Bible, “the word of truth and Gospel of our salvation,” is made familiar to all classes.

The universal ignorance that prevailed in Europe, from the seventh to the eleventh century, may be ascribed to the scarcity of books during that period, and the difficulty of rendering them more common, concurring with other causes arising from the state of government and manners. The Romans wrote their books either on parchment, or on paper made of the Egyptian papyrus. The latter, being the cheapest, was of course the most commonly used. But after the Saracens conquered Egypt, in the seventh century, the communication between that country and the people settled in Italy, or in other parts of Europe, was almost entirely broken off, and the papyrus was no longer in use among them. They were obliged on that account to write all their books upon parchment; and as the price of that was high, books became extremely rare and of great value. We may judge of the scarcity of materials for writing them from one circumstance. There still remain several manuscripts of the eighth, ninth, and following centuries, written on parchment, from which some former writing had been erased, in order to substitute a new composition in its place. Thus, it is probable, several of the works of the ancients perished. A book of Livy or of Tacitus might be erased, to make room for the legendary tale of a saint, or the superstitious prayers of a missal. Nay, worse instances are recorded, of obliterating copies of the Holy Scriptures to make room for the lucubrations of some of the more modern fathers of the church. Manuscripts thus defaced, the vellum or parchment of which is occupied with some other writings, are called “palimpsests,” *codices rescripti* or *palimpsesti*, from *παλίμψητος*, “that which has been twice scraped.” As this want of materials for writing will serve to account for the loss of many of the works of the ancients, and for the small number of MSS. previous to the eleventh century, many facts prove the scarcity of books at this period. Private persons seldom possessed any books whatever; and even monasteries of note had only one missal. In 1299, John de Pontissara, bishop of Winchester, borrows of his cathedral convent of St. Swithin, at Winchester, “*bibliam bene glossatam*,” that is, the Bible, with marginal annotations, in two folio volumes; but gives a bond for the return of it, drawn up with great solemnity. For the bequest of this Bible to the convent, and one hundred marks, the monks founded a daily mass for the soul of the

donor. If any person gave a book to a religious house, he believed that so valuable a donation merited eternal salvation, and he offered it on the altar with great ceremony. The prior and convent of Rochester declare, that they will every year pronounce the irrevocable sentence of damnation on him who shall purloin or conceal a Latin translation of Aristotle's Poetics, or even obliterate the title. Sometimes a book was given to a monastery, on condition that the donor should have the use of it for his life; and sometimes to a private person, with the reservation that he who receives it should pray for the soul of his benefactor. In the year 1225, Roger de Insula, dean of York, gave several Latin Bibles to the university of Oxford, on condition that the students who perused them should deposit a cautionary pledge. The library of that university, before the year 1300, consisted only of a few tracts, chained or kept in chests, in the choir of St. Mary's church. The price of books became so high, that persons of a moderate 173 could not afford to purchase them. In the year 1174, Walter, prior of St. Swithin's at Winchester, purchased of the monks of Dorchester, in Oxfordshire, Bede's homilies, and St. Austin's psalter for twelve measures of barley and a pall, on which was embroidered in silver the history of St. Birinus converting a Saxon king. About the year 1400, a copy of John of Meun's "Roman de la Rose" was sold before the palace gate at Paris for forty crowns, or 33l. 6s. 6d. The countess of Anjou paid, for a copy of the homilies of Haimon, bishop of Halberstadt, two hundred sheep, five quarters of wheat, and the same quantity of rye and millet. Even so late as the year 1471, when Louis XI. of France borrowed the works of Rhasis, the Arabian physician, from the faculty of medicine at Paris, he not only deposited by way of pledge a considerable quantity of plate, but he was obliged to procure a nobleman to join with him as surety in a deed, binding himself under a great forfeiture to restore it. But when, in the eleventh century, the art of making paper was invented, and more especially after the manufacture became general, the number of MSS. increased, and the study of the sciences was wonderfully facilitated. Indeed, the invention of the art of making paper, and the invention of the art of printing, are two very memorable events in the history of literature and of human civilization. It is remarkable, that the former preceded the first dawning of letters and improvement in knowledge, toward the close of the eleventh century; and the latter ushered in the light which spread over Europe at the æra of the reformation.

6. If the ancient books were large, they were formed of a number of skins, of a number of pieces of linen and cotton cloth, or of papyrus, or parchment, connected together. The leaves were rarely written over on both sides, Ezek. ii, 9; Zech. v, 1. Books, when written upon very flexible materials, were, as stated above, rolled round a stick; and, if they were very long, round two, from the two extremities. The reader unrolled the book to the place which he wanted, ἀναπτύζας τὸ βιβλίον, and rolled it up again,

when he had read it, πτύζας τὸ βιβλίον, Luke iv, 17–20; whence the name הללמ, a volume, or thing rolled up, Psalm xl, 7; Isaiah xxxiv, 4; Ezek. ii, 9; 2 Kings xix, 14; Ezra vi, 2. The leaves thus rolled round the stick, which has been mentioned, and bound with a string, could be easily sealed, Isaiah xxix, 11; Dan. xii, 4; Rev. v, 1; vi, 7. Those books, which were inscribed on tablets of wood, lead, brass, or ivory, were connected together by rings at the back, through which a rod was passed to carry them by. The orientals appear to have taken pleasure in giving tropical or enigmatical titles to their books. The titles, prefixed to the fifty-sixth, sixtieth, and eightieth psalms appear to be of this description. And there can be no doubt, that David's elegy upon Saul and Jonathan, 2 Sam. i, 18, is called נשק or the bow, in conformity with this peculiarity of taste.

The book, or flying roll, spoken of in Zech. v, 1, 2, twenty cubits long and ten wide, was one of the ancient rolls, composed of many skins, or parchments, glued or sewed together at the end. Though some of these rolls or volumes were very long, yet none, probably, was ever made of such a size as this. This contained the curses and calamities which should befall the Jews. The extreme length and breadth of it shows the excessive number and enormity of their sins, and the extent of their punishment.

Isaiah, describing the effects of God's wrath, says, "The heavens shall be folded up like a book," (scroll,) Isaiah xxxiv, 4. He alludes to the way among the ancients, of rolling up books, when they purposed to close them. A volume of several feet in length was suddenly rolled up into a very small compass. Thus the heavens should shrink into themselves, and disappear, as it were, from the eyes of God, when his wrath should be kindled. These ways of speaking are figurative, and very energetic.

7. Book is sometimes used for letters, memoirs, an edict, or contract. In short, the word book, in Hebrew, sepher, is much more extensive than the Latin liber. The letters which Rabshakeh delivered from Sennacherib to Hezekiah are called a book. The English translation, indeed, reads letter; but the Septuagint has βιβλίον, and the Hebrew text, הספרים. The contract, confirmed by Jeremiah for the purchase of a field, is called by the same name, Jer. xxxii, 10; and also the edict of Ahasuerus in favour of the Jews, Esther ix, 20, though our translators have called it letters. The writing which a man gave to his wife when he divorced her, was denominated, in Hebrew, "a book of divorce," Deut. xxiv.

Books, Writers of. The ancients seldom wrote their treatises with their own hand, but dictated them to their freedmen and slaves. These were either ταχυγράφοι, amanuenses, notarii, "hasty writers," or καλλιγράφοι, librarii, "fair writers," or βιβλιογράφοι, librarii, "copyists." The office of these last

was to transcribe fairly that which the former had written hastily and from dictation; they were those who were obliged to write books and other documents which were intended to be durable. The correctness of the copies was under the care of the emendator, corrector, ὁ δοκιμάζων τὰ γεγραμμένα. A great part of the books of the New Testament was dictated after this custom. St. Paul noted it as a particular circumstance in the Epistle to the Galatians, that he had written it with his own hand, Gal. vi, 11. But he affixed the salutation with his own hand, 2 Thess. iii, 17; 1 Cor. xvi, 21; Col. iv, 18. The amanuensis who wrote the Epistle to the Romans, has mentioned himself near the conclusion, Rom. xvi, 22.

Books, modes of publication. Works could only be multiplied by means of transcripts. Whenever in this way they passed over to others, they were beyond the control of the author, and published. The edition, or publication, by means of the booksellers, was, only at a later period, advantageous to the Christians. The recitatio [reading aloud] preceded the publication, which took place often merely among some few friends, and often with great preparations before many persons, who were invited for that purpose. From hence the author became known as the writer, and the world became previously informed of all which they might expect from the work. If the composition pleased them, he was requested to permit its transcription; and thus the work left the hands of the author, and belonged to the publicum: [public.] Frequently an individual sent his literary labours to some illustrious man, as a present, strena, [a new-year's gift,] munusculum; [a small present;] or he prefixed his name to it, for the sake of giving him a proof of friendship or regard, by means of this express and particular direction of his work. When it was only thus presented or sent to him, and he accepted it, he was considered as the person bound to introduce it to the world, or as the patronus libri, [patron of the book,] who had pledged himself, as the patronus personæ [patron of the person] to this duty. It now became his office to provide for its publication by means of transcripts, to facilitate its approach ad limina potentiorum to the gates of men of great influence, and to be its defensor.

Thus the works of the first founders of the Christian church made their appearance before their community. Their Epistles were read in those congregations to which they were directed; and whoever wished to possess them either took a transcript of them, or caused one to be procured for him. The historical works were made known by the authors in the congregations of the Christians, per recitationem: [by reading aloud:] the object and general interest in them procured for them readers and transcribers. St. Luke dedicated his writings to an illustrious man of the name of Theophilus.

Book of Life, or Book of the Living, or Book of the Lord, Psalm lxi, 28. Some have thought it very probable that these descriptive phrases, which are frequent in Scripture, are taken from the custom, observed generally in the courts of princes, of keeping a list of persons who are in their service, of the provinces which they govern, of the officers of their armies, of the number of their troops, and sometimes even of the names of their soldiers. Thus, when it is said that any one is written in the book of life, it means that he particularly belongs to God, and is enrolled among the number of his friends and servants: and to be “blotted out of the book of life,” is to be erased from the list of God’s friends and servants, as those who are guilty of treachery are struck off the roll of officers belonging to a prince. The most satisfactory explanation of these phrases is, however, that which refers them to the genealogical lists of the Jews, or to the registers kept of the living, from which the names of all the dead were blotted out.

Book of Judgment. Daniel, speaking of God’s judgment, says, “The judgment was set, and the books were opened,” Dan. vii, 10. This is an allusion to what was practised when a prince called his servants to account. The accounts are produced and examined. It is possible he might allude, also, to a custom of the Persians, among whom it was a constant practice every day to write down the services rendered to the king, and the rewards given to those who had performed them. Of this we see an instance in the history of Ahasuerus and Mordecai, Esther iv, 12, 34. When, therefore, the king sits in judgment, the books are opened: he obliges all his servants to reckon with him; he punishes those who have failed in their duty; he compels those to pay who are indebted to him; and he rewards those who have done him services. A similar proceeding will take place at the day of God’s final judgment.

Sealed Book, mentioned Isa. xxix, 11, and the book sealed with seven seals, in the Revelation v, 1–3, are the prophecies of Isaiah and of John, which were written in a book, or roll, after the manner of the ancients, and were sealed, which figure truly signifies that they were mysterious: they had respect to times remote, and to future events; so that a complete knowledge of their meaning could not be obtained till after what was foretold should happen, and the seals, as it were taken off. In old times, letters, and other writings that were to be sealed, were first wrapped round with thread or flax, and then wax and the seal were applied to them. To read them, it was necessary to cut the thread or flax, and to break the seals.

BOOTY, spoils taken in war, Num. xxxi, 27–32. According to the law of Moses, the booty was to be divided equally between those who were in the battle and those who were in the camp, whatever disparity there might be in the number of each party. The law farther required that, out of that part

of the spoils which was assigned to the fighting men, the Lord's share should be separated; and for every five hundred men, oxen, asses, sheep, &c, they were to take one for the high priest, as being the Lord's first fruits. And out of the other moiety, belonging to the children of Israel, they were to give for every fifty men, oxen, asses, sheep, &c, one to the Levites.

BOOZ, or BOAZ, the son of Salmon and Rahab, Ruth iv, 21, &c; Matt., i, 5. Rahab, we know, was a Canaanite of Jericho, Joshua ii, 1. Salmon, who was of the tribe of Judah, married her, and she bore him Booz, one of our Saviour's ancestors according to the flesh. Some say there were three of this name, the son, the grandson, and the great grandson, of Salmon: the last Booz was Ruth's husband, and the father of Obed.

2. Booz, or Boaz, was the name of one of the two brazen pillars which Solomon erected in the porch of the temple, the other column being called Jachin. This last pillar was on the right hand of the entrance into the temple, and Booz on the left, 1 Kings vii, 21. The word signifies strength or firmness. Mr. Hutchinson has an express treatise upon these two columns, attempting to show that they represented the true system of the universe, which he insists was given by God to David, and by him to Solomon, and was wrought by Hiram upon these pillars.

175BOSOM. See Accubation.

BOSESSES, the thickest and strongest parts of a buckler, Job xv, 20.

BOTTLE. The eastern bottle is made of a goat or kid skin, stripped off without opening the belly; the apertures made by cutting off the tail and legs are sewed up, and, when filled, it is tied about the neck. The Arabs and Persians never go a journey without a small leathern bottle of water hanging by their side like a scrip. These skin bottles preserve their water, milk, and other liquids, in a fresher state than any other vessels they can use. The people of the east, indeed, put into them every thing they mean to carry to a distance, whether dry or liquid, and very rarely make use of boxes and pots, unless to preserve such things as are liable to be broken. They enclose these leathern bottles in woollen sacks, because their beasts of carriage often fall down under their load, or cast it down on the sandy desert. These skin bottles were not confined to the countries of Asia; the roving tribes, which passed the Hellespont soon after the deluge, and settled in Greece and Italy, probably introduced them into those countries. We learn from Homer, that they were in common use among the Greeks at the siege of Troy; for, with a view to an accommodation between the hostile armies, the heralds carried through the city the things which were necessary

to ratify the compact, two lambs, and exhilarating wine, the fruit of the earth, in a bottle of goat skin:

Ἄρνε δύω, καὶ οἶνον εὖφρονα, καρπὸν ἀρούρης,  
Ἄσκῳ ἐν αἰγείῳ. II. lib. iii, l. 246.

The bottle of wine which Samuel's mother brought to Eli, 1 Sam. i, 24, is called נבל, and was an earthen jug. Another word is used to signify the vessel out of which Jael gave milk to Sisera: she opened a bottle of milk, and gave him drink, Judges iv, 19. This is called נאור, which refers to something supple, moist, oozing, or, perhaps, imports moistened into pliancy, as that skin must be which is kept constantly filled with milk. This kind was usually made of goat skins. This word is also used to denote the bottle in which Jesse sent wine by David to Saul, 1 Sam. xvi, 20. It is likewise employed to express the bottle into which the Psalmist desires his tears may be collected, Psalm lvi, 8; and that to which he resembles himself, and which he calls a bottle in the smoke, Psalm cxix, 83, that is, a skin bottle, blackened and shrivelled. Beside the words already considered, another אבות, in the plural, is used, Job xxxii, 19. This signifies, in general, to swell or distend. On receiving the liquor poured into it, a skin bottle must be greatly swelled and distended; and it must be swelled still farther by the fermentation of the liquor within it, as that advances to ripeness. In this state, if no vent be given to the liquor, it may overpower the strength of the bottle, or it may penetrate by some secret crevice or weaker part. Hence arises the propriety of putting new wine into new bottles, which, being strong, may resist the expansion, the internal pressure of their contents, and preserve the wine to due maturity; while old bottles may, without danger, contain old wine, whose fermentation is already past, Matt. ix, 17; Luke v, 38.

BOUDDHISTS, or BUDHISTS, one of the three great sects of India, distinct both from the Brahminical sect, and the Jainas. The Bouddhists do not believe in a First Cause: they consider matter as eternal; that every portion of animated existence has in itself its own rise, tendency, and destiny; that the condition of creatures on earth is regulated by works of merit and demerit; that works of merit not only raise individuals to happiness, but, as they prevail, exalt the world itself to prosperity; while, on the other hand, when vice is predominant, the world degenerates till the universe itself is dissolved. They suppose, however, that there is always some superior deity, who has attained to this elevation by religious merit; but they do not regard him as the governor of the world. To the present grand period, comprehending all the time included in a "kulpu," they assign five deities, four of whom have already appeared, including Goutumu, or Bouddhu, whose exaltation continues five thousand years, two thousand three hundred and fifty-six of which had expired, A. D. 1814.



After the expiration of the five thousand years, another saint will obtain the ascendancy, and be deified. Six hundred millions of saints are said to be canonized with each deity, though it is admitted that Bouddhu took only twenty-four thousand devotees to heaven with him. The lowest state of existence is in hell; the next is that in the forms of brutes: both these are states of punishment. The next ascent is to that of man, which is probationary. The next includes many degrees of honour and happiness up to demigods, &c, which are states of reward for works of merit. The ascent to superior deity is from the state of man. The Bouddhists are taught that there are four superior heavens which are not destroyed at the end of "kulpu;" that below these there are twelve other heavens, followed by six inferior heavens; after which follows the earth; then the world of snakes; and then thirty-two chief hells: to which are to be added, one hundred and twenty hells of milder torments. The highest state of glory is absorption. The person who is unchangeable in his resolution; who has obtained the knowledge of things past, present, and to come, through one "kulpu;" who can make himself invisible; go where he pleases; and who has attained to complete abstraction; will enjoy absorption. Those who perform works of merit are admitted to the heavens of the different gods, or are made kings or great men on earth; and those who are wicked are born in the forms of different animals, or consigned to different hells. The happiness of these heavens is described as entirely sensual. The Bouddhists believe that at the end of a "kulpu" the universe is destroyed. To convey some idea of the extent of this period, the illiterate Cingalese use this comparison: "If a man were to ascend a mountain nine miles high, and to renew these journeys 176000000 in every hundred years, till the mountain were worn down by his feet to an atom, the time required to do this would be nothing to the fourth part of a 'kulpu.'" Bouddhu, before his exaltation, taught his followers that, after his death, the remains of his body, his doctrine, or an assembly of his disciples, were to be held in equal reverence with himself. When a Cingalese, therefore, approaches an image of Bouddhu, he says, "I take refuge in Bouddhu; I take refuge in his doctrine; I take refuge in his followers." There are five commands given to the common Bouddhists; the first forbids the destruction of animal life; the second forbids theft; the third, adultery; the fourth, falsehood; the fifth, the use of spirituous liquors. There are other commands for superior classes, or devotees, which forbid dancing, songs, music, festivals, perfumes, elegant dresses, elevated seats, &c. Among works of the highest merit, one is the feeding of a hungry infirm tiger with a person's own flesh.

**BOURIGNONISTS**, the followers of the celebrated Mad. Antoinette Bourignon de la Ponte, a native of Flanders, born at Lisle, in 1616. She was so much deformed at her birth, that it was even debated whether she should not be stifled as a monster. As she grew up, however, this deformity

greatly decreased, and she discovered a superior mind, a strong imagination, and very early indications of a devotional spirit, strongly tinged with mysticism. She conceived herself to be divinely called, and set apart to revive the true spirit of Christianity that had been extinguished by theological animosities and debates. In her confession of faith, she professes her belief in the Scriptures, and in the divinity and atonement of Christ. The leading principles which pervade her productions are these: that man is perfectly free to resist or receive divine grace; that God is ever unchangeable in love toward all his creatures, and does not inflict any arbitrary punishment, but that the evils they suffer are the natural consequences of sin; that true religion consists not in any outward forms of worship, nor systems of faith, but in immediate communion with the Deity, by internal feelings and impulses, and by a perfect acquiescence in his will.

This lady was educated in the Roman Catholic religion; but she declaimed equally against the corruptions of the church of Rome and those of the Reformed churches: hence she was opposed and persecuted by both Catholics and Protestants, and after being driven about from place to place, she died at Franeker, in 1680. She maintained that there ought to be a general toleration of all religions. Her notion on God's foreknowledge was, that God was capable of foreknowing all events, but, his power being equal to his knowledge, he purposely withheld from himself that knowledge in certain cases, that he might not interfere with the free agency and responsibility of his creatures. Her works are very numerous, making eighteen volumes in octavo: of which the principal are, "The Light of the World;" "The Testimony of Truth;" and "The Renovation of the Gospel Spirit;" which are much in esteem among the admirers of mystical theology.

**BOW.** The expression, "to break the bow," so frequent in Scripture, signifies to destroy the power of a people, because the principal offensive weapon of armies was anciently the bow. "A deceitful bow" is one that, from some defect, either in bending or the string, carries the arrow wide of the mark, however well aimed. See Arms.

**BOWELS.** The bowels are the seat of mercy, tenderness, and compassion. Joseph's bowels were moved at the sight of his brother Benjamin; that is, he felt himself softened and affected. The true mother of the child whom Solomon commanded to be divided, felt her bowels move, and consented that it should be given to the woman who was not its real mother, 1 Kings, iii, 26. The Hebrews also sometimes place wisdom and understanding in the bowels, "Who hath put wisdom in the inner parts?" or bowels, Job xxxviii, 36. The Psalmist says, "Thy law is within my heart," literally, in

the midst of my bowels,--it is by me strongly and affectionately regarded, Psalm xl, 8.

BOX TREE, תאשור, Isa. xli, 9; lx, 13; Ezek. xxvii, 6; 2 Esdras xiv, 24, where the word appears to be used for tablets. Most of the ancient, and several of the modern, translators render this word the buxus, or "box tree;" but from its being mentioned along with trees of the forest, some more stately tree must be intended, probably the cedar.

BRACELET. A bracelet is commonly worn by the oriental princes, as a badge of power and authority. When the calif Cayem Bemrillah granted the investiture of certain dominions to an eastern prince, he sent him letters patent, a crown, a chain, and bracelets. This was probably the reason that the Amalekite brought the bracelet which he found on Saul's arm, along with his crown, to David, 2 Sam. i, 10. It was a royal ornament, and belonged to the regalia of the kingdom. The bracelet, it must be acknowledged, was worn both by men and women of different ranks; but the original word, in the second book of Samuel, occurs only in two other places, and is quite different from the term which is employed to express the more common ornament known by that name. And beside, this ornament was worn by kings and princes in a different manner from their subjects. It was fastened above the elbow; and was commonly of great value.

BRAHMINS, or BRACHMINS, the highest caste of Hindoos, to whom is confined the priesthood, and, in general, all their ancient learning, which is locked up in their sacred language, called the Sanscrit. The Brahmins derive that name from Brahma, the Creator; for they maintain the doctrine of three embodied energies, the creative, the preserving, and the destroying; personified under the names of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, all sprung from Brimh; and to each of them is assigned a kind of celestial consort, a female deity, which they describe as a passive energy.

177Like the philosophers of Greece, they seem to have had an open and a secret doctrine: the latter, a species of Spinozism, considering the great Supreme as "the soul of the world;" endowed with no other quality than ubiquity; requiring no worship, and exerting no power, but in the production of the three great energies above mentioned. These are so ingeniously diversified as to produce three hundred and thirty millions of gods, or objects of idolatry; so various in character as to suit every man's taste or humour, and to furnish examples of every vice and folly to which humanity is subject.

As it respects a future state, two of the principal doctrines of Brachminism are transmigration and absorption. After death, the person is conveyed, by the messengers of Yumu, through the air to the place of judgment. After receiving his sentence, he wanders about the earth for twelve months, as an aërial being or ghost; and then takes a body suited to his future condition, whether he ascend to the gods, or suffer in a new body, or be hurled into some hell. This is the doctrine of several “pooranus;” others maintain, that immediately after death and judgment, the person suffers the pains of hell, and removes his sin by suffering; and then returns to the earth in some bodily form. The descriptions which the “pooranus” give of the heavens of the gods are truly in the eastern style; all things, even the beds of the gods, are made of gold and precious stones. All the pleasures of these heavens are exactly what we should expect in a system formed by uninspired and unrenewed men: like the paradise of Mohammed, they are brothels, rather than places of rewards for “the pure in heart.” Here all the vicious passions are personified, or rather, deified: the quarrels and licentious intrigues of the gods fill these places with perpetual uproar, while their impurities are described with the same literality and gross detail, as similar things are talked of among these idolaters on earth.

But the highest degree of happiness is absorption. God, as separated from matter, the Hindoos contemplate as a being reposing in his own happiness, destitute of ideas; as infinite placidity; as an unruffled sea of bliss; as being perfectly abstracted, and void of consciousness. They therefore deem it the height of perfection to be like this being. Hence Krishnu, in his discourse to Urjoonu, praises the man “who forsaketh every desire that entereth into his heart; who is happy of himself; who is without affection; who rejoiceth not either in good or evil; who, like the tortoise, can restrain his members from their wonted purpose; to whom pleasure and pain, gold, iron, and stones are the same.” “The learned,” adds Krushnu, “behold Brumhu alike in the reverend ‘branhun,’ perfected in knowledge; in the ox, and in the elephant; in the dog, and in him who eateth of the flesh of dogs.” The person whose very nature, say they, is absorbed in divine meditation; whose life is like a sweet sleep, unconscious and undisturbed; who does not even desire God, and who is thus changed into the image of the ever blessed; obtains absorption into Brumhu. The ceremonies leading to absorption are called by the name of “tupushya” and the persons performing them, a “tupushwee.” Forsaking the world; retiring to a forest; fasting, living on roots, fruits, &c;--remaining in certain postures; exposure to all the inclemencies of the weather, &c; these, and many other austere practices are prescribed, to subdue the passions, to fix the mind, habituate it to meditation, and fill it with that serenity and indifference to the world which is to prepare it for absorption, and place it beyond the reach of future birth.

BRAMBLE, תרס, a prickly shrub, Judges ix, 14, 15; Psalm lviii, 9. In the latter place it is translated "thorn." Hiller supposes atad to be the cynobastus, or sweetbrier. The author of "Scripture Illustrated" says, that the bramble seems to be well chosen as the representative of the original; which should be a plant bearing fruit of some kind, being associated, Judges ix, 14, though by opposition, with the vine. The apologue or fable of Jotham has always been admired for its spirit and application. It has also been considered as the oldest fable extant.

BRANCH, a title of Messiah: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots," Isaiah xi, 1. See also Zech. iii, 8; vi, 12; Jer. xxiii, 5; xxxiii, 15. When Christ is represented as a slender twig, shooting out from the trunk of an old tree lopped to the very root and decayed, and becoming itself a mighty tree, reference is made, 1. To the kingly dignity of Christ, springing up from the decayed house of David; 2. To the exaltation which was to succeed his humbled condition on earth, and to the glory and vigour of his mediatorial reign.

BRASS. נחשת. The word brass occurs very often in our translation of the Bible; but that is a mixed metal, for the making of which we are indebted to the German metallurgists of the thirteenth century. That the ancients knew not the art of making it, is almost certain. None of their writings even hint at the process. There can be no doubt that copper is the original metal intended. This is spoken of as known prior to the flood; and to have been discovered, or at least wrought, as was also iron, in the seventh generation from Adam, by Tubal-cain: whence the name Vulcan. The knowledge of these two metals must have been carried over the world afterward with the spreading colonies of the Noachidæ. Agreeably to this, the ancient histories of the Greeks and Romans speak of Cadmus as the inventor of the metal which by the former is called χαλκός, and by the latter æs; and from him had the denomination cadmea. According to others, Cadmus discovered a mine, of which he taught the use. The name of the person here spoken of was undoubtedly the same with Ham, or Cam, the son of Noah, who probably learned the art of assaying metals from the family of Tubal-cain, and communicated that knowledge to the people of the colony which he settled.

178BRASEN SERPENT, the, was an image of polished brass, in the form of one of those fiery serpents which were sent to chastise the murmuring Israelites in the wilderness, and whose bite caused violent heat, thirst, and inflammation. By divine command "Moses made a serpent of brass," or copper, and "put it upon a pole; and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived," Num. xxi,

6–9. This brazen serpent was preserved as a monument of the divine mercy, but in process of time became an instrument of idolatry. When this superstition began, it is difficult to determine; but the best account is given by the Jewish rabbi, David Kimchi, in the following manner: From the time that the kings of Israel did evil, and the children of Israel followed idolatry, till the reign of Hezekiah, they offered incense to it; for it being written in the law of Moses, “Whoever looketh upon it shall live,” they fancied they might obtain blessings by its mediation, and therefore thought it worthy to be worshipped. It had been kept from the days of Moses, in memory of a miracle, in the same manner as the pot of manna was: and Asa and Jehoshaphat did not extirpate it when they rooted out idolatry, because in their reign they did not observe that the people worshipped this serpent, or burnt incense to it; and therefore they left it as a memorial. But Hezekiah thought fit to take it quite away, when he abolished other idolatry, because in the time of his father they adored it as an idol; and though pious people among them accounted it only as a memorial of a wonderful work, yet he judged it better to abolish it, though the memory of the miracle should happen to be lost, than suffer it to remain, and leave the Israelites in danger to commit idolatry hereafter with it. On the subject of the serpent-bitten Israelites being healed by looking at the brazen serpent, there is a good comment in the book of Wisdom, chap. xvi, 4–12, in which are these remarkable words:--“They were admonished, having a sign of salvation,” that is, the brazen serpent, “to put them in remembrance of the commandments of thy law. For he that turned himself toward it, was not saved by the THING that he saw, but by THEE, that art the Saviour of all,” verses 6, 7. To the circumstance of looking at the brazen serpent in order to be healed, our Lord refers, John iii, 14, 15: “As Moses lifted up the (brazen) serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.”

BREAD, a term which in Scripture is used, as by us, frequently for food in general; but is also often found in its proper sense. Sparing in the use of flesh, like all the nations of the east, the chosen people usually satisfied their hunger with bread, and quenched their thirst in the running stream. Their bread was generally made of wheat or barley, or lentiles and beans. Bread of wheat flour, as being the most excellent, was preferred: barley bread was used only in times of scarcity and distress. So mean and contemptible, in the estimation of the numerous and well-appointed armies of Midian, was Gideon, with his handful of undisciplined militia, that he seems to have been compared to bread of this inferior quality, which may account for the ready interpretation of the dream of the Midianite respecting him: “And when Gideon was come, behold, there was a man that told a dream unto his fellow, and said, Behold, I dreamed a dream, and

lo, a cake of barley bread tumbled into the host of Midian, and came unto a tent and smote it that it fell, and overturned it, that the tent lay along. And his fellow answered and said, This is nothing else save the sword of Gideon, the son of Joash, a man of Israel; for into his hand hath God delivered Midian, and all the host." In the cities and villages of Barbary, where public ovens are established, the bread is usually leavened; but among the Bedoweens and Kabyles, as soon as the dough is kneaded, it is made into thin cakes, either to be baked immediately upon the coals, or else in a shallow earthen vessel like a frying-pan, called Tajen. Such were the unleavened cakes which we so frequently read of in Scripture; and those also which Sarah made quickly upon the hearth. These last are about an inch thick; and, being commonly prepared in woody countries, are used all along the shores of the Black Sea, from the Palus Mæotis to the Caspian, in Chaldea and Mesopotamia, except in towns. A fire is made in the middle of the room: and when the bread is ready for baking, a corner of the hearth is swept, the bread is laid upon it, and covered with ashes and embers; in a quarter of an hour, they turn it. Sometimes they use small convex plates of iron, which are most common in Persia, and among the nomadic tribes, as being the easiest way of baking, and done with the least expense; for the bread is extremely thin, and soon prepared. The oven is also used in every part of Asia: it is made in the ground, four or five feet deep, and three in diameter, well plastered with mortar. When it is hot, they place the bread (which is commonly long, and not thicker than a finger) against the sides: it is baked in a moment. Ovens, Chardin apprehends, were not used in Canaan in the patriarchal age: all the bread of that time was baked upon a plate, or under the ashes; and he supposes, what is nearly self-evident, that the cakes which Sarah baked on the hearth were of the last sort, and that the shew bread was of the same kind. The Arabs about Mount Carmel use a great strong pitcher, in which they kindle a fire; and when it is heated, they mix meal and water, which they apply with the hollow of their hands to the outside of the pitcher; and this extremely soft paste, spreading itself, is baked in an instant. The heat of the pitcher having dried up all the moisture, the bread comes off as thin as our wafers; and the operation is so speedily performed, that in a very little time a sufficient quantity is made. But their best sort of bread they bake, either by heating an oven, or a large pitcher full of little smooth shining flints, upon which they lay the dough, spread out in the form of a thin broad cake. Sometimes they use a shallow earthen vessel, resembling a frying pan, which seems to be the pan mentioned by Moses, in which the meat-offering was baked. This vessel, Dr. Shaw informs us, serves both for baking and frying; for the bagreah of the people of Barbary differs not much from our pancakes; only, instead of rubbing the pan in which they fry them with butter, they rub it with soap, to make them like a honey-comb. If these accounts of the Arab stone pitcher, the pan, and the iron hearth or copper plate, be attended to, it will

not be difficult to understand the laws of Moses in the second chapter of Leviticus: they will be found to answer perfectly well to the description which he gives us of the different ways of preparing the meat-offerings. As the Hebrews made their bread thin, in the form of little flat cakes, they did not cut it with a knife, but broke it; which gave rise to the expression, breaking bread, so frequent in Scripture.

The Arabians and other eastern people, among whom wood is scarce, often bake their bread between two fires made of cow dung, which burns slowly, and bakes the bread very leisurely. The crumb of it is very good, if it be eaten the same day; but the crust is black and burnt, and retains a smell of the materials that were used in baking it. This may serve to explain a passage in Ezekiel, iv, 9–13. The straits of a siege and the scarcity of fuel were thus intimated to the Prophet. During the whole octave of the passover, the Hebrews use only unleavened bread, as a memorial that at the time of their departure out of Egypt they wanted leisure to bake leavened bread; and, having left the country with precipitation, they were content to bake bread which was not leavened, Exod. xii, 8. The practice of the Jews at this day, with relation to the use of unleavened bread, is as follows: They forbid to eat, or have in their houses, or in any place belonging to them, either leavened bread or any thing else that is leavened. That they may the better observe this rule, they search into all the corners of the house with scrupulous exactness for all bread or paste, or any thing that is leavened. After they have thus well cleansed their houses, they whiten them, and furnish them with kitchen and table utensils, all new, and with others which are to be used only on that day. If they are movables, which have served only for something else, and are made of metal, they have them polished, and put into the fire, to take away all the impurity which they may have contracted by touching any thing leavened. All this is done on the thirteenth day of Nisan, or on the vigil of the feast of the passover, which begins with the fifteenth of the same month, or the fourteenth day in the evening; for the Hebrews reckon their days from one evening to another. On the fourteenth of Nisan, at eleven o'clock, they burn the common bread, to show that the prohibition of eating leavened bread is then commenced; and this action is attended with words, whereby the master of the house declares that he has no longer any thing leavened in his keeping; that, at least, he believes so. In allusion to this practice, we are commanded to “purge out the old leaven;” by which “malice and wickedness” are intended; and to feed only on the “unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.”

2. Shew Bread, or, according to the Hebrews, the bread of faces, was bread offered every Sabbath day upon the golden table in the holy place, Exod. xxv, 30. The Hebrews affirm that these loaves were square, and had four



sides, and were covered with leaves of gold. They were twelve in number, according to the number of the twelve tribes, in whose names they were offered. Every loaf was composed of two assarons of flour, which make about five pints and one-tenth. These loaves were unleavened. They were presented hot every Sabbath day, the old ones being taken away and eaten by the priests only. This offering was accompanied with salt and frankincense, and even with wine, according to some commentators. The Scripture mentions only salt and incense; but it is presumed that wine was added, because it was not wanting in other sacrifices and offerings. It is believed that these loaves were placed one upon another, in two piles of six each; and that between every loaf were two thin plates of gold, folded back in a semicircle the whole length of them, to admit air, and to prevent the loaves from growing mouldy. These golden plates, thus turned in, were supported at their extremities by two golden forks, which rested on the ground. The twelve loaves, because they stood before the Lord, were called לחם הפנים, ἄρτοι προσέσεως, or ἐνώπιοι, the bread of faces, or of the presence; and are therefore denominated in our English translation the shew bread.

Since part of the frankincense put upon the bread was to be burnt on the altar for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord; and since Aaron and his sons were to eat it in the holy place, Lev. xxiv, 5–9, it is probable that this bread typified Christ, first presented as a sacrifice to Jehovah, and then becoming spiritual food to such as in and through him are spiritual priests to God, even his Father, Rev. i, 6; v, 10; xx, 6; 1 Peter ii, 5. It appears, from some places in Scripture, (see Exodus xxix, 32, and Numbers vi, 15,) that there was always near the altar a basket full of bread, in order to be offered together with the ordinary sacrifices.

BREASTPLATE, or PECTORAL, one part of the priestly vestments, belonging to the Jewish high priests. It was about ten inches square, Exod. xxviii, 13–31; and consisted of a folded piece of the same rich embroidered stuff of which the ephod was made. It was worn on the breast of the high priest, and was set with twelve precious stones, on each of which was engraven the name of one of the tribes. They were set in four rows, three in each row, and were divided from each other by the little golden squares or partitions in which they were set. The names of these stones, and that of the tribe engraven on them, as also their disposition 180on the breastplate, are usually given as follows; but what stones really answer to the Hebrew name, is for the most part very uncertain:--

Sardine,	Topaz,	Carbuncle,
Reuben.	Simeon.	Levi.
Emerald,	Sapphire,	Diamond,

Judah. Dan. Naphtali.  
 Ligure, Agate, Amethyst,  
 Gad. Asher. Issachar.  
 Beryl, Onyx, Jasper,  
 Zebulun. Joseph. Benjamin.

This breastplate was fastened at the four corners, those on the top to each shoulder, by a golden hook or ring, at the end of a wreathen chain; and those below to the girdle of the ephod, by two strings or ribbons, which had likewise two rings or hooks. This ornament was never to be separated from the priestly garment; and it was called the memorial, because it was a sign whereby the children of Israel might know that they were presented to God, and that they were had in remembrance by him. It was also called the breastplate of judgment, because it had the divine oracle of Urim and Thummim annexed to it. These words signify lights and perfections, and are mentioned as in the high priest's breastplate; but what they were, we cannot determine. Some think they were two precious stones added to the other twelve, by the extraordinary lustre of which, God marked his approbation of a design, and, by their becoming dim, his disallowance of it; others, that these two words were written on a precious stone, or plate of gold, fixed in the breastplate; others, that the letters of the names of the tribes, were the Urim and Thummim; and that the letters by standing out, or by an extraordinary illumination, marked such words as contained the answer of God to him who consulted this oracle. Le Clerc will have them to be the names of two precious stones, set in a golden collar of the high priest, and coming down to his breast, as the magistrates of Egypt wore a golden chain, at the end of which hung the figure of truth, engraven on a precious stone. Prideaux thinks the words chiefly denote the clearness of the oracles dictated to the high priest, though perhaps the lustre of the stones in his breastplate might represent this clearness. Jahn says the most probable opinion is, that Urim and Thummim (אורים, ותמים, light and justice, Septuagint, δῆλωσις καὶ ἀλήθεια) [manifestation and truth] was a sacred lot, 1 Samuel xiv, 41, 42. There were employed, perhaps, in determining this lot, three precious stones, on one of which was engraven כן, yes; on the other, לא, no; the third being destitute of any inscription. The question proposed, therefore, was always to be put in such a way, that the answer might be direct, either yes or no, provided any answer was given at all. These stones were carried in the purse or bag, formed by the lining or interior of the pectoral; and when the question was proposed, if the high priest drew out the stone which exhibited yes, the answer was affirmative; if the one on which no was written, the answer was negative; if the third, no answer was to be given, Joshua vii, 13–21; 1 Sam. xiv, 40–43; xxviii, 6. In the midst of all this conjecture, only two things are certain: 1. That one of the appointed methods of consulting God, on extraordinary emergencies, was by Urim and Thummim: 2. That the oracles of God

rejected all equivocal and enigmatical replies, which was the character of the Heathen pretended oracles. "The words of the Lord are pure words." His own oracle bears, therefore, an inscription which signifies lights and perfections, or, the shining and the perfect; or, according to the LXX, manifestation and truth. In this respect it might be a type of the Christian revelation made to the true Israel, the Christian church, by the Gospel. St. Paul seems especially to allude to this translation of Urim and Thummim by the Septuagint, when he speaks of himself and his fellow labourers, "commending themselves to every man's conscience by manifestation of the truth;" in opposition to those who by their errors and compliances with the Jewish prejudices, or with the philosophical taste of the Greeks, obscured the truth, and rendered ambiguous the guidance of Christian doctrine. His preaching is thus tacitly compared to the oracles of God; theirs, to the misleading and perplexed oracles of the Heathen.

**BRIDE and BRIDEGROOM.** Under this head an account of the marriage customs of ancient times, the knowledge of which is so necessary to explain many allusions in the Holy Scriptures, may be properly introduced. Among the Jews, the state of marriage was, from the remotest periods of their history, reckoned so honourable, that the person who neglected or declined to enter into it without a good reason, was thought to be guilty of a great crime. Such a mode of thinking was not confined to them; in several of the Grecian states, marriage was held in equal respect. The Jews did not allow marriageable persons to enter into that honourable state without restriction; the high priest was forbidden by law to marry a widow; and the priests of every rank, to take a harlot to wife, a profane woman, or one put away from her husband. To prevent the alienation of inheritances, an heiress could not marry but into her own tribe. The whole people of Israel, being a holy nation, separated from all the earth to the service of the true God, and to be the depositaries of his law, were forbidden to contract matrimonial alliances with the idolatrous nations in their vicinity. The marriage engagement of a minor, without the knowledge and consent of the parents, was of no force; so sacred was the parental authority held among that people. These customs appear to have been derived from a very remote antiquity; for when Eliezer of Damascus went to Mesopotamia to take a wife from thence unto his master's son, he disclosed the motives of his journey to the father and brother of Rebecca; and Hamor applied to Jacob and his sons, for their consent to the union of Dinah with his son Shechem. Samson also consulted his parents about his marriage; and entreated them to get for him the object of his choice. Marriage contracts seem to have been made in the primitive ages with little ceremony. The suitor himself, or his father, sent a messenger to the father of the woman, to ask her in marriage. In the remote ages of antiquity, women were literally purchased by their husbands; and the presents made

to their parents or other relations were called their dowry. Thus, we find Shechem bargaining with Jacob and his sons for Dinah: "Let me find grace in your eyes, and what ye shall say unto me, I will give: ask me never so much dowry and gift, and I will give according as ye shall say unto me; but give me the damsel to wife," Gen. xxxiv, 2. The practice still continues in the country of Shechem; for when a young Arab wishes to marry, he must purchase his wife; and for this reason, fathers, among the Arabs, are never more happy than when they have many daughters. They are reckoned the principal riches of a house. An Arabian suitor will offer fifty sheep, six camels, or a dozen of cows: if he be not rich enough to make such offers, he proposes to give a mare or a colt, considering in the offer the merit of the young woman, the rank of her family, and his own circumstances. In the primitive times of Greece, a well-educated lady was valued at four oxen. When they are agreed on both sides, the contract is drawn up by him that acts as *cadi* or judge among these Arabs. In some parts of the east, a measure of corn is formally mentioned in contracts for their concubines, or temporary wives, beside the sum of money which is stipulated by way of dowry. This custom is probably as ancient as concubinage, with which it is connected; and if so, it will perhaps account for the Prophet Hosea's purchasing a wife of this kind, for fifteen pieces of silver, and for a homer of barley, and a half homer of barley. When the intended husband was not able to give a dowry, he offered an equivalent. The patriarch Jacob, who came to Laban with only his staff, offered to serve him seven years for Rachel: a proposal which Laban accepted. This custom has descended to modern times; for in Cabul the young men who are unable to advance the required dowry "live with their future father-in-law, and earn their bride by their services, without ever seeing the object of their wishes." The contract of marriage was made in the house of the woman's father, before the elders and governors of the city or district. The espousals by money, or a written instrument, were performed by the man and woman under a tent or canopy erected for that purpose. Into this chamber the bridegroom was accustomed to go with his bride, that he might talk with her more familiarly; which was considered as a ceremony of confirmation to the wedlock. While he was there, no person was allowed to enter: his friends and attendants waited for him at the door, with torches and lamps in their hands; and when he came out, he was received by all that were present with great joy and acclamation. To this ancient custom, the Psalmist alludes in his magnificent description of the heavens: "In them he set a tabernacle for the sun; which, as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, rejoices as a strong man to run a race," Psalm xix, 4. A Jewish virgin legally betrothed was considered as a lawful wife; and, by consequence, could not be put away without a bill of divorce. And if she proved unfaithful to her betrothed husband, she was punished as an adulteress; and her seducer incurred the same punishment as if he had polluted the wife of his neighbour. This is the reason that the

angel addressed Joseph, the betrothed husband of Mary, in these terms: "Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." The Evangelist Luke gives her the same title: "And Joseph also went up from Galilee unto Bethlehem, to be taxed, with Mary his espoused wife," Luke ii, 4, 5.

2. Ten or twelve months commonly intervened between the ceremony of espousals and the marriage: during this interval, the espoused wife continued with her parents, that she might provide herself with nuptial ornaments suitable to her station. This custom serves to explain a circumstance in Samson's marriage, which is involved in some obscurity. "He went down," says the historian, "and talked with the woman," (whom he had seen at Timnath,) "and she pleased him well," Judges xiv, 7, &c. These words seem to refer to the ceremony of espousals; the following, to the subsequent marriage: "And after a time he returned to take her," Judges xiv, 8. Hence a considerable time intervened between the espousals and their actual union. From the time of the espousals, the bridegroom was at liberty to visit his espoused wife in the house of her father; yet neither of the parties left their own abode during eight days before the marriage; but persons of the same age visited the bridegroom, and made merry with him. These circumstances are distinctly marked in the account which the sacred historian has given us of Samson's marriage: "So his father went down unto the woman, and made there a feast; for so used the young men to do. And it came to pass when they saw him, that they brought thirty companions to be with him," Judges xiv, 10. These companions were the children of the bride chamber, of whom our Lord speaks: "Can the children of the bride chamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?" Matt. xix, 15. The marriage ceremony was commonly performed in a garden, or in the open air; the bride was placed under a canopy, supported by four youths, and adorned with jewels according to the rank of the married persons; all the company crying out with joyful acclamations, "Blessed be he that cometh!" It was anciently the custom, at the conclusion of the ceremony, for the father and mother and kindred of the woman, to pray for a blessing upon the parties. Bethuel and Laban, and the other members of their family, pronounced a solemn benediction upon Rebecca before her departure: "And they blessed Rebecca, and said unto her, Thou art our sister, be thou the mother of thousands of millions; and let thy seed possess the gate of those that hate them," Gen. xxiv, 60. And in times long posterior to the age of Isaac, when Ruth, the Moabitess, was espoused to Boaz, "all the people that were in the gate, and the elders, said, We are witnesses: the Lord make the woman that is come into thine house like Rachel, and like Leah, which two did build the house of Israel; and do thou worthily in Ephratah, and be famous in Bethlehem," Ruth iv, 11, 12. After the benedictions, the bride is conducted with great pomp to the house of

her husband: this is usually done in the evening; and as the procession moved along, money, sweetmeats, flowers, and other articles, were thrown among the populace, which they caught in cloths made for such occasions, stretched in a particular manner upon frames. The use of perfumes at eastern marriages is common; and upon great occasions very profuse.

3. It was the custom among the ancient Greeks, and the nations around them, to conduct the new-married couple with torches and lamps to their dwelling; as appears from the messenger in Euripides, who says he called to mind the time when he bore torches before Menelaus and Helena. These torches were usually carried by servants; and the procession was sometimes attended by singers and dancers. Thus Homer, in his description of the shield of Achilles:--

--ἐν τῇ μὲν ῥα γάμοι τ' ἔσαν εἰλαπίναι τε,  
Νύμφας δ' ἐκ θαλάμων, δαΐδων ὑπο λαμπομενάων,  
Ἥγινεον ἀνὰ ἄστῳ. κ. τ. λ. II. lib. xviii, l. 490.

“In one of the sculptured cities, nuptials were celebrating, and solemn feasts; through the city they conducted the new-married pair from their chambers, with flaming torches, while frequent shouts of Hymen burst from the attending throng, and young men danced in skilful measures to the sound of the pipe and the harp.”

A similar custom is observed among the Hindoos. The husband and wife, on the day of their marriage, being both in the same palanquin, go about seven and eight o'clock at night, accompanied with all their kindred and friends; the trumpets and drums go before them; and they are lighted by a number of flambeaux; immediately before the palanquin walk many women, whose business it is to sing verses, in which they wish them all manner of prosperity. They march in this equipage through the streets for the space of some hours, after which they return to their own house, where the domestics are in waiting. The whole house is illumined with small lamps; and many of those flambeaux already mentioned are kept ready for their arrival, beside those which accompany them, and are carried before the palanquin. These flambeaux are composed of many pieces of old linen, squeezed hard against one another in a round figure, and thrust down into a mould of copper. The persons that hold them in one hand have in the other a bottle of the same metal with the copper mould, which is full of oil, which they take care to pour out from time to time upon the linen, which otherwise gives no light. The Roman ladies also were led home to their husbands in the evening by the light of torches. A Jewish marriage seems to have been conducted in much the same way; for in that beautiful psalm, where David describes the majesty of Christ's kingdom, we meet with this passage: “And the daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift; even the rich

among the people shall entreat thy favour. The king's daughter is all-glorious within; her clothing is of wrought gold. She shall be brought unto the king in raiment of needle work; the virgins, her companions that follow her, shall be brought unto thee. With gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought: they shall enter into the king's palace," Psalm xlv, 12, &c. In the parable of the ten virgins, the same circumstances are introduced: "They that were foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them: but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. While the bridegroom tarried," leading the procession through the streets of the city, the women and domestics that were appointed to wait his arrival at home, "all slumbered and slept. And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh! Go ye out to meet him. Then all those virgins arose and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out," Matt. xxv, 6.

The following extract from Ward's "View of the Hindoos" very strikingly illustrates this parable: "At a marriage, the procession of which I saw some years ago, the bridegroom came from a distance, and the bride lived at Serampore, to which place the bridegroom was to come by water. After waiting two or three hours, at length, near midnight, it was announced, as if in the very words of Scripture, 'Behold, the bridegroom cometh! Go ye out to meet him.' All the persons employed now lighted their lamps, and ran with them in their hands to fill up their stations in the procession; some of them had lost their lights, and were unprepared; but it was then too late to seek them, and the cavalcade moved forward to the house of the bride, at which place the company entered a large and splendidly illuminated area, before the house covered with an awning, where a great multitude of friends dressed in their best apparel were seated upon mats. The bridegroom was carried in the arms of a friend, and placed on a superb seat in the midst of the company, where he sat a short time, and then went into the house, the door of which was immediately shut, and guarded by Sepoys. I and others expostulated with the door keepers, but in vain."

4. But among the Jews, the bridegroom was not always permitted to accompany his bride from her father's house; an intimate friend was often sent to conduct her, while he remained at home to receive her in his apartment. Her female attendants had the honour to introduce her; and whenever they changed the bride's dress, which is often done, they presented her to the bridegroom. It is the custom, and belongs to their ideas of magnificence, frequently to dress and undress the bride, and to cause her to wear on that same day all the clothes made up for her nuptials. These circumstances discover the force of St. John's language, in his magnificent description of the Christian church in her millennial state: "And I, John,

saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband,” Rev. xxi, 2.

5. Those that were invited to the marriage were expected to appear in their best and gayest attire. If the bridegroom was in circumstances to afford it, wedding garments were prepared for all the guests, which were hung up in the antechamber for them to put on over the rest of their clothes, as they entered the apartments where the marriage feast was prepared. To refuse, or even to neglect, putting on the wedding garment, was reckoned an insult to the bridegroom; aggravated by the circumstance that it was provided by himself for the very purpose of being worn on that occasion, and was hung up in the way to the inner apartment, that the guests must have seen it, and recollected the design of its suspension. This accounts for the severity of the sentence pronounced by the king, who came in to see the guests, and found among them one who had neglected to put it on: “And he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless,” Matt. xxii, 11, because it was provided at the expense of the entertainer, and placed full in his view. “Then said the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

The following extract will show the importance of having a suitable garment for a marriage feast, and the offence taken against those who refuse it when presented as a gift. “The next day, Dec. 3d, the king sent to invite the ambassadors to dine with him once more. The Mehemander told them, it was the custom that they should wear over their own clothes the best of those garments which the king had sent them. The ambassadors at first made some scruple of that compliance; but when they were told that it was a custom observed by all ambassadors, and that no doubt the king would take it very ill at their hands if they presented themselves before him without the marks of his liberality, they at last resolved to do it; and, after their example, all the rest of the retinue.”

**BRIER.** This word occurs several times in our translation of the Bible, but with various authorities from the original. 1. הברקנים, Judges viii, 7, 16, is a particular kind of thorn. 2. הדק, Prov. xv, 19; Micah vii, 4. It seems hardly possible to determine what kind of plant this is. Some kind of tangling prickly shrub is undoubtedly meant. In the former passage there is a beautiful opposition, which is lost in our rendering: “The narrow way of the slothful is like a perplexed path among briars; whereas the broad road” (elsewhere rendered causeway) “of the righteous is a high bank;” that is, free from obstructions, direct, conspicuous, and open. The common course of life of these two characters answers to this comparison. Their manner of going about business, or of transacting it, answers to this. An idle man



always takes the most intricate, the most oblique, and eventually the most thorny, measures to accomplish his purpose; the honest and diligent man prefers the most open and direct. In Micah, the unjust judge, taking bribes, is a brier, holding every thing that comes within his reach, hooking all that he can catch. 3. טרבים, Ezek. ii, 6. This word is translated by the Septuagint, παροξυρῆσυστιν, stung by the œstrus, or gadfly; and they use the like word in Hosea iv, 16, where, what in our version is “a backsliding heifer,” they render “a heifer stung by the œstrus.” These coincident renderings lead to the belief that both places may be understood of some venomous insect. The word סרר may lead us to sarra, by which the Arabs thus describe “a great bluish fly, having greenish eyes, its tail armed with a piercer, by which it pesters almost all horned cattle, settling on their heads, &c. Often it creeps up the noses of asses. It is a species of gadfly; but carrying its sting in its tail.” 4. סלון, Ezek. xxviii, 24, and סלונים, Ezek. ii, 6, must be classed among thorns. The second word Parkhurst supposes to be a kind of thorn, overspreading a large surface of ground, as the dewbrier. It is used in connection with קוצ, which, in Gen. iii, 18, is rendered thorns. The author of “Scripture Illustrated” queries, however, whether, as it is associated with “scorpions” in Ezek. ii, 6, both this word and serebim may not mean some species of venomous insects. 5. טרפד, mentioned only in Isaiah lv, 13, probably means a prickly plant; but what particular kind it is impossible to determine. 6. שמיר. This word is used only by the Prophet Isaiah, and in the following places: Isa. v, 6; vii, 23–25; ix, 17; x, 17; xxvii, 4; and xxxii, 13. It is probably a brier of a low kind; such as overruns uncultivated lands.

BRIMSTONE, גפריה, Gen. xix, 24; Deut. xxix, 23; Job xviii, 15; Psalm xi, 6; Isaiah xxx, 33; xxxiv, 9; Ezek. xxxviii, 22. It is rendered θείον by the Septuagint, and is so called in Luke xvii, 29. Fire and brimstone are represented in many passages of Scripture as the elements by which God punishes the wicked; both in this life, and another. There is in this a manifest allusion to the overthrow of the cities of the plain of the Jordan, by showers of ignited sulphur, to which the physical appearances of the country bear witness to this day. The soil is bituminous, and might be raised by eruptions into the air, and then inflamed and return in horrid showers of overwhelming fire. This awful catastrophe, therefore, stands as a type of the final and eternal punishment of the wicked in another world. In Job. xviii, 15, Bildad, describing the calamities which overtake the wicked person, says, “Brimstone shall be scattered upon his habitation.” This may be a general expression, 184to designate any great destruction: as that in Psalm xi, 6, “Upon the wicked he shall rain fire and brimstone.” Moses, among other calamities which he sets forth in case of the people’s disobedience, threatens them with the fall of brimstone, salt, and burning like the overthrow of Sodom, &c, Deut. xxix, 23. The Prophet Isaiah, xxxiv, 9, writes that the anger of the Lord shall be shown by the streams of

the land being turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone. See Dead Sea.

**BROOK** is distinguished from a river by its flowing only at particular times; for example, after great rains, or the melting of the snow; whereas a river flows constantly at all seasons. However, this distinction is not always observed in the Scripture; and one is not unfrequently taken for the other, -the great rivers, such as the Euphrates, the Nile, the Jordan, and others being called brooks. Thus the Euphrates, Isaiah xv, 7, is called the brook of willows. It is observed that the Hebrew word, נַחַל, which signifies a brook, is also the term for a valley, whence the one is often placed for the other, in different translations of the Scriptures. To deal deceitfully "as a brook," and to "pass away as the stream thereof," is to deceive our friend when he most needs and expects our help and comfort, Job vi, 15; because brooks, being temporary streams, are dried up in the heats of summer, when the traveller most needs a supply of water on his journey.

**BROTHER.** 1. A brother by the same mother, a uterine brother, Matt. iv, 21; xx, 20. 2. A brother, though not by the same mother, Matt. i, 2. 3. A near kinsman, a cousin, Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3. Observe, that in Matt. xiii, 55, James, and Joses, and Judas, are called the ἀδελφοὶ, brethren, of Christ, but were most probably only his cousins by his mother's side; for James and Joses were the sons of Mary, Matt. xxvii, 56; and James and Judas, the sons of Alpheus, Luke vi, 15, 16; which Alpheus is therefore probably the same with Cleopas, the husband of Mary, sister to our Lord's mother, John xix, 25.

**BUCKLER.** See Arms.

**BUILD.** Beside the proper and literal signification of this word, it is used with reference to children and a numerous posterity. Sarah desires Abraham to take Hagar to wife, that by her she may be builded up, that is, have children to uphold her family, Gen. xvi, 2. The midwives who refused obedience to Pharaoh's orders, when he commanded them to put to death all the male children of the Hebrews, were rewarded for it; God built them houses, that is, he gave them a numerous posterity. The Prophet Nathan tells David that God would build his house; that is, give him children and successors, 2 Sam. vii, 27. Moses, speaking of the formation of the first woman, says, God built her with the rib of Adam, Gen. ii, 22.

**BUL,** the eighth month of the ecclesiastical year of the Jews, and the second month of the civil year. It answers to October, and consists of twenty-nine days. On the sixth day of this month the Jews fasted, because on that day Nebuchadnezzar put to death the children of Zedekiah in the

presence of their unhappy father, whose eyes, after they had been witnesses of this sad spectacle, he ordered to be put out, 2 Kings xxv, 7. We find the name of this month mentioned in Scripture but once, 1 Kings vi, 38.

BULL, the male of the beeve kind; and it is to be recollected that the Hebrews never castrated animals. There are several words translated “bull” in Scripture, of which the following is a list, with the meaning of each: שׁוֹר, a bove, or cow, of any age. תַּאֲוִי, the wild bull, oryx, or buffalo, occurs only Deut. xiv, 5; and in Isaiah li, 20, תּוֹא, with the interchange of the two last letters. אַבִּירִי, a word implying strength, translated “bulls,” Psalm xxii, 12; l, 13; lxviii, 30; Isaiah xxxiv, 7; Jer. xlvi, 15. בָּקָר, herds, horned cattle of full age. פֶּרֶ, a full grown bull, or cow, fit for propagating. עֵגֶל, a full grown, plump young bull; and in the feminine, a heifer. תּוֹר, Chaldee taur, and Latin taurus; the ox accustomed to the yoke: occurs only in Ezra vi, 9, 17; vii, 17; Dan. iv, 25, 32, 33; xxii, 29, 30.

This animal was reputed by the Hebrews to be clean, and was generally made use of by them for sacrifices. The Egyptians had a particular veneration for it, and paid divine honours to it; and the Jews imitated them in the worship of the golden calves or bulls, in the wilderness, and in the kingdom of Israel. The wild bull is found in the Syrian and Arabian deserts. It is frequently mentioned by the Arabian poets, who are copious in their descriptions of hunting it, and borrow many images from its beauty, strength, swiftness, and the loftiness of its horns. They represent it as fierce and untamable; as being white on the back, and having large shining eyes. Bulls, in a figurative and allegorical sense, are taken for powerful, fierce, and insolent enemies, Psalm xxii, 12; lxviii, 30.

BULRUSH, גַּמָּא, Exodus ii, 3; Job viii, 11; Isaiah xviii, 2; xxxv, 7. A plant growing on the banks of the Nile, and in marshy grounds. The stalk rises to the height of six or seven cubits, beside two under water. This stalk is triangular, and terminates in a crown of small filaments resembling hair, which the ancients used to compare to a thyrus. This reed, the Cyperus papyrus of Linnæus, commonly called “the Egyptian reed,” was of the greatest use to the inhabitants of the country where it grew; the pith contained in the stock served them for food, and the woody part for building vessels, figures of which are to be seen on the engraven stones and other monuments of Egyptian antiquity. For this purpose they made it up, like rushes, into bundles; and, by tying these bundles together, gave their vessels the necessary shape and solidity. “The vessels of bulrushes,” or papyrus, “that are mentioned in sacred and profane history,” says Dr. Shaw, “were no other than large fabrics of the same kind with that of Moses, Exodus ii, 3; which, from the late introduction of plank and stronger materials, are now laid aside.” Thus Pliny takes notice of the

“naves 185papyraceas armamentaue Nili,” “ships made of papyrus, and the equipments of the Nile;” and he observes, “ex ipsâ quidem papyro navigia texunt,” “of the papyrus itself they construct sailing vessels.” Herodotus and Diodorus have recorded the same fact; and among the poets, Lucan, “Conseritur bibulâ Memphitis cymba papyro,” “the Memphian” or Egyptian boat is made of the thirsty papyrus; where the epithet bibulâ, “drinking,” “soaking,” “thirsty,” is particularly remarkable, as corresponding with great exactness to the nature of the plant, and to its Hebrew name, which signifies to soak or drink up. These vegetables require much water for their growth; when, therefore, the river on whose banks they grew was reduced, they perished sooner than other plants. This explains Job viii, 11, where the circumstance is referred to as an image of transient prosperity: “Can the flag grow without water? Whilst it is yet in its greenness, and not cut down, it withereth before any other herb.”

BURIAL, the interment of a deceased person; an office held so sacred, that they who neglected it have in all nations been held in abhorrence. As soon as the last breath had fled, the nearest relation, or the dearest friend, gave the lifeless body the parting kiss, the last farewell and sign of affection to the departed relative. This was a custom of immemorial antiquity; for the patriarch Jacob had no sooner yielded up his spirit, than his beloved Joseph, claiming for once the right of the first-born, “fell upon his face and kissed him.” It is probable he first closed his eyes, as God had promised he should do: “Joseph shall put his hands upon thine eyes.” The parting kiss being given, the company rent their clothes, which was a custom of great antiquity, and the highest expression of grief in the primitive ages. This ceremony was never omitted by the Hebrews when any mournful event happened, and was performed in the following manner: they took a knife, and holding the blade downward, gave the upper garment a cut in the right side, and rent it a hand’s breadth. For very near relations, all the garments are rent on the right side. After closing the eyes, the next care was to bind up the face, which it was no more lawful to behold. The next care of surviving friends was to wash the body, probably, that the ointments and perfumes with which it was to be wrapped up, might enter more easily into the pores, when opened by warm water. This ablution, which was always esteemed an act of great charity and devotion, was performed by women. Thus the body of Dorcas was washed, and laid in an upper room, till the arrival of the Apostle Peter, in the hope that his prayers might restore her to life. After the body was washed, it was shrouded, and swathed with a linen cloth, although in most places, they only put on a pair of drawers and a white tunic; and the head was bound about with a napkin. Such were the napkin and grave clothes in which the Saviour was buried.

2. The body was sometimes embalmed, which was performed by the Egyptians after the following method: the brain was removed with a bent iron, and the vacuity filled up with medicaments; the bowels were also drawn out, and the trunk being stuffed with myrrh, cassia, and other spices, except frankincense, which were proper to exsiccate the humours, it was pickled in nitre, in which it lay for seventy days. After this period, it was wrapped in bandages of fine linen and gums, to make it adhere; and was then delivered to the relations of the deceased entire; all its features, and the very hairs of the eyelids, being preserved. In this manner were the kings of Judah embalmed for many ages. But when the funeral obsequies were not long delayed, they used another kind of embalming. They wrapped up the body with sweet spices and odours, without extracting the brain, or removing the bowels. This is the way in which it was proposed to embalm the lifeless body of our Saviour; which was prevented by his resurrection. The meaner sort of people seem to have been interred in their grave clothes, without a coffin. In this manner was the sacred body of our Lord committed to the tomb. The body was sometimes placed upon a bier, which bore some resemblance to a coffin or bed, in order to be carried out to burial. Upon one of these was carried forth the widow's son of Nain, whom our compassionate Lord raised to life, and restored to his mother. We are informed in the history of the kings of Judah, that, Asa being dead, they laid him in the bed, or bier, which was filled with sweet odours. Josephus, the Jewish historian, describing the funeral of Herod the Great, says, His bed was adorned with precious stones; his body rested under a purple covering; he had a diadem and a crown of gold upon his head, a sceptre in his hand; and all his house followed the bed. The bier used by the Turks at Aleppo is a kind of coffin, much in the form of ours, only the lid rises with a ledge in the middle.

3. The Israelites committed the dead to their native dust; and from the Egyptians, probably, borrowed the practice of burning many spices at their funerals. "They buried Asa in his own sepulchres, which he made for himself in the city of David, and laid him in the bed which was filled with sweet odours, and divers kinds of spices, prepared by the apothecaries' art; and they made a very great burning for him," 2 Chron. xvi, 14. Thus the Old Testament historian entirely justifies the account which the Evangelist gives, of the quantity of spices with which the sacred body of Christ was swathed. The Jews object to the quantity used on that occasion, as unnecessarily profuse, and even incredible; but it appears from their own writings, that spices were used at such times in great abundance. In the Talmud it is said, that no less than eighty pounds of spices were consumed at the funeral of rabbi Gamaliel the elder. And at the funeral of Herod, if we may believe the account of their most celebrated historian, the procession was followed by five hundred of his domestics carrying spices.

Why then should it be reckoned incredible, that Nicodemus brought of myrrh 186 and aloes about a hundred pounds' weight, to embalm the body of Jesus?

4. The funeral procession was attended by professional mourners, eminently skilled in the art of lamentation, whom the friends and relations of the deceased hired, to assist them in expressing their sorrow. They began the ceremony with the stridulous voices of old women, who strove, by their doleful modulations, to extort grief from those that were present. The children in the streets through which they passed, often suspended their sports, to imitate the sounds, and joined with equal sincerity in the lamentations. "But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the markets, and calling unto their fellows, and saying, We have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented," Matt. ix, 17. Music was afterward introduced to aid the voices of the mourners: the trumpet was used at the funerals of the great, and the small pipe or flute for those of meaner condition. Hired mourners were in use among the Greeks as early as the Trojan war, and probably in ages long before; for in Homer, a choir of mourners were planted around the couch on which the body of Hector was laid out, who sung his funeral dirge with many sighs and tears:-

Ἵοι δ' ἐπεὶ εἰσάγαγον κλυτὰ δώματα, τὸν μὲν ἔπειτα  
Τρητοῖς ἐν λεχέεσσι θέσαν, παρὰ δ' εἶσαν ἀοιδοῦς,  
Θρήνων ἐξάρχθς. κ. τ. λ. II. lib. xxiv, l. 720.

"A melancholy choir attend around,  
With plaintive sighs and music's solemn sound;  
Alternately they sing, alternate flow  
The obedient tears, melodious in their wo." Pope.

In Egypt, the lower class of people call in women who play on the tabor; and whose business it is, like the hired mourners in other countries, to sing elegiac airs to the sound of that instrument, which they accompany with the most frightful distortions of their limbs. These women attend the corpse to the grave, intermixed with the female relations and friends of the deceased, who commonly have their hair in the utmost disorder; their heads covered with dust; their faces daubed with indigo, or at least rubbed with mud; and howling like maniacs. Such were the minstrels whom our Lord found in the house of Jairus, making so great a noise round the bed on which the dead body of his daughter lay. The noise and tumult of these retained mourners, and the other attendants, appear to have begun immediately after the person expired. It is evident that this sort of mourning and lamentation was a kind of art among the Jews: "Wailing shall be in the streets; and they shall call such as are skilful of lamentation to wail," Amos v, 16. Mourners are still hired at the obsequies of Hindoos and

Mohammedans, as in former times. To the dreadful noise and tumult of the hired mourners, the following passage of Jeremiah indisputably refers; and shows the custom to be derived from a very remote antiquity: "Call for the mourning women that they may come; and send for cunning women, that they may come, and let them make haste, and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, and our eyelids gush out with waters," Jer. ix, 17. The funeral processions of the Jews in Barbary are conducted nearly in the same manner as those in Syria. The corpse is borne by four to the place of burial: in the first rank march the priests, next to them the kindred of the deceased; after whom come those that are invited to the funeral; and all singing in a sort of plain song, the forty-ninth Psalm. Hence the Prophet, Amos viii, 3, warns his people that public calamities were approaching, so numerous and severe, as should make them forget the usual rites of burial, and even to sing one of the songs of Zion over the dust of a departed relative. This appears to be confirmed by a prediction in the eighth chapter: "And the songs of the temple shall be howlings in that day, saith the Lord God; there shall be many dead bodies in every place; they shall cast them forth with silence;" they shall have none to lament and bewail; none to blow the funeral trump or touch the pipe and tabor; none to sing the plaintive dirge, or express their hope of a blessed resurrection, in the strains of inspiration. All shall be silent despair. See Sepulchres.

BUSH. סנה. This word occurs in Exod. iii, 2, 4, and Deut. xxxiii, 16, as the name of the bush in which God appeared to Moses. If it be the *χουόνος* mentioned by Dioscorides, it is the white thorn. Celsius calls it the *rubus fruticosus*. The number of these bushes in this region seems to have given the name to the mountain Sinai. The word נהללים, found only in Isa. vii, 19, and there rendered "bushes," means fruitful pastures.

BUTTER is taken in Scripture, as it has been almost perpetually in the east, for cream or liquid butter, Prov. xxx, 33; 2 Sam. xvii, 29. The ancient way of making butter in Arabia and Palestine was probably nearly the same as is still practised by the Bedoween Arabs, and Moors in Barbary, and which is thus described by Dr. Shaw: "Their method of making butter is by putting the milk or cream into a goat's skin turned inside out, which they suspend from one side of the tent to the other; and then pressing it to and fro in one uniform direction, they quickly separate the unctuous and wheyey parts. In the Levant they tread upon the skin with their feet, which produces the same effect." The last method of separating the butter from the milk, perhaps may throw light upon a passage in Job of some difficulty: "When I washed my steps with butter, and the rock poured me out rivers of oil," Job xxxi, 6. The method of making butter in the east illustrates the conduct of Jael, the wife of Heber, described in the book of Judges: "And Sisera said unto her, Give me, I pray thee, a little water to drink, for I am thirsty:

and she opened a bottle of milk, and gave him drink and covered him.” In the Song of Deborah, the statement is repeated: “He asked water, and she gave him milk; she brought forth butter in a lordly dish,” Judges iv, 19; v, 25. The word חמאה, which our translators rendered butter, properly signifies cream; which is undoubtedly the meaning of it in this passage: for Sisera complained of thirst, and asked a little water to quench it;--a purpose to which butter is but little adapted. Mr. Harmer, indeed, urges the same objection to cream, which, he contends, few people would think a very proper beverage for one that was extremely thirsty; and concludes that it must have been butter-milk which Jael, who had just been churning, gave to Sisera. But the opinion of Dr. Russel is preferable,--that the hemah of the Scriptures is probably the same as the haymak of the Arabs, which is not, as Harmer supposed, simple cream, but cream produced by simmering fresh sheep’s milk for some hours over a slow fire. It could not be butter newly churned, which Jael presented to Sisera, because the Arab butter is apt to be foul, and is commonly passed through a strainer before it is used: and Russel declares, he never saw butter offered to a stranger, but always haymak; nor did he ever observe the orientals drink butter-milk, but always leban, which is coagulated sour milk, diluted with water. It was leban, therefore, which Pococke mistook for butter-milk, with which the Arabs treated him in the Holy Land. A similar conclusion may be drawn concerning the butter and milk which the wife of Heber presented to Sisera: they were forced cream or haymak, and leban, or coagulated sour milk, diluted with water, which is a common and refreshing beverage in those sultry regions. In Isaiah vii, 15, butter and honey are mentioned as food which, in Egypt and other places in the east, is in use to this day. The butter and honey are mixed, and the bread is then dipped in it.

BYSSUS. By this word we generally understand that fine Egyptian linen of which the priests’ tunics were made. But we must distinguish three kinds of commodities, which are generally comprehended under the name of linen: 1. The Hebrew בד, which signifies linen: 2. שש, which signifies cotton: 3. ברץ, which is commonly called byssus, and is the silk growing from a certain shell fish, called pinna. We do not find the name butz in the text of Moses, though the Greek and Latin use the word byssus, to signify the fine linen of certain habits belonging to the priests. The word butz occurs only in 1 Chron. xv, 27; Ezek. xxvii, 16; Esther i, 6. In the Chronicles we see David dressed in a mantle of butz, with the singers and Levites. Solomon used butz in the veils of the temple and sanctuary. Ahasuerus’s tents were upheld by cords of butz; and Mordecai was clothed with a mantle of purple and butz, when king Ahasuerus honoured him with the first employment in his kingdom. Lastly, it is observed that there was a manufacture of butz in the city of Beersheba, in Palestine. This butz must have been different from common linen, since in the same place where it



is said, David wore a mantle of byssus, we read likewise that he had on a linen ephod.

CAB, or KAB, a Hebrew measure, containing three pints one-third of our wine measure, or two pints five-sixths of our corn measure.

CABBALA, a mysterious kind of science, delivered to the ancient Jews, as they pretend, by revelation, and transmitted by oral tradition to those of our times; serving for the interpretation of the books both of nature and Scripture. The word is variously written, as Cabala, Caballa, Kabbala, Kabala, Cabalistica, Ars Cabala, and Gaballa. It is originally Hebrew, קבלה, and properly signifies reception; formed from the verb קבל, to receive by tradition, or from father to son; especially in the Chaldee and Rabbinical Hebrew. Cabbala, then, primarily denotes any sentiment, opinion, usage, or explication of Scripture, transmitted from father to son. In this sense the word cabbala is not only applied to the whole art, but also to each operation performed according to the rules of that art. Thus it is, rabbi Jacob Ben Ascher, surnamed Baal-Hatturim, is said to have compiled most of the cabbalas invented on the books of Moses before his time. As to the origin of the cabbala, the Jews relate many marvellous tales. They derive the mysteries contained in it from Adam; and assert, that whilst the first man was in paradise, the angel Raphael brought him a book from heaven, which contained the doctrines of heavenly wisdom; and that when Adam received this book, angels came down from heaven to learn its contents; but that he refused to admit them to the knowledge of sacred things, intrusted to himself alone: that, after the fall, this book was taken back into heaven; that, after many prayers and tears, God restored it to Adam; and that it passed from Adam to Seth. The Jewish fables farther relate, that the book being lost, and the mysteries contained in it almost forgotten, in the degenerate age preceding the flood, they were restored by special revelation to Abraham, who transmitted them to writing in the book "Jezirah;" and that the revelation was renewed to Moses, who received a traditionary and mystical, as well as a written and preceptive, law from God. Accordingly, the Jews believe that God gave to Moses on Mount Sinai, not only the law, but also the explication of that law; and that Moses, after his coming down, retiring to his tent, rehearsed to Aaron both the one and the other. When he had done, the sons of Aaron, Eleazar and Ithamar, were introduced to a second rehearsal. This being over, the seventy elders that composed the sanhedrim were admitted; and, lastly, the people, as many as pleased; to all of whom Moses again repeated both the law and explanation, as he received them from God: so that Aaron heard it four times, his sons thrice, the elders twice, and the people once. Now, of the two things which Moses taught them, the laws and the explanation, only the first were committed to writing; which is what we have in Exodus,

Leviticus, and Numbers. As to the second, or the explication of those laws, they were contented to impress it well in their memory, to teach it their children; they to theirs, &c. Hence the first part they call simply the law, or the written law; the second, the oral law, or cabbala. Such is the original notion of the cabbala.

2. The cabbala being again lost amidst the 188calamities of the Babylonish captivity, was once more revealed to Esdras; and it is said to have been preserved in Egypt, and transmitted to posterity through the hands of Simeon Ben Setach, Elkanah, Akibha, Simeon Ben Jochai, and others. The only warrantable inference from these accounts, which bear the obvious marks of fiction, is, that the cabbalistic doctrine obtained early credit among the Jews as a part of their sacred tradition, and was transmitted, under this notion, by the Jews in Egypt to their brethren in Palestine. Under the sanction of ancient names, many fictitious writings were produced, which greatly contributed to the spreading of this mystical system. Among these were “Sepher Happeliah,” or the book of wonders; “Sepher Hakkaneh,” or the book of the pen; and “Sepher Habbahir,” or the book of light. The first unfolds many doctrines said to have been delivered by Elias to the rabbi Elkanah; the second contains mystical commentaries on the divine commands; and the third illustrates the most sublime mysteries. Among the profound doctors who, beside the study of tradition, cultivated with great industry the cabbalistic philosophy, the most celebrated persons are the rabbis Akibba, who lived soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, and Simeon Ben Jochai, who flourished in the second century. To the former is ascribed the book entitled “Jezirah,” concerning the creation; and to the latter, the book “Sohar,” or brightness; and these are the principal sources from which we derive our knowledge of the cabbala.

3. That this system of the cabbalistic philosophy, which we may consider as the acroamatic, esoteric, or concealed doctrine of the Jews, by way of contradistinction from the exoteric or popular doctrine, was not of Hebrew origin, we may conclude with a very great degree of probability, from the total dissimilarity of its abstruse and mysterious doctrines to the simple principles of religion taught in the Mosaic law; and that it was borrowed from the Egyptian schools will sufficiently appear from a comparison of its tenets with those of the oriental and Alexandrian philosophy. Many writers have, indeed, imagined that they have found in the cabbalistic dogmas a near resemblance of the doctrines of Christianity; and they have thought that the fundamental principles of this mystical system were derived from divine revelation. This opinion, however, may be traced up to a prejudice which originated with the Jews, and passed from them to the Christian fathers, by which they were led to ascribe all Pagan wisdom to a Hebrew origin: a notion which very probably took its rise in Egypt, when

Pagan tenets first crept in among the Jews. Philo, Josephus, and other learned Jews, in order to flatter their own vanity, and that of their countrymen, industriously propagated this opinion; and the more learned fathers of the Christian church, who entertained a high opinion of the Platonic philosophy, hastily adopted it, from an imagination that if they could trace back the most valuable doctrines of Paganism to a Hebrew origin, this could not fail to recommend the Jewish and Christian religions to the attention of the Gentile philosophers. Many learned moderns, relying implicitly upon these authorities, have maintained the same opinion; and have thence been inclined to credit the report of the divine original of the Jewish cabbala. But the opinion is unfounded; and the cabbalistic system is essentially inconsistent with the pure doctrine of divine revelation. The true state of the case seems to be, that during the prophetic ages, the traditions of the Jews consisted in a simple explanation of those divine truths which the prophets delivered, or their law exhibited, under the veil of emblems. After this period, when the sects of the Essenes and Therapeutæ were formed in Egypt, foreign tenets and institutions were borrowed from the Egyptians and Greeks; and, in the form of allegorical interpretations of the law, were admitted into what might then be called the Jewish mysteries, or secret doctrines. These innovations chiefly consisted in certain dogmas concerning God and divine things, at this time received in the Egyptian schools; particularly at Alexandria, where the Platonic and Pythagorean doctrines on these subjects had been blended with the oriental philosophy. The Jewish mysteries, thus enlarged by the accession of Pagan dogmas, were conveyed from Egypt to Palestine, at the time when the Pharisees, who had been driven into Egypt under Hyrcanus, returned with many other Jews into their own country. From this time the cabbalistic mysteries continued to be taught in the Jewish schools; but at length they were adulterated by a mixture of Peripatetic doctrines, and other tenets. These mysteries were not, probably, reduced to any systematic forms in writing, till after the dispersion of the Jews; when in consequence of their national calamities, they became apprehensive that those sacred treasures would be corrupted or lost. In preceding periods, the cabbalistic doctrines underwent various corruptions, particularly from the prevalence of the Aristotelian philosophy. The similarity, or rather the coincidence, of the cabbalistic, Alexandrian, and oriental philosophy, will be sufficiently evinced by briefly stating the common tenets in which these different systems agreed. They are as follow:--“All things are derived by emanation from one principle; and this principle is God. From him a substantial power immediately proceeds, which is the image of God, and the source of all subsequent emanations. This second principle sends forth, by the energy of emanation, other natures, which are more or less perfect, according to their different degrees of distance, in the scale of emanation, from the first source of existence, and which constitute different worlds or orders of

being, all united to the eternal power from which they proceed. Matter is nothing more than the most remote effect of the emanative energy of the Deity. The material world receives its form from the immediate agency of powers far beneath the first source of being. Evil is the necessary effect of the imperfection of matter. Human souls are distant emanations 189 from Deity; and, after they are liberated from their material vehicles, will return, through various stages of purification, to the fountain whence they first proceeded." From this brief view it appears, that the cabbalistic system, which is the offspring of the other two, is a fanatical kind of philosophy, originating in defect of judgment and eccentricity of imagination, and tending to produce a wild and pernicious enthusiasm.

4. Among the explications of the law which are furnished by the cabbala, and which, in reality, are little else but the several interpretations and decisions of the rabbins on the laws of Moses, some are mystical; consisting of odd abstruse significations given to a word, or even to the letters whereof it is composed: whence, by different combinations, they draw meanings from Scripture very different from those it seems naturally to import. The art of interpreting Scripture after this manner is called more particularly cabbala; and it is in this last sense the word is more ordinarily used among us. This cabbala, called also artificial cabbala, to distinguish it from the first kind, or simple tradition, is divided into three sorts. The first, called gematria, consists in taking letters as figures, or arithmetical numbers, and explaining each word by the arithmetical value of the letters whereof it is composed; which is done various ways: the second is called notaricon, and consists either in taking each letter of a word for an entire diction, or in making one entire diction out of the initial letters of many: the third kind, called themurah, that is, changing, consists in changing and transposing the letters of a word; which is done various ways. The generality of the Jews prefer the cabbala to the literal Scripture; comparing the former to the sparkling lustre of a precious stone, and the latter to the fainter glimmering of a candle. The cabbala only differs from masorah, as the latter denotes the science of reading the Scripture; the former, of interpreting it. Both are supposed to have been handed down from generation to generation by oral tradition only, till at length the readings were fixed by the vowels and accents, as the interpretations were by the gemara.

5. Cabbala is also applied to the use, or rather abuse, which visionaries and enthusiasts make of Scripture, for discovering futurity by the study and consideration of the combination of certain words, letters, and numbers, in the sacred writings. All the words, terms, magic figures, numbers, letters, charms, &c, used in the Jewish magic, as also in the hermetical science, are comprised under this species of cabbala; which professes to teach the

art of curing diseases, and performing other wonders, by means of certain arrangements of sacred letters and words. But it is only the Christians that call it by this name, on account of the resemblance this art bears to the explications of the Jewish cabbala: for the Jews never used the word cabbala in any such sense; but ever with the utmost respect and veneration. It is not, however, the magic of the Jews alone which we call cabbala; but the word is also used for any kind of magic.

CABUL, the name which Hiram, king of Tyre, gave to the twenty cities in the land of Galilee, of which Solomon made him a present, in acknowledgment for the great services in building the temple, 1 Kings ix, 31. These cities not being agreeable to Hiram, on viewing them, he called them the land of Cabul, which in the Hebrew tongue denotes displeasing; others take it to signify binding or adhesive, from the clayey nature of the soil.

CÆSAR, a title borne by all the Roman emperors till the destruction of the empire. It took its rise from the surname of the first emperor, Caius Julius Cæsar; and this title, by a decree of the senate, all the succeeding emperors were to bear. In Scripture, the reigning emperor is generally mentioned by the name of Cæsar, without expressing any other distinction: so in Matt. xxii, 21, "Render unto Cæsar," &c, Tiberias is meant; and in Acts xxv, 10, "I appeal unto Cæsar," Nero is intended.

CÆSAREA, a city and port of Palestine, built by Herod the Great, and thus called in honour of Augustus Cæsar. It was on the site of the tower of Strato. This city, which was six hundred furlongs from Jerusalem, is often mentioned in the New Testament. Here it was that Herod Agrippa was smitten of the Lord for not giving God the glory, when the people were so extravagant in his praise. Cornelius the centurion, who was baptized by St. Peter, resided here, Acts x, 1, &c; and also Philip the deacon, with his four maiden daughters. At Cæsarea the Prophet Agabus foretold that Paul would be bound and persecuted at Jerusalem. Lastly, the Apostle himself continued two years a prisoner at Cæsarea, till he was conducted to Rome. When Judea was reduced to the state of a Roman province, Cæsarea became the stated residence of the proconsul, which accounts for the circumstance of Paul being carried thither from Jerusalem, to defend himself.

Dr. E. D. Clarke's remarks upon this once celebrated city will be read with interest: "On the 15th of July, 1801, we embarked, after sunset, for Acre, to avail ourselves of the land wind, which blows during the night, at this season of the year. By day break, the next morning, we were off the coast of Cæsarea; and so near with the land that we could very distinctly perceive

the appearance of its numerous and extensive ruins. The remains of this city, although still considerable, have long been resorted to as a quarry, whenever building materials are required at Acre. Djezzar Pacha brought from hence the columns of rare and beautiful marble, as well as the other ornaments of his palace, bath, fountain, and mosque at Acre. The place at present is inhabited only by jackals and beasts of prey. As we were becalmed during the night, we heard the cries of these animals until day break. Poccocke mentions the curious fact of the former existence of crocodiles in the river of Cæsarea. Perhaps there has not been in the history of the world an example of any city, that in so short a space of time rose to such an extraordinary height of splendour as did this of Cæsarea; or that exhibits a more awful contrast to its former magnificence, by the present desolate appearance of its ruins. Not a single inhabitant remains. Its theatres, once resounding with the shouts of multitudes, echo no other sound than the nightly cries of animals roaming for their prey. Of its gorgeous palaces and temples, enriched with the choicest works of art, and decorated with the most precious marbles, scarcely a trace can be discerned. Within the space of ten years after laying the foundation, from an obscure fortress, it became the most celebrated and flourishing city of all Syria. It was named Cæsarea by Herod, in honour of Augustus, and dedicated by him to that emperor, in the twenty-eighth year of his reign. Upon this occasion, that the ceremony might be rendered illustrious, by a degree of profusion unknown in any former instance, Herod assembled the most skilful musicians, wrestlers, and gladiators from all parts of the world. This solemnity was to be renewed every fifth year. But, as we viewed the ruins of this memorable city, every other circumstance respecting its history was absorbed in the consideration that we were actually beholding the very spot where the scholar of Tarsus, after two years' imprisonment, made that eloquent appeal, in the audience of the king of Judea, which must ever be remembered with piety and delight. In the history of the actions of the holy Apostles, whether we regard the internal evidence of the narrative, or the interest excited by a story so wonderfully appalling to our passions and affections, there is nothing that we call to mind with fuller emotions of sublimity and satisfaction. 'In the demonstration of the Spirit and of power,' the mighty advocate for the Christian faith had before 'reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come,' till the Roman governor, Felix, trembled as he spoke. Not all the oratory of Tertullus; not the clamour of his numerous adversaries; not even the countenance of the most profligate of tyrants availed against the firmness and intrepidity of the oracle of God. The judge had trembled before his prisoner; and now a second occasion offered, in which, for the admiration and the triumph of the Christian world, one of the bitterest persecutors of the name of Christ, and a Jew, appeals, in the public tribunal of a large and populous city, to all

its chiefs and its rulers, its governor and its king, for the truth of his conversion founded on the highest evidence.”

CÆSAREA PHILIPPI was first called Laish or Leshem, Judg. xviii, 7. After it was subdued by the Danites, Judg. v, 29, it received the name of Dan; and is by Heathen writers called Paneas. Philip, the youngest son of Herod the Great, made it the capital of his tetrarchy, enlarged and embellished it, and gave it the name of Cæsarea Philippi. It was situated at the foot of Mount Hermon, near the head of the Jordan; and was about fifty miles from Damascus, and thirty from Tyre. Our Saviour visited and taught in this place, and healed one who was possessed of an evil spirit: here also he gave the memorable rebuke to Peter, Mark viii.

CAIAPHAS, high priest of the Jews, succeeded Simon, son of Camith; and after possessing this dignity nine years, from A. M. 4029 to 4038, he was succeeded by Jonathan, son of Ananas, or Annas. Caiaphas was high priest, A. M. 4037, which was the year of Jesus Christ's death. He married a daughter of Annas, who also is called high priest in the Gospel, because he had long enjoyed that dignity. When the priests deliberated on the seizure and death of Jesus Christ, Caiaphas declared, that there was no room for debate on that matter, “because it was expedient that one man should die for the people, that the whole nation should not perish,” John xi, 49, 50. This sentiment was a prophecy, which God suffered to proceed from the mouth of the high priest on this occasion, importing, that the death of Jesus would be for the salvation of the world. When Judas had betrayed Jesus, he was first taken before Annas, who sent him to his son-in-law, Caiaphas, who possibly lived in the same house, John xviii, 24. The priests and doctors of the law there assembled to judge our Saviour, and to condemn him. The depositions of certain false witnesses being insufficient to justify a sentence of death against him, and Jesus continuing silent, Caiaphas, as high priest, said to him, “I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God!” To this adjuration, so solemnly made by the superior judge, Jesus answered, “Thou hast said; nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.” On hearing these words, Caiaphas rent his clothes, saying, “What farther need have we of witnesses? Behold, now you have heard his blasphemy. What think ye?” They answered, “He is worthy of death.” And as the power of life and death was not at this time in their hands, but was reserved by the Romans, they conducted him to Pilate, that he might confirm their sentence, and order his execution.

Two years after this, Vitellus, governor of Syria, coming to Jerusalem at the passover, was received very magnificently by the people. As an

acknowledgment for this honour, he restored the custody of the high priest's ornaments to the priests, he remitted certain duties raised on the fruits of the earth, and deposed the high priest Caiaphas. From this it appears that Caiaphas had fallen under popular odium, for his deposition was to gratify the people.

**CAIN**, the eldest son of Adam and Eve. He was the first man who had been a child, and the first man born of woman. For his history, as connected with that of Abel, see Abel. The curse pronounced upon Cain, on account of his fratricide, is thus expressed: "And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is thy brother Abel? And he said, I know not: am I my brother's keeper? And God said, What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground. And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand. When thou tillest it, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee its strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth. And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth," meaning, probably, from his own native district, and from the presence of his kindred, "and from thy face shall I be hid;" by which he probably intended the divine glory, or Shekinah, whose appearance sanctified the place of primitive worship, and was the pledge of acceptance and protection. The mark set upon Cain "lest any one finding him should kill him," has been variously interpreted. Some have supposed it a change in the colour of his skin, others a certain horror of countenance. The LXX. understood the passage to mean, that the Lord gave him a sign, to assure him that his life should be preserved. Whatever it was, its object was not to aggravate, but to mitigate, his punishment, which may intimate that Cain had manifested repentance. Cain, being thus banished from the presence of the Lord, retired into the land of Nod, lying east from the province of Eden. While he dwelt in this country, which is generally understood to be Susiana, or Chusistan, he had a son, whom he named Enoch, in memory of whom he built a city of the same name. This is all we learn from Scripture concerning Cain.

**CAKE**. See Bread.

**CALAH**, a city of Assyria, built by Ashur, Gen. x, 12. From it the adjacent country, on the north-east of the Tigris, and south of the Gordian mountains of Armenia, was called Callachene, or Callacine.

**CALAMUS**, קנה. Exod. xxx, 23; Cantic. iv, 14; Isa. xliii, 24; Jer. vi, 20; Ezek. xxvii, 19. An aromatic reed, growing in moist places in Egypt, in Judea near lake Genezareth, and in several parts of Syria. It grows to about two feet in height; bearing from the root a knotted stalk, quite round,



containing in its cavity a soft white pith. The whole is of an agreeable aromatic smell; and the plant is said to scent the air with a fragrance even while growing. When cut down, dried, and powdered, it makes an ingredient in the richest perfumes. It was used for this purpose by the Jews.

Calamus Scriptorius, a reed answering the purpose of a pen to write with. The ancients used styles, to write on tablets covered with wax; but reeds, to write on parchment or papyrus. The Psalmist says, "My tongue is the pen of a ready writer," xlv, 1. The Hebrew signifies rather a style. The third book of Maccabees states, that the writers employed in making a list of the Jews in Egypt, produced their reeds quite worn out. Baruch wrote his prophecies with ink, Jer. xxxvi, 4; and, consequently, used reeds; for it does not appear that quills were then used to write with. In third John 13, the Apostle says, he did not design to write with pen (reed) and ink. The Arabians, Persians, Turks, Greeks, and Armenians, to this day, write with reeds or rushes.

CALEB, the son of Jephunneh, of the tribe of Judah, was one of those who accompanied Joshua, when he was deputed by Moses to view the land of Canaan, which the Lord had promised them for an inheritance, Num. xiii. The deputies sent on this occasion were twelve in number, selected one out of each of the tribes, and they performed their commission with great promptitude and skill; they traversed the country in every direction, bringing with them, on their return, some of its finest fruits for the inspection of their brethren. Some of them, however, after making the report of the beauty and goodness of the country, which they described to be a land flowing with milk and honey, added, that the inhabitants of it were remarkable for their strength, while its cities were large and enclosed with walls. These later particulars having excited a spirit of murmuring among the Israelites, Caleb endeavoured to animate their courage by dwelling upon the fertility of the country, and exhorting them to go boldly and take possession of it. Others, however, dissuaded the people from making the attempt, assuring them that they would never make themselves masters of it. We have seen giants there, said they, in comparison of whom we were as grasshoppers; on which the people declared against the project, and intimated their wish to return again into Egypt. Moses and Aaron no sooner heard this than they fell upon their faces before the whole congregation, and Joshua and Caleb rent their clothes, imploring them to take courage and march boldly on; since, if God were with them, they might easily make a conquest of the whole land. So exasperated, however, were the multitude, that they were proceeding to stone Caleb and Joshua, when the glory of the Lord appeared upon the tabernacle, and threatened their extermination. Moses, having fervently interceded for them, the Lord graciously heard his prayer; but though he was pleased not to destroy them

immediately, he protested with an oath, that none of those who had murmured against him should see the land of Canaan, but that they should all die in the wilderness. "As for my servant Caleb," it was added, "who hath faithfully followed me, him will I bring into the land, and he shall possess it, he and his children after him," Num. xiv, 1–24. Joshua also obtained a similar exception, verses 30, 38. When Joshua had entered the promised land, and conquered a considerable part of it, Caleb, with the people of his tribe, came to meet him at Gilgal, and finding that he was about to divide the land among the twelve tribes, Caleb petitioned to have the country which was inhabited by the giants allotted to him, on which Joshua blessed him and granted his request. Assisted by a portion of his tribe, he marched against Hebron, and slew the children of Anak: thence he proceeded to Debir, and finding the place almost impregnable, he offered his daughter Achsah in marriage to the hero that should take it. This was done by his nephew Othniel, who in consequence obtained Achsah with a considerable portion also of territory. We are not informed of the particular time or manner of the death of Caleb; but by his three sons, Iru, Elah, and Naam, he had a numerous posterity, who maintained an honourable rank among their brethren. See Num. xiii, xiv, Josh. xiv, 6–15; xv, 13–19; Judges i, 9–15; 1 Chron. iv, 15–20. עגל

CALF, עגל. The young of the ox kind. There is frequent mention in Scripture of calves, because they were made use of commonly in sacrifices. The "fatted calf," mentioned in several places, as in 1 Sam. xxviii, 24, and Luke xv, 23, was stall fed, with special reference to a particular festival or extraordinary sacrifice. The "calves of the lips," mentioned by Hosea, xiv, 2, signify the sacrifices of praise which the captives of Babylon addressed to God, being no longer in a condition to offer sacrifices in his temple. The Septuagint render it the "fruit of the lips;" and their reading is followed by the Syriac, and by the Apostle to the Hebrews, xiii, 15. The "golden calf" was an idol set up and worshipped by the Israelites at the foot of mount Sinai in their passage through the wilderness to the land of Canaan. Having been conducted through the wilderness by a pillar of cloud and fire, which preceded them in their marches, while Moses was receiving the divine commands that cloud covered the mountain, and they probably imagined that it would no longer be their guide; and, therefore, applied to Aaron to make for them a sacred sign or symbol, as other nations had, which might visibly represent God. With this request, preferred tumultuously, and in a menacing manner, Aaron in a moment of weakness complied. The image thus formed is supposed to have been like the Egyptian deity, Apis, which was an ox, an animal used in agriculture, and so a symbol of the god who presided over their fields, or of the productive power of the Deity. The means by which Moses reduced the golden calf to powder, so that when mixed with water he made the people drink it, in contempt, has puzzled

commentators. Some understand that he did this by a chymical process, then well known, but now a secret; others, that he beat it into gold leaf, and then separated this into parts so fine, as to be easily potable; others, that he reduced it by filing. The account says, that he took the calf, burned it to powder, and mixed the powder with water; from which it is probable, as several Jewish writers have thought, that the calf was not wholly made of gold, but of wood, covered with a profusion of gold ornaments cast and fashioned for the occasion. For this reason it obtained the epithet golden, as afterward some ornaments of the temple were called, which we know were only overlaid with gold. It would in that case be enough to reduce the wood to powder in the fire, which would also blacken and deface the golden ornaments; but there is no need to suppose they were also reduced to powder. It is plain from Aaron's proclaiming a fast to Jehovah, Exod. xxxii, 4, and from the worship of Jeroboam's calves being so expressly distinguished from that of Baal, 2 Kings x, 28–31, that both Aaron and Jeroboam meant the calves they formed and set up for worship to be emblems of Jehovah. Nevertheless, the inspired Psalmist speaks of Aaron's calf with the utmost abhorrence, and declares that, by worshipping it, they forgot God their Saviour, (see 1 Cor. x, 9,) who had wrought so many miracles for them, and that for this crime God threatened to destroy them, Psalm cvi, 19–24; Exod. xxxii, 10; and St. Stephen calls it plainly εἶδωλον, an idol, Acts vii, 41. As for Jeroboam, after he had, for political reasons, 1 Kings xii, 27, &c, made a schism in the Jewish church, and set up two calves in Dan and Bethel, as objects of worship, he is scarcely ever mentioned in Scripture but with a particular stigma set upon him: "Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin."

CALL, to name a person or thing, Acts xi, 26; Rom. vii, 3. 2. To cry to another for help; and hence, to pray. The first passage in the Old Testament in which we meet with this phrase, is Gen. iv, 26, where we read, "Then began men to call on the name of the Lord," or Jehovah; the meaning of which seems to be, that they then first began to worship him in public assemblies. In both the Old and New Testament, to call upon the name of the Lord, imports invoking the true God in prayer, with a confession that he is Jehovah, that is, with an acknowledgment of his essential and incommunicable attributes. In this view the phrase is applied to the worship of Christ.

CALLING, a term in theology, which is taken in a different sense by the advocates and the impugners of the Calvinistic doctrine of grace. By the former it is thus stated: In the golden chain of spiritual blessings which the Apostle enumerates in Rom. viii, 30, originating in the divine predestination, and terminating in the bestowment of eternal glory on the heirs of salvation, that of calling forms an important link. "Moreover,

whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also glorified.” Hence we read of “the called according to his purpose,” Rom. viii, 28. There is indeed a universal call of the Gospel to all men; for wherever it comes it is the voice of God to those who hear it, calling them to repent and believe the divine testimony unto the salvation of their souls; and it leaves them inexcusable in rejecting it, John iii, 14–19; but this universal call is not inseparably connected with salvation; for it is in reference to it that Christ says, “Many are called, but few are chosen,” Matt. xxii, 14. But the Scripture also speaks of a calling which is effectual, and which consequently is more than the outward ministry of the word; yea, more than some of its partial and temporary effects upon many who hear it, for it is always ascribed to God’s making his word effectual through the enlightening and sanctifying influences of his Holy Spirit. Thus it is said, “Paul may plant, and Apollos water, but God giveth the increase,” 1 Cor. iii, 6, 7. Again, he is said to have “opened the heart of Lydia, 193that she attended to the doctrine of Paul,” Acts xvi, 14. “No man can come unto Christ, except the Father draw him,” John vi, 44. Hence faith is said to be the gift of God, Eph. ii, 8; Phil. i, 29. The Spirit takes of the things of Christ and shows them to men, John xvi, 14; and thus opens their eyes, turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, Acts xxvi, 18. And so God saves his people, not by works of righteousness which they have done, but according to his mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, Titus iii, 5. Thus they are saved, and called with a holy calling, not according to their works, but according to the divine purpose and grace which was given them in Christ Jesus before the world began, 2 Tim. i, 9.

2. To this it is replied, that this whole statement respecting a believer’s calling is without any support from the Scriptures, and is either a misunderstanding, or a misapplication of their sense. “To call” signifies to invite to the blessings of the Gospel, to offer salvation through Christ, either by God himself, or, under his appointment, by his servants; and in the parable of the marriage of the king’s son, Matt. xxii, 1–14, which appears to have given rise, in many instances, to the use of this term in the Epistles, we have three descriptions of “called” or invited persons. First, the disobedient, who would not come in at the call, but made light of it. Second, the class of persons represented by the man who, when the king came in to see his guests, had not on the wedding garment; and with respect to whom our Lord makes the general remark, “For many are called, but few are chosen;” so that the persons thus represented by this individual culprit were not only “called,” but actually came into the company. Third, the approved guests; those who were both called and chosen. As far as the simple calling or invitation is concerned, all these three classes stood upon equal ground--all were invited; and it depended upon their choice and

conduct whether they embraced the invitation, and were admitted as guests. We have nothing here to countenance the notion of what is termed "effectual calling." This implies an irresistible influence exerted upon all the approved guests, but withheld from the disobedient, who could not, therefore, be otherwise than disobedient; or at most could only come in without that wedding garment, which it was never put into their power to take out of the king's wardrobe; and the want of which would necessarily exclude them, if not from the church on earth, yet from the church in heaven. The doctrine of Christ's parables is in entire contradiction to this notion of irresistible influence; for they who refused, and they who complied but partially with the calling, are represented, not merely as being left without the benefit of the feast, but as incurring additional guilt and condemnation for refusing the invitation. It is to this offer of salvation by the Gospel, this invitation to spiritual and eternal benefits, that St. Peter appears to refer, when he says, "For the PROMISE is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall CALL," Acts ii, 39; a passage which declares "the promise" to be as extensive as the "calling;" in other words, as the offer or invitation. To this also St. Paul refers, Rom. i, 5, 6: "By whom we have received grace and Apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all nations, for his name;" that is, to publish his Gospel, in order to bring all nations to the obedience of faith; "among whom are ye also the CALLED of Jesus Christ;" you at Rome have heard the Gospel, and have been invited to salvation in consequence of this design. This promulgation of the Gospel, by the personal ministry of the Apostle, under the name of calling, is also referred to in Gal. i, 6: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ," obviously meaning, that it was he himself who had called them, by his preaching, to embrace the grace of Christ. So also in chap. v, 13: "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty." Again: 1 Thess. ii, 12: "That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath CALLED you," invited you, "to his kingdom and glory."

3. In our Lord's parable it will also be observed, that the persons called are not invited as separate individuals to partake of solitary blessings; but they are called to "a feast," into a company or society, before whom the banquet is spread. The full revelation of the transfer of the visible church of Christ from Jews by birth, to believers of all nations, was not, however, then made. When this branch of the evangelic system was fully revealed to the Apostles, and taught by them to others, that part of the meaning of our Lord's parable which was not at first developed was more particularly discovered to his inspired followers. The calling of guests to the evangelical feast, we then more fully learn, was not the mere calling of men to partake of spiritual benefits; but calling them also to form a spiritual society composed of Jews and Gentiles, the believing men of all nations;

to have a common fellowship in these blessings, and to be formed into this fellowship for the purpose of increasing their number, and diffusing the benefits of salvation among the people or nation to which they respectively belonged. The invitation, "the calling," of the first preachers was to all who heard them in Rome, in Ephesus, in Corinth, and other places; and those who embraced it, and joined themselves to the church by faith, baptism, and continued public profession, were named, especially and eminently, "the called," because of their obedience to the invitation. They not only put in their claim to the blessings of Christianity individually, but became members of the new church, that spiritual society of believers which God now visibly owned as his people. As they were thus called into a common fellowship by the Gospel, this is sometimes termed their "vocation;" as the object of this church state was to promote "holiness," it is termed a "holy vocation;" as sanctity was required of the members, they are said to have been "called to be saints;" as the final result was, through the mercy of God, to 194be eternal life, we hear of "the hope of their calling," and of their being "called to his eternal glory by Christ Jesus."

4. These views will abundantly explain the various passages in which the term calling occurs in the Epistles: "Even us whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles," Rom. ix, 24; that is, whom he hath made members of his church through faith. "But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God;" the wisdom and efficacy of the Gospel being, of course, acknowledged in their very profession of Christ, in opposition to those to whom the preaching of "Christ crucified" was "a stumbling block," and "foolishness," 1 Cor. i, 24. "Is any man called," (brought to acknowledge Christ, and to become a member of his church,) "being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised," 1 Cor. vii, 18. "That ye walk worthy of the vocation, wherewith ye are called. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling," Eph. iv, 1, 4. "That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you to his kingdom and glory," 1 Thess. ii, 12. "Through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth, whereunto he called you by our Gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Thess. ii, 13, 14. "Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling; not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began; but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Tim. i, 9, 10. On this passage we may remark, that the "calling," and the "purpose" mentioned in it, must of necessity be interpreted to refer to the establishment of the church on the principle of faith, so that it might include men of all nations; and not, as formerly, be restricted to natural descent. For personal election, and a purpose of effectual personal calling,

could not have been hidden till manifested by the “appearing of Christ;” since every instance of true conversion to God in any age prior to the appearing of Christ, would be as much a manifestation of eternal election, and an instance of personal effectual calling, according to the Calvinistic scheme, as it was after the appearance of Christ. The Apostle is speaking of a purpose of God, which was kept secret till revealed by the Christian system; and, from various other parallel passages, we learn that this secret, this “mystery,” as he often calls it, was the union of the Jews and Gentiles in “one body,” or church, by faith.

5. In none of these passages is the doctrine of the exclusive calling of a set number of men contained; and the synod of Dort, as though they felt this, only attempt to infer the doctrine from a text already quoted; but which we will now more fully notice: “Whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified,” Rom. viii, 30. This is the text on which the Calvinists chiefly rest their doctrine of effectual calling; and tracing it, as they say, through its steps and links, they conclude, that a set and determinate number of persons having been predestinated unto salvation, this set number only are called effectually, then justified, and finally glorified. But this passage was evidently nothing to the purpose, unless it had spoken of a set and determinate number of men as predestinated and called, independent of any consideration of their faith and obedience; which number as being determinate, would, by consequence exclude the rest. The context declares that those who are foreknown, and predestinated to eternal glory, are true believers, those who “love God,” as stated in a subsequent verse; for of such only the Apostle speaks; and when he adds, “Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified;” he shows in particular how the divine purpose to glorify believers is carried into effect, through all its stages. The great instrument of bringing men to “love God” is the Gospel; they are, therefore, called, invited by it, to this state and benefit; the calling being obeyed, they are justified; and being justified, and continuing in that state of grace, they are glorified. Nothing, however, is here said to favour the conclusion, that many others who were called by the Gospel, but refused, might not have been justified and glorified as well as they; nothing to distinguish this calling into common and effectual: and the very guilt which those are every where represented as contracting who despised the Gospel calling, shows that they reject a grace which is sufficient, and sincerely intended, to save them.

CALNEH, a city in the land of Shinar, built by Nimrod, and one of the cities mentioned Genesis x, 10, as belonging to his kingdom. It is believed

to be the same with Calno, mentioned in Isa. x, 9. It is said by the Chaldee interpreters, as also by Eusebius and Jerom, to be the same with Ctesiphon, standing upon the Tigris, about three miles distant from Seleucia, and that for some time it was the capital city of the Parthians. Bochart, Wells, and Michaëlis, agree in this opinion.

CALVARY, or, as it is called in Hebrew, Golgotha, “a skull,” or “place of skulls,” supposed to be thus denominated from the similitude it bore to the figure of a skull or man’s head, or from its being a place of burial. It was a small eminence or hill to the north of Mount Sion, and to the west of old Jerusalem, upon which our Lord was crucified. The ancient summit of Calvary has been much altered, by reducing its level in some parts, and raising it in others, in order to bring it within the area of a large and irregular building, called “The Church of the Holy Sepulchre,” which now occupies its site. But in doing this, care has been taken that none of the parts connected with the crucifixion should suffer any alteration. The same building also encloses within its spacious walls several other places reputed sacred. The places which claim the chief attraction of the Christian visitant of this church, and those only perhaps which can be relied on, are, the spot on which the crucifixion took place, and the sepulchre in which our Lord was afterward laid. The first has been preserved without mutilation: being a piece of ground about ten yards square, in its original position; and so high above the common floor of the church, that there are, according to Chateaubriand, twenty-one steps to ascend up to it. Mr. Buckingham describes the present mount as a rock, the summit of which is ascended by a steep flight of eighteen or twenty steps from the common level of the church, which is equal with that of the street without; and beside this, there is a descent of thirty steps, from the level of the church, into the chapel of St. Helena, and by eleven more to the place where the cross was said to be found. On this little mount is shown the hole in which the cross was fixed; and near it the position of the crosses of the two thieves: one, the penitent, on the north; and the other on the south. Here, also, is shown a cleft in the rock, said to have been caused by the earthquake which happened at the crucifixion. The sepulchre, distant, according to Mr. Jolliffe, forty-three yards from the cross, presents rather a singular and unexpected appearance to a stranger; who, for such a place, would naturally expect to find an excavation in the ground, instead of which, he perceives it altogether raised, as if artificially, above its level. The truth is, that in the alterations which were made on Calvary, to bring all the principal places within the projected church, the earth around the sepulchre was dug away; so that, what was originally a cave in the earth has now the appearance of a closet or grotto above ground. The sepulchre itself is about six feet square and eight high. There is a solid block of the stone left in excavating the rock, about two feet and a half from the floor,



and running along the whole of the inner side; on which the body of our Lord is said to have been laid. This, as well as the rest of the sepulchre, is now faced with marble: partly from the false taste which prevailed in the early ages of Christianity, in disguising with profuse and ill-suited embellishments the spots rendered memorable in the history of its Founder; and partly, perhaps, to preserve it from the depredations of the visitants. This description of the holy sepulchre will but ill accord with the notions entertained by some English readers of a grave; but a cave or grotto, thus excavated in rocky ground, on the side of a hill, was the common receptacle for the dead among the eastern nations. Such was the tomb of Christ; such that of Lazarus; and such are the sepulchres still found in Judea and the east. It may be useful farther to observe, that it was customary with Jews of property to provide a sepulchre of this kind on their own ground, as the place of their interment after death; and it appears that Calvary itself, or the ground immediately around it, was occupied with gardens; one of which belonged to Joseph of Arimathea, who had then recently caused a new sepulchre to be made for himself. It was this sepulchre, so close at hand, and so appropriate, which he resigned for the use of our Lord; little thinking perhaps, at the time, how soon it would again be left vacant for its original purpose by his glorious resurrection.

CALVINISM, that scheme of doctrine on predestination and grace, which was taught by Calvin, the celebrated reformer, in the early part of the sixteenth century. His opinions are largely opened in the third book of his "Institutes:" "Predestination we call the eternal decree of God; by which he hath determined in himself what he would have to become of every individual of mankind. For they are not all created with similar destiny; but eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or other of these ends, we say, he is predestinated, either to life, or to death." After having spoken of the election of the race of Abraham, and then of particular branches of that race, he proceeds: "Though it is sufficiently clear, that God, in his secret counsel, freely chooses whom he will, and rejects others, his gratuitous election is but half displayed till we come to particular individuals, to whom God not only offers salvation, but assigns it in such a manner that the certainty of the effect is liable to no suspense or doubt." He sums up the chapter, in which he thus generally states the doctrine, in these words: "In conformity, therefore, to the clear doctrine of the Scripture, we assert, that, by an eternal and immutable counsel, God hath once for all determined both whom he would admit to salvation, and whom he would condemn to destruction. We affirm that this counsel, as far as concerns the elect, is founded on his gratuitous mercy, totally irrespective of human merit; but that to those whom he devotes to condemnation, the gate of life is closed by a just and irreprehensible, but incomprehensible, judgment. In

the elect, we consider calling as an evidence of election; and justification as another token of its manifestation, till they arrive in glory, which constitutes its completion. As God seals his elect by vocation and justification, so by excluding the reprobate from the knowledge of his name, and sanctification of his Spirit, he affords another indication of the judgment that awaits them,” chap. 21, book iii.

2. In the commencement of the following chapter he thus rejects the notion that predestination is to be understood as resulting from God’s foreknowledge of what would be the conduct of either the elect or the reprobate: “It is a notion commonly entertained, that God, foreseeing what would be the respective merits of every individual, makes a correspondent distinction between different persons; that he adopts as his children such as he foreknows will be deserving of his grace; and devotes to the damnation of death others, whose dispositions he sees will be inclined to wickedness and impiety. Thus they not only obscure election by covering it with the veil of foreknowledge, but pretend that it originates in another cause,” book iii, chap. 22. Consistently 196with this, he a little farther on asserts, that election does not flow from holiness, but holiness from election: “For when it is said, that the faithful are elected that they should be holy, it is fully implied, that the holiness they were in future to possess had its origin in election.” He proceeds to quote the example of Jacob and Esau, as loved and hated before they had done good or evil, to show that the only reason of election and reprobation is to be placed in God’s “secret counsel.” He will not allow the future wickedness of the reprobate to have been considered in the decree of their rejection, any more than the righteousness of the elect, as influencing their better fate: “‘God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.’ You see how he (the Apostle) attributes both to the mere will of God. If, therefore, we can assign no reason why he grants mercy to his people but because such is his pleasure, neither shall we find any other cause but his will for the reprobation of others. For when God is said to harden, or show mercy to whom he pleases, men are taught, by this declaration, to seek no cause beside his will.” (Ibid.) “Many, indeed, as if they wished to avert odium from God, admit election in such a way as to deny that any one is reprobated. But this is puerile and absurd; because election itself could not exist, without being opposed to reprobation;--whom God passes by he therefore reprobates; and from no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestines for his children,” book iii, chap. xxiii.

3. This is the scheme of predestination as exhibited by Calvin; and to the objection taken from justice, he replies, “They” (the objectors) “inquire by what right the Lord is angry with his creatures who had not provoked him

by any previous offence; for that to devote to destruction whom he pleases, is more like the caprice of a tyrant, than the lawful sentence of a judge. If such thoughts ever enter into the minds of pious men, they will be sufficiently enabled to break their violence by this one consideration, how exceedingly presumptuous it is, only to inquire into the causes of the divine will; which is, in fact, and is justly entitled to be, the cause of every thing that exists. For if it has any cause, then there must be something antecedent on which it depends, which it is impious to suppose. For the will of God is the highest rule of justice; so that what he wills must be considered just, for this very reason, because he wills it." Thus he assumes the very thing in dispute, that God has willed the destruction of any part of the human race, "for no other cause than because he wills it;" of which assumption there is not only not a word of proof in Scripture; but, on the contrary, it ascribes the death of him that dieth to his own will, and not to the will of God. 2. He pretends that to assign any cause to the divine will is to suppose something antecedent to, something above God, and therefore "impious;" as if we might not suppose something IN God to be the rule of his will, not only without any impiety, but with truth and piety; as, for instance, his perfect wisdom, holiness, justice, and goodness; or, in other words, to believe the exercise of his will to flow from the perfection of his whole nature; a much more honourable and Scriptural view of the will of God than that which subjects it to no rule, even though it should arise from the nature of God himself. 3. When he calls the will of God, "the highest rule of justice," beyond which we cannot push our inquiries, he confounds the will of God, as a rule of justice to us, and as a rule to himself. This will is our rule; yet even then, because we know that it is the will of a perfect being: but when Calvin represents mere will as constituting God's own rule of justice, he shuts out knowledge, discrimination of the nature of things, and holiness; which is saying something very different from that great truth, that God cannot will any thing but what is perfectly just. It is to say that blind will, will which has no respect to any thing but itself, is God's highest rule of justice; a position which, if presented abstractedly, many Calvinists themselves would spurn. 4. He determines the question by the authority of his own metaphysics, and totally forgets that one dictum of inspiration overturns his whole theory,--God "willeth all men to be saved;" a declaration, which in no part of the sacred volume is opposed or limited by any contrary declaration.

4. Calvin was not, however, content thus to leave the matter; but resorts to an argument, in which he has been generally followed by those who have adopted his system with some mitigations: "As we are all corrupted by sin, we must necessarily be odious to God, and that not from tyrannical cruelty, but in the most equitable estimation of justice. If all whom the Lord predestinates to death are, in their natural condition, liable to the sentence

of death, what injustice do they complain of receiving from him?" To this Calvin very fairly states the obvious rejoinder made in his day; and which the common sense of mankind will always make,--"They object, Were they not by the decree of God antecedently predestinated to that corruption which is now stated as the cause of their condemnation? When they perish in their corruption, therefore, they only suffer the punishment of that misery into which, in consequence of his predestination, Adam fell, and precipitated his posterity with him." The manner in which Calvin attempts to meet this objection, shows how truly unanswerable it is upon his system. "I confess," says he, "indeed, that all the descendants of Adam fell, by the Divine will, into that miserable condition in which they are now involved; and this is what I asserted from the beginning, that we must always return at last to the sovereign determination of God's will; the cause of which is hidden in himself. But it follows not, therefore, that God is liable to this reproach; for we will answer them in the language of Paul, 'O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus'" That is, in order to escape the pinch of the objection, he assumes that St. Paul affirms that God has "formed" a part of the human race for eternal misery; and that, by imposing silence upon them, he intended to declare that this proceeding in God was just. Now the passage may be proved from its context to have no respect to the eternal state of men at all; but, if that were less obvious, it gives no answer to the objection; and we are brought round again, as indeed he confesses, to his former, and indeed only, argument, that the whole matter as he states it, is to be referred back to the divine will; which will, though perfectly arbitrary, is, as he contends, the highest rule of justice: "I say, with Augustine, that the Lord created those whom he certainly foreknew would fall into destruction; and that this was actually so, because he willed it; but of his will, it belongs not to us to demand the reason, which we are incapable of comprehending; nor is it reasonable, that the divine will should be made the subject of controversy with us, which is only another name for the highest rule of justice." Thus he shuts us out from pursuing the argument. But the evasion proves the objection unanswerable. For if all is to be resolved into the mere will of God as to the destruction of the reprobate; if they were created for this purpose, as Calvin expressly affirms; if they fell into their corruption in pursuance of God's determination; if, as he had said before, "God passes them by, and reprobates them, from no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance of his children," why refer to their natural corruption at all, and their being odious to God in that state, since the same reason is given for their corruption as for their reprobation?--not any fault of theirs; but the mere will of God, "the reprobation hidden in his secret counsel," and that not grounded on the visible and tangible fact of their demerit. Thus the election taught by Calvin is not the choice of some

persons to peculiar grace from the whole mass, equally deserving of punishment; (though this is a sophism;) since, in that case, the decree of reprobation would rest upon God's foreknowledge of those passed by as corrupt and guilty, which notion he rejects: "For since God foresees future events only in consequence of his decree that they shall happen, it is useless to contend about foreknowledge, while it is evident that all things come to pass rather by ordination and decree." "It is a HORRIBLE DECREE, I confess; but no one can deny that God foreknew the future fate of man before he created him; and that he did foreknow it, because it was appointed by his own decree." Agreeably to this, he repudiates the distinction between will and permission: "For what reason shall we assign for his permitting it, but because it is his will? It is not probable, however, that man procured his own destruction by the mere permission, and without any appointment, of God."

5. With this doctrine he again attempts to reconcile the demerit of men: "Their perdition depends on the divine predestination in such a manner, that the cause and matter of it are found in themselves. For the first man fell because the Lord had determined it should so happen. The reason of this determination is unknown to us.--Man, therefore, falls according to the appointment of divine providence; but he falls by his own fault. The Lord had a little before pronounced every thing that he had made to be 'very good.' Whence, then, comes the depravity of man to revolt from his God? Lest it should be thought to come from creation, God approved and commended what had proceeded from himself. By his own wickedness, therefore, man corrupted the nature he had received pure from the Lord, and by his fall he drew all his posterity with him to destruction." It is in this way that Calvin attempts to avoid the charge of making God the author of sin. But how God should not merely permit the defection of the first man, but appoint it, and will it, and that his will should be the "necessity of things," (all which he had before asserted,) and yet that Deity should not be the author of that which he appointed, willed, and imposed a necessity upon, would be rather a delicate inquiry. It is enough that Calvin rejects the impious doctrine; and even though his principles directly lead to it, since he has put in his disclaimer, he is entitled to be exempted from the charge;--but the logical conclusion is inevitable.

6. In much the same manner he contends that the necessity of sinning is laid upon the reprobate by the ordination of God, and yet denies God to be the author of their sinful acts, since the corruption of men was derived from Adam, by his own fault, and not from God. He exhorts us "rather to contemplate the evident cause of condemnation, which is nearer to us, in the corrupt nature of mankind, than search after a hidden and altogether incomprehensible one, in the predestination of God." "For though, by the

eternal providence of God, man was created to that misery to which he is subject, yet the ground of it he has derived from himself, not God; since he is thus ruined, solely in consequence of his having degenerated from the pure creation of God to vicious and impure depravity." Thus, almost in the same breath, he affirms that men became reprobate from no other cause than "the will of God," and his "sovereign determination;" that men have no reason "to expostulate with God, if they are predestinated to eternal death, without any demerit of their own, merely by his sovereign will;"--and then, that the corrupt nature of mankind is the evident and nearer cause of condemnation; (which cause, however, was still a matter of "appointment," and "ordination," not "permission;") and that man is "ruined solely in consequence of his having degenerated from the pure state in which God created him." These propositions manifestly fight with each other; for if the reason of reprobation be laid in man's corruption, it cannot be laid in the mere will and sovereign determination of God, unless we suppose him to be the author of sin. It is this offensive doctrine only, which can reconcile them. For if God so wills, and appoints, and necessitates the depravity of man, as to be the author of it, then there is no inconsistency in saying that the ruin of the reprobate is both from the mere will of God, and from the corruption of their nature, which is but the result of that will. The one is then, as Calvin states, the "evident and nearer cause," the other the more remote and hidden one; yet they have the same source, and are substantially acts of the same will. But if it be denied that God is, in any sense, the author of evil, and if sin is from man alone, then is the "corruption of nature" the effect of an independent will; and if this corruption be the "real source," as he says, of men's condemnation, then the decree of reprobation rests not upon the sovereign will of God, as its sole cause, which he affirms; but upon a cause dependent on the will of the first man: but as this is denied, then the other must follow. Calvin himself, indeed, contends for the perfect concurrence of these proximate and remote causes, although in point of fact, to have been perfectly consistent with himself, he ought rather to have called the mere will of God THE CAUSE of the decree of reprobation, and the corruption of man THE MEANS by which it is carried into effect:--language which he sanctions, and which many of his followers have not scrupled to adopt.

7. So certainly does this opinion involve in it the consequences, that in sin man is the instrument, and God the actor, that it cannot be maintained, as stated by Calvin, without this conclusion. For as two causes of reprobation are expressly laid down, they must be either opposed to each other, or be consenting. If they are opposed, the scheme is given up; if consenting, then are both reprobation and human corruption the results of the same will, the same decree, and necessity. It would be trifling to say that the decree does not influence; for if so, it is no decree in Calvin's sense, who understands

the decree of God, as the foregoing extracts and the whole third book of his "Institutes" plainly show, as appointing what shall be, and by that appointment making it necessary. Otherwise, he could not reject the distinction between will and permission, and avow the sentiment of St. Augustine, "that the will of God is the necessity of things; and that what he has willed will necessarily come to pass," book iii, chap. 23, sec. 8. So, in writing to Castellio, he makes the sin of Adam the result of an act of God: "You say Adam fell by his free will. I except against it. That he might not fall, he stood in need of that strength and constancy with which God armeth all the elect, as long as he will keep them blameless. Whom God has elected, he props up with an invincible power unto perseverance. Why did he not afford this to Adam, if he would have had him stand in his integrity?" And with this view of necessity, as resulting from the decree of God, the immediate followers of Calvin coincided; the end and the means, as to the elect, and as to the reprobate, are equally fixed by the decree, and are both to be traced to the appointing and ordaining will of God. On such a scheme it is therefore worse than trifling to attempt to make out a case of justice in favour of this assumed divine procedure, by alleging the corruption and guilt of man: a point which, indeed, Calvin himself, in fact, gives up when he says, "That the reprobate obey not the word of God, when made known to them, is justly imputed to the wickedness and depravity of their hearts, provided it be at the same time stated, that they are abandoned to this depravity, because they have been raised up by a just but inscrutable judgment of God, to display his glory in their condemnation."

8. It was by availing themselves of the ineffectual struggles of Calvin to give some colour of justice to his reprobating decree by fixing upon the corruption of man as a cause of reprobation, that some of his followers endeavoured, in the very teeth of his own express words, to reduce his system to sublapsarianism. This was attempted by Amyraldus; who was answered by Curcellæus, in his tract "De Jure Dei in Creaturas." This last writer, partly by several of the same passages we have given above from Calvin's Institutes, and by extracts from his other writings, proves that Calvin did by no means consider man, as fallen, to be the object of reprobation; but man not yet created; man as to be created, and so reprobated, under no consideration in the divine mind of his fall or actual guilt, except as consequences of an eternal preterition of the persons of the reprobate, resolvable only into the sovereign pleasure of God. The references he makes to men as corrupt, and to their corrupt state as the proximate cause of their rejection, are all manifestly used to parry off rather than to answer objections, and somewhat to moderate and soften, as Curcellæus observes, the harsher parts of his system. And, indeed, for what reason are we so often brought back to that unfailing refuge of Calvin, "the presumption and wickedness of replying against God?" For if reprobation

be a matter of human desert, it cannot be a mystery; if it be adequate punishment for an adequate fault, there is no need to urge it upon us to bow with submission to an unexplained sovereignty. We may add, there is no need to speak of a remote or first cause of reprobation, if the proximate cause will explain the whole case; and that Calvin's continual reference to God's secret counsel, and will, and inscrutable judgment, could have no aptness to his argument. Among English divines, Dr. Twisse has sufficiently defended Calvin from the charge, as he esteems it, of sublapsarianism; and, whatever merit Twisse's own supralapsarian creed may have, his argument on this point is unanswerable.

9. As it is not intended here to enter into this controversy, on which multitudes of books have been written, and the leading authors are known almost to every one, the above may be sufficient to convey a just notion of Calvin's own opinions. After these subjects had long agitated the reformed churches, and given rise to several modifications of Calvin's original scheme, and to numerous writings in refutation of it, the synod of Dort digested the whole into five articles from which arose the celebrated controversy on the five points. These articles, as being the standard of what is generally called strict Calvinism, are, in substance, as follows:--

(1.) "Of Predestination. As all men have sinned in Adam, and have become exposed to the curse and eternal death, God would have done no injustice to any one, if he had determined to leave the whole human race under sin and the curse, and to condemn them on account of sin; according to those words of the Apostle, 'All the world is become guilty before God,' Rom. iii, 19, 23; vi, 23. That some, in time, have faith given them by God, and others have it not given, proceeds from his eternal decree; for 'known unto God are all his works from the beginning,' &c, Acts xv, 18; Eph. i, 11. According to which decree, he graciously softens the hearts of the elect, however hard, and he bends them to believe; but the non-elect he leaves, in his judgment, to their own perversity and hardness. And here, especially, a deep discrimination, at the same time both merciful and just; a discrimination of men equally lost, opens itself to us; or that decree of election and reprobation which is revealed in the word of God; which, as perverse, impure, and unstable persons do wrest to their own destruction, so it affords ineffable consolation to holy and pious souls. But election is the immutable purpose of God; by which, before the foundations of the world were laid, he chose, out of the whole human race, fallen by their own fault from their primeval integrity into sin and destruction, according to the most free good pleasure of his own will, and of mere grace, a certain number of men, neither better nor worthier than others, but lying in the same misery with the rest, to salvation in Christ; whom he had, even from eternity, constituted Mediator and head of all the elect, and the foundation



of salvation; and therefore he decreed to give them unto him to be saved, and effectually to call and draw them into communion with him, by his word and Spirit; or he decreed himself to give unto them true faith, to justify, to sanctify, and at length powerfully to glorify them, &c, Eph. i, 4–6; Rom. viii, 30. This same election is not made from any foreseen faith, obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality and disposition, as a pre-requisite cause or condition in the man who should be elected, &c. ‘He hath chosen us,’ not because we were, but ‘that we might be, holy,’ &c, Eph. i, 4; Rom. ix, 11–13; Acts xiii, 48. Moreover, Holy Scripture doth illustrate and commend to us this eternal and free grace of our election, in this more especially, that it doth testify all men not to be elected; but that some are non-elect, or passed by, in the eternal election of God, whom truly God, from most free, just, irreprehensible, and immutable good pleasure, decreed to leave in the common misery into which they had, by their own fault, cast themselves; and not to bestow on them living faith, and the grace of conversion; but having been left in their own ways, and under just judgment, at length, not only on account of their unbelief, but also of all their other sins, to condemn and eternally punish them, to the manifestation of his own justice. And this is the decree of reprobation, which determines that God is, in no wise, the author of sin, (which, to be thought of, is blasphemy,) but a tremendous, incomprehensible, just judge, and avenger.“

(2.) “Of the Death of Christ.” Passing over, for brevity’s sake, what is said of the necessity of atonement, in order to pardon, and of Christ having offered that atonement and satisfaction, it is added, “This death of the Son of God is a single and most perfect sacrifice and satisfaction for sins; of infinite value and price, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world; but because many who are called by the Gospel do not repent, nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief; this doth not arise from defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross, but from their own fault. God willed that Christ, through the blood of the cross, should, out of every people, tribe, nation, and language, efficaciously redeem all those, and those only, who were from eternity chosen to salvation, and given to him by the Father; that he should confer on them the gift of faith,” &c.

(3.) “Of Man’s Corruption, &c. All men are conceived in sin, and born the children of wrath, indisposed (inepti) to all saving good, propense to evil, dead in sin, and the slaves of sin; and without the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit, they neither are willing nor able to return to God, to correct their depraved nature, or to dispose themselves to the correction of it.“

(4.) “Of Grace and Free will. But in like manner as, by the fall, man does not cease to be man, endowed with intellect and will; neither hath sin,

which hath pervaded the whole human race, taken away the nature of the human species, but it hath depraved and spiritually stained it; so that even this divine grace of regeneration does not act upon men like stocks and trees, nor take away the properties of his will; or violently compel it, while unwilling; but it spiritually quickens, heals, corrects, and sweetly, and at the same time powerfully, inclines it; so that whereas before it was wholly governed by the rebellion and resistance of the flesh, now prompt and sincere obedience of the Spirit may begin to reign; in which the renewal of our spiritual will, and our liberty, truly consist; in which manner, (or for which reason,) unless the admirable Author of all good should work in us, there could be no hope to man of rising from the fall by that free will, by which, when standing, he fell into ruin.”

(5.) “On Perseverance. God, who is rich in mercy, from his immutable purpose of election, does not wholly take away his Holy Spirit from his own, even in lamentable falls; nor does he so permit them to glide down, (prolabi,) that they should fall from the grace of adoption, and the state of justification; or commit the ‘sin unto death,’ or against the Holy Spirit; that, being deserted by him, they should cast themselves headlong into eternal destruction. So that not by their own merits or strength, but by the gratuitous mercy of God, they obtain it, that they neither totally fall from faith and grace, nor finally continue in their falls and perish.”

10. The controversy on these difficult subjects was not decided by the decrees of the synod of Dort, which, it will be seen under that article, were purposely drawn up in a politic and wary manner, so as to quadrate with the opinions, and not to outrage the feelings, of any grade of Calvinists. Prior to the convention of that celebrated assembly, the doctrines of Calvin had been refined upon and incautiously carried out to some of their legitimate consequences, in a manner almost without precedent, except that of the Mohammedan doctors on the absolute fate which holds a distinguished place in the Koran. Several of the brightest and most acute wits in Europe occupied themselves in sublimating to the height of extravagance the two kindred branches of predestination,—the eternal and absolute election of certain men to everlasting glory, and the reprobation of the rest of mankind to endless punishment, without regard in the divine mind to the foreseen faith of one class or to the foreseen unbelief of the other. This course was commenced by Beza, the contemporary and successor of Calvin, who possessed neither his genius nor his caution; and his writings contain several rash assertions on these points, which, it is probable, would never have obtained the approbation of his departed friend and instructor. Zanchius, with true Italian astuteness, carried on this process of refinement in high style; and his predestinarian improvements were only equalled by those of Piscator, Pareus, Keckerman, Hommius,

Kimedontius, Polanus, Sturmius, Danæus, Thysius, Donteklock, Bogerman, Gomar, Smoutius, Triglandius, down to the minor tribe of Contra-Remonstrants, Damman, Maccovius, and Sibrandus Lubbertus. Nor were the clever divines of our own country a whit behind the foreigners in accomplishing this grand object; and the theological reader, on seeing the names of Perkins, Whitaker, Abbot, and Twisse, will instantly recognise men whose doctrinal vagaries were familiar to all the Calvinists in Europe. No one can form an adequate conception of the injury thus inflicted on the divine attributes of wisdom, goodness, and mercy, as they have been revealed in the Scriptures, unless he has read the immense mass of quotations from the writings of these and other divines, which were presented to the notice of the synod of Dort by the Remonstrants, especially in their Rejection of Errors under each of the five points in dispute; the proofs of which were quoted from their respective authors, and the accuracy and faithfulness of which were never called in question. Not only would the minds of all sober Christians in these days be shocked when perusing the monstrous sentiments propounded in those extracts, but even the tolerably stiff Calvinists of Oliver Cromwell's time felt themselves scandalized by any allusion to them, and would not admit that their opinions had the least affinity to such desecrating dogmas. Little more than twenty years after the synod of Dort, that distinguished polemical divine and accurate scholar, Dr. Thomas Pierce, published his able and very interesting pamphlet, entitled, "A Correct Copy of Some Notes concerning God's Decrees;" in which, without naming the authors, he gave ten extracts from celebrated Calvinistic treatises, to prove, that "there are men of no small name who have told the world, that all the evil of sin which is in man proceedeth from God only as the author, and from man only as the instrument." Four of these extracts will furnish sufficient matter to every judicious mind for mournful reflections on the strange obliquities to which the human understanding is liable:--(1.) "A wicked man, by the just impulse of God, doeth that which is not lawful for him to do." (2.) "When God makes an angel or a man a transgressor, he himself doth not transgress, because he doth not break a law. The very same sin, namely, adultery or murder, inasmuch as it is the work of God, the author, mover, and compeller, is not a crime; but inasmuch as it is of man, it is a wickedness." (3.) "God can will that man shall not fall, by his will which is called *voluntas signi*; and in the mean while he can ordain that the same man shall infallibly and efficaciously fall, by his will which is called *voluntas beneplaciti*. The former will of God is improperly called his will, for it only signifieth what man ought to do by right; but the latter will is properly called a will, because by that he decreed what should inevitably come to pass." (4.) "God's will doth pass, not only into the permission of the sin, but into the sin itself which is permitted. The Dominicans," the high predestinarian order in the church of Rome, "do imperfectly and obscurely

relate the truth whilst, beside God's concurrence to the making way for sin, they require nothing but the negation of efficacious grace, when it is manifest that there is a farther prostitution of sin required." Of these four passages the first is from Calvin himself, the second from Zuinglius, and the third and fourth from Dr. Twisse. This pamphlet was the first in a smart controversy, in which Doctor (afterward Bishop) Reynolds, Baxter, Hickman, and Barlee, took part against Dr. Pierce, but in which those eminent men virtually disclaimed all community of sentiment between themselves and such high predestinarians. In their warmth, however, they accused the Doctor of having "rifled the well-furnished cabinet of the Batavian Remonstrant writings," and of not having hesitated "to be beholden to very thieves, namely, such roguish pamphlets as *Fur Predestinatus* and others are, rather than want materials for invectives against Calvin, Beza, Twisse," &c. In his reply, the Doctor says, "When I published my papers on God's decrees, I had never so much as seen that well-furnished cabinet, the '*Acta Synodalia Remonstrantium*;" and he proves that he has copied none of his extracts from *Fur Predestinatus*. As his opponents were "so unthankful for the lenity" which he had displayed in 201 giving "so short a catalogue," he added other affirmations of a still more revolting import, if that were possible. The four extracts which follow, will serve as a correct specimen of the gross and unguarded assertions of some of those good men who were thus exposed; the first two are from Zanchius, the other two from Piscator, both of them men of renown in that age:--(1.) "Reprobates are compelled with a necessity of sinning, and so of perishing, by this ordination of God; and so compelled that they cannot choose but sin and perish." (2.) "God works all things in all men, not only in the godly, but also in the ungodly." (3.) "Judas could not but betray Christ, seeing that God's decrees are immutable; and whether a man bless or curse, he always doth it necessarily in respect of God's providence, and in so doing he doeth always according to the will of God." (4.) "It doth or at least may appear from the word of God, that we neither can do more good than we do, nor omit more evil than we omit; because God from eternity hath precisely decreed that both [the good and the evil] should so be done. It is fatally constituted when, and how, and how much, every one of us ought to study and love piety, or not to love it." In that newly emancipated age, the ample discussion of these topics could not fail to produce much good; and the result in the course of a few years was, that a vast number of those who had implicitly followed the guidance of Calvin, deserted his standard, and either went completely over to the ranks of Arminius, or halted midway under the command of Baxter. From that time to the middle of the eighteenth century, those dogmas which are usually designated as ultra-Calvinian or Antinomian, received no support except from such shallow divines as Dr. Crisp and his immediate admirers. But when the Rev. John Wesley and his brother, as Arminians, propounded

the doctrines of the Gospel in as evangelical a manner, and with as marked success, as any Calvinist, a number of those excellent men, both in the church and among the Dissenters, who had been early benefited by the ministry of the two brothers, thought, as many now do, that it was impossible for any thing to be evangelical that was not Calvinistic; and, apparently with the design of being at as great a remove as possible from a reputed heresy, they became in principle real Antinomians. In forming this conclusion, and in running to a supposed opposite extreme, such persons seem to have forgotten that those truly evangelical principles,--which in Germany and the neighbouring states effected the reformation from Popery, which transformed sinners into Christians and martyrs, and which, in the perverted state of society that then obtained, but too painfully reminded the sainted sufferers of the domestic, municipal, and national grievances and persecutions to which the earliest confessors of the name of Christ were subjected,--had been in beneficial operation long before Calvin's doctrinal system was brought to maturity, and when he was known only as the humble and diligent pastor of the church of Geneva. And even after the publication of his "Institutes," which contained the peculiarities of his creed, he had to wait many years, to labour hard, not always in the most sanctified spirit, both from the pulpit and the press, and to endure many personal mortifications, before he was able to obtrude his novel dogmas on his own immediate connections, or to make any sensible impression on the generally received theology of his learned contemporaries. Such persons ought also to recollect, that, as Dr. Watts justly observes, "some of the most rigid and narrow limitations of grace to men are found chiefly in Calvin's Institutions, which were written in his youth. But his comments on Scripture were the labours of his riper years and maturer judgment."

11. His first tract on predestination was published in 1552; and the first complete edition of his "Institutes" did not see the light till the year 1558; but the change in Melancthon's opinions, from the fatality of Stoicism, to the universality of the Gospel, occurred at least six years prior to 1535, when the second edition of his "Common Places" was published, that contained his amended creed, and strong cautions against the contrary doctrines. One of the most eloquent and best informed writers of the present age has, in reference to this subject, justly observed: "Both Luther and Melancthon, after their creed became permanently settled at the diet of Augsburg, (A. D. 1530,) kept one object constantly in view,--to inculcate only what was plain and practical, and never to attempt philosophizing. They perceived, that before the reformation the doctrine of divine foreknowledge had been grossly misconceived and abused, although guarded by all the logic of the schools; and they felt, that, after it, they had themselves at first contributed to increase the evil, by grounding upon the

same high argument, although for a very different purpose, the position of an infallible necessity. Thenceforward, therefore, they only taught a predestination which the Christian religion explains, and the Christian life exemplifies. Thus, while their adversaries philosophized upon a predestination of individuals, preferred one before another by divine regard because worthy of such a preference, they taught only that which has been revealed with certainty,--the predestination of a peculiar description of persons, of a people zealous of good works, of the Christian church contemplated as an aggregate, not on account of its own dignity, but on account of Christ its supreme Head, and the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him. While restoring Scriptural simplicity to the doctrine of predestination, perplexed and disfigured by the vanity of the schools, they studiously and anxiously preserved every trace of that universal benevolence by which Christianity is particularly distinguished. 'Let us,' they said, 'with both our hands, or rather with all our heart, hold fast the true and pious maxim, that God is not the author of sin, that he sits not in heaven writing Stoical laws in the volumes of fate; but, endowed with a perfect freedom himself, 202he communicates a liberty of action to his creatures; firmly opposing the position of necessity as false, and pernicious to morals and religion. God, we may be assured, is no cruel and merciless tyrant; he does not hate and reject men, but loves them as a parent loves his children.' Universal grace, indeed, was at all times a favourite topic with the Lutherans; nor would they admit of any predestination except that of a beneficent Deity, who was in Christ reconciling the world to himself; except a predestination conformable with that order of things which he has established, and with the use or abuse of the means which he has ordained. 'The Almighty,' they said, 'has seriously willed and decreed, from eternity, all men to be saved and to enjoy everlasting felicity; let us not therefore indulge in evil suggestions, and separate ourselves from his grace, which is as expanded as the space between heaven and earth; let us not restrain the general promise, in which he offers his favour to all without discrimination, nor confine it to those who, affecting a peculiar garb, wish to be alone esteemed pious and sanctified. If many perish, the fault is not to be imputed to the divine will, but to human obstinacy, which despises that will, and disregards a salvation destined for all men.' 'And because many are called, but few are chosen, let us not,' they added, 'entertain an opinion highly impious,--that God tenders his grace to many, but communicates it only to a few; for should we not in the greatest degree detest a Deity by whose arbitrary will we believed ourselves to be excluded from salvation?' Upon the important point likewise of the conditional acceptance of the individual, their ideas were not more distinct than their language was explicit. 'If God chose,' they argued, 'certain persons only in order to unite them to himself, and rejected the remainder in all respects alike, would not such AN ELECTION WITHOUT CAUSES seem

tyrannical? Let us therefore be persuaded, that some cause exists in us, as some difference is to be found between those who are, and those who are not, accepted.' Thus they conceived that, predestinating his elect in Christ, or the Christian church, to eternal salvation, he excludes none from that number by a partial adoption of favourites, but calls all equally, and accepts of all who obey his calling, or, in other words, who become true Christians by possessing the qualifications which Christianity requires.--'He,' they stated, who 'falls from grace, cannot but perish, completely losing remission of sin, with the other benefits which Christ has purchased for him, and acquiring in their stead divine wrath and death eternal.' Melancthon, who in his private correspondence expressly termed Calvin the Zeno of his day, says, 'Let us execrate the Stoical disputations which some introduce, who imagine that the elect always retain the Holy Spirit, even when they commit atrocious crimes,--a manifest and highly reprehensible error; and let us not confirm in fools security and blindness.'"

These quotations might be augmented by others from the earliest Lutheran authors, more Arminian in their import than any which Arminius ever wrote: but the preceding are sufficient to show, that, during upward of thirty years, the Protestant church in Germany was nourished by doctrines most manifestly at variance with the refinements afterward promulgated by Calvin. Real conversions of sinners were never more abundant than in that golden age; yet these were produced by the blessing of God upon an evangelical agency that had scarcely any thing in common with the Genevan dogmas. With these and similar facts before him, therefore, no Calvinist can in common honesty claim for the peculiarities of his creed, for those doctrines which distinguish it from the Melancthonism of the Protestant churches of England and Germany, the exclusive title of Evangelical. Equally fallacious is the ground on which he can prefer any such claim on account of the alleged counsel and advice given by Calvin to our reformers while they were engaged in the formation of our Articles and Liturgy. On no fact in the ecclesiastical history of this country are our annalists more completely at agreement than on this,--that Calvin's name and writings were scarcely known in England till the time when the persecution under Queen Mary forced many of our best divines into banishment; and that, to the great future disquietude of the church, several of these exiles on their return imported a personal bias either in favour of his discipline or of his dogmas. Anterior to that period he had received no such pressing invitations from our reformers, and from the king himself, as Melancthon had done, for his friendly theological aid in drawing up the doctrinal and disciplinary formulæ of our national church. The man who asserts the contrary to this, and who has the hardihood to deny the Melancthonian origin of the Articles and Liturgy, discovers at once his

want of correct information on these subjects, and has never read the convincing documents appended to the Archbishop of Cashel's (Dr. Laurence's) "Eight Sermons," being the Bampton Lectures for 1804, and entitled, "An Attempt to Illustrate those Articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical;" Todd's treatise "On Original Sin, Free Will, &c, as maintained by certain Declarations of our Reformers;" Plaifere's "Appello Evangelium;" nor even the portable yet convincing pamphlets of Kipling and Winchester, the former entitled "The Articles not Calvinistic;" the latter, "A Dissertation on the Seventeenth Article of the Church."

12. There is one fact connected with these assumed yet unfounded claims, which has never yet been placed in its proper light, but which it may be well briefly to notice in this place. Calvin himself, in 1535, wrote the following truly Melancthonian paragraphs as part of his preface to the New Testament in French: "This Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, was the only, true, and eternal Son of God, whom the Father was about to send into the world, that he might collect all men together from this horrid dispersion and devastation. When, at 203length, that fulness of time arrived, that day preordained by the Lord, he openly showed himself as that Messiah who had for so many ages been the desire of all nations, and hath most abundantly performed all those things which were necessary for the redemption of all men. But this great blessing was not confined solely within the boundaries of the land of Israel, since, on the contrary, it was intended [porrigendum] to be held out for the acceptance of the whole human race; because through Christ alone the entire family of man was to be reconciled to God, as will be seen, and most amply demonstrated, in these pages of the New Testament." "To this inheritance of our heavenly Father's kingdom we are all called without respect of persons,--whether we be men or women, high or low, masters or servants, teachers or disciples, [doctores] divines or laics, Jews or Greeks, Frenchmen or [Romani] Italians. From this inheritance no one is excluded, if he only so receive Christ as he is offered by the Father for the salvation of all men, and embrace him when received." Great research has been displayed by the Calvinists at different periods, in endeavouring to discover, in the public formularies of the church, or in the private productions of our reformers, some trace of affinity between them and the writings of Calvin. Only two cases of such affinity have yet been found; and, unfortunately for the validity of all pretensions of this kind, neither of them contains a single peculiarity of Calvinism, but, on the contrary, both are of the moderate and evangelical class of the Melancthonian school. One of the passages thus discovered is here subjoined from Cranmer's "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament," &c; and bears all the marks of verisimilitude to the second of the preceding paragraphs from Calvin,



though written fifteen years after it:--“Almighty God, without respect of person, accepteth the oblation and sacrifice of priest and lay person, of king and subject, of master and servant, of man and woman, of young and old, yea, of English, French, Scot, Greek, Latin, Jew, and Gentile; of every man according to his faithful and obedient heart unto him, and that through the sacrifice propitiatory of Jesus Christ.” Had either this or the other passage contained the least tinge of what is now considered as belonging exclusively to the system of Calvin, the English admirers of that great man would have had some grounds for the assertions which have been too confidently made, because so easily refuted.

13. Having given this summary of the sentiments of Calvin himself, and of the ancient or strict Calvinists, it is proper to observe, that there are, and always have been, many who generally embrace the Calvinistic system, but object to some particular parts, and to the strong language in which some of the propositions are expressed. These are called moderate or modern Calvinists, who differ from Calvin, and the synod of Dort, chiefly on two points,--the doctrine of reprobation, and the extent of the death of Christ. The theory of Baxter has already been noticed. This and all other mitigated schemes rest on two principles, the sufficiency of the atonement for all mankind, and the sufficiency of grace for those who do not believe. Still something more is held to be necessary than this sufficiency of grace in order to actual salvation; namely, an acceptance by man, which can only be made under that degree of effectual supernatural aid which is dispensed only to a certain number of persons, who are thus distinguished as the “elect of God.” The main characteristic of all these theories, from the first to the last, from the highest to the lowest, is, that a part of mankind are shut out from the mercies of God, on some ground irrespective of their refusal of a sincere offer to them of salvation through Christ, made with a communicated power of embracing it. Some power they allow to the reprobate, as natural power, and degrees of superadded moral power; but in no case the power to believe unto salvation; and thus, as one well observes, “When they have cut some fair trenches, as if they would bring the water of life unto the dwellings of the reprobate, on a sudden they open a sluice which carries it off again.” The whole labour of these theories is to find out some plausible reason for the infliction of punishment on them that perish, independent of the only cause assigned by the word of God--their rejection of a mercy free for all, and made attainable by all. See Baxterianism.

14. After all, however, it is pleasant to find these indications of a growing consciousness, on the part of modern predestinarians, that the common notions and common language of mankind on these deep subjects are not far from the truth. And though some too fastidious Arminians may

complain, that, in this desire to enlist the views and words of common sense on the side of Calvinism, many of those by whom they are employed attach to them a meaning very different from that which ordinary usage warrants; yet even this tendency to approximate to right views should be regarded as favourable to the progress of truth, and the evidently improved feeling which has suggested such approximation ought to be met in a conciliating spirit. But this is a fault which must always be an appendage to such a system, however it may be modified; and does not exclusively apply to its modern supporters. The following remarks by Archbishop Laurence on the ambiguity of language not unfrequently discernible in the writings of Calvin himself, are worthy of consideration:--“In whatsoever sense he wished these words to be understood, it must be admitted that he sometimes adapted the style of others, who had a very different object in view, to his own peculiar opinions. And hence, from the want of a due discrimination, the sentiments of his contemporaries, opposite in their natural tendency, are often improperly forced into the vortex of Calvinism. Systematizing was his darling propensity, and the ambition of being distinguished as a leader in reform his predominant passion: in the arrangements of the former, he never felt a doubt, or found a difficulty; and in the 204pursuits of the latter he displayed an equal degree of perseverance and ardour. Thus, in the doctrine of the eucharist, it is well known that he laboured to acquire celebrity, and conciliate followers, by maintaining a kind of middle sacramental presence between the corporeal of the Lutherans, and the mere spiritual of the Zuinglians; expressing himself in language which, partly derived from one, and partly from the other, verged toward neither extreme; but which, by his singular talent at perspicuous combination, he applied, and not without success, to his own particular purpose. Nor was he less solicitous to press into his service a foreign phraseology upon the subject more immediately before me; a subject on his theory of which he not a little prided himself, and seemed contented to stake his reputation. He perceived that the Lutherans, strongly reprobating every discussion upon the decrees of a Deity unrevealed to us, founded predestination solely on a Scriptural basis; contending for a divine will which is seriously, not fictitiously, disposed to save all men, and predetermined to save all who become and continue sincere Christians. Zuingle, indeed, had reasoned from a different principle; and, although persuaded that God’s mercies in Christ were liberally bestowed on all without distinction, on infants who commit not actual crime, and on the Heathen as well as the Christian world, he nevertheless was a necessitarian in the strictest sense of the expression; referring events of every kind to an uncontrollable and absolute predetermination. Zuingle, however, died in 1531, before the youth of Calvin permitted him to assume the character of a reformer; who found Bullinger then at the head of the Zuinglian church, not only applauding, but adopting, the moderation of the Lutherans; and,

to use the phrase of Turretin, plainly Melancthonizing. But the doctrine alluded to, it may be imagined, was of a species too limited and unphilosophical for one of his enterprising turn of mind, who never met with an obstacle which he attempted not instantly to surmount. Disregarding, therefore, the sober restrictions of the times, he gave loose to the most unbounded speculation: yet, anxious by all means to win over all to his opinion, he studiously laboured to preserve, on some popular points, a verbal conformity with the Lutherans. With them, in words, he taught the universality of God's good will; but it was a universality which he extended only to the offer of salvation; conceiving the reprobate to be precluded from the reception of that offer by the secret decree of an immutable Deity. The striking feature of their system was an election in Christ, by which they meant an election as Christians. This also, in words, he inculcated: his idea, however, of an election in Christ was totally different from theirs; for he held it to be the previous election of certain favourites by an irrelative will of God, whom, and whom alone, Christ was subsequently appointed to save. But his ingenuity was such, in adapting the terms borrowed from another source to his own theory, that some erroneously conceive them to have been thus originally used by the Lutherans themselves. Hence, therefore, much confusion has arisen in the attempt of properly discriminating between the various sentiments of Protestants upon this question, at the period under consideration: all have been regarded as formed upon the model which Calvin exhibited; at least by writers who have contemplated him as the greatest reformer of his age, but who have forgotten that, although they chose to esteem him the greatest, they could not represent him as the first in point of time; and that his title to preëminence, in the common estimation of his contemporaries, was then far from being acknowledged."

15. On one topic, however, Calvin and the older divines of that school were very explicit. They tell us plainly, that they found all the Christian fathers, both of the Greek and the Latin church down to the age of St. Augustine, quite unmanageable for their purpose; and therefore occasionally bestow upon them and their productions epithets not the most courteous. Yet some modern writers, not possessing half the splendid qualifications of those veterans in learning, make a gorgeous display of the little that they know concerning antiquity; and wish to lead their readers to suppose, that the whole stream of early Christianity has flowed down only in their channel. Every one must have remarked how much like Calvin all those fathers speak whose works are quoted by Toplady in his "Historic Defence." Nor can the two Milners, in their "History of the Church," entirely escape censure on this account,--though both were excellent men, and better scholars than Toplady. But from the manner in which they "show up" only those ancient Christian authors, some of whose sentiments seem to be

nearly in unison with their own, they induce the unlearned or half informed to draw the erroneous conclusion,--that the peculiarities of Calvinism are not the inventions of a comparatively recent æra, and that they have always formed a prominent part of the profession of faith of every Christian community since the days of the Apostles.

All men must admire the candid and liberal spirit which breathes in the subjoined high but just eulogium on Calvin, from the pen of the same amiable Archbishop: "Calvin himself was both a wise and a good man; inferior to none of his contemporaries in general ability, and superior to almost all in the art, as well as elegance, of composition, in the perspicuity and arrangement of his ideas, the structure of his periods, and the Latinity of his diction. Although attached to a theory, which he found it difficult in the extreme to free from the suspicion of blasphemy against God, as the author of sin, he certainly was no blasphemer; but, on the contrary, adopted that very theory from an anxiety not to commit, but, as he conceived, to avoid blasphemy,--that of ascribing to human, what he deemed alone imputable to divine, agency."

CAMBYSES, the son of Cyrus, king of Persia. He succeeded his father, A. M. 3475, and is the Ahasuerus mentioned in Ezra iv, 6, 205to whom, as soon as he came to the crown, the Samaritans applied by petition, desiring that the rebuilding of Jerusalem might be stopped. What the motives were which they made use of to prevail upon this prince, we are ignorant; but it is certain, that though he was not persuaded to revoke his father's decree, yet he put a stop to the works, so that for the remaining seven years and five months which he reigned, the building of the city and temple was suspended. See Ahasuerus.

CAMEL, גמל. This animal is called in ancient Arabic, gimel; and in modern, diammel; in Greek, κάμηλος. With very little variation, the name is retained in modern languages. The camel is very common in Arabia, Judea, and the neighbouring countries; and is often mentioned in Scripture, and reckoned among the most valuable property, 1 Chron. v, 21; Job i, 3, &c. "No creature," says Volney, "seems so peculiarly fitted to the climate in which he exists as the camel. Designing this animal to dwell in a country where he can find little nourishment, nature has been sparing of her materials in the whole of his formation. She has not bestowed upon him the fleshiness of the ox, horse, or elephant; but limiting herself to what is strictly necessary, has given him a long head, without ears, at the end of a long neck without flesh; has taken from his legs and thighs every muscle not immediately requisite for motion; and, in short, bestowed upon his withered body only the vessels and tendons necessary to connect its frame together. She has furnished him with a strong jaw, that he may grind the

hardest aliments; but, lest he should consume too much, has straitened his stomach, and obliged him to chew the cud; has lined his foot with a lump of flesh, which sliding in the mud, and being no way adapted to climbing, fits him only for a dry, level, and sandy soil, like that of Arabia. So great, in short, is the importance of the camel to the desert, that, were it deprived of that useful animal, it must infallibly lose every inhabitant." The chief use of the camel has always been as a beast of burden, and for performing journeys across the deserts. They have sometimes been used in war, to carry the baggage of an oriented army, and mingle in the tumult of the battle. Many of the Amalekite warriors, who burnt Ziklag in the time of David, were mounted on camels; for the sacred historian remarks, that of the whole army not a man escaped the furious onset of that heroic and exasperated leader, "save four hundred young men, which rode upon camels, and fled," 1 Sam. xxx, 17.

The passage of Scripture in which our Lord says, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven," Matt. xix, 24, has been the occasion of much criticism. Some assert that near Jerusalem was a low gate called "the needle's eye," through which a camel could not pass unless his load was taken off. Others conjecture that κάμιλος should be read κάβιλος, a cable. But there are no ancient manuscripts to support the reading. In the Jewish Talmud, there is, however, a similar proverb respecting an elephant: "Rabbi Shesheth answered Rabbi Amram, who had advanced an absurdity, 'Perhaps thou art one of the Pambidithians, who can make an elephant pass through the eye of a needle;'" that is, says the Aruch, "who speak things impossible." There is also a saying of the same kind in the Koran: "The impious, who in his arrogancy shall accuse our doctrine of falsity, shall find the gates of heaven shut; nor shall he enter there, till a camel shall pass through the eye of a needle. It is thus that we shall recompense the wicked," Surat. vii, 37. Indeed, Grotius, Lightfoot, Wetstein, and Michaëlis join in opinion, that the comparison is so much in the figurative style of the oriental nations and of the rabbins, that the text is sufficiently authentic.

CAMEL'S HAIR, mentioned Matt. iii, 4; Mark i, 6. John the Baptist, we are told, was habited in a raiment of camel's hair; and Chardin assures us, that the modern dervises wear such garments; as they do also great leathern girdles. Camel's hair is also made into those beautiful stuffs, called shawls; but certainly the coarser manufacture of this material was adopted by John, and we may receive a good idea of its texture, from what Braithwaite says of the Arabian tents: "They are made of camel's hair, somewhat like our coarse hair cloths to lay over goods." By this coarse vesture the Baptist was not merely distinguished, but contrasted with those in royal palaces, who

wore “soft raiment,” such as shawls or other superfine manufactures, whether of the same material or not.

CAMERONIANS, a sect in Scotland, who separated from the Presbyterians in 1666, and continued to hold their religious assemblies in the fields. The Cameronians took their denomination from Richard Cameron, a famous field preacher, who, refusing to accept the indulgence to tender consciences granted by King Charles II, as such an acceptance seemed an acknowledgment of the king’s supremacy, and that he had before a right to silence them, separated from his brethren, and even headed a rebellion in which he was killed. His followers were never entirely reduced till the Revolution, when they voluntarily submitted to King William. The Cameronians adhered rigidly to the form of government established in 1648.

CAMERONISTS, or CAMERONITES, is the denomination of a party of Calvinists in France, who asserted, that the cause of men’s doing good or evil proceeds from the knowledge which God infuses into them; and that God does not move the will physically, but only morally, in virtue of its dependence on the judgment of the mind. They had this name from John Cameron, one of the most famous divines among the Protestants of France, in the seventeenth century, who was born at Glasgow, in Scotland, about the year 1580, and taught Greek there till he removed to Bourdeaux in 1600. Here he acquired such celebrity by the fluency with which he spoke Greek, that he was appointed to teach the 206 learned languages at Bergerac. He afterward became professor of philosophy at Sedan; but returning to Bourdeaux in 1604, he devoted himself to the study of divinity. Upon being appointed tutor to the sons of the chancellor of Navarre, he accompanied them to Paris, Geneva, and Heidelberg. After having discharged the office of a minister at Bourdeaux, which he assumed in 1608, for ten years, he accepted the professorship of divinity at Saumur. Upon the dispersion of that academy by the public commotions in 1621, he removed to England, and taught divinity at his own house in London. King James inclined to favour him on account of his supposed attachment to the hierarchy, made him master of the college, and professor of divinity, at Glasgow; but after holding this office, which he found to be unpleasant to him, for a year, he returned to Saumur, where he read private lectures. From thence he removed, in 1624, to Montauban; where the disturbances excited by the emissaries of the duke de Rohan led him to remonstrate against the principles which produced them, with more zeal than prudence. This occasioned his being insulted by a private person in the streets, and severely beaten: and this treatment so much affected him, that he soon after died, in 1625, at the early age of forty-six years. Bayle represents him as “a man of great parts and judgment, of an excellent memory, very learned,

a good philosopher, good humoured, liberal not only of his knowledge but his purse, a great talker, a long-winded preacher, little versed in the fathers, inflexible in his opinions, and inclined to turbulence.” He was one of those who attempted to reconcile the doctrine of predestination, as it had been taught at Geneva, and confirmed at Dort, with the sentiments of those who believe that God offers salvation to all mankind. His opinion was maintained and propagated by Moses Amyraut, and several others of the most learned among the reformed ministers, who thought Calvin’s doctrine too harsh. They were called Hypothetical Universalists. Cameron likewise maintained the possibility of salvation in the church of Rome. See Amyraut and Baxterianism.

CAMP, or ENCAMPMENT, of the Israelites. The whole body of the people, consisting of six hundred thousand fighting men, beside women and children, was disposed under four battalions, so placed as to enclose the tabernacle, in the form of a square, and each under one general standard. (See Armies.) There were forty-one encampments, from their first in the month of March, at Rameses, in the land of Goshen, in Egypt, and in the wilderness, until they reached the land of Canaan. They are thus enumerated in Numbers xxxiii:--

1. Rameses
2. Succoth
3. Etham, on the edge of the wilderness
4. Pihahiroth
5. Marah
6. Elim
7. By the Red Sea
8. Wilderness of Sin
9. Dophkah
10. Alush
11. Rephidim
12. Wilderness of Sinai
13. Kibroth-hattaavah
14. Hazeroth
15. Rithmah
16. Rimmon-parez
17. Libnah
18. Rissah
19. Kehelatha
20. Shapher
21. Haradah
  
22. Makheloth

23. Tahath
24. Tarah
25. Mithcah
26. Hashmonah
27. Moseroth
28. Bene-jaakan
29. Hor-hagidgad
30. Jotbathah
31. Ebronah
32. Ebion-gaber
33. Kadesh
34. Mount Hor
35. Zalmonah
36. Punon
37. Oboth
38. Ije-abarim
39. Dibon-gad
40. Almon-diblathaim
41. Mountains of Abarim

In the second year after their exodus from Egypt they were numbered; and upon an exact poll, the number of their males amounted to six hundred and three thousand, five hundred and fifty, from twenty years old and upward, Num. i, ii. This vast mass of people, encamped in beautiful order, must have presented a most impressive spectacle. That it failed not to produce effect upon the richly endowed and poetic mind of Balaam, appears from Num. xxiv, 2; "And Balaam lifted up his eyes and he saw Israel abiding in his tents according to their tribes; and the Spirit of God came upon him, and he took up his parable and said, How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel! As the valleys are they spread forth, as gardens by the river side, as the trees of lign aloes which the Lord hath planted, and as cedar trees beside waters." Grandeur, order, beauty, and freshness, were the ideas at once suggested to the mind of this unfaithful prophet, and called forth his unwilling admiration. Perhaps we may consider this spectacle as a type of the order, beauty, and glory of the true "church in the wilderness," in those happy days when God "shall not behold iniquity in Jacob, nor perverseness in Israel;" when it shall be said, "The Lord his God is with him, and the shout of a king is among them."

CAMPHIRE. כפר. Greek, κύπρος. Latin cyprus. Canticles i, 14; iv, 13. Sir T. Browne supposes that the plant mentioned in the Canticles, rendered κύπρος in the Septuagint, and cyprus in the Vulgate, is that described by Dioscorides and Pliny, which grows in Egypt, and near to Ascalon, producing an odorate bush of flowers, and yielding the celebrated oleum cyprinum. [A sweet oil made of the flowers of the privet tree.] This is one



of the plants which is most grateful to the eye and the smell. The deep colour of its bark, the light green of its foliage, the softened mixture of white and yellow with which the flowers, collected into long clusters like the lilac, are coloured; the red tint of the ramifications which support them, form an agreeable combination. The flowers, whose shades are so delicate, diffuse around the sweetest odours, and embalm the gardens and apartments which they embellish. The women take pleasure in decking themselves with them. With the powder of the dried leaves they give an orange tincture to their nails, to the inside of their hands, and to the soles of their feet. The expression, עשתה את־צפרניה, rendered “pare their 207nails,” Deut. xxi, 12, may perhaps rather mean, “adorn their nails;” and imply the antiquity of this practice. This is a universal custom in Egypt, and not to conform to it would be considered indecent. It seems to have been practised by the ancient Egyptians, for the nails of the mummies are most commonly of a reddish hue.

In the Song of Solomon, the bride is described as saying, “My beloved is unto me as a cluster of camphire in the vineyards of Engedi,” chap. i, 24; and again, “Thy plants are an orchard of pomegranates, with pleasant fruits, camphire with spikenard,” chap. iv, 13.

CANA, a town of Galilee, where Jesus performed his first miracle, John ii, 1, 2, &c. It lay in the tribe of Zebulun, not far from Nazareth. Cana was visited by Dr. E. D. Clarke, who says, “It is worthy of note, that, walking among the ruins of a church, we saw large massy stone pots, answering the description given of the ancient vessels of the country; these were not preserved nor exhibited as reliques, but lying about, disregarded by the present inhabitants, as antiquities with whose original use they were unacquainted. From their appearance, and the number of them, it was quite evident that a practice of keeping water in large stone pots, each holding from eighteen to twenty-seven gallons, was once common in the country.”

CANAAN, the son of Ham. The Hebrews believe that Canaan, having first discovered Noah’s nakedness, told his father Ham; and that Noah, when he awoke, having understood what had passed, cursed Canaan, the first author of the offence. Others are of opinion that Ham was punished in his son Canaan, Gen. ix, 25. For though Canaan is mentioned, Ham is not exempted from the malediction; on the contrary, he suffers more from it, since parents are more affected with their children’s misfortunes than with their own; especially if the evils have been inflicted through some fault or folly of theirs. Some have thought that Canaan may be put elliptically for the father of Canaan, that is, Ham, as it is rendered in the Arabic and Septuagint translations.

The posterity of Canaan was numerous. His eldest son, Sidon, founded the city of Sidon, and was father of the Sidonians and Phenicians. Canaan had ten other sons, who were fathers of as many tribes, dwelling in Palestine and Syria; namely, the Hittites, the Jebusites, the Amorites, the Girgasites, the Hivites, the Arkites, the Sinites, the Arvadites, the Zemarites, and the Hemathites. It is believed that Canaan lived and died in Palestine, which from him was called the land of Canaan. Notwithstanding the curse is directed against Canaan the son, and not against Ham the father, it is often supposed that all the posterity of Ham were placed under the malediction, "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." But the true reason why Canaan only was mentioned probably is, that the curse was in fact restricted to the posterity of Canaan. It is true that many Africans, descendants of other branches of Ham's family, have been largely and cruelly enslaved; but so have other tribes in different parts of the world. There is certainly no proof that the negro race were ever placed under this malediction. Had they been included in it, this would neither have justified their oppressors, nor proved that Christianity is not designed to remove the evil of slavery. But Canaan alone in his descendants, is cursed, and Ham only in that branch of his posterity. It follows that the subjugation of the Canaanitish races to Israel fulfils the prophecy. To them it was limited, and with them it expired. Part of the seven nations of the Canaanites were made slaves to the Israelites, when they took possession of their land; and the remainder by Solomon.

Canaan, Land of. In the map it presents the appearance of a narrow slip of country, extending along the eastern coast of the Mediterranean; from which, to the river Jordan, the utmost width does not exceed fifty miles. This river was the eastern boundary of the land of Canaan, or Palestine, properly so called, which derived its name from the Philistines or Palestines originally inhabiting the coast. To three of the twelve tribes, however, Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, portions of territory were assigned on the eastern side of the river, which were afterward extended by the subjugation of the neighbouring nations. The territory of Tyre and Sidon was its ancient border on the north-west; the range of the Libanus and Antilibanus forms a natural boundary on the north and north-east; while in the south it is pressed upon by the Syrian and Arabian deserts. Within this circumscribed district, such were the physical advantages of the soil and climate, there existed, in the happiest periods of the Jewish nation, an immense population. The kingdom of David and Solomon, however, extended far beyond these narrow limits. In a north-eastern direction, it was bounded only by the river Euphrates, and included a considerable part of Syria. It is stated that Solomon had dominion over all the region on the western side of the Euphrates, from Thiphsah, or Thapsacus, on that river, in latitude 25° 20', to Azzah, or Gaza. "Tadmora in the wilderness,"

(Palmyra,) which the Jewish monarch is stated to have built, (that is, either founded or fortified,) is considerably to the north-east of Damascus, being only a day's journey from the Euphrates; and Hamath, the Epiphania of the Greeks, (still called Hamah,) in the territory belonging to which city Solomon had several "store cities," is seated on the Orontes, in latitude 34° 45' N. On the east and south-east, the kingdom of Solomon was extended by the conquest of the country of Moab, that of the Ammonites, and Edom; and tracts which were either inhabited or pastured by the Israelites, lay still farther eastward. Maon, which belonged to the tribe of Judah, and was situated in or near the desert of Paran, is described by Abulfeda as the farthest city of Syria toward Arabia, being two days' journey beyond Zoar. In the time of David, the people of Israel, women and children included, amounted, on the lowest computation, to five millions; beside 208 the tributary Canaanites, and other conquered nations.

The vast resources of the country, and the power of the Jewish monarch, may be estimated not only by the consideration in which he was held by the contemporary sovereigns of Egypt, Tyre, and Assyria, but by the strength of the several kingdoms into which the dominions of David were subsequently divided. Damascus revolted during the reign of Solomon, and shook off the Jewish yoke. At his death, ten of the tribes revolted under Jeroboam, and the country became divided into the two rival kingdoms of Judah and Israel, having for their capitals Jerusalem and Samaria. The kingdom of Israel fell before the Assyrian conqueror, in the year B. C. 721, after it had subsisted about two hundred and fifty years. That of Judah survived about one hundred and thirty years, Judea being finally subdued and laid waste by Nebuchadnezzar, and the temple burned B. C. 588. Idumea was conquered a few years after. From this period till the æra of Alexander the Great, Palestine remained subject to the Chaldean, Median, and Persian dynasties. At his death, Judea fell under the dominion of the kings of Syria, and, with some short and troubled intervals, remained subject either to the kings of Syria or of Egypt, till John Hyrcanus shook off the Syrian yoke, and assumed the diadem, B. C. 130. The Asmonean dynasty, which united, in the person of the monarch, the functions of king and pontiff, though tributary to Roman conquerors, lasted one hundred and twenty-six years, till the kingdom was given by Anthony to Herod the Great, of an Idumean family, B. C. 39.

2. At the time of the Christian æra, Palestine was divided into five provinces; Judea, Samaria, Galilee, Perea, and Idumea. On the death of Herod, Archelaus, his eldest son, succeeded to the government of Judea, Samaria, and Idumea, with the title of tetrarch; Galilee being assigned to Herod Antipas; and Perea, or the country beyond Jordan, to the third brother, Philip. But in less than ten years the dominions of Archelaus

became annexed, on his disgrace, to the Roman province of Syria; and Judea was thenceforth governed by Roman procurators. Jerusalem, after its final destruction by Titus, A. D. 71, remained desolate and almost uninhabited, till the emperor Hadrian colonized it, and erected temples to Jupiter and Venus on its site. The empress Helena, in the fourth century, set the example of repairing in pilgrimage to the Holy Land, to visit the scenes consecrated by the Gospel narrative; and the country became enriched by the crowds of devotees who flocked there. In the beginning of the seventh century, it was overrun by the Saracens, who held it till Jerusalem was taken by the crusaders in the twelfth. The Latin kingdom of Jerusalem continued for about eighty years, during which the Holy Land streamed continually with Christian and Saracen blood. In 1187, Judea was conquered by the illustrious Saladin, on the decline of whose kingdom it passed through various revolutions, and at length, in 1317, was finally swallowed up in the Turkish empire.

Palestine is now distributed into pashalics. That of Acre or Akka extends from Djebail nearly to Jaffa; that of Gaza comprehends Jaffa and the adjacent plains; and these two being now united, all the coast is under the jurisdiction of the pasha of Acre. Jerusalem, Hebron, Nablous, Tiberias, and in fact, the greater part of Palestine, are included in the pashalic of Damascus, now held in conjunction with that of Aleppo; which renders the present pasha, in effect, the viceroy of Syria. Though both pashas continue to be dutiful subjects to the Grand Seignior in appearance, and annually transmit considerable sums to Constantinople to insure the yearly renewal of their office, they are to be considered as tributaries, rather than subjects of the Porte; and it is supposed to be the religious supremacy of the Sultan, as caliph and vicar of Mohammed, more than any apprehension of his power, which prevents them from declaring themselves independent. The reverence shown for the firmauns of the Porte throughout Syria attests the strong hold which the Sultan maintains, in this character, on the Turkish population. The pashas of Egypt and Bagdad are attached to the Turkish sovereign by the same ecclesiastical tie, which alone has kept the ill-compacted and feeble empire from crumbling to ruin.

3. A few additional remarks upon the topography and climate will tend to elucidate the force of many of those parts of Scripture which contain allusions to these topics. Dr. E. D. Clarke, after stating his resolve to make the Scriptures his only guide throughout this interesting territory, says, "The delight afforded by the internal evidences of truth, in every instance where their fidelity of description was proved by a comparison of existing documents, surpassed even all we had anticipated. Such extraordinary instances of coincidence even with the customs of the country as they are now exhibited, and so many wonderful examples of illustration afforded

by contrasting the simple narrative with the appearances presented, made us only regret the shortness of our time, and the limited sphere of our abilities for the comparison." Judea is beautifully diversified with hills and plains--hills now barren and gloomy, but once cultivated to their summits, and smiling in the variety of their produce, chiefly the olive and the vine; and plains, over which the Bedouin now roves to collect a scanty herbage for his cattle, but once yielding an abundance of which the inhabitants of a northern climate can form no idea. Rich in its soil; glowing in the sunshine of an almost perpetual summer; and abounding in scenery of the grandest, as well as of the most beautiful kind; this happy country was indeed a land which the Lord had blessed: but Mohammedan sloth and despotism, as the instruments employed to execute the curse of Heaven, have converted it into a waste of rock and desert, with the exception of some few spots, which remain to attest the veracity of the accounts formerly given of it. The hills of Judea frequently rise into mountains; the most considerable of which are those of Lebanon and Hermon, on the north; those 209 which surround the sea of Galilee, and the Dead Sea, also attain a respectable elevation. The other mountains of note are, Carmel, Tabor, Ebal, and Gerizim, and the mountains of Gilboa, Gilead, and Abarim; with the summits of the latter, Nebo and Pisgah: a description of which will be found under their respective heads. Many of the hills and rocks abound in caverns, the refuge of the distressed, or the resorts of robbers.

4. From the paucity of rain which falls in Judea, and the heat and dryness of the atmosphere for the greater part of the year, it possesses but few rivers; and as these, have all their rise within its boundaries, their course is short, and their size inconsiderable: the principal is the Jordan, which runs about a hundred miles. The other remarkable streams are, the Arnon, the Jabbok, the Kishon, the Kedron, the Besor, the Sorek, and the stream called the river of Egypt. These, also, will be found described under their respective heads. This country was once adorned with woods and forests: as we read of the forest of cedars in Lebanon, the forest of oaks in Bashan, the forest or wood of Ephraim, and the forest of Hareth in the tribe of Judah. Of these, the woods of Bashan alone remain; the rest have been swept away by the ravages of time and of armies, and by the gradual consumption of the inhabitants, whose indolence and ignorance have prevented their planting others.

5. There are no volcanoes now existing in Judea or its vicinity: nor is mention made of any in history, although volcanic traces are found in many parts on its eastern side, as they are also in the mountains of Edom on the south, the Djebel Shera and Hesma, as noticed by Burckhardt. There can be no doubt that many of the sacred writers were familiarly acquainted with the phenomena of volcanoes; whence it may be inferred that they were

presented to their observation at no great distance, and from which they drew some of their sublimest imagery. Mr. Horne has adduced the following instances: "The mountains quake at him, and the hills melt, and the earth is burned at his presence. His fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by him," Nahum i, 5, 6. "Behold, the Lord cometh forth out of his place, and will come down and tread upon the high places of the earth. And the mountains shall be molten under him, and the valleys shall be cleft as wax before the fire, and as the waters that are poured down a steep place," Micah i, 3, 4. "O that thou wouldest rend the heavens, that thou wouldest come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence. As when the melting fire burneth, the fire causeth the waters to boil, to make thy name known to thine adversaries, that the nations may tremble at thy presence. When thou didst terrible things which we looked not for, thou camest down, the mountains flowed down at thy presence," Isa. lxiv, 1-3.

6. The climate of Judea, from the southern latitude of the country, is necessarily warm. The cold of winter is, indeed, sometimes greater than in European climates situated some degrees farther to the north; but it is of short duration, and the general character of the climate is that of heat. Both heat and cold are, however, tempered by the nature of the surface; the winter being scarcely felt in the valleys, while in the summer the heat is almost insupportable; and, on the contrary, in the more elevated parts, during the winter months, or rather weeks, frosts frequently occur, and snow sometimes falls, while the air in summer is comparatively cool and refreshing. Many winters pass without either snow or frost; and in the coldest weather which ever occurs, the sun in the middle of the day is generally warm, and often hot; so that the pain of cold is in reality but little felt, and the poor who cannot afford fires may enjoy, during several hours of the day, the more genial and invigorating influence of the sun. This is the ordinary character of the winters; though in some years, as will be seen presently, the cold is more severely felt during the short time that it prevails, which is never more than two months, and more frequently not so much as one. Toward the end of November, or beginning of December, domestic fires become agreeable. It was at this time that Jehoiakim, king of Judah, is represented by Jeremiah as sitting in his winter house, with a fire burning on the hearth before him, Jer. xxxvi, 22. The same luxury, though frequently by no means necessary, is used by the wealthy till the end of March.

7. Rain only falls during the autumn, winter, and spring, when it sometimes descends with great violence: the greatest quantity, and that which properly constitutes the rainy season, happening between the autumnal equinox, or somewhat later, and the beginning of December; during which period,

heavy clouds often obscure the sky, and several days of violent rain sometimes succeed each other with winds. This is what in Scripture is termed the early or the former rain. Showers continue to fall at uncertain intervals, with some cloudy but more fair weather, till toward the vernal equinox, when they become again more frequent and copious till the middle of April. These are the latter rains, Joel ii, 23. From this time to the end of May, showers come on at irregular intervals, gradually decreasing as the season advances; the sky being for the most part serene, and the temperature of the air agreeable, though sometimes acquiring a high degree of heat. From the end of May, or beginning of June, to the end of September, or middle of October, scarce a drop of rain falls, the sky being constantly unclouded, and the heat generally oppressive. During this period, the inhabitants commonly sleep on the tops of their houses. The storms, especially in the autumn, are preceded by short but violent gusts of wind, which, from the surface of a parched soil, raise great clouds of dust; which explains what is meant by, “Ye shall not see wind,” 2 Kings iii, 7. The continuation of the same passage likewise implies, that such circumscribed whirlwinds were generally considered as the precursors of rain: a circumstance likewise alluded to by Solomon, who says, “Whoso boasteth himself of a false gift, is like clouds and wind without rain,” Prov. xxv, 14. Another prognostic of an approaching storm is a small cloud rising in the west, and increasing until it overspreads the whole heavens. Such was the cloud, “like a man’s hand,” which appeared to Elijah, on mount Carmel; which spread “till the heaven was black with clouds and wind, and there was a great rain,” 1 Kings xviii, 44. To this phenomenon, and the certainty of the prognostic, our Saviour alludes: “When ye see a cloud” (or the cloud, τὴν νεφέλην) “rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is,” Luke xii, 54. The same appearance is noticed by Homer:--

Ὦς δ’ ὄτ’ ἀπὸ σκοπιῆς εἶδεν νεφος αιπολος ανηρ  
 Ἐρχόμενον κατὰ πόντον ὑπὸ Ζεφύροιο ἰωῆς,  
 Τῷ δε τ’, ἄνευθεν ἐόντι, μελάντερον, ἤῤιτι πῖσσα,  
 Φαίνεται’ ἰὸν κατὰ πόντον, ἄγει δέ τέ λαίλαπα πολλήν.  
 Πίγησεν τε ἰδὼν. κ. τ. λ. II. lib. iv, 275.

“Slow from the main the heavy vapours rise,  
 Spread in dim streams, and sail along the skies,  
 Till black as night the swelling tempest shows,  
 The cloud condensing as the west wind blows.  
 He dreads the impending storm,” &c. Pope.

Hail frequently falls in the winter and spring in very heavy storms, and with hailstones of an enormous size. Dr. Russel says that he has seen some at Aleppo which measured two inches in diameter; but sometimes they are found to consist of irregularly shaped pieces, weighing near three ounces.

The copious dew forms another peculiarity of this climate, frequently alluded to in Scripture: so copious, indeed, is it sometimes, as to resemble small rain, and to supply the wants of superficial vegetation. Mr. Maundrell, when travelling near mount Hermon, says, "We were instructed by experience what the Psalmist means by 'the dew of Hermon,' Psalm cxxxiii, 3; our tents being as wet with it, as if it had rained all night."

8. The seasons are often adverted to in Scripture, under the terms "seed time and harvest." The former, for wheat, is about the middle of October to the middle or end of November: barley is put into the ground two and sometimes three months later. The wheat harvest commences about the twentieth of May, and early in June the whole is off the ground. The barley harvest, it is to be observed, is generally a fortnight earlier. A survey of the astonishing produce of this country, and of the manner in which its most rocky and, to appearance, insuperably sterile parts, are made to yield to the wants of man, will be sufficient to refute the objections raised by skeptical writers against the possibility of its furnishing subsistence to the multitude of its former inhabitants recorded in Scripture. Dr. Clarke, when travelling from Napolose to Jerusalem, relates, "The road was mountainous, rocky, and full of loose stones; yet the cultivation was every where marvellous: it afforded one of the most striking pictures of human industry which it is possible to behold. The limestone rocks and stony valleys of Judea were entirely covered with plantations of figs, vines, and olive trees: not a single spot seemed to be neglected. The hills, from their bases to their upmost summits, were entirely covered with gardens: all of these were free from weeds, and in the highest state of agricultural perfection. Even the sides of the most barren mountains had been rendered fertile, by being divided into terraces, like steps rising one above another, whereon soil had been accumulated with astonishing labour. Among the standing crops, we noticed millet, cotton, linseed, and tobacco; and occasionally small fields of barley. A sight of this territory can alone convey any adequate idea of its surprising produce: it is truly the Eden of the east, rejoicing in the abundance of its wealth. Under a wise and a beneficent government, the produce of the Holy Land would exceed all calculation. Its perennial harvest; the salubrity of its air; its limpid springs; its rivers, lakes, and matchless plains; its hills and dales;--all these, added to the serenity of its climate, prove this land to be indeed 'a field which the Lord hath blessed: God hath given it of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine.'" An oriental's ideas of fertility differ, however, from ours; for to him, plantations of figs, vines, and olives, with which the limestone rocks of Judea were once covered, would suggest the same associations of plenty and opulence that are called up in the mind of an Englishman by rich tracts of corn land. The land of Canaan is characterized as flowing with milk and honey; and it still answers to this description; for



it contains extensive pasture lands of the richest quality, and the rocky country is covered with aromatic plants, yielding to the wild bees, who hive in the hollow of the rocks, such abundance of honey as to supply the poorer classes with an article of food. Honey from the rocks is repeatedly referred to in the Scriptures, as a delicious food, and an emblem of plenty, 1 Sam. xiv, 25; Psa. lxxxi, 16. Dates are another important article of consumption; and the neighbourhood of Judea was famous for its numerous palm trees, which are found springing up from chance-sown kernels in the midst of the most arid districts. When to these wild productions we add the oil extracted from the olive, so essential an article to an oriental, we shall be at no loss to account for the ancient fertility of the most barren districts of Judea, or for the adequacy of the soil to the support of so numerous a population, notwithstanding the comparatively small proportion of arable land. There is no reason to doubt, however, that corn and rice would be imported by the Tyrian merchants; which the Israelites would have no difficulty in exchanging for the produce of the olive ground and the vineyard, or for their flocks and herds. Delicious wine is still produced in some districts, and the valleys bear plentiful crops of tobacco, wheat, barley, and millet. Tacitus compares both the climate and the soil, indeed, to those of Italy; and he particularly specifies the palm tree and balsam tree as productions which gave the country an advantage over his own. Among other indigenous productions may be enumerated the cedar and other varieties of the pine, the cypress, the oak, the sycamore, the mulberry tree, the fig tree, the willow, the turpentine tree, the acacia, the aspen, the arbutus, the myrtle, the almond tree, the tamarisk, the oleander, the peach tree, the chaste tree, the carob or locust tree, the oskar, the doom, the mustard plant, the aloe, the citron, the apple, the pomegranate, and many flowering shrubs. The country about Jericho was celebrated for its balsam, as well as for its palm trees; and two plantations of it existed during the last war between the Jews and the Romans, for which both parties fought desperately. But Gilead appears to have been the country in which it chiefly abounded: hence the name, "balm of Gilead." Since the country has fallen under the Turkish dominion, it has ceased to be cultivated in Palestine, but is still found in Arabia. Other indigenous productions have either disappeared or are now confined to circumscribed districts. Iron is found in the mountain range of Libanus, and silk is produced in abundance in the plains of Samaria.

9. The grand distinction of Canaan, however, is, that it was the only part of the earth made, by divine institution, a type of heaven. So it was exhibited to Abraham, and also to the Jews. It pointed to the eternal rest which the spiritual seed of the father of the faithful were to enjoy after the pilgrimage of life; its holy city was the figure of the "Jerusalem above;" and Zion, with its solemn and joyful services represented that "hill of the Lord" to which

the redeemed shall come with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads; where they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall fly away.

CANAANITES, the posterity of Canaan by his eleven sons, who are supposed to have settled in the land of Canaan, soon after the dispersion of Babel. Five of these are known to have dwelt in the land of Canaan; viz. Heth, Jebus, Hemor or Amor, Girgashi, and Hevi or Hivi; and these, together with their father Canaan, became the heads of so many nations. Sina or Sini was another son of Canaan, whose settlement is not so precisely ascertained; but some authors infer, from the affinity of the names, that the Desert of Sin, and Mount Sinai, were the places of his abode, and that they were so called from him. The Hittites inhabited the country about Hebron, as far as Beersheba, and the brook Besor, reckoned by Moses the southern limits of Canaan. The Jebusites dwelt near them on the north, as far as the city of Jebus, since called Jerusalem. The Amorites possessed the country on the east side of Jordan, between the river Arnon on the south-east, and Mount Gilead on the north, afterward the lot of Reuben and Gad. The Girgashites lay next above the Amorites, on the east side of the Sea of Tiberias, and their land was afterward possessed by the half tribe of Manasseh. The Hivites dwelt northward, under Mount Libanus. The Perizzites, who make one of the seven nations of the Canaanites, are supposed, by Heylin and others, to be the descendants of Sina or Sini; and it is probable, since we do not read of their abode in cities, that they lived dispersed, and in tents, like the Scythians, roving on both sides of the Jordan, on the hills and plains; and that they were called by that name from the Hebrew pharatz, which signifies "to disperse." The Canaanites dwelt in the midst of all, and were surrounded by the rest. This appears from the sacred writings to have been the respective situation of those seven nations, which are said to have been doomed to destruction for their idolatry and wickedness, when the Israelites first invaded their country. The learned have not absolutely determined whether the nations proceeding from Canaan's other six sons should be reckoned among the inhabitants of the land of Canaan. The prevalent opinion is, that they were not included. As to the customs, manners, arts, sciences, and language of the seven nations that inhabited the land of Canaan, they must, from the situation they severally occupied, have been very different. Those who inhabited the sea coast were merchants, and by reason of their commerce and wealth scattered colonies over almost all the islands and maritime provinces of the Mediterranean. (See Phenicia) The colonies which Cadmus carried to Thebes in Bæotia, and his brother Cilix into Cilicia, are said to have proceeded from the stock of Canaan. Sicily, Sardinia, Malta, Cyprus, Corfu, Majorca, Minorca, Gades, and Ebutris, are supposed to have been peopled by the Canaanites. The other Canaanites, whose

situation was inland, were employed partly in pasturage, and partly in tillage, and they were also well skilled in the exercise of arms. Those who dwelt in the walled cities, and who had fixed abodes, cultivated the land; and those who wandered about, as the Perizzites seem to have done, grazed cattle: so that among the Canaanites, we discover the various classes of merchants, and, consequently, mariners; of artificers, soldiers, shepherds, and husbandmen. We learn, also, from their history, that they were all ready, however diversified by their occupations or local interests, to join in a common cause; that they were well appointed for war, both offensive and defensive; that their towns were well fortified; that they were sufficiently furnished with military weapons and warlike chariots; that they were daring, obstinate, and almost invincible; and that they were not destitute of craft and policy. Their language, we find, was well understood by Abraham, who was a Hebrew, for he conversed readily with them on all occasions; but as to their mode of writing, whether it was originally their own or borrowed from the Israelites, it is not so easy to determine. Their religion, at least in part, seems to have been preserved pure till the days of Abraham, who acknowledged Melchisedek to be priest of the most high God; and Melchisedek was, without doubt, a Canaanite, or, at least, dwelt at that time in Canaan in high esteem and veneration.

2. But we learn from the Scripture history, 212 that the Hittites in particular were become degenerate in the time of Isaac and Rebekah; for they could not endure the thoughts of Jacob's marrying one of the daughters of Heth, as Esau had done. From this time, then, we may date the prevalence of those abominations which subjected them to the divine displeasure, and made them unworthy of the land which they possessed. In the days of Moses, they were become incorrigible idolaters; for he commands his people to destroy their altars, and break down their images, (statues or pillars,) and cut down their groves, and burn their graven images with fire. And lest they should pervert the Israelites, the latter were strictly enjoined not to intermarry with them; but "to smite them, and utterly destroy them, nor show mercy upon them," Deut. vii, 1-5. They are accused of the cruel custom of sacrificing men, and are said to have made their seed pass through the fire to Moloch, Lev. xviii, 21. Their morals were as corrupt as their doctrine: adultery, bestiality of all sorts, profanation, incest, and all manner of uncleanness, are the sins laid to their charge. "The Canaanites," says Mr. Bryant, "as they were a sister tribe of the Mizraim, resembled them in their rites and religion. They held a heifer, or cow, in high veneration, agreeably to the customs of Egypt. Their chief deity was the sun, whom they worshipped, together with the Baalim, under the titles of Ourchol, Adonis, or Thamuz."

3. When the measure of the idolatries and abominations of the Canaanites was filled up, God delivered their country into the hands of the Israelites, who conquered it under Joshua. However, they resisted with obstinate valour, and kept Joshua employed six years from the time of his passing the river Jordan, and entering Canaan, in the year B. C. 1451, to the year B. C. 1445, the sabbatical year beginning from the autumnal equinox; when he made a division of the land among the tribes of Israel, and rested from his conquests. As God had commanded this people, long before, to be treated with rigour, see Deut. vii, 2, Joshua extirpated great numbers, and obliged the rest to fly, some of them into Africa, and others into Greece. Procopius says, they first retreated into Egypt, but advanced into Africa, where they built many cities, and spread themselves over those vast regions which reach to the straits, preserving their old language with little alteration. In the time of Athanasius, the Africans still said they were descended from the Canaanites; and when asked their origin, they answered, "Canani." It is agreed, that the Punic tongue was nearly the same as the Canaanitish or Hebrew.

4. On the rigorous treatment of the nations of Canaan by the Israelites, to which infidels have taken so many exceptions, the following remarks of Paley are a sufficient reply: The first thing to be observed is, that the nations of Canaan were destroyed for their wickedness. This is plain from Lev. xviii, 24, &c. Now the facts disclosed in this passage sufficiently testify, that the Canaanites were a wicked people; that detestable practices were general among them, and even habitual; that it was for these enormities the nations of Canaan were destroyed. It was not, as some have imagined, to make way for the Israelites; nor was it simply to make away with their idolatry; but it was because of the abominable crimes which usually accompanied the latter. And we may farther learn from the passage, that God's abhorrence of these crimes and his indignation against them are regulated by the rules of strict impartiality, since Moses solemnly warns the Israelites against falling into the like wicked courses, "that the land," says he, "cast not you out also, when you defile it, as it cast out the nations that were before you; for whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people," Lev. xviii, 28, 29. Now, when God, for the wickedness of a people, sends an earthquake, or a fire, or a plague among them, there is no complaint of injustice, especially when the calamity is known, or expressly declared beforehand, to be inflicted for the wickedness of such people. It is rather regarded as an act of exemplary penal justice, and, as such, consistent with the character of the moral Governor of the universe. The objection, therefore, is not to the Canaanitish nations being destroyed; (for when their national wickedness is considered, and when that is expressly stated as the cause of their destruction, the dispensation, however severe,

will not be questioned;) but the objection is solely to the manner of destroying them. I mean there is nothing but the manner left to be objected to: their wickedness accounts for the thing itself. To which objection it may be replied, that if the thing itself be just, the manner is of little signification, of little signification even to the sufferers themselves. For where is the great difference, even to them, whether they were destroyed by an earthquake, a pestilence, a famine, or by the hands of an enemy? Where is the difference, even to our imperfect apprehensions of divine justice, provided it be, and is known to be, for their wickedness that they are destroyed? But this destruction, you say, confounded the innocent with the guilty. The sword of Joshua, and of the Jews spared neither women nor children. Is it not the same with all other national visitations? Would not an earthquake, or a fire, or a plague, or a famine among them have done the same? Even in an ordinary and natural death the same thing happens; God takes away the life he lends, without regard, that we can perceive, to age, or sex, or character. "But, after all, promiscuous massacres, the burning of cities, the laying waste of countries, are things dreadful to reflect upon." Who doubts it? so are all the judgments of Almighty God. The effect, in whatever way it shows itself, must necessarily be tremendous, when the Lord, as the Psalmist expresses it, "moveth out of his place to punish the wicked." But it ought to satisfy us; at least this is the point upon which we ought to rest and fix our attention; that it was for excessive, wilful, and forewarned wickedness, that all this befel them, and that it is 213all along so declared in the history which recites it.

But, farther, if punishing them by the hands of the Israelites rather than by a pestilence, an earthquake, a fire, or any such calamity, be still an objection, we may perceive, I think, some reasons for this method of punishment in preference to any other whatever; always bearing in our mind, that the question is not concerning the justice of the punishment, but the mode of it. It is well known, that the people of those ages were affected by no proof of the power of the gods which they worshipped, so deeply as by their giving them victory in war. It was by this species of evidence that the superiority of their own gods above the gods of the nations which they conquered, was, in their opinion, evinced. This being the actual persuasion which then prevailed in the world, no matter whether well or ill founded, how were the neighbouring nations, for whose admonition this dreadful example was intended, how were they to be convinced of the supreme power of the God of Israel above the pretended gods of other nations; and of the righteous character of Jehovah, that is, of his abhorrence of the vices which prevailed in the land of Canaan? How, I say, were they to be convinced so well, or at all indeed, as by enabling the Israelites, whose God he was known and acknowledged to be, to conquer under his banner, and drive out before them, those who resisted the execution of that commission

with which the Israelites declared themselves to be invested, namely, the expulsion and extermination of the Canaanitish nations? This convinced surrounding countries, and all who were observers or spectators of what passed, first, that the God of Israel was a real God; secondly, that the gods which other nations worshipped, were either no gods, or had no power against the God of Israel; and thirdly, that it was he, and he alone, who possessed both the power and the will, to punish, to destroy, and to exterminate from before his face, both nations and individuals, who gave themselves up to the crimes and wickedness for which the Canaanites were notorious. Nothing of this sort would have appeared, or with the same evidence, from an earthquake, or a plague, or any natural calamity. These might not have been attributed to divine agency at all, or not to the interposition of the God of Israel.

Another reason which made this destruction both more necessary, and more general, than it would have otherwise been, was the consideration, that if any of the old inhabitants were left, they would prove a snare to those who succeeded them in the country; would draw and seduce them by degrees into the vices and corruptions which prevailed among themselves. Vices of all kinds, but vices most particularly of the licentious kind, are astonishingly infectious. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. A small number of persons addicted to them, and allowed to practise them with impunity or encouragement, will spread them through the whole mass. This reason is formally and expressly assigned, not simply for the punishment, but for the extent to which it was carried; namely, extermination: "Thou shalt utterly destroy them, that they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods."

In reading the Old Testament account, therefore, of the Jewish wars and conquests in Canaan, and the terrible destruction brought upon the inhabitants thereof, we are always to remember that we are reading the execution of a dreadful but just sentence, pronounced by Jehovah against the intolerable and incorrigible crimes of these nations; that they were intended to be made an example to the whole world of God's avenging wrath against sins, which, if they had been suffered to continue, might have polluted the whole ancient world, and which could only be checked by the signal and public overthrow of nations notoriously addicted to them, and so addicted as even to have incorporated them into their religion and their public institutions; and that the Israelites were mere instruments in the hands of a righteous Providence for effecting the extirpation of a people, of whom it was necessary to make a public example to the rest of mankind; that this extermination, which might have been accomplished by a pestilence, by fire, by earthquakes, was appointed to be done by the hands of the Israelites, as being the clearest and most intelligible method of

displaying the power and the righteousness of the God of Israel; his power over the pretended gods of other nations; and his righteous indignation against the crimes into which they were fallen.

CANDACE, the name of an Ethiopian queen, whose eunuch coming to Jerusalem to worship the Lord, was baptized by Philip the deacon, near Bethsura, in the way to Gaza, as he was returning to his own country, Acts viii, 27. The Ethiopia here mentioned was the isle or peninsula of Meroë to the south of Egypt, which, as Mr. Bruce shows, is now called Atbara, up the Nile. Candace was the common name of the queens of that country. Strabo and Pliny mention queens of that name as reigning in their times. That the queen mentioned in the Acts was converted by the instrumentality of her servant, and that the country thus received Christianity at that early period, are statements not supported by any good testimony. See Abyssinian Church.

CANDLESTICK. The instrument so rendered by our translators was more properly a stand for lamps. One of beaten gold was made by Moses, Exod. xxv, 31, 32, and put into the tabernacle in the holy place, over against the table of shew bread. The basis of this candlestick was also of pure gold; it had seven branches, three on each side, and one in the middle. When Solomon had built the temple, he was not satisfied with placing one golden candlestick there, but had ten put up, of the same form and metal with that described by Moses, five on the north, and five on the south side of the holy place, 1 Kings vii, 49. After the Jews returned from their captivity, the golden candlestick was again placed in the temple, as it had been before in the tabernacle by 214Moses. The lamps were kept burning perpetually; and were supplied morning and evening with pure olive oil. Josephus says, that after the Romans had destroyed the temple, the several things which were found within it, were carried in triumph to Rome, namely, the golden table, and the golden candlestick with seven branches. These were lodged in the temple built by Vespasian, and consecrated to Peace; and at the foot of Mount Palatine, there is a triumphal arch still visible, upon which Vespasian's triumph is represented, and the several monuments which were carried publicly in the procession are engraved, and among the rest the candlestick with the seven branches, which are still discernible upon it. In Rev. i, 12, 20, mention is made of seven golden candlesticks, which are said to be emblems of the seven Christian churches.

CANKER-WORM, קלל, Psalm cv, 34; Jer. li, 27, where it is rendered caterpillar; Joel i, 4; ii, 25; Nahum iii, 15, canker-worm. As it is frequently mentioned with the locust, it is thought by some to be a species of that insect. It certainly cannot be the canker-worm, as our version renders it; for in Nahum, it is expressly said to have wings and fly, to camp in the hedges

by day, and commit its depredations in the night. But it may be, as the Septuagint renders it in five passages out of eight where it occurs, the bruchus, or "hedge-chaffer." Nevertheless, the passage, Jer. li, 27, where the ialek is described as "rough," that is, with hair standing on end on it, leads us very naturally to the rendering of our translators in that place, "the rough caterpillar," which, like other caterpillars, at a proper time, casts its exterior covering and flies away in a winged state. Scheuchzer observes that we should not, perhaps, be far from the truth, if with the ancient interpreters, we understood this ialek, after all, as a kind of locust; as some species of them have hair principally on the head, and others have prickly points standing out.

CANON, a word used to denote the authorized catalogue of the sacred writings. The word is originally Greek, κανὼν, and signifies a rule or standard, by which other things are to be examined and judged. Accordingly the same word has been applied to the tongue of a balance, or that small part which, by its perpendicular position, determines the even poise or weight, or, by its inclination either way, the uneven poise of the things which are weighed. Hence it appears, that as the writings of the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists contain an authentic account of the revealed will of God, they are the rule of the belief and practice of those who receive them. Canon is also equivalent to a list or catalogue, in which are inserted those books which contain the rule of faith.

For an account of the settling of the canon of Scripture, see Bible. The following observations of Dr. Alexander, in his work on the canon, proving that no canonical book of the Old or New Testament has been lost, may here be properly introduced.--No canonical book of the Old Testament has been lost. On this subject, there has existed some diversity of opinion. Chrysostom is cited by Bellarmine as saying, "that many of the writings of the prophets had perished, which may readily be proved from the history in Chronicles. For the Jews were negligent, and not only negligent, but impious; so that some books were lost through carelessness, and others were burned, or otherwise destroyed." In confirmation of this opinion, an appeal is made to 1 Kings iv, 32, 33, where it is said of Solomon, "that he spake three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five. And he spake of trees, from the cedar in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes." All these productions, it is acknowledged, have perished. Again it is said in 1 Chron. xxix, 29, 30: "Now, the acts of David the king, first and last, behold they are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer; with all his reign, and his might, and the times that went over him, and over Israel, and over all the kingdoms of the countries." The book of



Jasher, also, is twice mentioned in Scripture. In Joshua x, 13: "And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves on their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher?" And in 2 Sam. i, 18: "And he bade them teach the children of Israel the use of the bow: behold, it is written in the book of Jasher."

The book of the wars of the Lord is referred to in Numbers xxi, 14. But we have in the canon no books under the name of Nathan and Gad, nor any book of Jasher, nor of the wars of the Lord. Moreover, we frequently are referred, in the sacred history, to other chronicles or annals, for a fuller account of the matters spoken of, which chronicles are not now extant. And in 2 Chron. ix, 29, it is said, "Now, the rest of the acts of Solomon, first and last, are they not written in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and in the visions of Iddo the seer, against Jeroboam, the son of Nebat?" Now, it is well known that none of these writings of the prophets are in the canon; at least, none of them under their names. It is said, also, in 2 Chron. xii, 15, "Now, the acts of Rehoboam, first and last, are they not written in the book of Shemaiah the prophet, and of Iddo the seer, concerning genealogies?" Of which works nothing remains under the names of these prophets.

1. The first observation which may be made on this subject is, that every book referred to or quoted in the sacred writings is not necessarily an inspired or canonical book. Because St. Paul cites passages from the Greek poets, it does not follow that we must receive their poems as inspired.

2. A book may be written by an inspired man, and yet be neither inspired nor canonical. Inspiration was not constantly afforded to the prophets; but was occasional, and for particular important purposes. In common matters, and especially in things no way connected with religion, it is reasonable to suppose that the Prophets and Apostles were left to the same guidance of reason and common sense as other men. A man, therefore, inspired to deliver some prophecy, or even to write a canonical book, might write other books with no greater assistance than other good men receive. Because Solomon was inspired to write some canonical books, it does not follow that what he wrote on natural history was also inspired, any more than Solomon's private letters to his friends, if ever he wrote any. Let it be remembered that the Prophets and Apostles were only inspired on special occasions, and on particular subjects, and all difficulties respecting such works as these will vanish. How many of the books referred to in the Bible, and mentioned above, may have been of this description, it is now impossible to tell; but probably several of them belong to this class. No doubt there were many books of annals much more minute and particular in the narration of facts than those which we have. It was often enough

merely to refer to these state papers, or public documents, as being sufficiently correct, in regard to the facts on account of which the reference was made. The book of the wars of the Lord might, for aught that appears, have been merely a muster roll of the army. The word translated book has so extensive a meaning in Hebrew, that it is not even necessary to suppose that it was a writing at all. The book of Jasher (or of Rectitude, if we translate the word) might have been some useful compend taken from Scripture, or composed by the wise, for the regulation of justice and equity between man and man. Augustine, in his "City of God," has distinguished accurately on this subject. "I think," says he, "that those books which should have authority in religion were revealed by the Holy Spirit, and that men composed others by historical diligence, as the prophets did these by inspiration. And these two classes of books are so distinct, that it is only by those written by inspiration that we are to suppose that God, through them, is speaking unto us. The one class is useful for fulness of knowledge; the other, for authority in religion; in which authority the canon is preserved."

3. But again: it may be maintained, without any prejudice to the completeness of the canon, that there may have been inspired writings which were not intended for the instruction of the church in all ages, but composed by the prophets for some special occasion. These writings, though inspired, were not canonical. They were temporary in their design; and when that was accomplished, they were no longer needed. We know that the prophets delivered, by inspiration, many discourses to the people, of which we have not a trace on record. Many true prophets are mentioned, who wrote nothing that we know of; and several are mentioned, whose names are not even given. The same is true of the Apostles. Very few of them had any concern in writing the canonical Scriptures, and yet they all possessed plenary inspiration. And if they wrote letters on special occasions, to the churches planted by them; yet these were not designed for the perpetual instruction of the universal church. Therefore, Shemaiah, and Iddo, and Nathan, and Gad, might have written some things by inspiration which were never intended to form a part of the sacred volume. It is not asserted that there certainly existed such temporary inspired writings: all that is necessary to be maintained is, that, supposing such to have existed, which is not improbable, it does not follow that the canon is incomplete by reason of their loss.

4. The last remark in relation to the books of the Old Testament supposed to be lost is, that it is highly probable that we have several of them now in the canon, under another name. The books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, were, probably, not written by one, but by a succession of prophets. There is reason to believe that, until the canon of sacred Scripture was closed, the succession of prophets was never interrupted. Whatever

was necessary to be added, by way of explanation, to any book already received into the canon, they were competent to annex; or, whatever annals or histories it was the purpose of God to have transmitted to posterity, they would be directed and inspired to prepare. Thus, different parts of these books might have been penned by Gad, Nathan, Iddo, Shemaiah, &c. That some parts of these histories were prepared by prophets, we have clear proof in one instance; for Isaiah has inserted in his prophecy several chapters which are contained in 2 Kings, and which, I think, there can be no doubt were originally written by himself. The Jewish doctors are of opinion that the book of Jasher is one of the books of the Pentateuch, or the whole law. The book of the wars of the Lord has by many been supposed to be no other than the book of Numbers.

Thus, it sufficiently appears from an examination of particulars, that there exists no evidence that any canonical book of the Old Testament has been lost. To which we may add, that there are many general considerations of great weight which go to prove that no part of the Scriptures of the Old Testament has been lost. The translation of these books into Greek is sufficient to show that the same books existed nearly two hundred years before the advent of Christ. And, above all, the unqualified testimony to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, by Christ and his Apostles, ought to satisfy us that we have lost none of the inspired books of the canon. The Scriptures are constantly referred to, and quoted as infallible authority by them, as we have before shown. These oracles were committed to the Jews as a sacred deposit, and they are never charged with unfaithfulness in this trust. The Scriptures are declared to have been written “for our learning;” and no intimation is given that they had ever been mutilated, or in any degree corrupted.

As to the New Testament, the same author proceeds: With respect to the New Testament, I am ready to concede, as was before done, that there may have been books written by inspired men that have been lost; for inspiration was occasional, not constant; and confined to matters of faith, and not afforded on the affairs of this life, or in matters of mere science. And if such writings have been lost, the canon of Scripture has suffered no more by this means, than by the loss of any other uninspired books. But again: I am willing to go farther, and say that it is possible (although I know no evidence of the fact) that some things, written under the influence of inspiration, for a particular occasion, and to rectify some disorder in a particular church, may have been lost, without injury to the canon. For, since much that the Apostles preached by inspiration is undoubtedly lost, so there is no reason why every word which they wrote must necessarily be preserved, and form a part of the canonical volume. For example: suppose that when St. Paul said, “I wrote to you in an epistle not to

company with fornicators,” 1 Cor. v, 9, he referred to an epistle which he had written to the Corinthians, before the one now called the First; it might never have been intended that this letter should form a constituent part of the canon; for although it treated of subjects connected with Christian faith or practice, yet, an occasion having arisen, in a short time, of treating these subjects more at large, every thing in that epistle (supposing it ever to have been written) may have been included in the two Epistles to the Corinthians which are now in the canon.

1. The first argument to prove that no canonical book has been lost, is derived from the watchful care of providence over the sacred Scriptures. Now, to suppose that a book written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and intended to form a part of the canon, which is the rule of faith to the church, should be utterly and irrecoverably lost, is surely not very honourable to the wisdom of God, and in no way consonant with the ordinary method of his dispensations, in regard to his precious truth. There is good reason to think that, if God saw it needful, and for the edification of the church, that such books should be written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, by his providence he would have taken care to preserve them from destruction. We do know that this treasure of divine truth has been, in all ages, and in the worst times, the special care of God, or not one of the sacred books would now be in existence. And if one canonical book might be lost through the negligence or unfaithfulness of men, why not all? And thus the end of God, in making a revelation of his will, might have been defeated. But whatever other corruptions have crept into the Jewish or Christian churches, it does not appear that either of them, as a body, ever incurred the censure of having been careless in preserving the oracles of God. Our Saviour never charges the Jews, who perverted the sacred Scriptures to their own ruin, with having lost any portion of the sacred deposit intrusted to them. History informs us of the fierce and malignant design of Antiochus Epiphanes, to abolish every vestige of the sacred volume; but the same history assures us that the Jewish people manifested a heroic fortitude and invincible patience in resisting and defeating his impious purpose. They chose rather to sacrifice their lives, and suffer a cruel death, than to deliver up the copies of the sacred volume in their possession. And the same spirit was manifested, and with the same result, in the Dioclesian persecution of the Christians. Every effort was made to obliterate the sacred writings of Christians; and multitudes suffered death for refusing to deliver up the New Testament. Some, indeed, overcome by the terrors of a cruel persecution, did, in the hour of temptation, consent to surrender the holy book; but they were ever afterward called traitors; and it was with the utmost difficulty that any of them could be received again into the communion of the church, after a long repentance, and the most humbling confessions of their fault. Now, if any canonical book was ever

lost, it must have been in these early times, when the word of God was valued far above life, and when every Christian stood ready to seal the truth with his blood.

2. Another argument which appears to me to be convincing is, that in a little time, all the sacred books were dispersed over the whole world. If a book had, by some accident or violence, been destroyed in one region, the loss could soon have been repaired, by sending for copies to other countries. The considerations just mentioned would, I presume, be satisfactory to all candid minds, were it not that it is supposed that there is evidence that some things were written by the Apostles which are not now in the canon. We have already referred to an epistle to the Corinthians, which St. Paul is supposed to have written to them, previously to the writing of those which we now possess. But it is by no means certain, or even probable, that St. Paul ever did write such an epistle; for not one ancient writer makes the least mention of any such letter, nor is there any where to be found any citation from it, or any reference to it. It is a matter of testimony, in which all the fathers concur, as with one voice, that St. Paul wrote no more than fourteen epistles, all of which we now have. But still, St. Paul's own declaration stands in the way of our opinion: "I wrote to you in an epistle," 1 Cor. v, 9, 11. The words in the original are, Ἐγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ; the literal version of which is, "I have written to you in the epistle," or "in this epistle;" that is, in the former part of it; where, in fact, we find the very thing which he says that he had written. See 1 Cor. v, 2, 5, 6. But it is thought by learned and judicious commentators, that the words following, Νυνὶ δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, "But now I have written unto you," require that we should understand the former clause, as relating to some former time; but a careful attention to the context will convince us that this reference is by no means necessary. The Apostle had told them in the beginning of the chapter, to avoid the company of fornicators, &c; but it is manifest, 217from the tenth verse, that he apprehended that his meaning might be misunderstood, by extending the prohibition too far, so as to decline all intercourse with the world; therefore, he repeats what he had said, and informs them that it had relation only to the professors of Christianity, who should be guilty of such vices. The whole may be thus paraphrased: "I wrote to you above in my letter, that you should separate from those who were fornicators, and that you should purge them out as old leaven; but, fearing lest you should misapprehend my meaning, by inferring that I have directed you to avoid all intercourse with the Heathen around you, who are addicted to these shameful vices, which would make it necessary that you should go out of the world, I now inform you that my meaning is, that you do not associate familiarly with any who make a profession of Christianity, and yet continue in these evil practices." In confirmation of this interpretation, we can adduce the old Syriac version, which, having been

made soon after the days of the Apostles, is good testimony in relation to this matter of fact. In this venerable version, the meaning of the eleventh verse is thus given: "This is what I have written unto you," or, "the meaning of what I have written unto you."

The only other passage in the New Testament which has been thought to refer to an epistle of St. Paul not now extant, is that in Colossians iv, 16: "And when this epistle is read among you, cause also that it be read in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea." But what evidence is there that St. Paul ever wrote an epistle to the Laodiceans? The text on which this opinion has been founded, in ancient and modern times, correctly interpreted, has no such import. The words in the original are, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἴνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε, "and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea," Col. iv, 16. These words have been differently taken; for, by them some understand that an epistle had been written by St. Paul to the Laodiceans, which he desired might be read in the church at Colosse. Chrysostom seems to have understood them thus; and the Romish writers almost universally have adopted this opinion. "Therefore," says Bellarmine, "it is certain that St. Paul's epistle to the Laodiceans is now lost." And their opinion is favoured by the Latin Vulgate, where we read, eamque Laodicensium, "that which is of the Laodiceans;" but even these words admit of another construction. Many learned Protestants, also, have embraced the same interpretation; while others suppose that St. Paul here refers to the epistle to the Ephesians, which they think he sent to the Laodiceans, and that the present inscription is spurious. But that neither of these opinions is correct, may be rendered very probable. That St. Paul could not intend, by the language used in the passage under consideration, an epistle written by himself, will appear by the following arguments: (1.) St. Paul could not, with any propriety of speech, have called an epistle written by himself, and sent to the Laodiceans, an epistle from Laodicea. He certainly would have said, πρὸς Λαοδικεῖαν, [to Laodicea,] or some such thing. Who ever heard of an epistle addressed to any individual, or to any society, denominated an epistle from them? (2.) If the epistle referred to in this passage had been one written by St. Paul, it would have been most natural for him to call it his epistle; and this would have rendered his meaning incapable of misconstruction. (3.) All those best qualified to judge of the fact, and who were well acquainted with St. Paul's history and writings, never mention any such epistle: neither Clement, Hermas, nor the Syriac interpreter, knew any thing of such an epistle of St. Paul. But it may be asked, To what epistle, then, does St. Paul refer? It seems safest in such a case, where testimony is deficient, to follow the literal sense of the words, and to believe that it was an epistle written by the Laodiceans, probably to

himself, which he had sent to the Colossians, together with his own epistle, for their perusal.

CANTICLES, the book of, in Hebrew, שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים, the song of songs. The church, as well as the synagogue, received this book generally as canonical. The royal author appears, in the typical spirit of his times, to have designed to render a ceremonial appointment descriptive of a spiritual relation; and this song is accordingly considered, by judicious writers, to be a mystical allegory of that sort which induces a more sublime sense on historical truths, and which, by the description of human events, shadows out divine circumstances. The sacred writers were, by God's condescension, authorized to illustrate his strict and intimate relation to the church by the figure of a marriage; and the emblem must have been strikingly becoming and expressive to the conceptions of the Jews, since they annexed ideas of peculiar mystery to this appointment, and imagined the marriage union to be a counterpart representation of some original pattern in heaven. Hence it was performed among them with very peculiar ceremonies and solemnity, with every thing that could give dignity and importance to its rites. Solomon, therefore, in celebrating the circumstances of his marriage, was naturally led, by a train of correspondent reflections, to consider that spiritual connection which it was often employed to symbolize; and the idea must have been the more forcibly suggested to him, as he was at this period preparing to build a temple to God, and thereby to furnish a visible representation of the Hebrew church. The spiritual allegory thus worked up by Solomon to its highest perfection, was very consistent with the prophetic style, which was accustomed to predict evangelical blessings by such parabolical figures; and Solomon was more immediately furnished with a pattern for this representation by the author of the forty-fifth Psalm, who describes, in a compendious allegory, the same future connection between Christ and his church.

2. But though the work be certainly an allegorical representation, many learned men, in an unrestrained eagerness to explain the song, 218 even in its minutest and most obscure particulars, have too far indulged their imaginations; and, by endeavouring too nicely to reconcile the literal with the spiritual sense, have been led beyond the boundaries which a reverence for the sacred Scriptures should ever prescribe. The ideas which the sacred writers furnish concerning the mystical relation between Christ and his church, though well accommodated to our apprehensions by the allusion of a marriage union, are too general to illustrate every particular contained in this poem, which may be supposed to have been intentionally decorated with some ornaments appropriate to the literal construction. When the general analogy is obvious, we are not always to expect minute resemblance, and should not be too curious in seeking for obscure and recondite allusions. Solomon, in the glow of an inspired fancy, and

unsuspecting of misconception or deliberate perversion, describes God and his church, with their respective attributes and graces, under colourings familiar and agreeable to mankind, and exhibits their ardent affection under the authorized figures of earthly love. No similitude, indeed, could be chosen so elegant and apposite for the illustration of this intimate and spiritual alliance, as a marriage union, if considered in the chaste simplicity of its first institution, or under the interesting circumstances with which it was established among the Jews.

3. This poem may be considered, as to its form, as a dramatic poem of the pastoral kind. There is a succession of time, and a change of place, to different parts of the palace and royal gardens. The persons introduced as speakers, are the bridegroom and bride, and their respective attendants. The interchange of dialogue is carried on in a wild and digressive manner; but the speeches are adapted to the persons with appropriate elegance. The companions of the bride compose a kind of chorus, which seems to bear some resemblance to that afterward adopted in the Grecian tragedy. Solomon and his queen assume the pastoral simplicity of style, which is favourable to the communication of their sentiments. The poem abounds throughout with beauties, and presents every where a delightful and romantic display of nature, painted at its most interesting season, and described with every ornament that an inventive fancy could furnish. It is justly entitled *Song of Songs*, or most excellent song, as being superior to any that an uninspired writer could have produced, and tending, if properly understood, to purify the mind, and to elevate the affections from earthly to heavenly things.

CAPERNAUM, a city celebrated in the Gospels, being the place where Jesus usually resided during the time of his ministry. It stood on the sea coast, that is, on the coast of the sea of Galilee, in the borders of Zebulun and Naphtalim, Matt. iv, 15, and consequently toward the upper part of it. As it was a convenient port from Galilee to any place on the other side of the sea, this might be our Lord's inducement to make it the place of his most constant residence. Upon this account Capernaum was highly honoured; and though "exalted unto heaven," as its inhabitants boasted, because it made no proper use of this signal favour it drew from him the severe denunciation, that it should "be brought down to hell," Matt. xi, 23. This sentence of destruction has been fully realized; the ancient city is reduced to a state of utter desolation. Burckhardt supposes the ruins called Tal Houm, near the rivulet called El Eshe, to be those of Capernaum. Mr. Buckingham, who gives this place the name of Talhewyn, describes considerable and extensive ruins; the only remains of those edifices which exalted Capernaum above its fellows.



CAPPADOCIA, is called in Hebrew Caphtor. Cappadocia joined Galatia on the east, and is mentioned in Acts ii, 9, and by St. Peter, who addresses his First Epistle to the dispersed throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Asia. The people of this country were formerly infamous for their vices; but after the promulgation of Christianity, it produced many great and worthy men: among these may be reckoned Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, and St. Basil, commonly styled the Great.

CAPTIVES. The treatment of persons taken in war among ancient nations throws great light upon many passages of Scripture. The eastern conqueror often stripped his unhappy captives naked, shaved their heads, and made them travel in that condition, exposed to the burning heat of a vertical sun by day, and the chilling cold of the night. Such barbarous treatment was to modest women the height of cruelty and indignity; especially to those who had been educated in softness and elegance, who had figured in all the superfluities of ornamental dress, and whose faces had hardly ever been exposed to the sight of man. The Prophet Isaiah mentions this as the hardest part of the sufferings in which female captives are involved: "The Lord will expose their nakedness." The daughter of Zion had indulged in all the softness of oriental luxury; but the offended Jehovah should cause her unrelenting enemies to drag her forth from her secret chambers into the view of an insolent soldiery; strip her of her ornaments, in which she so greatly delighted; take away her splendid and costly garments, discover her nakedness, and compel her to travel in that miserable plight to a far distant country, a helpless captive, the property of a cruel lord. Arrived in the land of their captivity, captives were often purchased at a very low price. The Prophet Joel complains of the contemptuous cheapness in which the people of Israel were held by those who made them captives: "And they have cast lots for my people; and have given a boy for a harlot, and sold a girl for wine, that they might drink." The custom of casting lots for the captives taken in war appears to have prevailed both among the Jews and the Greeks. The same allusion occurs in the prophecy of Obadiah: "Strangers carried away captive his forces, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem," Obadiah 11. With respect to the Greeks, we have an instance in Tryphiodorus:--

"Shared out by lot the female captives stand,  
The spoils divided with an equal hand;  
Each to his ship conveys his rightful share,  
Price of their toil, and trophies of the war."

2. By an inhuman custom which is still retained in the east, the eyes of captives taken in war were not seldom put out, sometimes literally scooped or dug out of their sockets. This dreadful calamity Samson had to endure from the unrelenting vengeance of his enemies. In a posterior age,

Zedekiah, the last king of Judah and Benjamin, after being compelled to behold the violent death of his sons and nobility, had his eyes put out, and was carried in chains to Babylon. The barbarous custom long survived the decline and fall of the Babylonian empire; for by the testimony of Mr. Maurice, in his history of Hindostan, the captive princes of that country were often treated in this manner by their more fortunate rivals; a red hot iron was passed over their eyes, which effectually deprived them of sight, and at the same time of their title and ability to reign. To the wretched state of such prisoners, the Prophet Isaiah alludes in a noble prediction, where he describes in very glowing colours the character and work of the promised Messiah: "He hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised," as captives too frequently were by the weight of their fetters.

3. It seems to have been the practice of eastern kings, to command their captives taken in war, especially those that had, by the atrociousness of their crimes, or the stoutness of their resistance, greatly provoked their indignation, to lie down on the ground, and then put to death a certain part of them, which they measured with a line, or determined by lot. This custom was not, perhaps, commonly practised by the people of God, in their wars with the nations around them; but one instance is recorded in the life of David, who inflicted this punishment on the Moabites: "And he smote Moab, and measured them with a line, casting them down to the ground; even with two lines measured he to put to death, and with one full line to keep alive: and so the Moabites became David's servants, and brought gifts," 2 Sam. viii, 2. But the most shocking punishment which the ingenious cruelty of a haughty and unfeeling conqueror ever inflicted on the miserable captive, is described by Virgil in the eighth book of the *Æneid*; and which even a Roman, inured to blood, could not mention without horror:--

"Quid memorem infandas cædes? quid facta tyranni," &c.

Line 483.

"What words can paint those execrable times,  
The subjects' sufferings, and the tyrant's crimes!  
That blood, those murders, O ye gods! replace  
On his own head, and on his impious race:  
The living and the dead at his command  
Were coupled face to face, and hand to hand,  
Till, choked with stench, in loathed embraces tied,  
The lingering wretches pined away, and died."  
Dryden.

It is to this deplorable condition of a captive that the Apostle refers, in that pathetic exclamation, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Who shall rescue me, miserable captive as I am, from this continual burden of sin which I carry about with me; and which is cumbersome and odious, as a dead carcass bound to a living body, to be dragged along with it where-ever it goes?

**CAPTIVITY.** God generally punished the sins and infidelities of the Jews by different captivities or servitudes. The first captivity is that of Egypt, from which they were delivered by Moses, and which should be considered rather as a permission of providence, than as a punishment for sin. Six captivities are reckoned during the government by judges: the first, under Chushanrithaim, king of Mesopotamia, which continued about eight years; the second, under Eglon, king of Moab, from which the Jews were delivered by Ehud; the third, under the Philistines, from which they were rescued by Shamgar; the fourth, under Jabin, king of Hazor, from which they were delivered by Deborah and Barak; the fifth, under the Midianites, from which Gideon freed them; and the sixth, under the Ammonites and Philistines, during the judicatures of Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon, Eli, Samson, and Samuel. But the greatest and most remarkable captivities were those of Israel and Judah, under their regal government.

Captivities of Israel. In the year of the world 3264, Tiglath-pileser took several cities, and carried away captives, principally from the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, 2 Kings xv, 29. In the year of the world 3283, Shalmaneser took and destroyed Samaria, after a siege of three years, and transplanted the tribes that had been spared by Tiglath-pileser, to provinces beyond the Euphrates, 2 Kings xviii, 10, 11. It is generally believed, there was no return of the ten tribes from this second captivity. But when we examine carefully the writings of the Prophets, we find a return of at least a great part of Israel from the captivity clearly pointed out. Hosea says, "They shall tremble as a bird out of Egypt, and as a dove out of the land of Assyria; and I will place them in their houses, saith the Lord," Hosea xi, 11. Amos says, "And I will bring again my people Israel from their captivity: they shall build their ruined cities and inhabit them," &c, Amos ix, 14. Obadiah observes, "The captivity of this host of the children of Israel shall possess that of the Canaanites," &c, Obadiah 18, 19. To the same purpose speak the other Prophets. "The Lord shall assemble the outcast of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah," Isa. xi, 12, 13. Ezekiel received an order from God to take two pieces of wood, and write on one, "For Judah and for the children of Israel;" and on the other, "For Joseph and for all the house of Israel;" and to join these two pieces of wood, 220that they might become one, and designate the reunion of Judah and Israel, Ezek. xxxvii, 16. Jeremiah is

equally express: "The house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel; and they shall come together out of the north, to the land which I have given for an inheritance to their fathers," Jer. iii, 18. See also Jer. xxxi, 7-9, 16, 17, 20; xvi, 15; xlix, 2, &c; Zech. ix, 13; x, 6, 10; Micah ii, 12. In the historical books of Scripture, we find that Israelites of the ten tribes, as well as of Judah and Benjamin, returned from the captivity. Among those that returned with Zerubbabel are reckoned some of Ephraim and Manasseh, who settled at Jerusalem with the tribe of Judah. When Ezra numbered those who returned from the captivity, he only inquired whether they were of the race of Israel; and at the first passover which was then celebrated in the temple, was a sacrifice of twelve he-goats for the whole house of Israel, according to the number of the tribes, Ezra vi, 16, 17; viii, 35. Under the Maccabees, and in our Saviour's time, we see Palestine peopled by Israelites of all the tribes indifferently. The Samaritan Chronicle asserts that in the thirty-fifth year of the pontificate of Abdelus, three thousand Israelites, by permission of King Sauredius, returned from captivity, under the conduct of Adus, son of Simon.

Captivities of Judah. The captivities of Judah are generally reckoned four: the first, in the year of the world 3398, under King Jehoiakim, when Daniel and others were carried to Babylon; the second, in the year of the world 3401, and in the seventh year of the reign of Jehoiakim, when Nebuchadnezzar carried three thousand and twenty-three Jews to Babylon; the third, in the year of the world 3406, and in the fourth of Jehoiachin, when this prince, with part of his people, was sent to Babylon; and the fourth in the year 3416, under Zedekiah, from which period begins the captivity of seventy years, foretold by the Prophet Jeremiah. Dr. Hales computes that the first of these captivities, which he thinks formed the commencement of the Babylonish captivity, took place in the year before Christ 605. The Jews were removed to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, who, designing to render that city the capital of the east, transplanted thither very great numbers of people, subdued by him in different countries. In Babylon the Jews had judges and elders, who governed them, and who decided matters in dispute juridically, according to their laws. Of this we see a proof in the story of Susanna, who was condemned by elders of her own nation. Cyrus, in the year of the world 3457, and in the first year of his reign at Babylon, permitted the Jews to return to their own country, Ezra i, 1. However, they did not obtain leave to rebuild the temple; and the completion of those prophecies which foretold the termination of their captivity after seventy years, was not till the year of the world 3486. In that year, Darius Hystaspes, by an edict, allowed them to rebuild the temple. In the year of the world 3537, Artaxerxes Longimanus sent Nehemiah to Jerusalem. The Jews assert that only the refuse of their nation returned from the captivity, and that the principal of them continued in and near

Babylon, where they had been settled, and where they became very numerous. It may, however, be doubted whether the refuse of Judah was really carried to Babylon. It appears from incidental observations in Scripture that some remained; and Major Rennell has offered several reasons for believing that only certain classes of the Jews were deported to Babylon, as well as into Assyria. Nebuchadnezzar carried away only the principal inhabitants, the warriors, and artisans of every kind; and he left the husbandmen, the labourers, and in general, the poorer classes, that constitute the great body of the people.

CARAITES, or KARÆITES, an ancient Jewish sect. The name signifies Textualists, or Scripturists, and was originally given to the school of Shammai, (about thirty years or more before Christ,) because they rejected the traditions of the elders, as embraced by the school of Hillel and the Pharisees, and all the fanciful interpretations of the Cabbala. They claim, however, a much higher antiquity, and produce a catalogue of doctors up to the time of Ezra. The rabbinites have been accustomed to call them Sadducees; but they believed in the inspiration of the Scriptures, the resurrection of the dead, and the final judgment. They believe that Messiah is not yet come, and reject all calculations of the time of his appearance: yet they say, it is proper that even every day they should receive their salvation by Messiah, the Son of David. As to the practice of religion, they differ from the rabbinites in the observance of the festivals, and keep the Sabbath with more strictness. They extend their prohibition of marriage to more degrees of affinity, and admit not of divorce on any slight or trivial grounds. The sect of Caraites still exists, but their number is inconsiderable. They are found chiefly in the Crimea, Lithuania, and Persia; at Damascus, Constantinople, and Cairo. Their honesty in the Crimea is said to be proverbial.

CARBUNCLE, ברקת, Exod. xxviii, 17; xxxix, 10; Ezek. xxviii, 13; and ἄνθραξ, Eccles. xxxii, 5; Tobit xiii, 17; a very elegant and rare gem, known to the ancients by the name ἄνθραξ, or coal, because, when held up before the sun, it appears like a piece of bright burning charcoal: the name carbunculus has the same meaning. It was the third stone in the first row of the pectoral; and is mentioned among the glorious stones of which the new Jerusalem is figuratively said to be built. Bishop Lowth observes that the precious stones, mentioned Isa. liv, 11, 12, and Rev. xxi, 18, seem to be general images to express beauty, magnificence, purity, strength, and solidity, agreeably to the ideas of the eastern nations; and to have never been intended to be strictly scrutinized, and minutely and particularly explained, as if they had some precise moral or spiritual meaning. Tobit, in his prophecy of the final restoration of Israel, Tobit xii, 16,17, describes the new Jerusalem in the same oriental manner.

221CARMEL, in the southern part of Palestine, where Nabal the Carmelite, Abigail's husband, dwelt, Joshua xv, 55; 1 Sam. xxv.

2. Carmel was also the name of a celebrated mountain in Palestine. Though spoken of in general as a single mountain, it ought rather to be considered as a mountainous region, the whole of which was known by the name of Carmel, while to one of the hills, more elevated than the rest, that name was usually applied by way of eminence. It had the plain of Sharon on the south; overlooked the port of Ptolemais on the north; and was bounded on the west by the Mediterranean sea; forming one of the most remarkable promontories that present themselves on the shores of that great sea. According to Volney, it is about two thousand feet in height, and has the shape of a flattened cone. Its sides are steep and rugged; the soil neither deep nor rich; and among the naked rocks stunted with plants, and wild forests which it presents to the eye, there are at present but few traces of that fertility which we are accustomed to associate with the idea of Mount Carmel. Yet even Volney himself acknowledges that he found among the brambles, wild vines and olive trees, which proved that the hand of industry had once been employed on a not ungrateful soil. Of its ancient productiveness there can be no doubt; the etymology and ordinary application of its name being sufficient evidence of the fact. Carmel is not only expressly mentioned in Scripture as excelling other districts in that respect; but, every place possessed of the same kind of excellence obtained from it the same appellation in the language both of the prophets and the people. Mount Carmel is celebrated in the Old Testament, as the usual place of residence of the Prophets Elijah and Elisha. It was here that Elijah so successfully opposed the false prophets of Baal, 1 Kings xviii; and there is a certain part of the mountain facing the west, and about eight miles from the point of the promontory, which the Arabs call Mansur, and the Europeans the place of sacrifice, in commemoration of that miraculous event. Near the same place is also still shown a cave, in which it is said the Prophet had his residence. The brook Kishon, which issues from Mount Tabor, waters the bottom of Carmel, and falls into the sea toward the northern side of the mountain, and not the southern, as some writers have erroneously stated. Its greatest elevation is about one thousand five hundred feet; hence, when the sea coast on one side, and the plain on the other, are oppressed with sultry heat, this hill is refreshed by cooling breezes, and enjoys a delightful temperature. The fastnesses of this rugged mountain are so difficult of access, that the Prophet Amos classes them with the deeps of hell, the height of heaven, and the bottom of the sea: "Though they dig into hell," (or the dark and silent chambers of the grave,) "thence shall mine hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down; and though they hide themselves in the top of

Carmel, I will search and take them out thence; and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the serpent, and he shall bite them,” Amos ix, 2, 3. Lebanon raises to heaven a summit of naked and barren rocks, covered for the greater part of the year with snow; but the top of Carmel, how naked and sterile soever its present condition, was clothed with verdure which seldom was known to fade. Even the lofty genius of Isaiah, stimulated and guided by the Spirit of inspiration, could not find a more appropriate figure to express the flourishing state of the Redeemer’s kingdom, than “the excellency of Carmel and Sharon.”

CART, a machine used in Palestine to force the corn out of the ear, and bruise the straw, Isaiah xxviii, 27, 28. The wheels of these carts were low, broad, and shod with iron, and were drawn over the sheaves spread on the floor by means, of oxen.

CASTOR and POLLUX. It is said that the vessel which carried Paul to Rome had the sign of Castor and Pollux, Acts xxviii, 11. Castor and Pollux were sea-gods, and invoked by sailors; and even the light balls or meteors which are sometimes seen on ships, were called Castor and Pollux. An inscription in Gruter proves that seamen implored Castor and Pollux in dangers at sea. It is to be observed, that St. Luke does not mention the name, but the sign, of the ship. By the word sign, the sacred writer meant a protecting image of the deity, to whom the vessel was in some sort consecrated; as at present in Catholic countries, most of their vessels are named after some saint, St. Xavier, St. Andero, St. Dominique, &c. It appears to be certain, that the figure which gave name to the ship was at the head, and the tutelary deity was placed on the poop.

CASUIST, one who studies and decides upon cases of conscience. Escobar has made a collection of the opinions of all the casuists before his time. M. Le Feore, preceptor to Louis XIII, said that the books of the casuists taught “the art of quibbling with God;” which does not seem far from truth, by reason of the multitude of distinctions and subtleties with which they abound. Mayer has published a bibliotheca of casuists, containing an account of all the writers on cases of conscience, ranged under three heads; the first comprehending the Lutheran; the second, the Calvinistic; and the third, the Roman casuists.

CASUISTRY, the doctrine and science of conscience and its cases, with the rules and principles of resolving the same; drawn partly from natural reason, or equity, and partly from the authority of Scripture, the canon law, councils, fathers, &c. To casuistry belongs the decision of all difficulties arising about what a man may lawfully do or not do; what is sin or not sin;

what things a man is obliged to do in order to discharge his duty, and what he may let alone without breach of it. Although the morality of the Gospel is distinguished by its purity and by its elevation, it is necessarily exhibited in a general form; certain leading principles are laid down; but the application of these to the innumerable cases which occur in the actual intercourse of life, is left to the understanding and the conscience of individuals. Had it been otherwise, the Christian code would have swelled to an extent which would have rendered it in a great degree useless; it would have been difficult or impossible to recollect all its provisions; and, minute as these would have been, they would still have been defective,--new situations or combinations of circumstances modifying duty continually arising, which it would have been impracticable or hurtful to anticipate. When the principles of duty are rightly unfolded, and when they are placed on a sound foundation, there is, to a fair mind, no difficulty in accommodating them to its own particular exigencies. A few cases, it is true, may occur, where it is a matter of doubt in what way men should act; but these are exceedingly rare, and the lives of vast numbers may come to an end without any of them happening to occasion perplexity. Every man may be, and perhaps is, sensible, that his errors are to be ascribed, not to his having been at a loss to know what he should have done, but to his deliberately or hastily violating what he saw to be right, or to his having allowed himself to confound, by vain and subtle distinctions, what, in the case of any one else, would have left in his mind no room for hesitation. The manner, however, in which the Gospel inculcates the law of God, combined with other causes in leading to a species of moral discussion, which, pretending to ascertain in every case what ought to be practised, and thus to afford plain and safe directions to the conscience, terminated in what has been denominated casuistry.

The schoolmen delighted in this species of intellectual labour. They transferred their zeal for the most fanciful and frivolous distinctions in what respected the doctrines of religion to its precepts; they anatomized the different virtues; nicely examined all the circumstances by which our estimate of them should be influenced; and they thus rendered the study of morality inextricable, confounded the natural notions of right and wrong, and so accustomed themselves and others to weigh their actions, that they could easily find some excuse for what was most culpable, while they continued under the impression that they were not deviating from what, as moral beings, was incumbent upon them. The corruption of manners which was introduced into the church during the dark ages rendered casuistry very popular; and, accordingly, many who affected to be the most enlightened writers of their age, and perhaps really were so, tortured their understanding or their fancy in solving cases of conscience, and often in polluting their own imaginations and those of others, by employing them



on possible crimes, upon which, however unlikely was their occurrence in life, they were eager to pronounce a decision. The happy change which the Reformation produced upon the views of men respecting the sacred Scriptures, tended to erect that pure standard of duty which for ages had been laid in the dust. Yet for a considerable time Protestant divines occupied themselves with the intricacies of casuistry, thus in some degree shutting out the light which they had fortunately poured upon the world. The Lutheran theologians walked very much in the tract which the schoolmen had opened, although their decisions were much more consonant with Christianity; and it was not uncommon in some countries for ecclesiastical assemblies to devote part of their time to the resolution of questions which might have been safely left unnoticed, which now are almost universally regarded as frivolous, and about which almost the most ignorant would be ashamed to ask an opinion. Even after much of the sophistry, and much of the moral perversion connected with casuistry, were exploded, the form of that science was preserved, and many valuable moral principles in conformity to it delivered. The venerable Bishop Hall published a celebrated work, to which he gave the appellation of "Cases of Conscience Practically resolved;" and he introduces it with the following observations addressed to the reader: "Of all divinity, that part is most useful which determines cases of conscience; and of all cases of conscience, the practical are most necessary, as action is of more concernment than speculation; and of all practical cases, those which are of most common use are of so much greater necessity and benefit to be resolved, as the errors thereof are more universal, and therefore more prejudicial to the society of mankind. These I have selected out of many; and having turned over divers casuists, have pitched upon those decisions which I hold most conformable to enlightened reason and religion; sometimes I follow them, and sometimes I leave them for a better guide." He divides his work into four parts,--Cases of profit and traffic, Cases of life and liberty, Cases of piety and religion, and Cases matrimonial; under each of these solving a number of questions, or rather giving a number of moral dissertations.

Casuistry, as a systematic perversion of Christian morality, is now, in the Protestant world, very much unknown; though there still is, and perhaps always will be, that softening down of the strict rules of duty, to which mankind are led either by self-deceit, or by the natural desire of reconciling, with the hope of the divine favour, considerable obliquity from that path of rectitude and virtue which alone is acceptable to God. But the most striking specimen of the length to which casuistry was carried, and of the dangerous consequences which resulted from it, is furnished by the history of the maxims and sentiments of the Jesuits, that celebrated order, which combined with profound literature, and the most zealous support of

Popery, an ambition that perverted their understandings, or rather induced them to employ their rational powers in the melancholy work of poisoning the sources of morality, and of casting the name and the appearance of virtue over a dissoluteness of principle and a profligacy of licentiousness, which, had they not been checked by sounder views, and by 223 feelings and habits favourable to morality, would have spread through the world the most degrading misery. See Jesuits.

CATERPILLAR. חסיל. The word occurs Deut. xxviii, 38; Psa. lxviii, 46; Isa. xxxiii, 4; 1 Kings viii, 37; 2 Chron. vi, 28; Joel i, 4; ii, 25. In the four last cited texts, it is distinguished from the locust, properly so called; and in Joel i, 4, is mentioned as “eating up” what the other species had left, and therefore might be called the consumer, by way of eminence. But the ancient interpreters are far from being agreed what particular species it signifies. The Septuagint in Chronicles, and Aquila in Psalms, render it βροῦχος: so the Vulgate in Chronicles and Isaiah, and Jerom in Psalms, bruchus, the chafer, which is a great devourer of leaves. From the Syriac version, however, Michaëlis is disposed to understand it the taupe grillon, “mole cricket,” which, in its grub state, is very destructive to corn and other vegetables, by feeding on their roots. See Locust.

CATHOLIC denotes what is general or universal. The rise of heresies induced the primitive Christian church to assume to itself the appellation of catholic, as being a characteristic to distinguish itself from them. The Romish church now proudly assumes the title catholic, in opposition to all who have separated from her communion, and whom she considers as heretics and schismatics, while she herself remains the only true and Christian church. The church of Christ is called catholic, because it extends throughout the world, and endures through all time.

2. Catholic, general, Epistles. They are seven in number; namely, one of James, two of Peter, three of John, and one of Jude. They are called catholic, because directed to Christian converts generally, and not to any particular church. Hug, in his “Introduction to the New Testament,” takes another view of the import of this term, which was certainly used at an early period, as by Origen and others:--“When the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles constituted one peculiar division, the works of Paul also another, there still remained writings of different authors, which might likewise form a collection of themselves, to which a name must be given. It might most aptly be called the common collection, καθολικὸν σύνταγμα, of the Apostles, and the treatises contained in it, κοινὰ and καθολικαὶ, which are commonly used by the Greeks as synonyms. For this we find a proof even in the most ancient ecclesiastical language. Clemens Alexandrinus calls the epistle which was despatched by the assembly of the Apostles, Acts xv, 23,

the ‘catholic epistle,’ as that in which all the Apostles had a share, τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καθολικὴν τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἅπαντων. Hence our seven epistles are catholic, or epistles of all the Apostles who are authors.”

CAVES, or CAVERNS. The country of Judea, being mountainous and rocky, is in many parts full of caverns, to which allusions frequently occur in the Old Testament. At Engedi, in particular, there was a cave so large, that David, with six hundred men, hid themselves in the sides of it, and Saul entered the mouth of the cave without perceiving that any one was there, 1 Sam. xxiv. Josephus tells us of a numerous gang of banditti, who, having infested the country, and being pursued by Herod with his army, retired into certain caverns, almost inaccessible, near Arbela in Galilee, where they were with great difficulty subdued. “Beyond Damascus,” says Strabo, “are two mountains, called Trachones, from which the country has the name of Trachonitis; and from hence, toward Arabia and Iturea, are certain rugged mountains, in which there are deep caverns; one of which will hold four thousand men.” Tavernier, in his “Travels in Persia,” speaks of a grotto between Aleppo and Bir, that would hold near three thousand horse. And Maundrel assures us, that “three hours distant from Sidon, about a mile from the sea, there runs along a high rocky mountain, in the sides of which are hewn a multitude of grottoes, all very little differing from each other. They have entrances about two foot square. There are of these subterraneous caverns two hundred in number. It may, with probability, at least, be concluded that these places were contrived for the use of the living, and not of the dead.” These extracts may be useful in explaining such passages of Scripture as the following: “Because of the Midianites, the children of Israel made them dens which are in the mountains, and caves, and strong holds,” Judges vi, 2. To these they betook themselves for refuge in times of distress and hostile invasion:--“When the men of Israel saw that they were in a strait, for the people were distressed, then the people did hide themselves in caves, and in thickets, and in rocks, and in high places, and in pits,” 1 Sam. xiii, 6. See also Jer. xli, 9: “To enter into the holes of the rocks and into the caves of the earth,” became with the prophets a very proper and familiar image to express a state of terror and consternation. Thus Isa. ii, 19: “They shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth.”

CEDAR, ִרָא. The cedar is a large and noble evergreen tree. Its lofty height, and its far extended branches, afford spacious shelter and shade, Ezek. xxxi, 3, 6, 8. The wood is very valuable; is of a reddish colour, of an aromatic smell, and reputed incorruptible. This is owing to its bitter taste, which the worms cannot endure, and to its resin, which preserves it from the injuries of the weather. The ark of the covenant, and much of the temple

of Solomon, and that of Diana at Ephesus, were built of cedar. The tree is much celebrated in Scripture. It is called, "the glory of Lebanon," Isa. lx, 13. On that mountain it must in former times have flourished in great abundance. There are some cedars still growing there which are prodigiously large. But the travellers who have visited the place within these two or three centuries, and who describe trees of vast size, inform us that their number is 224diminished greatly; so that, as Isaiah says, "a child may number them," Isa. x, 19. Maundrell measured one of the largest size, and found it to be twelve yards and six inches in girth, and yet sound; and thirty-seven yards in the spread of its boughs. Gabriel Sionita, a very learned Syrian Maronite, who assisted in editing the Paris Polyglott, a man worthy of all credit, thus describes the cedars of mount Lebanon, which he had examined on the spot: "The cedar grows on the most elevated part of the mountain, is taller than the pine, and so thick, that five men together could scarcely encompass one. It shoots out its branches at ten or twelve feet from the ground: they are large and distant from each other, and are perpetually green. The wood is of a brown colour, very solid and incorruptible, if preserved from wet. The tree bears a small cone like that of the pine."

CELSUS. A Pagan philosopher of the second century, who composed a work against Christianity, in which he so expressly refers to the facts of the Gospels, and to the books of the New Testament, as to have furnished important undesigned testimony to their antiquity and truth.

CEMETERY. See Sepulchre.

CENSER, a sacred instrument made use of in the religious rites of the Hebrews. It was a vase which contained incense to be used in sacrifice. When Aaron made an atonement for himself and his house, he was to take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar of the Lord, Lev. xvi, 12. And Solomon, when he provided furniture for the temple of the Lord, made, among other things, censers of pure gold, 1 Kings vii, 50.

CENTURION, an officer in the Roman army, who, as the term indicates, had the command of a hundred men, Matt. viii, 5, &c.

CEPHAS, Κηφᾶς, from כֶּפֶז, a rock. The Greek Πέτρος, and the Latin Petrus, have the same signification. See Peter.

CEREMONY, an assemblage of several actions, forms, and circumstances, serving to render a thing magnificent and solemn. Applied to religious services, it signifies the external rites and manner in which the ministers of religion perform their sacred functions, and direct or lead the worship of the people. In 1646, M. Ponce, published a history of ancient ceremonies,

showing the rise, growth, and introduction of each rite into the church, and its gradual advancement to superstition. Many of them were borrowed from Judaism, but more from Paganism. In all religions adapted to the nature of man there must be some positive institutions for fixing the mind upon spiritual objects, and counteracting that influence of material things upon habits and pursuits which is, and must be, constantly exerted. Without such institutions, religion might be preserved, indeed, by a few of superior understanding and of strong powers of reflection; but among mankind in general all trace of it would soon be lost. When the end for which they are appointed is kept in view, and the simple examples of the New Testament are observed, they are of vast importance to the production both of pious feelings and of virtuous conduct; but there has constantly been a propensity in the human race to mistake the means for the end, and to consider themselves as moral and religious, when they scrupulously observe what was intended to produce morality and religion. The reason is obvious: ceremonial observances can be performed without any great sacrifice of propensities and vices; they are palpable; when they are observed by men who, in the tenor of public life, do not act immorally, they are regarded by others as indicating high attainments in virtue; and through that self-deceit which so wonderfully misleads the reason, and inclines it to minister to the passions which it should restrain, men have themselves become persuaded that their acknowledgment of divine authority, implied in their respect to the ritual which that authority is conceived to have sanctioned, may be taken as a proof that they have nothing to apprehend from the violation of the law under which they are placed. But, whatever be the causes of this, the fact itself is established by the most extensive and the most incontrovertible evidence. We find it, indeed, wherever mankind have had notions of superior power, and of their obligation to yield obedience to the will of the supreme Being.

Under the system of polytheism which prevailed in the most enlightened nations previous to the publication of Christianity, this was carried so far, that the connection between religion and morality was in a great degree dissolved, rites and ceremonies, sacrifices and oblations, were all that it was thought requisite to observe; when these were carefully performed, there was no hesitation in ascribing piety to the persons who did perform them, however deficient they might be in virtuous and pious dispositions. Even under the Mosaical dispensation, proceeding as it did, immediately from heaven, and adapted, as in infinite wisdom it was, to the situation of those to whom it was given, the same evil early began to be experienced; and although it was lamented and exposed by the prophets, and the most enlightened men among the Jews, it was so far from being eradicated, that it continued to acquire strength, till it was exhibited in all its magnitude in the character prevalent among the Pharisees at the period of Christ's

manifestation. With this highly popular and revered class of men, religion was either merely a matter of ceremony, or was employed, for base and interested purposes, to cast a veil of sanctity over their actions. They said long prayers, but it was for a show; they gave alms, but it was after they had sounded a trumpet, that the eye of man might be fixed upon their beneficence; and, as to the point now under review, they were most strikingly described by our Saviour, when he said of them, "They pay tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, but they neglect the weightier matters of the law, justice, and mercy, and truth." The Christian religion not only expressly guards against an evil which had become so prevalent, but its whole spirit is at variance with it, its own ceremonial observances being few, and obviously emblematical of whatever is excellent and holy. But still the Gospel finds human nature as other religions found it; and ecclesiastical history, even from the earliest periods, shows with what astonishing perverseness, and with what wonderful ingenuity, men departed from the simplicity of Christianity, and substituted in its room the most childish, and often the most pernicious, practices and observances. The power of godliness was lost in forms; and the innovations of a profane will-worship became almost innumerable. The effect was, that men regarded God as less concerned with the moral conduct of his creatures, than with the quantum of service they performed in his temples; and religion and morals were so disjoined, that one became the substitute for the other, to the universal corruption of the Christian world.

CERINTHIANS. Of Cerinthus, the founder of this sect, Dr. Burton gives the following account: Cerinthus is said to have been one of those Jews who, when St. Peter returned to Jerusalem, expostulated with him for having baptized Cornelius, Acts xi, 2. He is also stated to have been one of those who went down from Judea to Antioch, and said, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved," Acts xv, 1. According to the same account, he was one of the false teachers who seduced the Galatians to Judaism; and he is also charged with joining in the attack which was made upon St. Paul, for polluting the temple by the introduction of Greeks, Acts xxi, 27, 28. I cannot find any older authority for these statements than that of Epiphanius, who wrote late in the fourth century, and is by no means worthy of implicit credit. He asserts, also, that Cerinthus was one of the persons alluded to by St. Luke, as having already undertaken to write the life of Jesus. But all these stories I take to be entirely inventions; and there is no evidence that Cerinthus made himself conspicuous at so early a period. Irenæus speaks of the heresy of the Nicolaitans, as being considerably prior to that of the Cerinthians. According to the same writer, Carpocrates also preceded Cerinthus; and if it be true, as so many of the fathers assert, that St. John wrote his Gospel expressly to confute this heresy, we can hardly come to any other

conclusion, than that it was late in the first century when Cerinthus rose into notice. He appears undoubtedly to have been a Jew; and there is evidence that, after having studied philosophy in Egypt, he spread his doctrines in Asia Minor. This will account for his embracing the Gnostic opinions, and for his exciting the notice of St. John, who resided at Ephesus. He was certainly a Gnostic in his notion of the creation of the world, which he conceived to have been formed by angels; and his attachment to that philosophy may explain what otherwise seems inconsistent, that he retained some of the Mosaic ceremonies, such as the observance of Sabbaths and circumcision; though, like other Gnostics, he ascribed the law and the prophets to the angel who created the world. This adoption or rejection of different parts of the same system was a peculiar feature of the Gnostic philosophy; and the name of Cerinthus probably became eminent, because he introduced a fresh change in the notion concerning Christ. The Gnostics, like their leader, Simon Magus, had all of them been Docetæ, and denied the real humanity; but Cerinthus is said to have maintained that Jesus had a real body, and was the son of human parents, Joseph and Mary. In the other points he agreed with the Gnostics, and believed that Christ was one of the æons who descended on Jesus at his baptism. It is difficult to ascertain who was the first Gnostic that introduced this opinion. Some writers give the merit of it to Ebion; and yet it is generally said that Cerinthus and Ebion agreed in their opinions concerning Christ, and that Cerinthus preceded Ebion. Again Carpocrates is said to have held the same sentiments; and he is placed by Irenæus before Cerinthus: so that it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide the chronological precedence of these heretics. Perhaps the safest inference to draw from so many conflicting testimonies is this: that Carpocrates was the first Gnostic of eminence who was not a Docetist; but that the notion of Jesus being born of human parents was taught more explicitly and with more success by Cerinthus. Carpocrates is reported to have been distinguished by the gross immorality of his life; and whatever we may think of the imputations cast upon the Gnostics in general, it seems impossible to deny that this person, at least, professed and practised a perfect liberty of action. There is also strong evidence that in this instance Cerinthus followed his example.

There is a peculiar doctrine ascribed to this heretic, which, if it originated with him, may well account for the celebrity of his name. Cerinthus has been handed down as the first person who held the notion of a millennium; and though the fathers undoubtedly believed that, previous to the general resurrection, the earth would undergo a renovation, and the just would rise to enjoy a long period of terrestrial happiness, yet there was a marked and palpable difference between the millennium of the fathers and that of Cerinthus. The fathers conceived this terrestrial happiness to be perfectly

pure and freed from the imperfections of our nature; but Cerinthus is said to have promised his followers a millennium of the grossest pleasures and the most sensual gratifications. It is singular that all the three sources, to which we may trace the Gnostic doctrines, might furnish some foundation for this notion of a millennium. Thus Plato has left some speculations concerning the "great year," when, after the expiration of thirty-six thousand years, the world was to be renewed, and the golden age to return. It was the belief of the Persian magi, according to Plutarch, that the time would come, when Ahreman, or the evil principle, would be destroyed; when the earth would lose its impediments and inequalities, and all mankind would be of one language, and enjoy uninterrupted happiness. It was taught, in the Cabbala, that the world was to last six thousand years, which would be followed by a period of rest for a thousand years more. There appears in this an evident allusion, though on a much grander scale, to the sabbatical years of rest. The institution of the jubilee, and the glowing descriptions given by the prophets of the restoration of the Jews, and the reign of the Messiah, may have led the later Jews to some of their mystical fancies; and when all these systems were blended together by the Gnostics, it is not strange, if a millennium formed part of their creed long before the time of Cerinthus. It seems probable, however, that he went much farther than his predecessors in teaching that the millennium would consist in a course of sensual indulgence; and it may have been his notions upon this subject, added to those concerning the human nature of Christ, which led him to maintain, contrary to the generality of Gnostics, that Christ had not yet risen, but that he would rise hereafter. The Gnostics, as we have seen, denied the resurrection altogether. Believing Jesus to be a phantom, they did not believe that he was crucified; and they could not therefore believe that he had risen. But Cerinthus, who held that Jesus was born, like other human beings, found no difficulty in believing literally that he was crucified; and he is said also to have taught that he would rise from the dead at some future period. It is most probable that this period was that of the millennium; and the words of St. John in the Revelation would easily be perverted, where it is said of the souls of the martyrs, that "they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years," Rev. xx, 4.

CHALCEDONY, χαλκηδών, Rev. xxi, 19; a precious stone. Arethas, who has written an account of Bithynia, says that it was so called from Chalcedon, a city of that country, opposite to Byzantium; and it was in colour like a carbuncle. Some have supposed this also to be the stone called יָפֶה, translated "emerald," Exodus xxviii, 18.

CHALDEA, or Babylonia, the country lying on both sides of the Euphrates, of which Babylon was the capital; and extending southward to the Persian Gulf, and northward into Mesopotamia, at least as far as Ur,



which is called Ur of the Chaldees. This country had also the name of Shinar. See Babylon.

CHALDEAN PHILOSOPHY claims attention on account of its very high antiquity. The most ancient people, next to the Hebrews, among the eastern nations, who appear to have been acquainted with philosophy, in its more general sense, were the Chaldeans; for though the Egyptians have pretended that the Chaldeans were an Egyptian colony, and that they derived their learning from Egypt, there is reason to believe that the kingdom of Babylon, of which Chaldea was a part, flourished before the Egyptian monarchy; and that the Egyptians were rather indebted to the Chaldeans, than the Chaldeans to the Egyptians. Nevertheless, the accounts that have been transmitted to us by the Chaldeans themselves, of the antiquity of their learning, are blended with fable, and involved in considerable uncertainty. There are other circumstances, independently of the antiquity of the Chaldean philosophy, which render our knowledge of it imperfect and uncertain. We derive our acquaintance with it from other nations, and principally from the Greeks, whose vanity led them to despise and misrepresent the pretended learning of barbarous nations. The Chaldeans also adopted a symbolical mode of instruction, and transmitted their doctrines to posterity under a veil of obscurity, which it is not easy to remove. To all which, we may add that, about the commencement of the Christian æra, a race of philosophers sprung up, who, with a view of gaining credit to their own wild and extravagant doctrines, passed them upon the world as the ancient wisdom of the Chaldeans and Persians, in spurious books, which they ascribed to Zoroaster, or some other eastern philosopher. Thus, the fictions of these impostors were confounded with the genuine dogmas of the ancient eastern nations. Notwithstanding these causes of uncertainty, which perplex the researches of modern inquirers into the distinguishing doctrines and character of the Chaldean philosophy, it appears probable that the philosophers of Chaldea were the priests of the Babylonian nation, who instructed the people in the principles of religion, interpreted its laws, and conducted its ceremonies. Their character was similar to that of the Persian magi, and they are often confounded with them by the Greek historians. Like the priests in most other nations, they employed religion in subserviency to the ruling powers, and made use of imposture to serve the purposes of civil policy. Accordingly, Diodorus Siculus relates, that they pretended to predict future events by divination, to explain prodigies, and interpret dreams, and to avert evils, or confer benefits, by means of augury and incantations. For many ages, they retained a principal place among diviners. In the reign of Marcus Antonius, when the emperor and his army, who were perishing with thirst, were suddenly relieved by a shower, the prodigy was ascribed to the power and skill of the Chaldean soothsayers. Thus accredited for their miraculous

powers, they maintained their consequence in the courts of princes. The principal instrument which they employed in support of their superstition, was astrology. The Chaldeans were probably the first people who made regular observations upon the heavenly bodies, and hence the appellation of Chaldean became afterward synonymous with that of astronomer. Nevertheless all their observations were applied to the sole purpose of establishing the credit of judicial astrology; and they employed their pretended skill in this art, in calculating nativities, foretelling the weather, predicting good and bad fortune, and other practices usual with impostors of this class. While they taught the vulgar that all human affairs are influenced by the stars, and professed to be acquainted with the nature and laws of their influence, and consequently to possess a power of prying into futurity, they encouraged much idle superstition, and many fraudulent practices. Hence other professors of these mischievous arts were afterward called Chaldeans, and the arts themselves were called Babylonian arts. Among the Romans these impostors were so troublesome, that, during the time of the republic, it became necessary to issue an edict requiring the Chaldeans, or mathematicians, (by which latter appellation they were commonly known,) to depart from Rome and Italy within ten days; and, afterward, under the emperors, these soothsayers were put under the most severe interdiction.

The Chaldean philosophy, notwithstanding the obscurity that has rendered it difficult of research, has been highly extolled, not only by the orientals and Greeks, but by Jewish and Christian writers: but upon recurring to authorities that are unquestionable, there seems to be little or nothing in this branch of the barbaric philosophy which deserves notice. The following brief detail will include the most interesting particulars. From the testimony of Diodorus, and also from other ancient authorities, collected by Eusebius, it appears, that the Chaldeans believed in God, the Lord and Parent of all, by whose providence the world is governed. From this principle sprung their religious rites, the immediate object of which was a supposed race of spiritual beings or demons, whose existence could not have been imagined, without first conceiving the idea of a supreme Being, the source of all intelligence. The belief of a supreme Deity, the fountain of all the divinities which were supposed to preside over the several parts of the material world, was the true origin of all religious worship, however idolatrous, not excepting even that which consisted in paying divine honours to the memory of dead men. Beside the supreme Being, the Chaldeans supposed spiritual beings to exist, of several orders; gods, demons, heroes: these they probably distributed into subordinate classes, agreeably to their practice of theurgy or magic. The Chaldeans, in common with the eastern nations in general, admitted the existence of certain evil spirits, clothed in a vehicle of grosser matter; and in subduing

or counteracting these, they placed a great part of the efficacy of their religious incantations. These doctrines were the mysteries of the Chaldean religion, imparted only to the initiated. Their popular religion consisted in the worship of the sun, moon, planets, and stars, as divinities, after the general practice of the east, Job xxxi, 27. From the religious system of the Chaldeans were derived two arts, for which they were long celebrated; namely, magic and astrology. Their magic, which should not be confounded with witchcraft, or a supposed intercourse with evil spirits, consisted in the performance of certain religious ceremonies or incantations, which were supposed, by the interposition of good demons, to produce supernatural effects. Their astrology was founded upon the chimerical principle, that the stars have an influence, either beneficial or malignant, upon the affairs of men, which may be discovered, and made the certain ground of prediction, in particular cases; and the whole art consisted in applying astronomical observations to this fanciful purpose, and thus imposing upon the credulity of the vulgar.

CHAMBER. See Upper Room.

CHAPTERS. The New Testament was early portioned out into certain divisions, which appear under various names. The custom of reading it publicly in the Christian assemblies after the law and the prophets, would soon cause such divisions to be applied to it. The law and the prophets were for this end already divided into parashim and haptaroth, and the New Testament could not long remain without being treated in the same way. The distribution into church lessons was indeed the oldest that took place in it. The Christian teachers gave the name of pericopes, to the sections read as lessons by the Jews. Justin Martyr avails himself of this expression, when he quotes prophetic passages. Such is the case also in Clemens of Alexandria; but this writer also gives the name of περικόπαι to larger sections of the Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles. Pericopes therefore were nothing else but ἀναγνώσματα, church lessons, or sections of the New Testament, which were read in the assemblies after Moses and the Prophets. In the third century another division also into κεφαλαία occurs. Dionysius of Alexandria speaks of them in reference to the Apocalypse, and the controversies respecting it. Some, says he, went through the whole book, from chapter to chapter, to show that it bore no sense. In the fifth century Euthalius produced again a division into chapters, which was accounted his invention. He himself however lays claim to nothing more than having composed τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐκθεσίμ, the summaries of the contents of the chapters in the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles. In the Epistles of St. Paul, not even these are his property; but they are derived "from one of the wisest of the fathers, and worshippers of Christ," as he himself says, and he only incorporated them into his

stichometrical edition of the New Testament. The chapters must, therefore, have been in existence before Euthalius, if the father whom he mentions composed notices of their contents. But how old they are cannot easily be known. The Euthalian κεφαλαία are distinguished from the pericopes, or reading portions, by their extent. The Jews had divided the law into fifty-three parashim, according to the number of the Sabbaths, taking into account the leap year. Nearly so distributed were the Acts of the Apostles, St. Paul's and the Catholic Epistles, according to the Alexandrine ritual, which Euthalius follows in his stichometrical edition, namely, into fifty-six pericopes; three more than the number of κουριάκαι ἡμέραι, Sundays, probably for three festivals, which might be observed at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide. The Gospels too had naturally in the same way many pericopes. Such in older times was the practice in Asia also; for Justin says, that the believers there assemble themselves for prayer and reading 228 on Sunday only, ἐν τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμερᾶ. Since then the whole New Testament was distributed into so few sections, these must necessarily have been great, and a pericope in Euthalius sometimes includes in it four, five, and even six chapters. We have spoken hitherto only of the chapters of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. In the Gospels there occur to us κεφαλαία of two sorts, the greater and the lesser. The lesser are the Ammonian which Eusebius rejected, after which he composed his ten canons in order to point out in the Monotessaron of Ammonius the respective contents of every Evangelist. He has explained himself in the Epistle to Carpianus on their use, and on the formation of his ten canons, where he names his sections sometimes κεφαλαία, sometimes περικόπαι. Matthew has three hundred and fifty-five of these, Mark two hundred and thirty-six, Luke three hundred and forty-two, and John two hundred and thirty-two. The other chapters are independent of these, which from their extent are also named the greater. Of these, Matthew contains sixty-eight, Mark forty-nine, Luke eighty-three, and John only eighteen. There are but very few manuscripts which have not both of them together. As to the church lessons, to come back to them once more, various alterations took place in them. As the festival days multiplied, the old division could no longer subsist, and in many churches the pericopes were shortened. At last as the ritual of ceremonies was enlarged, only certain portions were extracted from the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles, which sometimes were very short. A codex of this sort was termed ἐκλογάδιον; in reference to the Gospels alone, εὐαγγελισάριον; and in respect to the other books, πρᾶξαπόστολος. This seems to have taken place among the Latins much earlier than among the Greeks. There are perfectly credible testimonies, which establish such an arrangement among the former at the middle of the fifth century, at which date nothing of the kind is perceptible among the latter. The expression, πρᾶξαπόστολος, appears indeed frequently in the Typicum of St. Sabas, who died in the beginning of the fifth century. But

the Greeks do not disavow, that this Typicum or monastic ritual was not by himself, that it perished in the invasions of the barbarians, and was composed anew by John of Damascus, with references memoriter, [from memory,] to that of Sabas. He lived toward the middle of the eighth century, and with an earlier notice of lectionaries among the Greeks we are not acquainted. Finally, our present chapters come, as it is well known, from Cardinal Hugo de St. Cher, who in the twelfth century composed a concordance, and to this end distributed the Bible according to his own discretion into smaller portions. They are now moreover generally admitted in the editions of the Hebrew and Greek texts. The verses, however, are from Robert Stephens, who first introduced them in his edition of the New Testament, A. D. 1551. His son, Henry Stephens, was the first to record this for the information of posterity, in the preface to his Greek Concordance to the New Testament; in which he says, that two facts connected with it equally demand our admiration: "The first is, that my father, while travelling from Paris to Lyons, finished this division of each chapter into verses, and indeed the greater part of it [inter equitandum] when riding on his horse. The second fact is, that, a short time prior to this journey, while he had the matter still in contemplation, almost all those to whom he mentioned it told him plainly that he was an indiscreet man, as though he had a wish to spend his time and labour on an affair which would prove utterly useless, and which would not obtain for him any commendation, but, on the contrary, would expose him to much ridicule. But behold the result: in opposition to the opinion which condemned and discountenanced my father's undertaking, as soon as his invention was published, every edition of the New Testament, whether in the Greek, Latin, French, German, or in any other language, which did not adopt it, was immediately discarded." It perhaps will not be unedifying to add, that this passage has yielded mankind another proof that LEARNING is not always synonymous with WISDOM: for the phrase respecting riding, which occurs in it, has furnished matter of warm dispute to literary men; some of them contending that inter equitandum means, that Robert Stephens performed the greater part of his task while actually on horseback; but others, giving a more extended construction to the expression, assert that he was engaged in this occupation only when stopping for refreshment at inns on the road. Though the first interpretation would probably obtain the greatest number of suffrages from really learned and impartial men; yet it is quite sufficient for mankind to know, in either way, that this division into verses was completed in the course of that journey.

**CHARIOTS OF WAR.** The Scripture speaks of two sorts of these chariots, one for princes and generals to ride in, the other used to break the enemies battalions, by letting them loose armed with iron, which made dreadful

havoc among the troops. The most ancient chariots of which we have any notice are Pharaoh's, which were overwhelmed in the Red Sea, Exodus xiv, 7. The Canaanites, whom Joshua engaged at the waters of Merom, had cavalry and a multitude of chariots, Joshua xi, 4. Sisera, the general of Jabin, king of Hazor, had nine hundred chariots of iron in his army, Judges iv, 3. The tribe of Judah could not get possession of all the lands of their lot, because the ancient inhabitants of the country were strong in chariots of iron. The Philistines, in the war carried on by them against Saul, had thirty thousand chariots and six thousand horsemen, 1 Sam. xiii, 5. David, having taken one thousand chariots of war from Hadadezer, king of Syria, hamstrung the horses, and burned nine hundred chariots, reserving only one hundred to himself, 2 Sam. viii, 4. Solomon had a considerable number of chariots, but we know of no military expedition in which they were employed, 1 Kings 229x, 26. As Judea was a very mountainous country, chariots could be of no great use there, except in the plains; and the Hebrews often evaded them by fighting on the mountains. The kings of the Hebrews, when they went to war, were themselves generally mounted in chariots from which they fought, and issued their orders; and there was always a second chariot empty, which followed each of them, that if the first was broken he might ascend the other, 2 Chron. xxxv, 24. Chariots were sometimes consecrated to the sun; and the Scripture observes, that Josiah burned those which had been dedicated to the sun by his predecessors, 2 Kings xxiii, 11. This superstitious custom was borrowed from the Heathens, and principally from the Persians.

CHARITY, considered as a Christian grace, ought in our translation, in order to avoid mistake, to have been translated love. It is the love of God, and the love of our neighbour flowing from the love of God; and is described with wonderful copiousness, felicity, and even grandeur, by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii; a portion of Scripture which, as it shows the habitual temper of a true Christian, cannot be too frequently referred to for self-examination, and ought to be constantly present to us as our rule. 2. In the popular sense, charity is almsgiving; a duty of practical Christianity which is solemnly enjoined, and to which special promises are annexed.

CHARM. See Divination.

CHEBAR, a river of Chaldea, Ezek. i, 1. It is thought to have risen near the head of the Tigris, and to have run through Mesopotamia, to the southwest, and emptied itself into the Euphrates.

CHEDORLAOMER, a king of the Elamites, who were either Persians, or people bordering upon the Persians. This was one of the four confederated kings, who made war upon the five kings of the pentapolis of Sodom; and

who, after having defeated them, and made themselves masters of a great booty, were pursued and dispersed by Abraham, Gen. xiv.

CHEMARIM. This word occurs only once in our version of the Bible: "I will cut off the remnant of Baal, and the name of the Chemarims (Chemarim) with the priests," Zeph. i, 4; but it frequently occurs in the Hebrew, and is generally translated "priests of the idols," or "priests clothed in black," because *chamar* signifies blackness. By this word the best commentators understand the priests of false gods, and in particular the worshippers of fire, because they were, it is said, dressed in black. Le Clerc, however, declares against this last opinion. Our translators of the Bible would seem sometimes to understand by this word the idols or objects of worship, rather than their priests. This is also the opinion of Le Clerc. Calmet observes that *camar* in Arabic signifies the moon, and that Isis is the same deity. "Among the priests of Isis," says Calmet, "were those called *melanephoroi*, that is, wearers of black; but it is uncertain whether this name was given them by reason of their dressing wholly in black, or because they wore a black shining veil in the processions of this goddess."

CHEMOSH, כְּמוֹשׁ, an idol of the Moabites, Numbers xxi, 29. The name is derived from a root which in Arabic signifies to hasten. For this reason, many believe Chemosh to be the sun, whose precipitate course might well procure it the name of swift. Some identify Chemosh with Ammon; and Macrobius shows that Ammon was the sun, whose rays were denoted by his horns. Calmet is of opinion that the god Hamanus and Apollo Chomeus, mentioned by Strabo and Ammianus Marcellinus, was Chamos, or the sun. These deities were worshipped in many parts of the east. Some, from the resemblance of the Hebrew Chamos with the Greek Comos, have thought Chamos to signify Bacchus. Jerom and most interpreters consider Chamosh and Peor as the same deity; but some think that Baal-Peor was Tammuz, or Adonis. To Chemosh Solomon erected an altar upon the Mount of Olives, 1 Kings xi, 7. As to the form of the idol Chemosh, the Scripture is silent; but if, according to Jerom, it were like Baal-Peor, it must have been of the beeve kind; as were, probably, all the Baals, though accompanied with various insignia. There can be little doubt that part of the religious services performed to Chemosh, as to Baal-Peor, consisted in revelling and drunkenness, obscenities and impurities of the grossest kinds. From Chemosh the Greeks seem to have derived their Κῶμος, called by the Romans Comus, the god of feasting and revelling.

CHERETHIM. כִּרְתִּים. Cherethim, or Cherethites, are denominations for the Philistines: "I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines, and will cut off the Cherethim, and destroy the remnant of the sea coast," Ezek. xxv, 16. Zephaniah, exclaiming against the Philistines, says, "Wo unto the

inhabitants of the sea coasts, the nation of the Cherethites,” Zeph. ii, 5. It is said, 1 Sam. xxx, 14, that the Amalekites invaded the south of the Cherethites; that is, of the Philistines. David, and some of the kings, his successors, had guards called Cherethites and Pelethites, 2 Sam. xv, 18; xx, 7. Calmet thinks that they were of the country of the Philistines; but several expositors of our own country are of a different opinion. “We can hardly suppose,” say the latter, “that David would employ any of these uncircumcised people as his body-guard, or that the Israelitish soldiers would have patiently seen foreigners of that nation advanced to such places of honour and trust.” It may, therefore, be inferred that guards were called Cherethites, because they went with David into Philistia, where they continued with him all the time he was under the protection of Achish. These were the persons who accompanied David from the first, and who remained with him in his greatest distresses; and it is no wonder, if men of such approved fidelity should be chosen for his body-guard. Beside, it is not uncommon for soldiers to derive their names, not from the place of their nativity, but of their residence.

230CHERUB. כרוב, plural כרובים. It appears, from Gen. iii, 29, that this is a name given to angels; but whether it is the name of a distinct class of celestials, or designates the same order as the seraphim, we have no means of determining. But the term cherubim generally signifies those figures which Moses was commanded to make and place at each end of the mercy seat, or propitiatory, and which covered the ark with expanded wings in the most holy place of the Jewish tabernacle and temple. See Exodus xxv, 18, 19. The original meaning of the term, and the shape or form of these, any farther than that they were *alata animata*, “winged creatures,” is not certainly known. The word in Hebrew is sometimes taken for a calf or ox; and Ezekiel, x, 14, sets down the face of a cherub as synonymous to the face of an ox. The word cherub, in Syriac and Chaldee, signifies to till or plough, which is the proper work of oxen. Cherub also signifies strong and powerful. Grotius says they were figures much like that of a calf; and Bochart, likewise, thinks that they were more like the figure of an ox than any thing beside; and Spencer is of the same mind. But Josephus says they were extraordinary creatures of a figure unknown to mankind. The opinion of most critics, taken, it seems, from Ezek. i, 9, 10, is, that they were figures composed of parts of various creatures; as a man, a lion, an ox, an eagle. But certainly we have no decided proof that the figures placed in the holy of holies, in the tabernacle, were of the same form with those described by Ezekiel. The contrary, indeed, seems rather indicated, because they looked down upon the mercy seat, which is an attribute not well adapted to a four-faced creature, like the emblematical cherubim seen by Ezekiel.



The cherubim of the sanctuary were two in number; one at each end of the mercy seat; which, with the ark, was placed exactly in the middle, between the north and south sides of the tabernacle. It was here that atonement was made, and that God was rendered propitious by the high priest sprinkling the blood upon and before the mercy seat, Lev. xvi, 14, 15. Here the glory of God appeared, and here he met his high priest, and by him his people, and from hence he gave forth his oracles; whence the whole holy place was called *דביר*, the oracle. These cherubim, it must be observed, had feet whereon they stood, 2 Chron. iii, 13; and their feet were joined, in one continued beaten work, to the ends of the mercy seat which covered the ark: so that they were wholly over or above it. Those in the tabernacle were of beaten gold, being but of small dimensions, Exod. xxv, 18; but those in the temple of Solomon were made of the wood of the olive tree overlaid with gold; for they were very large, extending their wings to the whole breadth of the oracle, which was twenty cubits, 1 Kings vi, 23–28; 2 Chron. iii, 10–13. They are called “cherubim of glory,” not merely or chiefly on account of the matter or formation of them, but because they had the glory of God, or the glorious symbol of his presence, “the Shekinah,” resting between them. As this glory abode in the inward tabernacle, and as the figures of the cherubim represented the angels who surround the manifestation of the divine presence in the world above, that tabernacle was rendered a fit image of the court of heaven, in which light it is considered every where in the Epistle to the Hebrews. See chapters iv, 14; viii, 1; ix, 8, 9, 23, 24; xii, 22, 23.

The cherubim, it is true, have been considered by the disciples of Mr. Hutchinson as designed emblems of Jehovah himself, or rather of the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, with man taken into the divine essence. But that God, who is a pure Spirit, without parts or passions, perfectly separate and remote from all matter, should command Moses to make material and visible images or emblematical representations of himself, is utterly improbable: especially, considering that he had repeatedly, expressly, and solemnly forbidden every thing of this kind in the second commandment of the moral law, delivered from Mount Sinai, amidst thunder and lightning, “blackness, darkness, and tempest,” pronouncing with an audible and awful voice, while “the whole mount quaked greatly, and the sound of the trumpet waxed louder and louder, Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth.” Hence the solemn caution of Moses, Deut. iv, 15, &c: “Take ye good heed unto yourselves, (for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire,) lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female, of any beast that is on the earth, of any winged fowl that

flieth in the air, of any thing that creepeth on the ground, of any fish that is in the waters." Hence God's demand by his prophet: "To what will ye liken me, or shall I be equal, saith the Holy One?" And hence the censure of the inspired penman, Psalm cvi, 20: "They changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass." Add to this, that in most or all of the places where the cherubim are mentioned in the Scriptures, God is expressly distinguished from them. Thus, "He," the Lord, "placed at the east of the garden cherubim, and a flaming sword," Gen. iii, 24. "He rode on a cherub and did fly," Psalm xviii, 10. "He sitteth between the cherubim," Psalm xcix, 1. "He dwelleth between the cherubim," Psalm lxxx, 1. We also read of "the glory of the God of Israel going up, from the cherub whereupon he was, to the threshold of the house," Ezek. ix, 3. And again, "The glory of the Lord went up from the cherub, and the court was full of the brightness of the Lord's glory," Ezek. x, 4. And again, "The glory of the Lord departed from off the threshold, and stood over the cherubim," Ezek. x, 18. In all these passages the glory of the Lord, that is, the Shekinah, the glorious symbol of his presence, is distinguished from the cherubim; and not the least intimation is given in these passages, or any others, of the Scripture, that the cherubim were images or emblematical representations of him. Mr. Parkhurst's laborious effort to establish Mr. Hutchinson's opinion on the subject of the cherubim, in his Hebrew Lexicon, sub voce, is so obviously fanciful and contradictory, that few will be converted to this strange opinion. It seems much more probable that, as most eminent divines have supposed, the cherubim represented the angels who surround the divine presence in heaven. Accordingly, they had their faces turned toward the mercy seat, where God was supposed to dwell, whose glory the angels in heaven always behold, and upon which their eyes are continually fixed; as they are also upon Christ, the true propitiatory, which mystery of redemption they "desire," St. Peter tells us, "to look into," 1 Peter i, 12: a circumstance evidently signified by the faces of the cherubim being turned inward, and their eyes fixed on the mercy seat. We may here also observe that, allowing St. Peter in this passage to allude to the cherubic figures, which, from his mode of expression, can scarcely be doubted, this amounts to a strong presumption that the cherubim represented, not so much one order, as "the angels" in general, all of whom are said to "desire to look into" the subjects of human redemption, and to all whose orders, "the principalities and powers in heavenly places, the manifold wisdom of God is made known by the church." In Ezekiel, the cherubic figures are evidently connected with the dispensations of providence; and they have therefore appropriate forms, emblematical of the strength, wisdom, swiftness, and constancy, with which the holy angels minister in carrying on God's designs: but in the sanctuary they are connected with the administration of grace; and they are rather adoring beholders, than actors, and probably appeared under forms more simple.

As to the living creatures, improperly rendered “beasts” in our translation, Rev. iv, 7, some think them a hieroglyphical representation, not of the qualities of angels, but of those of real Christians; especially of those in the suffering and active periods of the church. The first a lion, signifying their undaunted courage, manifested in meeting with confidence the greatest sufferings; the second a calf or ox, emblematical of unwearied patience; the third with the face of a man representing prudence and compassion; the fourth a flying eagle, signifying activity and vigour. The four qualities thus emblematically set forth in these four living creatures, namely, undaunted courage, unwearied patience under sufferings, prudence united with kindness, and vigorous activity, are found, more or less, in the true members of Christ’s church in every age and nation. But others have imagined that this representation might be intended to intimate also that these qualities would especially prevail in succeeding ages of the church, in the order in which they are here placed: that is, that in the first age true Christians would be eminent for the courage, fortitude, and success, wherewith they should spread the Gospel; that in the next age they would manifest remarkable patience in bearing persecution, when they should be “killed all the day,” like calves or oxen appointed for the slaughter; that in the subsequent age or ages, when the storms of persecution were blown over, and Christianity was generally spread through the whole Roman empire, knowledge and wisdom, piety and virtue, should increase, and the church should wear the face of a man, and excel in prudence, humanity, love, and good works; and that in ages still later, being reformed from various corruptions in doctrine and practice, and full of vigour and activity, it should carry the Gospel, as upon the wings of a flying eagle, to the remotest nations under heaven, “to every kindred, and tongue, and people.” This is a thought which deserves some consideration. The four great monarchies of the earth had their prophetic emblems, taken both from metals and from beasts and birds; and it is not unreasonable to look for prophetic emblems of the one kingdom of Christ, in its varied and successive states. Perhaps, however, the most reasonable conclusion is, that, like the “living creatures” in the vision of Ezekiel, they are emblematical of the ministrations of angels in what pertains to those providential events which more particularly concern the church.

CHESNUT TREE, ערמון. This tree, which is mentioned only in Gen. xxx, 37, and Ezek. xxxi, 8, is by the Septuagint and Jerom rendered plane tree; and Drusius, Hiller, and most of the modern interpreters render it the same. The name is derived from a root which signifies nakedness; and it is often observed of the plane tree that the bark peels off from the trunk, leaving it naked, which peculiarity may have been the occasion of its Hebrew name. The son of Sirach says, “I grew up as a plane tree by the water,” Ecclesiasticus xxiv, 14.

CHILD. Mothers, in the earliest times, suckled their offspring themselves, and that from thirty to thirty-six months. The day when the child was weaned was made a festival, Gen. xxi, 8; Exod. ii, 7, 9; 1 Sam. i, 22–24; 2 Chron. xxxi, 16; 2 Mac. vii, 27, 28; Matt, xxi, 16. Nurses were employed, in case the mother died before the child was old enough to be weaned, and when from any circumstances she was unable to afford a sufficient supply of milk for its nourishment. In later ages, when matrons had become more delicate, and thought themselves too infirm to fulfil the duties which naturally devolved upon them, nurses were employed to take their place, and were reckoned among the principal members of the family. They are, accordingly, in consequence of the respectable station which they sustained, frequently mentioned in sacred history, Gen. xxxv, 8; 2 Kings xi, 2; 2 Chron. xxii, 11. The sons remained till the fifth year in the care of the women; they then came into the father's hands, and were taught not only the arts and duties of life, but were instructed in the Mosaic law, and in all parts of their country's religion, Deut, vi, 20–25; vii, 23219; xi, 19. Those who wished to have them farther instructed, provided they did not deem it preferable to employ private teachers, sent them away to some priest or Levite, who sometimes had a number of other children to instruct. It appears from 1 Sam. i, 24–28, that there was a school near the holy tabernacle, dedicated to the instruction of youth. There had been many other schools of this kind, which had fallen into decay, but were restored again by the Prophet Samuel; after whose time, the members of the seminaries in question, who were denominated by way of distinction "the sons of the prophets," acquired no little notoriety. Daughters rarely departed from the apartments appropriated to the females, except when they went out with an urn to draw water. They spent their time in learning those domestic and other arts, which are befitting a woman's situation and character, till they arrived at that period in life when they were to be sold, or, by a better fortune, given away in marriage, Prov. xxxi, 13; 2 Sam. xiii, 7.

2. In Scripture, disciples are often called children or sons, Solomon, in his Proverbs, says, to his disciple, "Hear, my son." The descendants of a man, how remote soever, are denominated his sons or children; as "the children of Edom," "the children of Moab," "the children of Israel." Such expressions as "the children of light," "the children of darkness," "the children of the kingdom," signify those who follow truth, those who remain in error, and those who belong to the church. Persons arrived at almost the age of maturity are sometimes called "children." Thus, Joseph is termed "the child," though he was at least sixteen years old, Gen. xxxvii, 30; and Benjamin, even when above thirty, was so denominated, xlv, 20. By the Jewish law, children were reckoned the property of their parents, who

could sell them for seven years to pay their debts. Their creditors had also the power of compelling them to resort to this measure. The poor woman, whose oil Elisha increased so much as enabled her to pay her husband's debts, complained to the prophet, that, her husband being dead, the creditor was come to take away her two sons to be bondmen, 2 Kings iv, 1. "Children, or sons of God," is a name by which the angels are sometimes described: "There was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord," Job i, 6; ii, 1. Good men, in opposition to the wicked, are also thus denominated; the children of Seth's family, in opposition to those of Cain: "The sons of God saw the daughters of men," Gen. vi, 2. Judges, magistrates, priests, are also termed children of God: "I have said, Ye are gods, and all of you are the children of the Most High," Psa. lxxxii, 6. The Israelites are called "sons of God," in opposition to the Gentiles, Hosea i, 10; John xi, 52. In the New Testament, believers are commonly called "children of God" by virtue of their adoption. St. Paul, in several places, extols the advantages of being adopted sons of God, Rom. viii, 14; Gal. iii, 26. "Children, or sons of men," is a name given to Cain's family before the deluge, and, in particular, to the giants who were violent men, and had corrupted their ways. Afterward, the impious Israelites were thus called: "O ye sons of men, how long will ye love vanity?" Psa. iv, 2. "The sons of men, whose teeth are spears and arrows," lvii, 4.

**CHILD BIRTH.** In oriental countries child birth is not an event of much difficulty; and mothers at such a season were originally the only assistants of their daughters, as any farther aid was deemed unnecessary, Exod. i, 19. In cases of more than ordinary difficulty, those matrons who had acquired some celebrity for skill and expertness on occasions of this kind, were invited in; and in this way there eventually rose into notice that class of women denominated midwives. The child was no sooner born, than it was washed in a bath, rubbed with salt, and wrapped in swaddling clothes, הַחֲתֵל, Ezek. xvi, 4. It was the custom at a very ancient period, for the father, while music in the mean while was heard to sound, to clasp the new born child to his bosom, and by this ceremony was understood to declare it to be his own, Gen. i, 23; Job iii, 12; Psa. xxii, 11. This practice was imitated by those wives who adopted the children of their maids, Gen. xvi, 2; xxx, 3–5. The birth day of a son, especially, was made a festival, and on each successive year was celebrated with renewed demonstrations of festivity and joy, Gen. xl, 20; Job i, 4; Matt. xiv, 6. The messenger, who brought the news of the birth of a son, was received with joy, and rewarded with presents, Job iii, 3; Jer. xx, 15. This is the case at the present day in Persia.

CHISLEU, the third month of the Jewish civil year, and the ninth of their sacred, answering to our November and December, Nehem. i, 1. It contains thirty days.

CHITTIM, the country, or countries, implied by this name in Scripture, are variously interpreted by historians and commentators. Chittim has been taken, by Hales and Lowth, for all the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean; which appears most consonant with the general use of the word by the different inspired writers.

CHRIST, an appellation synonymous with Messiah. The word Χριστός, signifies anointed, from χρίω, I anoint. Sometimes the word Christ is used singly, by way of autononasis, to denote a person sent from God, as an anointed prophet, king, or priest. "Christ," says Lactantius, "is no proper name, but one denoting power; for the Jews used to give this appellation to their kings, calling them Christ, or anointed, by reason of their sacred unction." But he adds, "The Heathens, by mistake, call Jesus Christ, Chrestus." Accordingly, Suetonius, speaking of Claudius, and of his expelling the Jews from Rome, says that "he banished them because they were continually promoting tumults, under the influence of one Chrestus:" "Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes, Româ expulit," taking Christ to be a proper name. The names of Messiah and Christ were originally derived from the ceremony of anointing, by which the kings and the high priests of God's people, and sometimes the prophets, 1 Kings xix, 16, were consecrated and admitted to the exercise of their functions; for all these functions were accounted holy among the Israelites. But the most eminent application of the word is to that illustrious personage, typified and predicted from the beginning, who is described by the prophets, under the character of God's Anointed, the Messiah, or the Christ. As to the use of the term in the New Testament, were we to judge by the common version, or even by most versions into modern tongues, we should receive it rather as a proper name, than an appellative, or name of office, and should think of it only as our Lord's surname. To this mistake our translators have contributed, by too seldom prefixing the article before Christ. The word Christ was at first as much an appellative as the word Baptist, and the one was as regularly accompanied with the article as the other. Yet our translators, who would always say "the Baptist," have, it should seem, studiously avoided saying "the Christ." The article, in such expressions as occur in Acts xvii, 3; xviii, 5, 28, adds considerable light to them, and yet no more than what the words of the historian manifestly convey to every reader who understands his language. It should therefore be, "Paul testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ," or the Messiah, &c. Many other similar instances occur. Should it be asked, Is the word Christ never to be understood in the New Testament as a proper name, but

always as having a direct reference to the office or dignity? it may be replied, that this word came at length, from the frequency of application to one individual, and only to one, to supply the place of a proper name. It would also very much accelerate this effect, that the name Jesus was common among the Jews at that time, and this rendered an addition necessary for distinguishing the person. To this purpose, Grotius remarks, that in process of time the name Jesus was very much dropped, and Christ, which had never been used before as the proper name of any person, and was, for that reason, a better distinction, was substituted for it; insomuch that, among the Heathens, our Lord came to be more known by the latter than by the former. This use seems to have begun soon after his ascension. During his life, it does not appear that the word was ever used in this manner; nay, the contrary is evident from several passages of the Gospels. The evangelists wrote some years after the period above mentioned; and therefore they adopted the practice common among Christians at that time, which was to employ the word as a surname for the sake of distinction. See Matt. i, 1, 18; Mark i, 1.

CHRISTIAN, a follower of the religion of Christ. It is probable that the name Christian, like that of Nazarenes and Galileans, was given to the disciples of our Lord in reproach or contempt. What confirms this opinion is, that the people of Antioch in Syria, Acts xi, 26, where they were first called Christians, are observed by Zosimus, Procopius, and Zonaras, to have been remarkable for their scurrilous jesting. Some have indeed thought that this name was given by the disciples to themselves; others, that it was imposed on them by divine authority; in either of which cases surely we should have met with it in the subsequent history of the Acts, and in the Apostolic Epistles, all of which were written some years after; whereas it is found but in two more places in the New Testament, Acts xxvi, 28, where a Jew is the speaker, and in 1 Pet. iv, 16, where reference appears to be made to the name as imposed upon them by their enemies. The word used, Acts xi, 26, signifies simply to be called or named, and when Doddridge and a few others take it to imply a divine appointment, they disregard the *usus loquendi* [established acceptance of the term] which gives no support to that opinion. The words of Tacitus, when speaking of the Christians persecuted by Nero, are remarkable, “*vulgus Christianos appellabat*,” “the vulgar called them Christians.” Epiphanius says, that they were called Jesseans, either from Jesse, the father of David, or, which is much more probable, from the name of Jesus, whose disciples they were. They were denominated Christians, A. D. 42 or 43; and though the name was first given reproachfully, they gloried in it, as expressing their adherence to Christ, and they soon generally assumed it.

CHRISTIANITY, the religion of Christians. By Christianity is here meant, not that religious system as it may be understood and set forth in any particular society calling itself Christian; but as it is contained in the sacred books acknowledged by all these societies, or churches, and which contained the only authorized rule of faith and practice.

2. The lofty profession which Christianity makes as a religion, and the promises it holds forth to mankind, entitle it to the most serious consideration of all. For it may in truth be said, that no other religion presents itself under aspects so sublime, or such as are calculated to awaken desires and hopes so enlarged and magnificent. It not only professes to be from God, but to have been taught to men by the Son of God incarnate in our nature, the Second Person in the adorable trinity of divine Persons, “the same in substance, equal in power and glory.” It declares that this divine personage is the appointed Redeemer of mankind from sin, death, and misery; that he was announced as such to our first parents upon their lapse from the innocence and blessedness of their primeval state; that he was exhibited to the faith and hope of the patriarchs in express promises; and, by the institution of sacrifices, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, so that man might be reconciled to God through Him, and restored to his forfeited inheritance of eternal life. It represents all former dispensations of true religion, all revelations of God’s will, and all promises of grace from God to man, as emanating from the anticipated sacrifice and sacerdotal intercession of its Author, and as all preparatory to the introduction of his perfect religion; and that as to the great political movements among the nations of antiquity, the rise and fall of empires were all either remotely or proximately connected with the designs of his advent among men. It professes to have completed the former revelations of God’s will and purposes; to have accomplished ancient prophecies; fulfilled ancient types; and taken up the glory of the Mosaic religion into its own “glory that excelleth;” and to contain within itself a perfect system of faith, morals, and acceptable worship. It not only exhibits so effectual a sacrifice for sin, that remission of all offences against God flows from its merits to all who heartily confide in it; but it proclaims itself to be a remedy for all the moral disorders of our fallen nature; it casts out every vice, implants every virtue, and restores man to “the image of God in which he was created,” even to “righteousness and true holiness.”

3. Its promises both to individuals and to society are of the largest kind. It represents its Founder as now exercising the office of the High Priest of the human race before God, and as having sat down at his right hand, a mediatorial and reconciling government being committed to him, until he shall come to judge all nations, and distribute the rewards of eternity to his followers, and inflict its never-terminating punishments upon those who



reject him. By virtue of this constitution of things, it promises pardon to the guilty, of every age and country, who seek it in penitence and prayer, comfort to the afflicted and troubled, victory over the fear of death, a happy intermediate state to the disembodied spirit, and finally the resurrection of the body from the dead, and honour and immortality to be conferred upon the whole man glorified in the immediate presence of God. It holds out the loftiest hopes also as to the world at large. It promises to introduce harmony among families and nations, to terminate all wars and all oppressions, and ultimately to fill the world with truth, order, and purity. It represents the present and past state of society, as in contest with its own principles of justice, mercy, and truth; but teaches the final triumph of the latter over every thing contrary to itself. It exhibits the ambition, the policy, and the restlessness of statesmen and warriors, as but the overruled instruments by which it is working out its own purposes of wisdom and benevolence; and it not only defies the proudest array of human power, but professes to subordinate it by a secret and irresistible working to its own designs. Finally, it exhibits itself as enlarging its plans, and completing its designs, by moral suasion, the evidence of its truth, and the secret divine influence which accompanies it. Such are the professions and promises of Christianity, a religion which enters into no compromise with other systems; which represents itself as the only religion now in the world having God for its author; and in his name; and by the hope of his mercy, and the terrors of his frown, it commands the obedience of faith to all people to whom it is published upon the solemn sanction, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned."

4. Corresponding with these professions, which throw every other religion that pretends to offer hope to man into utter insignificance, it is allowed that the evidences of its truth ought to be adequate to sustain the weight of so vast a fabric, and that men have a right to know that they are not deluded with a grand and impressive theory, but are receiving from this professed system of truth and salvation "the true sayings of God." Such evidence it has afforded in its splendid train of miracles; in its numerous appeals to the fulfilment of ancient PROPHECIES; in its own powerful INTERNAL EVIDENCE; in the INFLUENCE which it has always exercised, and continues to exert, upon the happiness of mankind; and in various collateral circumstances. Under the heads of Miracles and Prophecy, those important branches of evidence will be discussed, and to them the reader is referred. It is only necessary here to say, that the miracles to which Christianity appeals as proofs of its divine authority, are not only those which were wrought by Christ and his Apostles, but also those which took place among the patriarchs, under the law of Moses, and by the ministry of the Prophets; for the religion of those ancient times was but Christianity in its antecedent revelations. All these miracles, therefore, must be taken collectively, and

present attestations of the loftiest kind, as being manifestly the work of the “finger of God,” wrought under circumstances which precluded mistake, and exhibiting an immense variety, from the staying of the very wheels of the planetary system,--as when the sun and moon paused in their course, and the shadow on the dial of Ahaz went backward,--to the supernatural changes wrought upon the elements of matter, the healing of incurable diseases, the expulsion of tormenting demons, and the raising of the dead. Magnificent as this array of miracles is, it is equalled by the prophetic evidence, founded upon the acknowledged principle, that future and distant contingencies can only be known to that Being, one of whose attributes is an absolute prescience. And here, too, the variety and the grandeur presented by the prophetic scheme exhibit attestations to the truth of Christianity suited to its great claims and its elevated character. Within the range of prophetic vision all time is included, to the final consummation of all things; and the greatest as well as the smallest events are seen with equal distinctness, from the subversion of mighty empires and gigantic cities, to the parting of the raiment of our Lord, and the casting of the lot for his robe by the Roman guard stationed at his cross.

5. These subjects are discussed under the articles assigned to them; as also the INTERNAL EVIDENCE of the truth of Christianity, which arises from the excellence and beneficial tendency of its doctrines. Of its just and sublime conceptions and exhibitions of the divine character; of the truth of that view of the moral state of man upon which its disciplinary treatment is founded; of the correspondence that there is between its views of man’s mixed relation to God as a sinful creature, and yet pitied and cared for, and that actual mixture of good and evil, penalty and forbearance, which the condition of the world presents; of the connection of its doctrine of atonement with hope; of the adaptation of its doctrine of divine influence to the moral condition of mankind when rightly understood, and the affecting benevolence and condescension which it implies; and of its noble and sanctifying revelations of the blessedness of a future life, much might be said:--they are subjects indeed on which volumes have been written, and they can never be exhausted. But we confine ourselves to the MORAL TENDENCY, and the consequent BENEFICIAL INFLUENCE, of Christianity. No where except in the Scriptures have we a perfect system of morals; and the deficiencies of Pagan morality only exalt the purity, the comprehensiveness, the practicability of ours. The character of the Being acknowledged as supreme must always impress itself upon moral feeling and practice; the obligation of which rests upon his will. The God of the Bible is “holy,” without spot; “just,” without partiality; “good,” boundlessly benevolent and beneficent; and his law is the image of himself, “holy, just, and good.” These great moral qualities are not made known to us merely in the abstract, so as to be comparatively feeble in their

influence: but in the person of Christ, our God, incarnate, they are seen exemplified in action, displaying themselves amidst human relations, and the actual circumstances of human life. With Pagans the authority of moral rules was either the opinion of the wise, or the tradition of the ancient, confirmed, it is true, in some degree, by observation and experience; but to us, they are given as commands immediately issuing from the supreme Governor, and ratified as his by the most solemn and explicit attestations. With them many great moral principles, being indistinctly apprehended, were matters of doubt and debate; to us, the explicit manner in which they are given excludes both: for it cannot be questioned, whether we are commanded to love our neighbour as ourselves; to do to others as we would that they should do to us, a precept which comprehends almost all relative morality in one plain principle; to forgive our enemies; to love all mankind; to live righteously and soberly, as well as godly; that magistrates must be a terror only to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well; that subjects are to render honour to whom honour, and tribute to whom tribute, is due; that masters are to be just and merciful, and servants faithful and obedient. These, and many other familiar precepts, are too explicit to be mistaken, and too authoritative to be disputed; two of the most powerful means of rendering law effectual. Those who never enjoyed the benefit of revelation, never conceived justly and comprehensively of that moral state of the heart from which right and beneficent conduct alone can flow; and therefore when they speak of the same virtues as those enjoined by Christianity, they are to be understood as attaching to them a lower idea. In this the infinite superiority of Christianity displays itself. The principle of obedience is not only a sense of duty to God, and the fear of his displeasure; but a tender love, excited by his infinite compassions to us in the gift of his Son, which shrinks from offending. To this influential motive as a reason of obedience, is added another, drawn from its end: one not less influential, but which Heathen moralists never knew,—the testimony that we please God, manifested in the acceptance of our prayers, and in spiritual and felicitous communion with him. By Christianity, impurity of thought and desire is restrained in an equal degree as are their overt acts in the lips and conduct. Humanity, meekness, gentleness, placability, disinterestedness, and charity are all as clearly and solemnly enjoined as the grosser vices are prohibited; and on the unruly tongue itself is impressed “the law of kindness.” Nor are the injunctions feeble; they are strictly LAW, and not mere advice and recommendations: “Without holiness no man shall see the Lord;” and thus our entrance into heaven, and our escape from perdition, are made to depend upon this preparation of mind. To all this is added possibility, nay certainty, of attainment, if we use the appointed means. A Pagan could draw, though not with lines so perfect, a beau ideal of virtue, which he never thought attainable; but the “full assurance of hope” is given by the religion of Christ to all who are seeking the moral renovation of their

nature; because “it is God that worketh in us to will and to do of his good pleasure.”

6. When such is the moral nature of Christianity, how obvious is it that its tendency both as to individuals and to society must be in the highest sense beneficial! From every passion which wastes, and burns, and frets, and enfeebles the spirit, the individual is set free, and his inward peace renders his obedience cheerful and voluntary: and we might appeal to infidels themselves, whether, if the moral principles of the Gospel were wrought into the hearts, and embodied in the conduct, of all men, the world would not be happy; whether if governments ruled, and subjects obeyed, by the laws of Christ; whether if the rules of strict justice which are enjoined upon us regulated all the transactions of men, and all that mercy to the distressed which we are taught to feel and to practise came into operation; and whether, if the precepts which delineate and enforce the duties of husbands, wives, masters, servants, parents, children, did, in fact, fully and generally govern all these relations,--whether a better age than that called golden by the poets, would not then be realized, and Virgil's

*Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,*

[Now Astraea returns, and the Saturnian reign,]

be far too weak to express the mighty change? [It was in the reign of Saturn that the Heathen poets fixed the golden age. At that period, according to them, Astraea, (the goddess of justice,) 236 and many other deities lived on earth; but being offended with the wickedness of men, they successively fled to heaven. Astraea staid longest, but at last retired to her native seat, and was translated into the sign Virgo, next to Libra, who holds her balance. Such is the tendency of Christianity. On immense numbers of individuals it has superinduced these moral changes; all nations, where it has been fully and faithfully exhibited, bear, amidst their remaining vices, the impress of its hallowing and benevolent influence: it is now in active exertion in many of the darkest and worst parts of the earth, to convey the same blessings; and he who would arrest its progress, were he able, would quench the only hope which remains to our world, and prove himself an enemy, not only to himself, but to all mankind. What then, we ask, does all this prove, but that the Scriptures are worthy of God, and propose the very ends which rendered a revelation necessary? Of the whole system of practical religion which it contains we may say, as of that which is embodied in our Lord's sermon on the mount, in the words of one, who, in a course of sermons on that divine composition, has entered most deeply into its spirit, and presented a most instructive delineation of the character which it was intended to form: “Behold Christianity in its native form, as delivered by its great Author. See a picture of God, as far as he is imitable by man, drawn by God's own hand. What beauty appears in the whole!

How just a symmetry! What exact proportion in every part! How desirable is the happiness here described! How venerable, how lovely is the holiness!" "If," says Bishop Taylor, "wisdom, and mercy, and justice, and simplicity, and holiness, and purity, and meekness, and contentedness, and charity, be images of God, and rays of divinity, then that doctrine, in which all these shine so gloriously, and in which nothing else is ingredient, must needs be from God. If the holy Jesus had come into the world with less splendour of power and mighty demonstrations, yet the excellency of what he taught makes him alone fit to be the Master of the world;" and agreeable to all this, has been its actual influence upon mankind. Although, says Bishop Porteus, Christianity has not always been so well understood, or so honestly practised, as it ought to have been; although its spirit has been often mistaken, and its precepts misapplied, yet, under all these disadvantages, it has gradually produced a visible change in those points which most materially concern the peace and quiet of the world. Its beneficent spirit has spread itself through all the different relations and modifications of life, and communicated its kindly influence to almost every public and private concern of mankind. It has insensibly worked itself into the inmost frame and constitution of civil states. It has given a tinge to the complexion of their governments, to the temper and administration of their laws. It has restrained the spirit of the prince, and the madness of the people. It has softened the rigours of despotism, and tamed the insolence of conquest. It has, in some degree, taken away the edge of the sword, and thrown even over the horrors of war a veil of mercy. It has descended into families; has diminished the pressure of private tyranny; improved every domestic endearment; given tenderness to the parent, humanity to the master, respect to superiors, to inferiors ease; so that mankind are, upon the whole, even in a temporal view, under infinite obligations to the mild and pacific temper of the Gospel, and have reaped from it more substantial worldly benefits than from any other institution upon earth. As one proof of this, among many others, consider only the shocking carnage made in the human species by the exposure of infants, the gladiatorial shows, which sometimes cost Rome twenty or thirty lives in a month; and the exceedingly cruel usage of slaves allowed and practised by the ancient Pagans. These were not the accidental and temporary excesses of a sudden fury, but were legal and established, and constant methods of murdering and tormenting mankind. Had Christianity done nothing more than brought into disuse, as it confessedly has done, the two former of these inhuman customs entirely, and the latter to a very great degree, it has justly merited the title of the benevolent religion. But this is far from being all. Throughout the more enlightened parts of Christendom there prevails a gentleness of manners widely different from the ferocity of the most civilized nations of antiquity; and that liberality with which every species of distress is relieved, is a virtue peculiar to the Christian name.

But we may ask farther, What success has it had on the mind of man, as it respects his eternal welfare? How many thousands have felt its power, rejoiced in its benign influence, and under its dictates been constrained to devote themselves to the glory and praise of God! Burdened with guilt, incapable of finding relief from human resources, the mind has here found peace unspeakable in beholding that sacrifice which alone could atone for transgression. Here the hard and impenitent heart has been softened, the impetuous passions restrained, the ferocious temper subdued, powerful prejudices conquered, ignorance dispelled, and the obstacles to real happiness removed. Here the Christian, looking round on the glories and blandishments of this world, has been enabled, with a noble contempt, to despise all. Here death itself, the king of terrors, has lost his sting; and the soul, with a holy magnanimity, has borne up in the agonies of a dying hour, and sweetly sung itself away to everlasting bliss. In respect to its future spread, we have reason to believe that all nations shall feel its happy effects. The prophecies are pregnant with matter as to this belief. It seems that not only a nation, or a country, but the whole habitable globe, shall become the kingdom of our God, and of his Christ. And who is there that has ever known the excellency of this system; who is there that has ever experienced its happy efficacy; who is there that has ever been convinced of its divine origin, its delightful nature and peaceful tendency, but must join the benevolent and royal poet in saying, "Let the whole earth be filled with its glory? Amen and amen!"

7. Among the collateral proofs of the truth and divine origin of Christianity, its rapid and wonderful success justly holds an important place. Of its early triumphs, the history of the Acts of the Apostles is a splendid record; and in process of time it made a wonderful progress through Europe, Asia, and Africa. In the third century there were Christians in the camp, in the senate, and in the palace; in short, every where, as we are informed, except in the temples and the theatres: they filled the towns, the country, and the islands. Men and women of all ages and ranks, and even those of the first dignity, embraced the Christian faith; insomuch that the Pagans complained that the revenues of their temples were ruined. They were in such great numbers in the empire, that, as Tertullian expresses it, if they had retired into another country, they would have left the Romans only a frightful solitude. (See the next article.) For the illustration of this argument, we may observe, that the Christian religion was introduced every where in opposition to the sword of the magistrate, the craft and interest of the priests, the pride of the philosophers, the passions and prejudices of the people, all closely combined in support of the national worship, and to crush the Christian faith, which aimed at the subversion of Heathenism and idolatry. Moreover, this religion was not propagated in the dark, by persons who tacitly endeavoured to deceive the credulous; nor delivered out by little and little,

so that one doctrine might prepare the way for the reception of another; but it was fully and without disguise laid before men all at once, that they might judge of the whole under one view. Consequently mankind were not deluded into the belief of it, but received it upon proper examination and conviction. Beside, the Gospel was first preached and first believed by multitudes in Judea, where Jesus exercised his ministry, and where every individual had the means of knowing whether the things that were told him were matters of fact; and in this country, the scene of the principal transactions on which its credibility depended, the history of Christ could never have been received, unless it had been true, and known to all as truth. Again: the doctrine and history of Jesus were preached and believed in the most noted countries and cities of the world, in the very age when he is said to have lived. On the fiftieth day after our Lord's crucifixion, three thousand persons were converted in Jerusalem by a single sermon of the Apostles; and a few weeks after this, five thousand who believed were present at another sermon preached also in Jerusalem, Acts ii, 41; iv, 4; vi, 7; viii, 1; ix, 1, 20. About eight or ten years after our Lord's death, the disciples were become so numerous at Jerusalem and in the adjacent country, that they were objects of jealousy and alarm to Herod himself, Acts xii, 1. In the twenty-second year after the crucifixion, the disciples in Judea are said to have been many myriads, Acts xxi, 20. The age in which Christianity was introduced and received, was famous for men whose faculties were improved by the most perfect state of social life, but who were good judges of the evidence offered in support of the facts recorded in the Gospel history. For it should be recollected, that the success of the Gospel was not restricted to Judea; but it was preached in all the different provinces of the Roman empire. The first triumphs of Christianity were in the heart of Greece itself, the nursery of learning and the polite arts; for churches were planted at a very early period at Corinth, Ephesus, Beræa, Thessalonica, and Philippi. Even Rome herself, the seat of wealth and empire, was not able to resist the force of truth at a time when the facts related were recent, and when they might, if they had been false, have easily been disproved. From Greece and Rome, at a period of cultivation and refinement, of general peace, and extensive intercourse, when one great empire united different nations and distant people, the confutation of these facts would very soon have passed from one country to another, to the utter confusion of the persons who endeavoured to propagate the belief of them. Nor ought it to be forgotten that the religion to which such numbers were proselyted, was an exclusive one. It denied, without reserve, the truth of every article of Heathen mythology, and the existence of every object of their worship. It accepted no compromise; it admitted of no comprehension. If it prevailed at all, it must prevail by the overthrow of every statue, altar, and temple in the world. It pronounced all other gods to be false, and all other worship vain. These are considerations which must

have strengthened the opposition to it; augmented the hostility which it must encounter; and enhanced the difficulty of gaining proselytes: and more especially when we recollect, that among the converts to Christianity in the earliest age, a number of persons remarkable for their station, office, genius, education, and fortune, and who were personally interested by their emoluments and honours in either Judaism or Heathenism, appeared among the Christian proselytes. Its evidences approved themselves, not only to the multitude, but to men of the most refined sense and most distinguished abilities; and it dissolved the attachments which all powerful interest and authority created and upheld. Among the proselytes to Christianity we find Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea, members of the senate of Israel; Jairus, a ruler of the synagogue; Zaccheus, the chief of the publicans at Jericho; Apollos, distinguished for eloquence; Paul, learned in the Jewish law; Sergius Paulus, governor of the island of Cyprus; Cornelius, a Roman captain; Dionysius, a judge and senator of the Athenian areopagus; Erastus, treasurer of Corinth; Tyrannus, a teacher of grammar and rhetoric at Corinth; Publius, governor of Malta; Philemon, a person of considerable rank at Colosse; Simon, a noted sophist in Samaria; Zenas, a lawyer; and even the domestics of the emperor himself. These are noticed in the sacred writings; and 238<sup>th</sup> Heathen historians also mention some persons of great note who were converted at an early period. To all the preceding circumstances we may add a consideration of peculiar moment, which is, that the profession of Christianity led all, without exception, to renounce the pleasures and honours of the world, and to expose themselves to the most ignominious sufferings. And now, without adding any more to this argument, we may ask, How could the Christian religion have thus prevailed had it not been introduced by the power of God and of truth? And it has been supported in the world by the same power through a course of many ages, amidst the treachery of its friends, the opposition of its enemies, the dangers of prosperous periods, and the persecutions and violence of adverse circumstances; all which must have destroyed it, if it had not been founded in truth, and guarded by the protection of an almighty Providence.

CHRISTIANITY: Sketch of its History. The Christian religion was published by its great Author in Judea, a short time before the death of Herod the Great, and toward the conclusion of the long reign of Augustus. While other religions had been accommodated to the peculiar countries in which they had taken their origin, and had indeed generally grown out of incidents connected with the history of those to whom they were addressed, Christianity was so framed as to be adapted to the whole human race; and although, for the wisest reasons, it was first announced to the Jews, who had peculiar advantages for forming an accurate judgment with regard to it, it was early declared that, in conformity to predictions which had long



been known, and long interpreted, as referring to a new communication of the divine will, it was to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, and was to carry salvation to the ends of the earth. Although Christianity originated in Judea, it was not long confined within the narrow limits of the Holy Land. The open manner in which it was announced, the length of time during which its Author publicly addressed his countrymen, the innumerable miracles which he performed, and, above all, the report of the resurrection under circumstances which must have been communicated to the imperial government at Rome, excited the deep attention of the numerous Jews and proselytes who, from surrounding nations, regularly went up to Jerusalem, and of whom vast numbers were actually in that city when the resurrection must have been the subject of universal discussion. They very naturally carried to the different countries in which they usually resided, the astonishing intelligence with which they had been furnished; and provision was soon made for fulfilling the prediction which Jesus had uttered, that his Gospel would, before the destruction of Jerusalem, be circulated and embraced by many through the wide extent of the Roman empire. The Apostle Peter, in consequence of what he knew to be a solemn injunction from Heaven, communicated to a Gentile the truths of Christianity. St. Paul, who had distinguished himself by his enmity to the Christians, and by the cruelty with which he had persecuted them, having been converted, devoted himself to lay the foundations of the Gospel through a large portion of the most enlightened part of the world; and the miraculous gift of tongues, by which humble and illiterate men found themselves at once able to speak the languages of different nations, left no doubt that they were bound to preach their faith as extensively as had been marked out to them by the last instructions which they had received from their Master. They had to struggle with the most formidable difficulties in prosecuting this undertaking; for which, had they trusted merely to their own strength, and their own natural endowments, they were wholly unqualified.

2. The Roman empire at the period of their commencing the attempt, comprehended almost the whole of the civilized world, and thus included within it nations whose habits, customs, and sentiments essentially differed, and whom it required the most dexterous policy to unite in one community, or to subject to one government. The most effectual method by which, during the commonwealth, and at the rise of the empire, this had been accomplished, was a politic respect to the religious opinions which all these nations entertained. Not only were their modes of worship treated with scrupulous reverence, but their gods, in conformity with the genius of Paganism, were incorporated or associated with the deities of Rome, and they were thus joined to their conquerors by the strongest ties by which the affections can be secured. At all times religion had been an object of prominent interest with the Romans: at the foundation of the city, Romulus

had professed to be directed by Heaven: during the whole period of the republic, the most sacred attention had been paid to the rites and ceremonies sanctioned by the prevailing superstition, the prosperity of the state was invariably ascribed to the protection of the gods, and the most impressive solemnities, combined with the richest splendour and magnificence, cast around polytheism a mysterious sanctity, which even the philosophers affected to revere. Precautions accordingly had been early taken to prevent innovations upon the established ritual; foreign rites were prohibited till they had obtained the sanction of the senate; and when the solicitation of this sanction was neglected, the persons guilty of the neglect were frequently punished. From the nature of Paganism, it was perfectly consistent with its spirit to conjoin, with any particular mode of it, the forms which elsewhere prevailed. These additions left all which had been previously honoured in unimpaired vigour and influence, and, in fact, only increased the appearance of profound regard for religion, which the Romans so long assumed. But this part of the political constitution, lightly as it affected other religions, at once struck at the root of Christianity, which, unlike the prevailing modifications of idolatry, prohibited the worship of all the deities before whose altars mankind had for ages bent, and required, as essential for obtaining the divine favour, that they who believed in it should pay undivided homage to the one God, whose existence it revealed. The extension of the Gospel thus necessarily carried with it opposition to the most ancient and most revered law of the empire, and it was impossible for those who judged of it merely from this circumstance, without investigating its nature and tendency, to hesitate in directing against it the statutes which the zeal of their fathers had provided, to prevent such a revolution as would be produced by so thorough and so alarming a change in their religious principles. No sooner, however, had the message of salvation been addressed indiscriminately to all men, and, from the evidence by which it was accompanied, had brought numbers to acknowledge the heavenly source from which it is derived, than the detestation of it previously entertained burst forth in all its violence; and it is apparent that this had been widely and openly expressed before any imperial edicts were directed against the Christians. Tacitus, in the celebrated passage in which he mentions the disciples of Jesus, and which refers to a period not more than thirty years distant from the ascension, represents it as notorious in Rome, that Christ, during the reign of Tiberius, had been put to death as a criminal; he asserts that his adherents had long been odious on account of their enormities; he laments that their destructive superstition had found its way to the capital of the empire; and he attributes the melancholy fate to which they were condemned to the general persuasion, that they were actuated by hatred to the whole human race. It is necessary to keep this fact steadily in view, to form an accurate idea of that opposition which Christianity had to encounter. This opposition

is not to be estimated merely by reference to particular statutes, or even to be considered as fully exhibited when we have gathered together the public proceedings which have been recorded in history, or deplored in the writings of those who sought to avert them. It is to be remembered that even when the laws which the frantic zeal of some of the emperors had enacted were repealed, the general law of the empire was still in force; that it was competent for every one who had the cruelty to do so, to turn it against the Christians; and that the firm, though mistaken, conviction that the Christian profession involved in it the most revolting impiety, the most tremendous guilt, and the most dangerous hostility to the best interests of the state, would lead numbers to indulge their antipathy, when little notice was taken of the sufferers, and would keep the disciples of the hated faith in a state of unceasing alarm. (See Persecution.) What was the effect of this depressing situation? Did it check the dissemination of the Gospel, or confine it to the men by whom it was preached? So far was this from being the case, that from the period of the death, and, as it must here be termed, the alleged resurrection of Jesus, it was embraced by immense numbers in all the countries to which it was conveyed; and even while they were contemplating the sacrifices and the trials to which, by attaching themselves to it, they would be exposed, they did not hesitate to relinquish the religion in which they had been educated, and to exchange for misery and death all the comforts which the strongest feelings and propensities of our nature lead men to value and to pursue. Finally, imperial Rome bowed to the religion it had persecuted, and the emperor Constantine became a Christian.

3. The propagation of Christianity assumes a new aspect after it became the religion of the empire, and was guarded by the protection and surrounded by the munificence of imperial power. The causes which, in the first stage of its existence, had most powerfully acted against it, were now turned to its support; and all the motives by which men are usually guided led them to enter with, at least, apparent conviction into its sanctuaries. Not only was persecution, after the reign of Constantine, at an end, but with the exception of the short reign of Julian, who, having apostatized from Christianity, and become intoxicated with the fascinating speculations of the Platonic philosophy, was eager to raise the temples which his predecessor had laid in ruins, promotion and wealth and honour could be most effectually secured by transferring to the Gospel the zeal which had been in vain exhausted to preserve the sinking fabric of Paganism and idolatry. The emperors, who had displayed their zeal and their attachment to the religion of Jesus, by forcing their own subjects to profess it, conceived it to be their duty to communicate so great a blessing to all the nations which they could influence; and when they found it necessary to declare war against the savage tribes which pressed upon the frontiers, or

forced themselves within the precincts of the empire, they carried on hostilities with the view of rendering these instrumental no less to the diffusion of their religious tenets, than to the vindication of their authority, and the security of their dominions. The vanquished invaders felt little reluctance to purchase the forbearance or the clemency of their conquerors, by submitting to receive their religion; and this species of conversion, so little connected with the great objects which revelation was designed to accomplish, leaving, in fact, all the gross superstitious practices and all the immoral abominations which had previously existed, was boastfully held forth as a decisive proof of the triumph of the Gospel.

4. The foundation of the empire, not long after the days of Constantine, began to be shaken: and it experienced numberless assaults and convulsions, till it was finally divided into the eastern and western empires. The luxury and wealth which had enervated their possessors, and destroyed the heroism and intrepidity by which their ancestors had been distinguished, presented the most powerful temptations to the lawless bands which, driven from the sterile regions of the north of Europe, had pressed forward to seek for new and more favoured habitations. The feeble attempts to turn aside, by bribery, these ferocious barbarians increased the danger which they were intended to remove; 240and the history of Europe presents, for several ages, the disgusting spectacle of war, conducted with an atrocity eclipsing the stern virtues which sometimes were strikingly displayed. But although the insubordination of this turbulent and sanguinary period was little favourable to the mild influence of genuine Christianity, it did not prove so fatal to it as might have been apprehended; and it was even instrumental in extending its nominal dominion. Mankind, when scarcely emerged from barbarism, and attached to no particular country, but seeking wherever it can be found the food necessary for themselves and the flocks upon which they in a great measure depend, although they entertain those sentiments with regard to religion which seem almost interwoven with our nature, feel little attachment to any one system of superstition, and are open to the reception of new doctrines, which an association with what they value may have led them to venerate. When, accordingly, the tribes which finally overran the Roman empire had ceased from the destructive contests by which they got possession of the regions that had long been blessed with civilization and enlightened by science, they surveyed with amazement and with admiration the people whom they had conquered; they were delighted with the luxuries which abounded among them; they were charmed with their manners and customs; and they eagerly conformed to institutions from which they hoped that they should reap what the original inhabitants of their settlement had enjoyed. The religion of the vanquished they contemplated with reverence; they connected it with the wealth, the refinement, and the power

which they saw spread around them; and they easily exchanged the rude and careless worship of their native deities, for the polished and splendid devotional rites, which, with the most imposing solemnity, were celebrated by the Christians. Hence, they soon embraced the religion by which it was believed that these rites were prescribed; and they communicated it to the nations with whom they still maintained an alliance. There is no doubt that motives very little connected with the conviction of the understanding led to the progress of Christianity now described; and, in fact, that progress was occasioned by causes so different from those which should have produced it, that, had circumstances been changed, and had the religion of Jesus been continued to be persecuted by the most powerful states, multitudes who affected to revere it would, upon the same ground on which their veneration rested, have exerted themselves to deride its tenets, and to exterminate its professors.

5. But it was not the secular arm alone that was stretched forth to lead men to the reception of Christianity. The church, after it had been firmly established, and had, amidst the riches and honours with which it was endowed, forgotten that it should not have been of this world, conceived it incumbent, as an evidence of its zeal, or, as was too often the case, for extending its power and its influence, to make attempts to substitute the cross of Christ for the emblems of Paganism. In accomplishing this object, it employed different means. But although the conversions which took place, from the establishment of Christianity till the restoration of learning, or the reformation, which forms a new æra in the dissemination of the Gospel, were often unfortunately very far from planting the word of life in the hearts of those to whom it was conveyed, they were very extensive. They reached to almost every country in Europe; to Arabia, China, Judea, and many other parts of Asia; and the obscure tribes, to whom no missionaries were despatched, gradually conformed to the religion of those more powerful states upon which they depended, or to which they looked with respect or veneration.

6. Mohammedanism, however, arrested the progress of Christianity in some of these countries, and humbled it and oppressed it in others; but since the reformation, and especially within the last century, it has been extended, not so much by conquest, as by the legitimate means of colonization, and by missions and education, to the most distant and important parts of the world, to China, India, Africa, the American Islands, and those of the Pacific Ocean. The zeal, self-denial, and successes, of those missionaries, who have been sent forth within a few years by various Protestant societies, and their great successes form, indeed, a splendid section in the modern history of the church. They have sown the seed in almost every land, and the fruit has spread itself throughout the world.

CHRONICLES, Books of. This name is given to two historical books of Scripture, which the Hebrews call Dibri-Jamim, "Words of Days," that is, "Diaries," or "Journals." They are called in the LXX, Paralipomena, which signifies, "things omitted;" as if these books were a supplement of what had been omitted, or too much abridged, in the books of Kings, and other historical books of Scripture. And, indeed, we find in them many particulars which are not extant elsewhere: but it must not be thought that these are the records, or books of the acts, of the kings of Judah and Israel, so often referred to. Those ancient registers were much more extensive than these are; and the books of Chronicles themselves refer to those original memoirs, and make long extracts from them. They were compiled, and probably by Ezra, from the ancient chronicles of the kings of Judah and Israel just now mentioned, and they may be considered as a kind of supplement to the preceding books of Scripture. The former part of the first book of Chronicles contains a great variety of genealogical tables, beginning with Adam; and in particular gives a circumstantial account of the twelve tribes, which must have been very valuable to the Jews after their return from captivity. The descendants of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David, from all of whom it was predicted that the Saviour of the world should be born, are here marked with precision. These genealogies occupy the first nine chapters, and in the tenth is recorded the death of Saul 241From the eleventh chapter to the end of the book, we have a history of the reign of David, with a detailed statement of his preparation for the building of the temple, of his regulations respecting the priests and Levites, and his appointment of musicians for the public service of religion. The second book of Chronicles contains a brief sketch of the Jewish history, from the accession of Solomon to the return from the Babylonian captivity, being a period of four hundred and eighty years; and in both these books we find many particulars not noticed in the other historical books of Scripture.

CHRYSOLITE, Rev. xxi, 20, a precious stone of a golden colour. Schroder says it is the gem now called the Indian topaz, which is of a yellowish green colour, and very beautiful.

CHRYSOPRASUS, Rev. xxi, 20, a precious stone, which Pliny classes among the beryls; the best of which, he says, are of a sea-green colour; after these he mentions the chrysoberyls, which are a little paler, inclining to golden colour; and next, a sort still paler, and by some reckoned a distinct species, and called chrysoprasus.

CHURCH. The Greek word ἐκκλησία, so rendered, denotes an assembly met about business, whether spiritual or temporal, Acts xix, 32, 39. It is

understood also of the collective body of Christians, or all those over the face of the earth who profess to believe in Christ, and acknowledge him to be the Saviour of mankind; this is called the visible church. But by the word church, we are more strictly to understand the whole body of God's true people, in every period of time: this is the invisible or spiritual church. The people of God on earth are called the church militant, and those in heaven the church triumphant. It has been remarked by Dr. John Owen, that sin having entered into the world, God was pleased to found his church (the catholic or universal church) in the promise of the Messiah given to Adam; that this promise contained in it something of the nature of a covenant, including the grace which God designed to show to sinners in the Messiah, and the obedience which he required from them; and that consequently, from its first promulgation, that promise became the sole foundation of the church and of the whole worship of God therein. Prior to the days of Abraham, this church, though scattered up and down the world, and subject to many changes in its worship through the addition of new revelations, was still but one and the same, because founded in the same covenant, and interested thereby in all the benefits or privileges that God had granted, or would at any time grant. In process of time, God was pleased to restrict his church, as far as visible acknowledgment went, in a great measure, to the seed of Abraham. With the latter he renewed his covenant, requiring that he should walk before him and be upright. He also constituted him the father of the faithful, or of all them that believe, and the "heir of the world." So that since the days of Abraham, the church has, in every age, been founded upon the covenant made with that patriarch, and on the work of redemption which was to be performed according to that covenant. Now wheresoever this covenant made with Abraham is, and with whomsoever it is established, with them is the church of God, and to them all the promises and privileges of the church really belong. Hence we may learn that at the coming of the Messiah, there was not one church taken away and another set up in its room; but the church continued the same, in those that were the children of Abraham, according to the faith. It is common with divines to speak of the Jewish and the Christian churches, as though they were two distinct and totally different things; but that is not a correct view of the matter. The Christian church is not another church, but the very same that was before the coming of Christ, having the same faith with it, and interested in the same covenant. Great alterations indeed were made in the outward state and condition of the church, by the coming of the Messiah. The carnal privilege of the Jews, in their separation from other nations to give birth to the Messiah, then failed, and with that also their claim on that account to be the children of Abraham. The ordinances of worship suited to that state of things then expired, and came to an end. New ordinances of worship were appointed, suitable to the new light and grace which were then bestowed upon the church. The Gentiles came into the

faith of Abraham along with the Jews, being made joint partakers with them in his blessing. But none of these things, nor the whole collectively, did make such an alteration in the church, but that it was still one and the same. The olive tree was still the same, only some branches were broken off, and others grafted into it. The Jews fell, and the Gentiles came in their room. And this may enable us to determine the difference between the Jews and Christians relative to the Old Testament promises. They are all made to the church. No individual has any interest in them except by virtue of his membership with the church. The church is, and always was, one and the same. The Jewish plea, is, that the church is with them, because they are the children of Abraham according to the flesh. Christians reply, that their privilege on that ground was of another nature, and ended with the coming of the Messiah: that the church of God, unto whom all the promises belong, are only those who are heirs of the faith of Abraham, believing as he did, and are consequently interested in his covenant. These are Zion, Jerusalem, Israel, Jacob, the temple, or church of God.

2. By a particular church we understand an assembly of Christians united together, and meeting in one place, for the solemn worship of God. To this agrees the definition given by the compilers of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England: "A congregation of faithful men, in which the true word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinances, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same," Acts ix, 31; xx, 17; Gal. i, 2, 22; 1 Cor. xiv, 34; Col. iv, 15. The word is now also used to denote any particular denomination of Christians, distinguished by particular doctrines, ceremonies, &c, as the Romish church, the Greek church, the English church, &c.

3. On the subject of the church, opinions as opposite or varying as possible have been held, from that of the Papists, who contend for its visible unity throughout the world under a visible head, down to that of the Independents, who consider the universal church as composed of congregational churches, each perfect in itself, and entirely independent of every other. The first opinion is manifestly contradicted by the language of the Apostles, who, while they teach that there is but one church, composed of believers throughout the world, think it not at all inconsistent with this to speak of "the churches of Judea," "of Achaia," "the seven churches of Asia," "the church at Ephesus," &c. Among themselves the Apostles had no common head; but planted churches and gave directions for their government, in most cases without any apparent correspondence with each other. The Popish doctrine is certainly not found in their writings; and so far were they from making provision for the government of this one supposed church, by the appointment of one visible and exclusive head, that they provide for the future government of the respective churches



raised up by them in a totally different manner, that is, by the ordination of ministers for each church, who are indifferently called bishops, and presbyters, and pastors. The only unity of which they speak is the unity of the whole church in Christ, the invisible head, by faith; and the unity produced by “fervent love toward each other.” Nor has the Popish doctrine of the visible unity of the church any countenance from early antiquity. The best ecclesiastical historians have showed, that, through the greater part of the second century, the Christian churches were independent of each other. “Each Christian assembly,” says Mosheim, “was a little state governed by its own laws, which were either enacted, or at least approved, by the society. But in process of time, all the churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate states, assembled at certain times in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole.” So far indeed this union of churches appears to have been a wise and useful arrangement, although afterward it was carried to an injurious extreme, until finally it gave birth to the assumptions of the bishop of Rome, as universal bishop; a claim, however, which, when most successful, was but partially submitted to, the eastern churches having, for the most part, always maintained their independence. No very large association of churches of any kind existed till toward the close of the second century, which sufficiently refutes the papal argument from antiquity. The independence of the early Christian churches does not, however, appear to have resembled that of the churches which, in modern times, are called Independent. During the lives of the Apostles and Evangelists they were certainly subject to their counsel and control, which proves that the independency of separate societies was not the first form of the church. It may, indeed, be allowed, that some of the smaller and more insulated churches might, after the death of the Apostles and Evangelists, retain this form for some considerable time; but the larger churches, in the chief cities, and those planted in populous neighbourhoods, had many presbyters, and, as the members multiplied, they had several separate assemblies or congregations, yet all under the same common government. And when churches were raised up in the neighbourhood of cities, the appointment of chorepiscopi, or country bishops, and of visiting presbyters, both acting under the presbytery of the city, with the bishop at its head, is sufficiently in proof, that the ancient churches, especially the larger and more prosperous of them, existed in that form which, in modern times, we should call a religious connection, subject to a common government. This appears to have arisen out of the very circumstance of the increase of the church, through the zeal of the first Christians; and it was doubtless much more in the spirit of the very first discipline exercised by the Apostles and Evangelists, (when none of the churches were independent, but remained under the government of those who had been chiefly instrumental in raising them up,) to place themselves under a

common inspection, and to unite the weak with the strong, and the newly converted with those who were “in Christ before them.” There was also in this, greater security afforded both for the continuance of wholesome doctrine, and of godly discipline.

4. Church members are those who compose or belong to the visible church. As to the real church, the true members of it are such as come out from the world, 2 Cor. vi, 17; who are born again, 1 Peter i, 23; or made new creatures, 2 Cor. v, 17; whose faith works by love to God and all mankind, Gal. v, 6; James ii, 14, 26; who walk in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless. None but such are members of the true church; nor should any be admitted into any particular church without some evidence of their earnestly seeking this state of salvation.

5. Church fellowship is the communion that the members enjoy one with another. The ends of church fellowship are, the maintenance and exhibition of a system of sound doctrine; the support of the ordinances of evangelical worship in their purity and simplicity; the impartial exercise of church government and discipline; the promotion of holiness in all manner of conversation. The more particular duties are, earnest study to keep peace and unity; bearing of one another’s burdens, Gal. vi, 1, 2; earnest endeavours to prevent each other’s stumbling, 1 Cor. x, 23–33; Heb. x, 24–27; Rom. xiv, 13; steadfast continuance in the faith and worship of the Gospel, Acts ii, 42; 243praying for and sympathizing with each other, 1 Sam. xii, 23; Eph. vi, 18. The advantages are, peculiar incitement to holiness; the right to some promises applicable to none but those who attend the ordinances of God, and hold communion with the saints, Psalm xcii, 13; cxxxii, 13, 16; xxxvi, 8; Jer. xxxi, 12; the being placed under the watchful eye of pastors, Heb. xiii, 7; that they may restore each other if they fall, Gal. vi, 1; and the more effectually promote the cause of true religion.

6. As to church order and discipline, without entering into the discussion of the many questions which have been raised on this subject, and argued in so many distinct treatises, it may be sufficient generally to observe, that the church of Christ being a visible and permanent society, bound to observe certain rites, and to obey certain rules, the existence of government in it is necessarily supposed. All religious rites suppose order, all order direction and control, and these a directive and controlling power. Again: all laws are nugatory without enforcement, in the present mixed and imperfect state of society; and all enforcement supposes an executive. If baptism be the door of admission into the church, some must judge of the fitness of candidates, and administrators of the rite must be appointed; if the Lord’s Supper must be partaken of, the times and the mode are to be

determined, the qualifications of communicants judged of, and the administration placed in suitable hands; if worship must be social and public, here again there must be an appointment of times, an order, and an administration; if the word of God is to be read and preached, then readers and preachers are necessary; if the continuance of any one in the fellowship of Christians be conditional upon good conduct, so that the purity and credit of the church may be guarded, then the power of enforcing discipline must be lodged some where. Thus government flows necessarily from the very nature of the institution of the Christian church; and since this institution has the authority of Christ and his Apostles, it is not to be supposed, that its government was left unprovided for; and if they have in fact made such a provision, it is no more a matter of mere option with Christians whether they will be subject to government in the church, than it is optional with them to confess Christ by becoming its members. The nature of this government, and the persons to whom it is committed, are both points which we must briefly examine by the light of the Holy Scriptures. As to the first, it is wholly spiritual:--“My kingdom,” says our Lord, “is not of this world.” The church is a society founded upon faith, and united by mutual love, for the personal edification of its members in holiness, and for the religious benefit of the world. The nature of its government is thus determined; it is concerned only with spiritual objects. It cannot employ force to compel men into its pale; for the only door of the church is faith; to which there can be no compulsion;--“he that believeth and is baptized” becomes a member. It cannot inflict pains and penalties upon the disobedient and refractory, like civil governments; for the only punitive discipline authorized in the New Testament, is comprised in “admonition,” “reproof,” “sharp rebukes,” and, finally, “excision from the society.” The last will be better understood, if we consider the special relations in which true Christians stand to each other, and the duties resulting from them. They are members of one body, and are therefore bound to tenderness and sympathy; they are the conjoint instructors of others, and are therefore to strive to be of “one judgment;” they are brethren, and they are to love one another as such, that is, with an affection more special than that general good will which they are commanded to bear to all mankind; they are therefore to seek the intimacy of friendly society among themselves, and, except in the ordinary and courteous intercourse of life, they are bound to keep themselves separate from the world; they are enjoined to do good unto all men, but “especially to them that are of the household of faith;” and they are forbidden “to eat” at the Lord’s table with immoral persons, that is, with those who, although they continue their Christian profession, dishonour it by their practice. With these relations of Christians to each other and to the world, and their correspondent duties, before our minds, we may easily interpret the nature of that extreme discipline which is vested in the church. “Persons who will not hear the

church” are to be held “as Heathen men and publicans,” as those who are not members of it; that is, they are to be separated from it, and regarded as of “the world,” quite out of the range of the above mentioned relations of Christians to each other, and their correspondent duties; but still, like “Heathen men and publicans” they are to be the objects of pity, and general benevolence. Nor is this extreme discipline to be hastily inflicted before “a first and second admonition,” nor before those who are “spiritual” have attempted “to restore a brother overtaken by a fault;” and when the “wicked person” is “put away,” still the door is to be kept open for his reception again upon repentance. The true excommunication of the Christian church is therefore a merciful and considerate separation of an incorrigible offender from the body of Christians, without any infliction of civil pains or penalties. “Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which ye have received from us,” 2 Thess. iii, 6. “Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump,” 1 Cor. v, 7. “But now I have written to you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one, no not to eat,” 1 Cor. v, 11. This then is the moral discipline which is imperative upon the church of Christ, and its government is criminally defective whenever it is not enforced. On the other hand, the disabilities and penalties which established churches in different 244places have connected with these sentences of excommunication, have no countenance at all in Scripture, and are wholly inconsistent with the spiritual character and ends of the Christian association.

7. As to the persons to whom the government of the church is committed, it is necessary to consider the composition, so to speak, of the primitive church, as stated in the New Testament. A full enunciation of these offices we find in Ephesians iv, 11: “And he gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.” Of these, the office of Apostle is allowed by all to have been confined to those immediately commissioned by Christ to witness the fact of his miracles, and of his resurrection from the dead, and to reveal the complete system of Christian doctrine and duty; confirming their extraordinary mission by miracles wrought by themselves. If by “prophets” we are to understand persons who foretold future events, then the office was from its very nature extraordinary, and the gift of prophecy has passed away with the other miraculous endowments of the first age of Christianity. If, with others, we understand that these prophets were extraordinary teachers raised up until the churches were settled under permanent qualified instructors; still the office was temporary. The “Evangelists” are

generally understood to be assistants of the Apostles, who acted under their especial authority and direction. Of this number were Timothy and Titus; and as the Apostle Paul directed them to ordain bishops or presbyters in the several churches, but gave them no authority to ordain successors to themselves in their particular office as Evangelists, it is clear that the Evangelists must also be reckoned among the number of extraordinary and temporary ministers suited to the first age of Christianity. Whether by “pastors and teachers” two offices be meant, or one, has been disputed. The change in the mode of expression seems to favour the latter view, and so the text is interpreted by St. Jerom, and St. Augustine; but the point is of little consequence. A pastor was a teacher, although every teacher might not be a pastor; but in many cases his office might be one of subordinate instruction, whether as an expounder of doctrine, a catechist, or even a more private instructor of those who as yet were unacquainted with the first principles of the Gospel of Christ. The term pastor implies the duties both of instruction and of government, of feeding and of ruling the flock of Christ; and, as the presbyters or bishops were ordained in the several churches, both by the Apostles and Evangelists, and rules are left by St. Paul as to their appointment, there can be no doubt but that these are the “pastors” spoken of in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that they were designed to be the permanent ministers of the church; and that with them both the government of the church and the performance of its leading religious services were deposited. Deacons had the charge of the gifts and offerings for charitable purposes, although, it appears from Justin Martyr, not in every instance; for he speaks of the weekly oblations as being deposited with the chief minister, and distributed by him. These pastors appear to have been indifferently called Bishops and Presbyters, and with them the regulation of the churches was, doubtless, deposited; not without checks and guards, the principal of which, however, was, in the primitive church, and continues to be in all modern churches which have no support from the magistracy, or are made independent of the people by endowments, the voluntariness of the association. A perfect religious liberty is always supposed by the Apostles to exist among Christians; no compulsion of the civil power is any where assumed by them as the basis of their advices or directions; no binding of the members to one church, without liberty to join another, by any ties but those involved in moral considerations, of sufficient weight, however, to prevent the evils of faction and schism. It was this which created a natural and competent check upon the ministers of the church; for being only sustained by the opinion of the churches, they could not but have respect to it; and it was this which gave to the sound part of a fallen church the advantage of renouncing, upon sufficient and well-weighed grounds, their communion with it, and of kindling up the light of a pure ministry and a holy discipline, by forming a separate association, bearing its testimony against errors in doctrine, and

failures in practice. Nor is it to be conceived, that, had this simple principle of perfect religious liberty been left unviolated through subsequent ages, the church could ever have become so corrupt, or with such difficulty and slowness have been recovered from its fall. This ancient Christian liberty has happily been restored in a few parts of Christendom. See Episcopacy and Presbyterianism.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND and IRELAND is that established by law in England and Ireland, where it forms a part of the common law of the land, or constitution of the country.

1. When and by whom Christianity was first introduced into Britain, cannot at this distance of time be exactly ascertained. Eusebius, indeed, positively declares that it was by the Apostles and their disciples; Bishops Jewel and Stillingfleet, Dr. Cave, and others, insist that it was by St. Paul; and Baronius affirms, on the authority of an ancient manuscript in the Vatican Library, that the Gospel was planted in Britain by Simon Zelotes, the Apostle, and Joseph of Arimathea; and that the latter came over A. D. 35, or about the twenty-first year of Tiberius, and died in this country. According to Archbishop Usher, the British churches had a school of learning in the year 182, to provide them with proper teachers; and it would appear that they flourished, without dependence on any foreign church, till the arrival of Austin the monk, in the latter part of the sixth century.

2. Episcopacy was early established in this country; and it ought to be remembered, to the honour of the British bishops and clergy, that during several centuries they withstood the encroachments of the see of Rome. Popery, however, was at length introduced into England, and, as some say, by Austin, the monk; and we find its errors every where prevalent during several ages preceding the reformation, till they were refuted by Wickliffe. The seed which Wickliffe had sown ripened after his death, and produced a glorious harvest. However, it was not till the reign of Henry VIII, that the reformation in England in reality commenced. When Luther declared war against the pope, Henry wrote his treatise on the seven sacraments against Luther's book, "Of the Captivity of Babylon," and was repaid by the pontiff with the title of "Defender of the Faith." This title, in a sense diametrically opposite, and by a claim of higher desert, was transmitted by Henry with his crown, and now belongs to his successors. Henry's affections being estranged from his queen Catharine, and fixed on Anne Boleyn, he requested a divorce from his wife; but the pope hesitating, the archbishop of Canterbury annulled his former marriage. The sentence of the archbishop was condemned by the pope, whose authority Henry therefore shook off, and was declared by parliament "supreme head of the church." In the year 1800, when the kingdoms of Britain and Ireland were

united, the churches of England and Ireland, which had always been the same in government, faith, and worship, became one united church.

3. The acknowledged standards of the faith and doctrines of the united church are, after the Scriptures, the Book of Homilies and the Thirty-nine Articles. Her liturgy is also doctrinal, as well as devotional. The homilies were composed by Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, men of unexceptionable learning and orthodoxy; or, according to others, the first book was written principally by Cranmer, and the second by Jewel. They were appointed to be read in churches at the beginning of the reformation, when, by reason of the scarcity of learned divines, few ministers were found who could safely be trusted to preach their own compositions. The first draught of the Articles was composed by Archbishop Cranmer, assisted by Bishop Ridley, in the year 1551; and after being corrected by the other bishops, and approved by the convocation, they were published in Latin and English in 1553, and amounted to forty-two in number. In 1562 they were revised and corrected. Being then reduced to thirty-nine, they were drawn up in Latin only; but in 1571 they were subscribed by the members of the two houses of convocation, both in Latin and English; and therefore the Latin and English copies are to be considered as equally authentic. The original manuscripts, subscribed by the houses of convocation, were burned in the fire of London; but Dr. Bennet has collated the oldest copies now extant, in which it appears that there are no variations of any importance. During the last century, disputes arose among the clergy respecting the propriety of subscribing to any human formulary of religious sentiments. Parliament, in 1772, was applied to for the abolition of the subscription, by certain clergymen and others, whose petition received the most ample discussion, but was rejected by a large majority. It has been generally held by most, if not all, Calvinists, both in and out of the church, that the doctrinal parts of our Articles are Calvinistic. This opinion, however, has been warmly controverted. It is no doubt nearer the truth to conclude that the Articles are framed with comprehensive latitude; and that neither Calvinism nor Arminianism was intended to be exclusively established. In this view such liberal sentiments as the following, from the Apology of the Church of England, in 1732, are not of uncommon occurrence: "This, I know, I am myself an Anti-Calvinian; and yet, were I to compile articles for the church, I would abhor the thoughts of forming them so fully according to my own scheme of thinking, or of descending so minutely into all the particular branches of it, that none but Arminians should be able to subscribe, or that the church should lose the credit and service of such valuable men as the Abbots, Davenant, Usher, and other Calvinists undoubtedly were. And since our reformers were men of temper and moderation, it seems but justice, I am sure it is but reasonable, to think they intended such a latitude as I contend for, so that both parties, the followers of Arminius as well as

of Calvin, might subscribe.” In a subsequent page, however, the same author says, “But what, if there was not so entire a harmony among the compilers or imposers, as was before supposed? What if several of them were Anti-Calvinian? This will incline the balance still more in our favour, and enlarge the probability of the articles being drawn up in a moderate, indefinite way. The divines who fled for refuge, in Queen Mary’s reign, to Geneva, Zurich, and other places beyond sea, (where, by conceiving a great veneration for Calvin, they were mightily changed in their sentiments and ways of thinking,) began to propagate his notions soon after their return in the next reign: and this seems to have been the prime occasion of Calvinism taking any considerable root in this kingdom. In King Edward’s time it doth not appear to have prevailed, except among a few ‘gospelers,’ and how they were reflected on by Bishop Latimer and Hooper has been already observed. When the articles were formed in 1552, I do not find that any deference was paid to Calvin’s judgment or authority: instead of that, the assistance he offered was, to his no little grief and dissatisfaction, refused. Next to the Scriptures and the doctrine of the primitive church, the compilers had an eye to the Augustan Confession, as appears from the identity of many of the articles; to the writings of Melancthon, whose assistance they desired, and whom King Edward invited over hither; the works of Erasmus; and the Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man. This last book was published by King Henry’s authority in 1543; and because it then had the approbation of most of those who compiled the Articles nine years afterward, it will be of consequence to see how it stands affected toward Calvinism. It teaches the cardinal point of universal redemption in several places; which strikes directly at the root of the Calvinian system, and, as Dr. Whitby expresses it, ‘draws all the rest after it, on which side soever the truth lies.’” This judicious amplitude has received much elucidation in Dr. Puller’s *Moderation of the Church of England considered*, 1679; and in other works of more recent date.

4. In this church, divine service is conducted by a liturgy, which was composed in 1547, and has undergone several alterations, the last of which took place in 1661, in the reign of Charles II. Many applications have been since made for a review; and particular alterations were proposed in 1689, by several learned and excellent divines, in the number of whom were Archbishops Tillotson and Tenison, and Bishops Patrick, Burnet, Stillingfleet, Kidder, &c. This subject has been recently revived; and it is believed that some changes are under consideration. To this liturgy every clergyman promises at his ordination to conform in his public ministrations.

5. Ever since the reign of Henry VIII, the sovereigns of England have been styled “supreme heads of the church,” as well as “defenders of the faith;”



but this title is said to convey no spiritual meaning; or, in other words, it only substitutes the king in place of the pope, with respect to temporalities, and the external economy of the church. The church of England is governed by two archbishops and twenty-four bishops, beside the bishop of Sodor and Man. The benefices of the bishops were converted by William the Conqueror into temporal baronies; and, therefore, all of them, except the bishop of Man, are barons or lords of parliament, and sit and vote in the house of lords, where they represent the clergy. The bishops' representatives and assistants are the archdeacons, of whom there are sixty in England. The other dignitaries of the church are the deans, prebendaries, canons, &c; and the inferior clergy are the rectors, vicars, and curates. The united church knows only three orders of ministers; bishops, priests, and deacons: but in these orders are comprehended archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, rectors, vicars, and curates. The church of Ireland is governed by four archbishops and eighteen bishops. Since the union of Britain and Ireland, one archbishop and three bishops sit alternately in the house of peers, by rotation of sessions.

CILICIA, a country in the south-east of Asia Minor, and lying on the northern coast, at the east end of the Mediterranean Sea: the capital city thereof was Tarsus, the native city of St. Paul, Acts xxi, 39.

CINNAMON, קינמון, an agreeable aromatic; the inward bark of the canella, a small tree of the height of the willow. It is mentioned, Exodus xxx, 23, among the materials in the composition of the holy anointing oil; and in Proverbs vii, 17; Canticles iv, 14; Ecclesiasticus xxiv, 15; and Revelation xviii, 13, among the richest perfumes. This spice is now brought from the east Indies; but as there was no traffic with India in the days of Moses, it was then brought, probably, from Arabia, or some neighbouring country. We learn, however, from Pliny, that a species of it grew in Syria.

CINNEROTH, or CINNERETH, a city on the north-western side of the sea of Galilee; which, from it, is frequently called in the Old Testament the sea of Cinneroth: from which word, that of Genesaret, in the New Testament, is conjectured by Dr. Wells to have been framed.

CIRCUMCISION is from the Latin, circumcidere, "to cut all round," because the Jews, in circumcising their children, cut off after this manner the skin which covers the prepuce. God enjoined Abraham to use circumcision, as a sign of his covenant. In obedience to this order, Abraham, at ninety-nine years of age, was circumcised: also his son Ishmael, and all the males of his property, Gen. xvii, 10. God repeated the precept of circumcision to Moses: he ordered that all who were to partake of the paschal sacrifice should receive circumcision; and that this rite

should be performed on children, on the eighth day after their birth. The Jews have always been very exact in observing this ceremony, and it appears that they did not neglect it when in Egypt. But Moses, while in Midian with Jethro his father-in-law, did not circumcise his two sons born in that country; and during the journey of the Israelites in the wilderness, their children were not circumcised. Circumcision was practised among the Arabians, Saracens, and Ishmaelites. These people, as well as the Israelites, sprung from Abraham. Circumcision was introduced with the law of Moses among the Samaritans and Cutheans. The Idumeans, though descended from Abraham and Isaac, were not circumcised till subdued by John Hircanus. Those who assert that the Phenicians were circumcised, mean, probably, the Samaritans; for we know, from other authority, that the Phenicians did not observe this ceremony. As to the Egyptians, circumcision never was of general and indispensable obligation on the whole nation; certain priests only, and particular professions, were obliged to it. Circumcision is likewise the ceremony of initiation into the Mohammedan religion. There is, indeed, no law in the Koran which enjoins it, and they have the precept only in tradition. They say that Mohammed commanded it out of respect to Abraham, the head of his race. They have no fixed day for the performance of this rite, and generally wait till the child is five or six years of age.

Circumcision, Covenant of. That the covenant with Abraham, of which circumcision was made the sign and seal, Genesis xvii, 7–14, was the general covenant of grace, and not wholly, or even chiefly, a political and national covenant, may be satisfactorily established. The first engagement in it was, that God would “greatly bless” Abraham; which promise, although it comprehended temporal blessings, referred, as we learn from St. Paul, more fully to the blessing of his justification by the imputation of his faith for righteousness, with all the spiritual advantages consequent upon the relation which was thus established between him and God, in time and eternity. The second promise in the covenant was, that he should be “the father of many nations;” which we are also taught by St. Paul to interpret more with reference to his spiritual seed, the followers of that faith whereof cometh justification, than to his natural descendants. “That the promise might be sure to all the seed, not only to that which is by the law, but to that also which is by the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all,”--of all believing Gentiles as well as Jews. The third stipulation in God’s covenant with the patriarch, was the gift to Abraham and to his seed of “the land of Canaan,” in which the temporal promise was manifestly but the type of the higher promise of a heavenly inheritance. Hence St. Paul says, “By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise;” but this “faith” did not respect the fulfilment of the temporal promise; for St. Paul

adds, "they looked for a city which had foundations, whose builder and maker is God," Heb. xi, 19. The next promise was, that God would always be "a God to Abraham and to his seed after him," a promise which is connected with the highest spiritual blessings, such as the remission of sins, and the sanctification of our nature, as well as with a visible church state. It is even used to express the felicitous state of the church in heaven, Rev. xxi, 3. The final engagement in the Abrahamic covenant was, that in Abraham's "seed, all nations of the earth should be blessed;" and this blessing, we are expressly taught by St. Paul, was nothing less than the justification of all nations, that is, of all believers in all nations, by faith in Christ: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen by faith, preached before the Gospel to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they who are of faith are blessed with believing Abraham;" they receive the same blessing, justification, by the same means, faith, Gal. iii, 8, 9. This covenant with Abraham, therefore, although it respected a natural seed, Isaac, from whom a numerous progeny was to spring; and an earthly inheritance provided for this issue, the land of Canaan; and a special covenant relation with the descendants of Isaac, through the line of Jacob, to whom Jehovah was to be "a God," visibly and specially, and they a visible and "peculiar people;" yet was, under all these temporal, earthly, and external advantages, but a higher and spiritual grace embodying itself under these circumstances, as types of a dispensation of salvation and eternal life, to all who should follow the faith of Abraham, whose justification before God was the pattern of the justification of every man, whether Jew or Gentile, in all ages. Now, of this covenant, in its spiritual as well as in its temporal provisions, circumcision was most certainly the sacrament, that is the "sign" and the "seal;" for St. Paul thus explains the case: "And he received the SIGN of circumcision, a SEAL of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." And as this rite was enjoined upon Abraham's posterity, so that every "uncircumcised man-child whose flesh of his foreskin was not circumcised on the eighth day," was to be "cut off from his people," by the special judgment of God, and that because "he had broken God's covenant," Gen. xvii, 14; it therefore follows that this rite was a constant publication of God's covenant of grace among the descendants of Abraham, and its repetition a continual confirmation of that covenant, on the part of God, to all practising it in that faith of which it was the ostensible expression.

2. As the covenant of grace made with Abraham was bound up with temporal promises and privileges, so circumcision was a sign and seal of the covenant in both its parts,—its spiritual and its temporal, its superior and inferior provisions. The spiritual promises of the covenant continued unrestricted to all the descendants of Abraham, whether by Isaac or by Ishmael; and still lower down, to the descendants of Esau as well as to

those of Jacob. Circumcision was practised among them all by virtue of its divine institution at first; and was extended to their foreign servants, and to proselytes, as well as to their children; and where-ever the sign of the covenant of grace was by divine appointment, there it was as a seal of that covenant, to all who believingly used it; for we read of no restriction of its spiritual blessings, that is, its saving engagements, to one line of descent from Abraham only. But over the temporal branch of the covenant, and the external religious privileges arising out of it, God exercised a rightful sovereignty, and expressly restricted them first to the line of Isaac, and then to that of Jacob, with whose descendants he entered into special covenant by the ministry of Moses. The temporal blessings and external privileges comprised under general expressions in the covenant with Abraham, were explained and enlarged under that of Moses, while the spiritual blessings remained unrestricted as before. This was probably the reason why circumcision was reënacted under the law of Moses. It was a confirmation of the temporal blessings of the Abrahamic covenant, now, by a covenant of peculiarity, made over to them, while it was still recognized as a consuetudinary rite which had descended to them from their fathers, and as the sign and seal of the covenant of grace, made with Abraham and with all his descendants without exception. This double reference of circumcision, both to the authority of Moses and to that of the patriarchs, is found in the words of our Lord, John vii, 22: "Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision, not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;" or, as it is better translated by Campbell, "Moses instituted circumcision among you, (not that it is from Moses, but from the patriarchs,) and ye circumcise on the Sabbath. If on the Sabbath a child receive circumcision, that the law of Moses may not be violated," &c.

2483. From these observations, the controversy in the Apostolic churches respecting circumcision will derive much elucidation. The covenant with Abraham prescribed circumcision as an act of faith in its promises, and as a pledge to perform its conditions on the part of his descendants. But the object on which this faith rested, was "the Seed of Abraham," in whom the nations of the earth were to be blessed: which Seed, says St. Paul, "is Christ,"--Christ as promised, not yet come. When the Christ had come, so as fully to enter upon his redeeming offices, he could no longer be the object of faith, as still to come; and this leading promise of the covenant being accomplished, the sign and seal of it vanished away. Nor could circumcision be continued in this view by any, without an implied denial that Jesus was the Christ, the expected Seed of Abraham. Circumcision also as an institution of Moses, who continued it as the sign and seal of the Abrahamic covenant both in its spiritual and temporal provisions, but with respect to the latter made it also a sign and seal of the restriction of its temporal blessings and peculiar religious privileges to the descendants of

Israel, was terminated by the entrance of our Lord upon his office of Mediator, in which office all nations were to be blessed in him. The Mosaic edition of the covenant not only guaranteed the land of Canaan, but the peculiarity of the Israelites, as the people and visible church of God to the exclusion of others, except by proselytism. But when our Lord commanded the Gospel to be preached to “all nations,” and opened the gates of the “common salvation” to all, whether Gentiles or Jews, circumcision, as the sign of a covenant of peculiarity and religious distinction, was also done away. It had not only no reason remaining, but the continuance of the rite involved the recognition of exclusive privileges which had been terminated by Christ. This will explain the views of the Apostle Paul on this great question. He declares that in Christ there is neither circumcision nor uncircumcision; that neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but “faith that worketh by love;” faith in the Seed of Abraham already come and already engaged in his mediatorial and redeeming work; faith, by virtue of which the Gentiles came into the church of Christ on the same terms as the Jews themselves, and were justified and saved. The doctrine of the non-necessity of circumcision, he applies to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles, although he specially resists the attempts of the Judaizers to impose this rite upon the Gentile converts; in which he was supported by the decision of the Holy Spirit when the appeal upon this question was made to “the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem,” from the church at Antioch. At the same time it is clear that he takes two different views of the practice of circumcision, as it was continued among many of the first Christians. The first is that strong one which is expressed in Gal. v, 2–4, “Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing; for I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is made of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace.” The second is that milder view which he himself must have had when he circumcised Timothy to render him more acceptable to the Jews; and which also appears to have led him to abstain from all allusion to this practice when writing his epistle to the believing Hebrews, although many, perhaps most of them, continue to circumcise their children, as did the Jewish Christians for a long time afterward. These different views of circumcision, held by the same person, may be explained by considering the different principles on which circumcision might be practised after it had become an obsolete ordinance.

(1.) It might be taken in the simple view of its first institution, as the sign and seal of the Abrahamic covenant; and then it was to be condemned as involving a denial that Abraham’s Seed, the Christ, had already come, since, upon his coming, every old covenant gave place to the new covenant introduced by him.

(2.) It might be practised and enjoined as the sign and seal of the Mosaic covenant, which was still the Abrahamic covenant with its spiritual blessings, but with restriction of its temporal promises and special ecclesiastical privileges to the line of Jacob, with a law of observances which was obligatory upon all entering that covenant by circumcision. In that case it involved, in like manner, the notion of the continuance of an old covenant, after the establishment of the new; for thus St. Paul states the case in Galatians iii, 19: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions until the Seed should come." After that therefore it had no effect:--it had waxed old, and had vanished away.

(3.) Again: circumcision might imply an obligation to observe all the ceremonial usages and the moral precepts of the Mosaic law, along with a general belief in the mission of Christ, as necessary to justification before God. This appears to have been the view of those among the Galatian Christians who submitted to circumcision, and of the Jewish teachers who enjoined it upon them; for St. Paul in that epistle constantly joins circumcision with legal observances, and as involving an obligation to do "the whole law," in order to justification.--"I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law; whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace." "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ," Gal. ii, 16. To all persons therefore practising circumcision in this view it was obvious, that "Christ was become of none effect," the very principle of justification by faith alone in him was renounced even while his divine mission was still admitted.

(4.) But there are two grounds on which circumcision maybe conceived to have been innocently, though not wisely, practised, among 249the Christian Jews. The first was that of preserving an ancient national distinction on which they valued themselves; and were a converted Jew in the present day disposed to perform that rite upon his children for this purpose only, renouncing in the act all consideration of it as a sign and seal of the old covenants, or as obliging to ceremonial acts in order to justification, no one would censure him with severity. It appears clear that it was under some such view that St. Paul circumcised Timothy, whose mother was a Jewess; he did it because of "the Jews which were in those quarters," that is, because of their national prejudices, "for they knew that his father was a Greek." The second was a lingering notion, that, even in the Christian church, the Jews who believed would still retain some degree of eminence, some superior relation to God; a notion which, however unfounded, was not one which demanded direct rebuke, when it did not proudly refuse spiritual communion with the converted Gentiles, but was

held by men who “rejoiced that God had granted to the Gentiles repentance unto life.” These considerations may account for the silence of St. Paul on the subject of circumcision in his Epistle to the Hebrews. Some of them continued to practise that rite, but they were probably believers of the class just mentioned; for had he thought that the rite was continued among them on any principle which affected the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, he would no doubt have been equally prompt and fearless in pointing out that apostasy from Christ which was implied in it, as when he wrote to the Galatians.

Not only might circumcision be practised with views so opposite that one might be wholly innocent, although an infirmity of prejudice; the other such as would involve a rejection of the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ; but some other Jewish observances also stood in the same circumstances. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, a part of his writings from which we obtain the most information on these questions, grounds his “doubts” whether the members of that church were not seeking to be “justified by the law” upon their observing “days, and months, and times, and years.” Had he done more than “doubt,” he would have expressed himself more positively. He saw their danger on this point; he saw that they were taking steps to this fatal result, by such an observance of these “days,” &c, as had a strong leaning and dangerous approach to that dependence upon them for justification, which would destroy their faith in Christ’s solely sufficient sacrifice; but his very doubting, not of the fact of their being addicted to these observances, but of the animus with which they regarded them, supposes it possible, however dangerous this Jewish conformity might be, that they might be observed for reasons which would still consist with their entire reliance upon the merits of Christ for salvation. Even he himself, strongly as he resisted the imposition of this conformity to Jewish customs upon the converts to Christianity as a matter of necessity, yet in practice must have conformed to many of them, when no sacrifice of principle was understood; for, in order to gain the Jews, he became “as a Jew.” See Abraham, and Baptism.

CISLEU, the ninth month of the ecclesiastical, and the third of the civil, year among the Hebrews. It answers nearly to our November.

CISTERN, a reservoir chiefly for rain water. Numbers of these are still to be seen in Palestine, some of which are a hundred and fifty paces long, and sixty broad. The reason of their being so large was, that their cities were many of them built in elevated situations; and the rain falling only twice in the year, namely, spring and autumn, it became necessary for them to collect a quantity of water, as well for the cattle as for the people. A broken cistern would of course be a great calamity to a family, or in some cases

even to a town; and with reference to this we may see the force of the reproof, Jer. ii, 13.

CITIES. By referring to some peculiarities in the building, fortifying, &c, of eastern cities we shall the better understand several allusions and expressions of the Old Testament. It is evident that the walls of fortified cities were sometimes partly constructed of combustible materials; for the Prophet, denouncing the judgments of God upon Syria and other countries, declares, "I will send a fire on the wall of Gaza, which shall devour the palaces thereof," Amos i, 7. The walls of Tyre and Rabbah seem to have been of the same perishable materials; for the Prophet adds, "I will send a fire upon the wall of Tyrus, which shall devour the palaces thereof;" and again, "I will kindle a fire in the walls of Rabbah, and it shall devour the palaces thereof with shouting in the day of battle," verses 10, 14. One method of securing the gates of fortified places, among the ancients, was to cover them with thick plates of iron; a custom which is still used in the east, and seems to be of great antiquity. We learn from Pitts, that Algiers has five gates, and some of these have two, some three, other gates within them; and some of them are plated all over with thick iron. The place where the Apostle was imprisoned seems to have been secured in the same manner; for, says the inspired historian, "When they were past the first and second ward, they came unto the iron gate that leadeth unto the city; which opened to them of its own accord," Acts xii, 10. Pococke, speaking of a bridge not far from Antioch, called the iron bridge, says, there are two towers belonging to it, the gates of which are covered with iron plates; which he supposes is the reason of the name it bears. Some of their gates are plated over with brass; such are the enormous gates of the principal mosque at Damascus, formerly the church of John the Baptist. To gates like these, the Psalmist probably refers in these words: "He hath broken the gates of brass," Psalm cvii, 16; and the Prophet, in that remarkable passage, where God promises to go before Cyrus his anointed, and "break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron," Isa. xlv, 2. But, conscious that all these precautions were insufficient for their security, the orientals employed watchmen to patrol the city during the night, to suppress any disorders in the streets, or to guard the walls against the attempts of a foreign enemy. To this custom Solomon refers in these words: "The watchmen that went about the city found me, they smote me, they wounded me; the keepers of the wall took away my veil from me," Song v, 7. This custom may be traced to a very remote antiquity; so early as the departure of Israel from the land of Egypt, the morning watch is mentioned, certainly indicating the time when the watchmen were commonly relieved. In Persia, the watchmen were obliged to indemnify those who were robbed in the streets; which accounts for the vigilance and severity which they display in the discharge of their office, and illustrates the character of



watchman given to Ezekiel, and the duties he was required to perform. If the wicked perished in his iniquities without warning, the Prophet was to be accountable for his blood; but if he duly pointed out his danger, he delivered his own soul, Ezek. xxxiii, 2. They were also charged, as with us, to announce the progress of the night to the slumbering city: "The burden of Dumah; he calls to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night," Isa. xxi, 11. This is confirmed by an observation of Chardin upon these words of Moses: "For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night:" that "as the people of the east have no clocks, the several parts of the day and of the night, which are eight in all, are announced. In the Indies, the parts of the night are made known, as well by instruments of music, in great cities, as by the rounds of the watchmen, who, with cries and small drums, give them notice that a fourth part of the night is past. Now, as these cries awaked those who had slept all that quarter part of the night, it appeared to them but as a moment." It is evident the ancient Jews knew, by some public notice, how the night watches passed away; but, whether they simply announced the termination of the watch, or made use of trumpets, or other sonorous instruments, in making the proclamation, it may not be easy to determine; and still less what kind of chronometers the watchmen used. The probability is, that the watches were announced with the sound of a trumpet; for the Prophet Ezekiel makes it a part of the watchman's duty, at least in time of war, to blow the trumpet, and warn the people. The watchman, in a time of danger, seems to have taken his station in a tower, which was built over the gate of the city.

The fortified cities in Canaan, as in some other countries, were commonly strengthened with a citadel, to which the inhabitants fled when they found it impossible to defend the place. The whole inhabitants of Thebez, unable to resist the repeated and furious assaults of Abimelech, retired into one of these towers, and bid defiance to his rage: "But there was a strong tower within the city, and thither fled all the men and women, and all they of the city, and shut it to them, and gat them up to the top of the tower." The extraordinary strength of this tower, and the various means of defence which were accumulated within its narrow walls, may be inferred from the violence of Abimelech's attack, and its fatal issue: "And Abimelech came unto the tower, and fought against it, and went hard unto the door of the tower, to burn it with fire. And a certain woman cast a piece of a millstone upon Abimelech's head, and all to break his skull," Judges ix, 52. The city of Shechem had a tower of the same kind, into which the people retired, when the same usurper took it and sowed it with salt, Judges ix, 46. These strong towers which were built within a fortified city, were commonly placed on an eminence, to which they ascended by a flight of steps. Such

was the situation of the city of David, a strong tower upon a high eminence at Jerusalem; and the manner of entrance, as described by the sacred writer: "But the gate of the fountain repaired Shallum, unto the stairs that go down from the city of David," Nehemiah iii, 15.

Cities of Refuge. See Refuge.

CLAUDIUS, a Roman emperor; he succeeded Caius Caligula, A. D. 41, and reigned thirteen years, eight months, and nineteen days, dying A. D. 54. King Agrippa was the principal means of persuading Claudius to accept the empire, which was tendered him by the soldiers. As an acknowledgment for this service, he gave Agrippa all Judea, and the kingdom of Chalcis to his brother Herod. He put an end to the dispute which had for some time existed between the Jews of Alexandria and the other freemen of that city, and confirmed the Jews in the possession of their right of freedom, which they had enjoyed from the beginning, and every where maintained them in the free exercise of their religion. But he would not permit them to hold any assemblies at Rome. King Agrippa dying A. D. 44, the emperor again reduced Judea into a province, and sent Cuspius Fadus to be governor. About the same time the famine happened which is mentioned Acts xi, 28–30, and was foretold by the Prophet Agabus. Claudius, in the ninth year of his reign, published an edict for expelling all Jews out of Rome, Acts xviii, 2. It is very probable that the Christians, who were at that time confounded with the Jews, were banished likewise.

2. Claudius Felix, successor of Cumanus in the government of Judea. Felix found means to solicit and engage Drusilla, sister of Agrippa the Younger, to leave her husband Azizus, king of the Emessenians, and to marry him, A. D. 53. Felix sent to Rome Eleazar, son of Dinæus, captain of a band of robbers, who had committed great ravages in Palestine; he procured the death of Jonathan, the high priest, who sometimes freely represented to him his duty; he defeated a body of three 251 thousand men, whom an Egyptian, a false prophet, had assembled upon the Mount of Olives. St. Paul being brought to Cesarea, where Felix usually resided, was well treated by this governor, who permitted his friends to see him, and render him services, hoping the Apostle would procure his redemption by a sum of money. He however neither condemned Paul, nor set him at liberty, when the Jews accused him; but adjourned the determination of this affair till the arrival of Lysias, who commanded the troops at Jerusalem, where he had taken Paul into custody, and who was expected at Cesarea, Acts xxiii, 26, 27, &c; xxiv, 1–3, &c.

While the Apostle was thus detained, Felix, with his wife Drusilla, who was a Jewess, sent for him, and desired him to explain the religion of Jesus

Christ. The Apostle spoke with his usual boldness, and discoursed to them on justice, temperance, and the last judgment. Felix trembled before this powerful exhibition of truths so arousing to his conscience; but he remanded St. Paul to his confinement. He farther detained him two years at Cesarea, in compliance with the wishes of the Jews, and in order to do something to propitiate them, because they were extremely dissatisfied with his government. Being recalled to Rome, A. D. 60; and many Jews going thither to complain of the extortions and violence committed by him in Judea, he would have been put to death, if his brother Pallas, who had been Claudius's slave, and was now his freedman, had not preserved him. Felix was succeeded in the government of Judea by Porcius Festus.

CLAY, קמח, is often mentioned in Scripture, nor is it necessary to explain the various references to what is so well known. It may be remarked, however, that clay was used for scaling doors. Norden and Pococke observe, that the inspectors of the granaries in Egypt, after closing the door, put their seal upon a handful of clay, with which they cover the lock. This may help to explain Job xxxviii, 14, in which the earth is represented as assuming form and imagery from the brightness of the rising sun, as rude clay receives a figure from the impression of a seal or signet.

CLEOPAS, according to Eusebius and Epiphanius, was brother of Joseph, both being sons of Jacob. He was the father of Simeon, of James the Less, of Jude, and Joseph or Joses. Cleopas married Mary, sister to the blessed virgin. He was therefore uncle to Jesus Christ, and his sons were first cousins to him. Cleopas, his wife, and sons, were disciples of Christ. Having beheld our Saviour expire upon the cross, he, like the other disciples, appears to have lost all hopes of seeing the kingdom of God established by him on earth. The third day after our Saviour's death, on the day of his resurrection, Cleopas, with another disciple, departed from Jerusalem to Emmaus; and in the way discoursed on what had lately happened. Our Saviour joined them, appearing as a traveller; and, taking up their discourse, he reasoned with them, convincing them out of the Scriptures, that it was necessary the Messiah should suffer death, previously to his being glorified. At Emmaus, Jesus seemed as if inclined to go farther; but Cleopas and his companion detained him, and made him sup with them. While they were at table, Jesus took bread, blessed it, brake, and gave it to them, and by this action their eyes were opened, and they knew him. Upon his disappearing they instantly returned to Jerusalem, to announce the fact to the Apostles, who in their turn declared that "the Lord was risen indeed and had appeared to Peter." In our translation of Luke xxiv, 31, it is said that Jesus "vanished out of their sight;" but the original is more properly rendered, "He suddenly went away from them," the word being often applied by the Greek writers to those who in any way, but

especially suddenly and abruptly, withdraw from any one's company. No other actions of Cleopas are known. It is the opinion of Jerom, that his residence was at Emmaus, and that he invited our Saviour into his own house. Supposing Cleopas to have been the brother of Joseph, and father of James, &c, Calmet thinks it more probable that as he was a Galilean, he dwelt in some city of Galilee.

CLOUD, a collection of vapours suspended in the atmosphere. When the Israelites had left Egypt, God gave them a pillar of cloud to direct their march, Exod. xiii, 21, 22. According to Jerom, in his Epistle to Fabiola, this cloud attended them from Succoth; or, according to others, from Rameses; or, as the Hebrews say, only from Ethan, till the death of Aaron; or, as the generality of commentators are of opinion, to the passage of Jordan. This pillar was commonly in front of the Israelites; but at Pihahiroth, when the Egyptian army approached behind them, it placed itself between Israel and the Egyptians, so that the Egyptians could not come near the Israelites all night, Exod. xiv, 19, 20. In the morning, the cloud moving on over the sea, and following the Israelites who had passed through it, the Egyptians pressing after were drowned. From that time, this cloud attended the Israelites; it was clear and bright during night, in order to afford them light; but in the day it was thick and gloomy, to defend them from the excessive heats of the deserts. "The angel of God which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them," Exod. xiv, 19. Here we may observe, that the angel and the cloud made the same motion, as it would seem, in company. The cloud by its motions gave the signal to the Israelites to encamp or to decamp. Where, therefore, it stayed, the people stayed till it rose again; then they broke up their camp, and followed it till it stopped. It was called a pillar, by reason of its form, which was high and elevated. Some interpreters suppose that there were two clouds, one to enlighten, the other to shade, the camp.

The Lord appeared at Sinai in the midst of a cloud, Exod. xix, 9; xxiv, 5; and after Moses had built and consecrated the tabernacle, the cloud filled the court around it, so that neither Moses nor the priests could enter, Exodus xl, 34, 35. The same happened at the dedication of the temple of Jerusalem by Solomon, 2 Chronicles v, 13; 1 Kings viii, 10. When the cloud appeared upon the tent, in front of which were held the assemblies of the people in the desert, it was then indicated that God was present; for the tent was a sign of God's presence. The angel descended in the cloud, and thence spoke to Moses, without being seen by the people, Exod. xvi, 10; Num. xi, 25; xvi, 5. It is common in Scripture, when mentioning God's appearing, to represent him as encompassed with clouds, which serve as a chariot, and contribute to veil his dreadful majesty, Job xxii, 14; Isaiah xix, 1; Matt.

xvii, 5; xxiv, 30, &c; Psalm xviii, 11, 12; xcvi, 2; civ, 3. Cloud is also used for morning mists: "Your goodness is as a morning cloud; and as the early dew it goeth away," Hosea vi, 4; xiii, 3. Job, speaking of the chaos, says, that God had confined the sea or the water, as it were with a cloud, and covered it with darkness, as a child is wrapped in its blankets. The author of Ecclesiasticus, xxiv, 6, used the same expression. The Son of God, at his second advent, is described as descending upon clouds, Matt. xxiv, 30; Luke xi, 27; Rev. xiv, 14–16.

COCCEIANS, the disciples of John Cocceius, a celebrated Dutch divine, born at Bremen, in 1608, where he was appointed professor of Hebrew, at the age of twenty-seven, and afterward filled the theological chair at Leyden, where he died in 1669. His works make ten volumes in folio. He was a man of good learning, and a vivid imagination. He considered the Old Testament as a mirror, which held forth figuratively the transactions and events that were to happen in the church under the dispensation of the New Testament, and unto the end of the world. He maintained, that by far the greater part of the ancient prophecies related to Christ's ministry and mediation, and the rise, progress, and revolutions of the church; not only under the figure of typical persons and transactions, but in a more direct manner; and that Christ was, indeed, as much the substance of the Old Testament as of the New. Cocceius also taught, that the covenant made between God and the Jews was of the same nature as the new covenant by Jesus Christ; that the law was promulgated by Moses, not merely as a rule of obedience, but also as a representation of the covenant of grace; that when the Jews had provoked the Deity by their various transgressions, particularly by the worship of the golden calf, the severe yoke of the ceremonial law was added as a punishment; that this yoke, which was painful in itself, became doubly so on account of its typical signification; since it admonished the Israelites from day to day of the imperfection of their state, filled them with anxiety, and was a perpetual proof that they had merited the righteous judgment of God, and could not expect, before the coming of the Messiah, the entire remission of their iniquities; that indeed good men, under the Mosaic dispensation, were, after death, made partakers of glory; but that, nevertheless, during the whole course of their lives they were far removed from that assurance of salvation, which rejoices the believer under the dispensation of the Gospel; and that their anxiety flowed from this consideration, that their sins, though they remained unpunished, were not yet pardoned; because Christ had not as yet offered himself up to make an atonement for them. Cocceius was also a millennarian, and expected a personal reign of Christ on earth in the last days. Many of his opinions were afterward adopted by the Hutchinsonians.

COCK, ἀλέκτωρ, a well known domestic fowl. Some derive the Greek name from α, and λέκτρον, a bed, because the crowing of cocks rouses men from their beds; but Mr. Parkhurst asks, “May not this name be as properly deduced from the Hebrew אור הלכת, the coming of the light, of which this ‘bird of dawning,’ as Shakspeare calls him, gives such remarkable notice, and for doing which he was, among the Heathen, sacred to the sun, who in Homer is himself called ἀλέκτωρ?” In Matt. xxvi, 34, our Lord is represented as saying, that before cock-crow Peter should deny him thrice; so Luke xxii, 34, and John xiii, 39. But according to Mark xiv, 30, he says, “Before the cock crow twice thou shalt deny me thrice.” These texts may be very satisfactorily reconciled, by observing, that ancient authors, both Greek and Latin, mention two cock-crowings, the one of which was soon after midnight, the other about three o’clock in the morning; and this latter being most noticed by men as the signal of their approaching labours, was called by way of eminence, the cock-crowing; and to this alone, Matthew, giving the general sense of our Saviour’s warning to Peter, refers; but Mark, recording his very words, mentions the two cock-crowings.

The rabbies tell us that cocks were not permitted to be kept in Jerusalem on account of the holiness of the place; and that for this reason some modern Jews cavil against this declaration of the Evangelists; but the cock is not among the birds prohibited in the law of Moses. If there was any restraint in the use and domestication of the animal, it must have been an arbitrary practice of the Jews, and could not have been binding on foreigners, of whom many resided at Jerusalem as officers or traders. Strangers would not be willing to forego an innocent kind of food in compliance with a conquered people; and the trafficking spirit of the Jews would induce them to supply aliens, if it did not expressly contradict the letter of their law. This is sufficient to account for fowl of this kind being there, even admitting a customary restraint. The celebrated Reland admits that it was not allowed to breed cocks in the city, but that the Jews were not prohibited from buying them to eat, and that therefore the cock mentioned in the Gospel might be in the house of a Jew who designed to kill it for his own table; or may have been kept in the precincts of Pilate, or of a Roman officer or soldier.

During the time of our Saviour, the night was divided into four watches, a fourth watch having been introduced among the Jews from the Romans, who derived it from the Greeks. The second and third watches are mentioned in Luke xii, 38; the fourth, in Matthew xiv, 25; and the four are all distinctly mentioned in Mark xiii, 35: “Watch, therefore; for ye know not when the master of the house cometh; at even,” ὄψε, or the late watch, “or at midnight,” μεσονυκτίου, “or at the cock-crowing,” ἀλεκτοροφωνίας, “or in the morning,” πρωῆ, the early watch. Here, the first watch was at

even, and continued from six till nine; the second commenced at nine, and ended at twelve, or midnight; the third watch, called by the Romans gallicinium, lasted from twelve to three; and the morning watch closed at six.

COCKATRICE, צִפְעָן, or צִפְעִי, Proverbs xxiii, 32; Isaiah xi, 8; xiv, 29; lix, 5; Jer. viii, 17. A venomous serpent. The original Hebrew word has been variously rendered, the aspic, the regulus, the hydra, the hemorhoos, the viper, and the cerastes. In Isaiah xi, 8, this serpent is evidently intended for a proportionate advance in malignity beyond the peten which precedes it; and in xiv, 29, it must mean a worse kind of serpent than the nahash. In lix, 5, it is referred to as oviparous. In Jer. viii, 17, Dr. Blayney, after Aquila, retains the rendering of basilisk. Bochart, who thinks it to be the regulus or basilisk, says that it may be so denominated by an onomatopœia from its hissing; and accordingly it is hence called in Latin sibilus, “the hisser.” So the Arabic saphaa signifies “flatu adurere,” [to scorch with a blast.] The Chaldee paraphrast, the Syriac, and the Arabic, render it the hurman or horman; which rabbi Selomo on Gen. xlix, 17, declares to be the tziphoni of the Hebrews: “Hurman vocatur species, cujus morsus est insanabilis. Is est Hebræis tziphoni, et Chaldaicè dicitur hurman, quia omnia facit הָרַם vastationem; id est, quia omnia vastat, et ad interneccionem destruit.” [The species is called hurman, whose bite is incurable. It is the tziphoni of the Hebrews, and is called in Chaldee hurman, because it makes all things הָרַם—a waste; that is, because it lays waste and utterly destroys every thing.]

COCKLE, בְּאֵשֶׁה. This word occurs only in Job xxxi, 40. By the Chaldee it is rendered noxious herbs; by Symmachus, ἀτελεσφόρητα, plants of imperfect fruit; by the Septuagint, βᾶτος, the blackberry bush; by Castelio, ebulus, “dwarf elder;” by Celsius, aconite; and by Bishop Stock and Dr. Good, the night-shade. M. Michaëlis maintains, after Celsius, that both this word and בְּאֵשֶׁה, Isaiah v, 2, 4, denote the aconite, a poisonous plant, growing spontaneously and luxuriantly on sunny hills, such as are used for vineyards. He says that this interpretation is certain, because, as Celsius had observed, בִּישׁ, in Arabic, denotes the aconite; and he intimates that it best suits Job xxxi, 40, where it is mentioned as growing instead of barley. The word appears to import a weed not only noxious, but of a fetid smell.

CÆLO-SYRIA, hollow or depressed Syria, Syria in the vale, 1 Macc. xiii, 10. This name imports the hollow land, or region, situated between two long ridges of mountains; and those mountains have been always understood to be Libanus and Anti-libanus. As these ridges run parallel for many leagues, they contain between them a long, extensive, and extremely fruitful valley.

COLOSSE, a city of Phrygia Minor, which stood on the river Lyceus, at an equal distance between Laodicea and Hierapolis. These three cities, says Eusebius, were destroyed by an earthquake, in the tenth of Nero, or about two years after the date of St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians. Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colosse were at no great distance from each other; which accounts for the Apostle Paul, when writing to his Christian brethren in the latter of these places, mentioning them all in connection with each other, Col. iv, 13. Of these cities, however, Laodicea was the greatest, for it was the metropolis of Phrygia, though Colosse is said to have been a great and wealthy place. The inhabitants of Phrygia, says Dr. Macknight, were famous for the worship of Bacchus, and of Cybele the mother of the gods; whence the latter was called Phrygia mater, by way of eminence. In her worship, as well as in that of Bacchus, both sexes practised every species of debauchery in speech and action, with a frantic rage which they pretended was occasioned by the inspiration of the deities whom they worshipped. These were the orgies, from ὄργη, rage, of Bacchus and Cybele, so famed in antiquity, the lascivious rites of which being perfectly adapted to the corruptions of the human heart, were performed by both sexes without shame or remorse. Hence as the Son of God came into the world to destroy the works of the devil, it appeared, in the eye of his Apostle, a matter of great importance to carry the light of the Gospel into countries where these abominable impurities were not only practised, but even dignified with the honourable appellation of religious worship; especially as nothing but the heaven-descended light of the Gospel could dispel such a pernicious infatuation. That this salutary purpose might be effectually accomplished, Paul, accompanied by Silas and Timothy, went at different times into Phrygia, and preached the Gospel in many cities of that country with great success; but it is thought by many persons, that the Epistle to the Colossians contains internal marks of his never having been at Colosse when he wrote it. This opinion rests principally upon the following passage: "For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh," Col. ii, 1: but these words, if they prove any thing upon this question, prove that St. Paul had never been either at Laodicea or Colosse; but surely it is very improbable that he should have travelled twice into Phrygia for the purpose of preaching the Gospel, and not have gone either to Laodicea or Colosse, which were the two principal cities of that country; especially as in the second journey into those parts it is said, that he "went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia, strengthening all the disciples;" and moreover, we know that it was the Apostle's practice to preach at the most considerable places of every district into which he went. Dr. Lardner, after arguing this point, says, "From all these considerations, it appears to me very probable that the church at Colosse had been planted



by the Apostle Paul, and that the Christians there were his friends, disciples, and converts.”

The Epistle greatly resembles that to the Ephesians, both in sentiment and expression. After saluting the Colossian Christians in his own name, and that of Timothy, St. Paul assures them, that since he had heard of their faith in Christ Jesus, and of their love to all Christians, he had not ceased to return thanks to God for them, and to pray that they might increase in spiritual knowledge, and abound in every good work; he describes the dignity of Christ, and declares the universality of the Gospel dispensation, which was a mystery formerly hidden, but now made manifest; and he mentions his own appointment, through the grace of God, to be the Apostle of the Gentiles; he expresses a tender concern for the Colossians and other Christians of Phrygia, and cautions them against being seduced from the simplicity of the Gospel, by the subtlety of Pagan philosophers, or the superstition of Judaizing Christians; he directs them to set their affections on things above, and forbids every species of licentiousness; he exhorts to a variety of Christian virtues, to meekness, veracity, humility, charity, and devotion; he enforces the duties of wives, husbands, children, fathers, servants, and masters; he inculcates the duty of prayer, and of prudent behaviour toward unbelievers; and after adding the salutations of several persons then at Rome, and desiring that this epistle might be read in the church of their neighbours the Laodiceans, he concludes with a salutation from himself, written, as usual, with his own hand.

COMFORTER, one of the titles by which the Holy Spirit is designated in the New Testament, John xiv, 16, 26; xv, 26. The name has no doubt a reference to his peculiar office in the economy of redemption; namely, that of imparting consolation to the hearts of Christ's disciples, which he effects by “taking of the things that are Christ's,” and explaining them; or, in other words, by illuminating their minds as to the meaning of the Scriptures, assuring them of the Saviour's love, bringing to their recollection his consolatory sayings, and filling their souls with peace and joy in believing them.--The word has also been rendered Advocate, Helper, Monitor, Teacher, &c. The first does not apply to the office of the Spirit; and the others are not so well supported by the connection of our Lord's discourse, which favours the translation, Comforter; because whatever gracious offices the Holy Spirit was to perform for the disciples, the great end of all was to remove that sorrow which the approach of the departure of Christ had produced, and to render their joy full and complete.

COMMERCE. Merchandise, in its various branches, was carried on in the east at the earliest period of which we have any account; and it was not long before the traffic between nations, both by sea and land, was very

considerable. Accordingly, frequent mention is made of public roads, fords, bridges, and beasts of burden; also of ships for the transportation of property, of weights, measures, and coin, both in the oldest books of the Bible, and in the most ancient profane histories. The Phenicians anciently held the first rank as a commercial nation. They were in the habit of purchasing goods of various kinds throughout all the east. They then carried them in ships down the Mediterranean, as far as the shores of Africa and Europe, brought back in return merchandise and silver, and disposed of these again in the more eastern countries. The first metropolis of the Phenicians was Sidon: afterward Tyre became the principal city. Tyre was built two hundred and forty years before the temple of Solomon, or twelve hundred and fifty-one before Christ. The Phenicians had ports of their own in almost every country; the most distinguished of which were Carthage and Tarshish, or Tartessus, in Spain. The ships from the latter place undertook very distant voyages: hence, any vessels that performed distant voyages were called “ships of Tarshish,” אֲנוֹת תַּרְשִׁישׁ. Something is said of the commerce of the Phenicians in the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth chapters of Ezekiel, and the twenty-third chapter of Isaiah. The inhabitants of Arabia Felix carried on a commerce with India. They carried some of the articles which they brought from India through the straits of Babelmandel into Abyssinia and Egypt; some they transported to Babylon through the Persian Gulf and the Euphrates; and some by the way of the Red Sea to the port of Eziongeber. They thus became rich; though it is possible their wealth may have been too much magnified by the ancients. The eminence of the Egyptians, as a commercial nation, commences with the reign of Necho. Their commerce, nevertheless, was not great, till Alexander had destroyed Tyre and built Alexandria.

2. The Phenicians sometimes received the goods of India by way of the Persian Gulf, where they had colonies in the islands of Dedan, Arad, and Tyre. Sometimes they received them from the Arabians, who either brought them by land through Arabia, or up the Red Sea to Eziongeber. In the latter case, having landed them at the port mentioned, they transported them through the country by the way of Gaza to Phenicia. The Phenicians increased the amount of their foreign goods by the addition of those which they themselves fabricated; and were thus enabled to supply all parts of the Mediterranean. The Egyptians at first received their goods from the Phenicians, Arabians, Africans, and Abyssinians; in all of which countries there are still the remains of large trading towns; but in a subsequent age, they imported goods from India in their own vessels; and eventually carried on an export trade with various ports on the Mediterranean. Oriental commerce, however, was chiefly carried on by land: accordingly, vessels are hardly mentioned in the Bible, except in Psalm cvii, 23–30, and in passages where the discourse turns upon the Phenicians, or upon the naval

affairs of Solomon and Jehoshaphat. The two principal routes from Palestine into Egypt were, the one along the shores of the Mediterranean from Gaza to Pelusium, and the other from Gaza by the way of Mount Sinai and the Elanitic branch of the Red Sea.

3. The merchants transported their goods upon camels; animals which are patient of thirst, and are easily supported in the deserts. For the common purpose of security against depredations, the oriental merchants travelled in company, as is common in the east at the present day. A large travelling company of this kind is called a caravan or carvan, a smaller one was called kafilé or kafle, Job vi, 18–20; Gen. xxxvii, 25; Isa. xxi, 13; Jer. ix, 2; Judges v, 6; Luke ii, 44. The furniture carried by the individuals of a caravan consisted of a mattress, a coverlet, a carpet for sitting upon, a round piece of leather, which answered the purpose of a table, a few pots and kettles of copper covered with tin; also a tin-plated cup, which was suspended before the breast under the outer garment, and was used for drinking, 1 Sam. xxvi, 11, 12, 16: leathern bags for holding water, tents, lights, and provisions in quality and abundance as each one could afford. Every caravan had a leader to conduct it through the desert, who was acquainted with the direction of its route, and with the cisterns and fountains. These he was able to ascertain, sometimes from heaps of stones, sometimes by the character of the soil, and, when other helps failed him, by the stars, Num. x, 29–32; Jer. xxxi, 21; Isa. xxi, 14. When all things are in readiness, the individuals who compose the caravan assemble at a distance from the city. The commander of the caravan, who is a different person from the conductor or leader, and is chosen from the wealthiest of its members, appoints the day of their departure. A similar arrangement was adopted among the Jews, whenever they travelled in large numbers to the city of Jerusalem. The caravans start very early, sometimes before day. They endeavour to find a stopping place or station to remain at during the night, which shall afford them a supply of water, Job vi, 15–20. They arrive at their stopping place before the close of the day; and, while it is yet light, prepare every thing that is necessary for the recommencement of their journey. In order to prevent any one from wandering away from the caravan, and getting lost during the night, lamps or torches are elevated upon poles and carried before it. The pillar of fire answered this purpose for the Israelites, when wandering in the wilderness. Sometimes the caravans lodge in cities; but when they do not, they pitch their tents so as to form an encampment; and during the night keep watch alternately for the sake of security. In the cities there are public inns, called Chan and Carvanserai, in which the caravans are lodged without expense. They are large square buildings, in the centre of which is an area, or open court. Carvanserais are denominated in the Greek of the New Testament, *πανδοχεῖον*, *κατάλυσσις* and *κατάλυμα*, Luke ii, 7; x, 34. The first mention

of one in the Old Testament is in Jer. xli, 17, גרות כמהם. It was situated near the city of Bethlehem.

4. Moses enacted no laws in favour of commerce, although there is no question that he saw the situation of Palestine to be very favourable for it. The reason of this was, that the Hebrews, who were designedly set apart to preserve the true religion, could not mingle with foreign idolatrous nations without injury. He therefore merely inculcated good faith and honesty in buying and selling, Lev. xix, 36, 37; Deut. xxv, 13–16; and left all the other interests of commerce to a future age. By the establishment, however, of the three great festivals, he gave occasion for some mercantile intercourse. At these festivals all the adult males of the nation were yearly assembled at one place. The consequence was, that those who had any thing to sell brought it; while those who wished to buy articles came with the expectation of having an opportunity. As Moses, though he did not encourage, did not interdict foreign commerce, Solomon, at a later period, not only carried on a traffic in horses, as already stated, but sent ships from the port of Eziongeber through the Red Sea to Ophir, probably the coast of Africa, 1 Kings ix, 26; 2 Chron. ix, 21. This traffic, although a source of emolument, appears to have been neglected after the death of Solomon. The attempt made by Jehoshaphat to restore it was frustrated, by his ships being dashed upon the rocks and destroyed, 1 Kings xxii, 48, 49; 2 Chron. xx, 36. Joppa, though not a very convenient one, was properly the port of Jerusalem; and some of the large vessels which went to Spain sailed from it, Jonah i, 3. In the age of Ezekiel, the commerce of Jerusalem was so great, that it gave an occasion of envy even to the Tyrians themselves, Ezek. xxvi, 2. After the captivity, a great number of Jews became merchants, and travelled for the purpose of traffic into all countries. About the year 150 B. C. prince Simon rendered the port at Joppa more convenient than it had hitherto been. In the time of Pompey the Great, there were so many Jews abroad on the ocean, even in the character of pirates, that King Antigonus was accused before him of having sent them out on purpose. A new port was built by Herod at Cesarea.

COMMUNION, in a religious sense, refers chiefly to the admission of persons to the Lord's Supper. This is said to be open, when all are admitted who apply, as in the Church of England; to be strict, when confined to the members of a single society, or, at least, to members of the same denomination; and it is mixed, when persons are admitted from societies of 256different denominations, on the profession of their faith, and evidence of their piety. The principal difficulty on this point arises between the strict Baptists and Pædo-Baptists.

CONCUBINE, פִּילגֶשׁ. This term, in western authors, commonly signifies, a woman, who, without being married to a man, yet lives with him as his wife; but, in the sacred writers, the word concubine is understood in another sense; meaning a lawful wife, but one not wedded with all the ceremonies and solemnities of matrimony; a wife of the second rank, inferior to the first wife, or mistress of the house. Children of concubines did not inherit their father's fortune; but he might provide for, and make presents to, them. Thus Abraham, by Sarah his wife, had Isaac, his heir; but, by his two concubines, Hagar and Keturah, he had other children, whom he did not make equal to Isaac. As polygamy was tolerated in the east, it was common to see in every family, beside lawful wives, several concubines. Since the abrogation of polygamy by Jesus Christ, and the restoration of marriage to its primitive institution, concubinage is ranked with adultery or fornication.

CONEY, שֶׁפֶן, Levit. xi, 5; Deut. xiv, 7; Psalm civ, 8; and Prov. xxx, 26. Bochart and others have supposed the shaphan of the Scriptures to be the jerboa; but Mr. Bruce proves that the ashkoko is intended. This curious animal is found in Ethiopia, and in great numbers on Mount Lebanon, &c. Instead of holes, they seem to delight in more airy places, in the mouths of caves, or clefts in the rock. They are gregarious, and frequently several dozens of them sit upon the great stones at the mouths of caves, and warm themselves in the sun, or come out and enjoy the freshness of the summer evening. They do not stand upright upon their feet, but seem to steal along as in fear, their belly being nearly close to the ground; advancing a few steps at a time, and then pausing. They have something very mild, feeble-like, and timid, in their deportment; are gentle and easily tamed, though, when roughly handled at the first, they bite very severely. Many are the reasons to believe this to be the animal called saphan in Hebrew, and erroneously by our translators, "the coney," or rabbit. The latter are gregarious indeed, and so far resemble the other, as also in size; but they seek not the same place of retreat; for the rabbit burrows most generally in the sand. Nor is there any thing in the character of rabbits that denotes excellent wisdom, or that they supply the want of strength by any remarkable sagacity. The saphan, then, is not the rabbit; which last, unless it was brought to him by his ships from Europe, Solomon never saw.

Let us now apply the characters of the ashkoko to the saphan. "He is above all other animals so much attached to the rocks, that I never once," says Mr. Bruce, "saw him on the ground, or from among large stones in the mouth of caves, where is his constant residence. He lives in families or flocks. He is in Judea, Palestine, and Arabia, and consequently must have been familiar to Solomon. David describes him very pertinently, and joins him to other animals perfectly known: 'The hills are a refuge for the wild

goats, and the rocks for the saphan:’ and Solomon says that ‘they are exceeding wise,’ that they are ‘but a feeble folk, yet make their houses in the rocks.’ Now this, I think, very obviously fixes the ashkoko to be the saphan; for his weakness seems to allude to his feet, and how inadequate these are to dig holes in the rock, where yet, however, he lodges. From their tenderness these are very liable to be excoriated or hurt; notwithstanding which, they build houses in the rocks more inaccessible than those of the rabbit, and in which they abide in greater safety, not by exertion of strength, for they have it not, but are truly, as Solomon says, ‘a feeble folk,’ but by their own sagacity and judgment; and are therefore justly described as wise. Lastly, what leaves the thing without doubt is, that some of the Arabs, particularly Damir, say that the saphan has no tail, that it is less than a cat, that it lives in houses or nests, which it builds of straw, in contradistinction to the rabbit and the rat, and those animals that burrow in the ground.”

CONFESSION signifies a public acknowledgment of any thing as our own: thus Christ will confess the faithful in the day of judgment, Luke xii, 8. 2. To own and profess the truths of Christ, and to obey his commandments, in spite of opposition and danger from enemies, Matt. x, 32. 3. To utter or speak the praises of God, or to give him thanks. 4. To acknowledge our sins and offences to God, either by private or public confession; or to our neighbour whom we have wronged; or to some pious persons from whom we expect to receive comfort and spiritual instruction; or to the whole congregation when our fault is published, Psalm xxxii, 5; Matt. iii, 6; James v, 16; 1 John i, 9. 5. To acknowledge a crime before a judge, Josh. vii, 19.

2. In the Jewish ceremony of annual expiation, the high priest confessed in general his own sins, the sins of other ministers of the temple, and those of all the people. When an Israelite offered a sacrifice for sin, he put his hand on the head of the victim, and confessed his faults, Lev. iv. On the day of atonement, the Jews still make a private confession of their sins, which is called by them cippur, and which is said to be done in the following manner: Two Jews retire into a corner of the synagogue. One of them bows very low before the other, with his face turned toward the north. He who performs the office of confessor gives the penitent nine-and-thirty blows on the back with a leathern strap, repeating these words, “God, being full of compassion, forgave their iniquity, and destroyed them not; yea, many a time turned he his anger away, and did not stir up all his wrath.” As there are only thirteen words in this verse recited in the Hebrew, he repeats it three times, and at every word strikes one blow; which makes nine-and-thirty words, and as many lashes. In the meantime, the penitent declares his sins, and at the 257<sup>th</sup> confession of every one beats himself on his breast. This being finished, he who has performed the office of confessor

prostrates himself on the ground, and receives in turn from his penitent nine-and-thirty lashes.

3. The Romish church not only requires confession as a duty, but has advanced it to the dignity of a sacrament. These confessions are made in private to the priest, who is not to reveal them under pain of the highest punishment. The council of Trent requires “secret confession to the priest alone, of all and every mortal sin, which, upon the most diligent search and examination of our consciences, we can remember ourselves to be guilty of since our baptism; together with all the circumstances of those sins, which may change the nature of them; because, without the perfect knowledge of these, the priest cannot make a judgment of the nature and quality of men’s sins, nor impose fitting penance for them.” This is the confession of sins which the same council confidently affirms “to have been instituted by our Lord, and by the law of God, to be necessary to salvation, and to have been always practised in the catholic church.” It is, however, evident, that such confession is unscriptural. St. James, indeed, says, “Confess your faults one to another,” James v, 16; but priests are not here mentioned, and the word faults seems to confine the precept to a mutual confession among Christians, of those offences by which they may have injured each other. Certain it is, that from this passage the necessity of auricular confession, and the power of priestly absolution, cannot be inferred. Though many of the early ecclesiastical writers earnestly recommend confession to the clergy, yet they never recommend it as essential to the pardon of sin, or as having connection with a sacrament. They only urge it as entitling a person to the prayers of the congregation; and as useful for supporting the authority of wholesome discipline, and for maintaining the purity of the Christian church. Chrysostom condemns all secret confession to men, as being obviously liable to great abuses; and Basil, Hilary, and Augustine, all advise confession of sins to God only. It has been proved by M. Daillé, that private, auricular, sacramental confession of sins was unknown in the primitive church. But, though private auricular confession is not of divine authority, yet, as Archbishop Tillotson properly observes, there are many cases in which men, under the guilt and trouble of their sins, can neither appease their own minds, nor sufficiently direct themselves, without recourse to some pious and prudent guide. In these cases, men certainly do very well, and many times prevent a great deal of trouble and perplexity to themselves, by a timely discovery of their condition to some faithful minister, in order to their direction and satisfaction. To this purpose a general confession is for the most part sufficient; and where there is occasion for a more particular discovery, there is no need of raking into the minute and foul circumstances of men’s sins to give that advice which is necessary for the cure and ease of the penitent. Auricular confession is unquestionably one of the greatest

corruptions of the Romish church. It goes upon the ground that the priest has power to forgive sins; it establishes the tyrannical influence of the priesthood; it turns the penitent from God who only can forgive sins, to man who is himself a sinner; and it tends to corrupt both the confessors and the confessed by a foul and particular disclosure of sinful thoughts and actions of every kind without exception.

Confessions of Faith, simply considered, is the same with creed, and signifies a summary of the principal articles of belief adopted by any individual or society. In its more common acceptation, it is restricted to the summaries of doctrine published by particular Christian churches, with the view of preventing their religious sentiments from being misunderstood or misrepresented, or, by requiring subscription to them, of securing uniformity of opinion among those who join their communion. Except a single sentence in one of the Ignatian Epistles, (A. D. 180,) which relates exclusively to the reality of Christ's personality and sufferings in opposition to the Docetæ, the earliest document of this kind is to be found in the writings of Irenæus, who flourished toward the end of the second century of the Christian æra. In his treatise against heresies, this father affirms that "the faith of the church planted throughout the whole world," consisted in the belief of "one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth and sea, and all that are in them; and one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation; and one Holy Spirit, who foretold, through the Prophets, the dispensations and advents, and the generation by the virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascension in the flesh into heaven, of Jesus Christ our beloved Lord, and his appearing from heaven in the glory of the Father, to unite together all things under one head, and to raise every individual of the human race; that unto Christ Jesus, our Lord and God, and Saviour and King, every knee may bow, and every tongue confess; that he may pronounce just sentence upon all." In various parts of Tertullian's writings similar statements occur, (A. D. 200,) which it is unnecessary particularly to quote. We shall only remark, that in one of them, the miraculous conception of Christ by the power of the Holy Ghost is distinctly mentioned; that in another, he declares it to have been the uniform doctrine from the beginning of the Gospel, that Christ was born of the virgin, both man and God, *ex eâ natum hominem et Deum*; and that in each of these, faith in the Father, Son, and Spirit, is recognised as essential to Christianity. The following passage we cite, for the purpose of marking its coincidence with the Apostles' Creed, to which we shall have occasion soon to advert: "This," says he, "is the sole, immovable, irreformable rule of faith; namely, to believe in the only God Almighty, maker of the world; 258and his Son Jesus Christ, born of the virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day raised from the dead, received into heaven, now sitting at the right



hand of the Father, about to come and judge the quick and the dead, by the resurrection also of the flesh.” The summaries contained in the works of Origen (A. D. 520) nearly resemble the preceding; any difference between them being easily accounted for, from the tenets of the particular heresies against which they were directed. In his “Commentary on St. John’s Gospel,” he thus writes: “We believe that there is one God, who created all things, and framed and made all things to exist out of nothing. We must also believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and in all the truth concerning his Deity and humanity; and we must likewise believe in the Holy Spirit; and that, being free agents, we shall be punished for the things in which we sin, and rewarded for those in which we do well.” According to Cyprian, the formula, to which assent was required from adults at their baptism, was in these terms: “Dost thou believe in God the Father, Christ the Son, the Holy Spirit, the remission of sins, and eternal life, through the holy church?” This was called by him *symboli lex*, “the law of the creed;” and by Novatian, *regula veritatis*, “the rule of truth.”

2. From these and similar sources, the different clauses of what is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed appear to have sprung. For, though it was long believed to be the composition of the Apostles, its claims to such an inspired origin are now universally rejected. Of its great antiquity, however, there can be no doubt; the whole of it, as it stands in the English liturgy, having been generally received as an authoritative confession in the fourth century. Toward the end of that century, Rufinus wrote a commentary on it, which is still extant, in which he acknowledges that the clause respecting Christ’s descent into hell was not admitted into the creeds either of the western or the eastern churches. We learn also that the epithet catholic was not at that time applied in it to the church. Its great simplicity and conciseness, beside, prove it to have been considerably earlier than the council of Nice, when the heretical speculations of various sects led the defenders of the orthodox faith to fence the interests of religion with more complicated and cumbrous barriers.

This confession of faith was then preëminently named *symbolum*; which might be understood in the general acceptation of sign, as the characteristic, representative sign of the Christian faith; or, in a more restricted sense, in reference to the *σύμβολον στρατιωτικόν*, or *tessera militaris*, the watch word of the Christian soldier, communicated to each man at his first entrance into the service of Christ. Perhaps this word, at first, only denoted the formula of baptism, and was afterward transferred to the confession of faith.

3. In the celebrated council of Nice, (A. D. 325,) in which Arianism was not only condemned, but proscribed, the confession established as the

universal standard of truth and orthodoxy runs thus: "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, descended from heaven, and became incarnate by the Holy Ghost, of the virgin Mary; and was made man, was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried; and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, of whose kingdom there will be no end. And I believe in the Holy Ghost who spake by the Prophets; and one catholic, and Apostolical church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

It were endless to specify the particular shades of difference by which the Arian confessions (the number of which amounted nearly to twenty in the space of a very few years) were distinguished from each other: suffice it to say, that while they agreed generally in substance, especially in rejecting the Nicene term, ὁμοούσιος, as applied to the Son, their variations of expression concerning the nature of his subordination to the Father were so astonishingly minute, as almost to bid defiance to any attempt which might be made, at this distance of time, to determine in what their real and essential differences consisted.

4. "The Book of Armagh," a very ancient collection of interesting national documents, which have recently been published by Sir William Betham in the second part of his curious "Irish Antiquarian Researches," contains the Confession of St. Patrick; who has been supposed, from several collateral circumstances, to have flourished some years prior to the time of St. Jerom, or about the commencement of the fourth century. The subjoined are the first two paragraphs in it, and will be admired for the orthodoxy, artlessness, and Christian experience which they exhibit:--"I, Patrick, a sinner, the rudest, the least, and the most insignificant of the faithful, had Calphurnius, a deacon, for my father, who was the son of Potitus, heretofore a priest, the son of Odissus, who lived in the village of Banavem Taberniæ. For he had a little farm adjacent, where I was captured. I was then almost sixteen years of age; but I knew not God, and was led into captivity by the Irish, with many thousand men, as we deserved, because we estranged ourselves from God, and did not keep his laws, and were disobedient to our pastors, who admonished us with respect to our salvation: and the Lord brought down upon us the anger of his Spirit, and

dispersed us among many nations, even to the extremity of the earth, where my meanness was conspicuous among foreigners, 259and where the Lord discovered to me a sense of my unbelief; that late I should remember my transgressions, and that I should be converted with my whole heart to the Lord my God, who had respect to my humiliation, and pitied my youth and ignorance, even before I knew him, and before I was wise, or could distinguish between right and wrong, and strengthened me, and cherished me, as a father would a son. From which time I could not remain silent; nor, indeed, did he cease to bless me with many acts of kindness; and so great was the favour of which he thought me worthy in the land of my captivity. For this is my retribution, that, after my rebuking, punishment, and acknowledgment of God, I should exalt him, and confess his wonderful acts before every nation which is under the whole heaven; because there is no other God, nor ever was before, nor will be after him, except God, the unbegotten Father, without beginning, possessing all things, as we have said, and his Son Jesus Christ, who, we bear witness, was always with the Father, before the formation of the world, in spirit (or spiritually) with the Father, inexpressibly begotten before all beginning, through whom visible things were made: he became man, having overcome death, and was received into heaven. And God has given to him all power ‘above every name, as well of the inhabitants of heaven as of the earth and of the powers below, that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord and God;’ whom we believe, and whose coming we expect, as presently about to be Judge of the living and dead, who will render unto every man according to his actions, and has poured upon us abundantly the gift of his Holy Spirit, and the pledge of immortality; who makes us that believe and are obedient to be the sons of God and joint heirs of Christ; whom we believe and adore, one God in the Trinity of the sacred name. For he spoke by the Prophet, ‘Call upon me in the day of tribulation, and I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me.’ And again he says, ‘It is an honourable thing to reveal and confess the works of God.’”

5. Macedonius having denied not only the divinity but the personality of the Holy Spirit, maintaining that he is only a divine energy diffused throughout the universe, a general council was called at Constantinople, A. D. 381, in order to crush this rising heresy. The confession promulgated on this occasion, and which “gave the finishing touch to what the council of Nice had left imperfect, and fixed, in a full and determinate manner, the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is still received among the generality of Christians,” exactly coincides with the Nicene confession, except in the article respecting the Spirit, which it thus extends: “And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who, together with the Father and the Son, is worshipped and glorified.”

6. Subsequent to this, and probably toward the middle of the fifth century, the creed which bears the name of Athanasius appears to have been composed. That it was not the work of this distinguished opposer of Arianism is established by the most satisfactory evidence. No traces of it are to be found in any of his writings, though they relate chiefly to the very subject of which it is an exposition; and so far from its being ascribed to him, not the least notice is taken of it by any of his contemporaries. Its language, beside, concerning the Spirit is so similar to that of the council of Constantinople, but still more precise and explicit, that there can be no doubt of its having been written posterior to the time of that assembly. Yet Athanasius died in the year 373. Accordingly, it has been, with great probability of truth, attributed, particularly by Dr. Waterland, to Hilary, bishop of Arles, who is said by one of his biographers to have composed an Exposition of the Creed: a title which certainly is more appropriate and characteristic of it than that of Creed simply, by which it is now so universally known. The damnatory clauses in this creed have frequently been made subjects of reprehension; and some clergymen of the church of England have scrupled to read them as directed by the Rubric. The following is an apology for those clauses, by the late venerable Archdeacon Dodwell, who seems to have felt none of those misgivings which troubled his doubting brethren:--“The form, as well as the substance, of this creed, and the very introduction to the main article, has been objected to: ‘Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith;’ to which is added, ‘Which faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.’ This, with a like condemnatory sentence in the conclusion of the creed, wherein a possibility of salvation is denied to him who does not cordially embrace this doctrine, is pronounced unreasonable, uncharitable, unchristian, with every other aggravating appellation that can be used. But the ground of this charge, and the whole of the difficulty suggested in it, from the variety of the circumstances of different persons, depends upon the interpretation of the phrase of ‘being saved.’ The meaning of this term in its primary signification, and as it is applied to common subjects in common discourse, means a preservation from threatening perils, or from threatened punishment. But, in an evangelical sense, and as it occurs in the New Testament, it includes much more: it means the whole Christian scheme of redemption and justification by the Son of God, with all the glorious privileges and promises contained in that scheme. It means not merely a hope of deliverance from danger or from vengeance, but a federal title to positive happiness, purchased by the merits, and declared to mankind by the Gospel of Christ Jesus our Lord. St. Paul calls it ‘the obtaining the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory,’ 2 Tim. ii, 10. ‘Whosoever,’ then, says the creed, ‘will’ thus ‘be saved,’ will be desirous

to secure the glorious promises of the Gospel, must pursue it upon the terms which that Gospel proposes, and particularly must embrace the doctrines which it reveals. The creed speaks of those only to whom the evidence of the Gospel has been fully set forth, and the importance of it fully explained. We are to justify it only to professed believers, and of them only. The state and lot of the Heathen world are quite out of the question. Neither common sense nor Scripture will permit us to interpret it of those who still 'sit in darkness and the shadow of death,' and never had the means of grace and the hope of glory proposed to them. Even with respect to those to whom the Gospel is preached, there is no necessity of interpreting the words here used in the harshest and strictest sense. There are many distinctions and limitations, which are always understood and supposed in such cases, though they are not expressly mentioned. General rules are laid down as such, are true as such; while excepted cases are referred to the judgment of those who are qualified to judge of them, and are not particularly pointed out; as for other reasons, so lest they should be extended too far, and defeat the general rule. Sufficient capacity in the persons to whom it is applied, and sufficient means of information and conviction, are always presupposed, where faith is spoken of as necessary. Where either of these is wanting, the case is (where it should be) in the hands of God. The creed is laid down as a rule of judgment to men, not to their Maker. We may learn from thence on what terms alone we can claim a title to the promises of the Gospel; but we do not learn from thence how far uncovenanted favour may be extended to particular persons. It is not intended to exclude the mercy of God to Heathens or heretics; it being his prerogative, and his alone, to judge how far the error or ignorance of any one is his wilful fault, or his unavoidable infirmity. But it is intended to establish the terms on which WE may now claim acceptance, and, in consequence of his gracious promise, may say, that 'God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.' The creed relates only to the covenant of salvation; and any expression which, used separately without this view and connection, might be thought to bear a stronger and more absolute sense, yet is limited by this relative coherence, and is to be interpreted by it. 'Perishing everlastingly,' in other discourses, may sometimes be understood of everlasting damnation; but here it means the being for ever excluded from the only stated claim of promised mercy. And 'without doubt,' he who does not embrace the truths proposed by revelation, has no title to those hopes which that revelation, and that only, offers to mankind. And even when such expressions of terror are used in the strongest sense, and threatened to unbelief or disobedience, they universally imply such exceptions as these,--'Unless personal disabilities lessen the guilt, or repentance intervene to prevent the punishment.' In short, no objection can be made against this assertion in the creed, but what would hold as strongly against that declaration of our blessed Lord, 'He that believeth, and is

baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned,' Mark xvi, 15. Indeed, this condemnatory sentence in this form by human authority is plainly founded on and borrowed from that divine authority in the Gospel; and whatever distinctions and limitations are allowed in that case are equally applicable to this, and will fully justify both. The necessity of a true belief in all whom Providence has blessed with the means and opportunities of learning it, in order to entitle them federally to eternal salvation, being thus established upon Scripture proof, the creed goes on very regularly to declare what is that true belief so indispensably necessary." This is, perhaps, all that can be said in favour of these comminations; but few will think it quite satisfactory. The effect of them has doubtless been, to induce many to fly to the opposite extreme of laxity on the subject of fundamental doctrines.

Before leaving the ancient formulas of Christian doctrine, it may be stated, that both in the council of Ephesus against the Nestorians, held A. D. 431; and in that of Chalcedon, against the Eutychians, in 451; it was solemnly declared and decreed, that "Christ was one divine person, in whom two natures, the human and the divine, were most closely united, but without being mixed or confounded together."

7. Amid the variance and opposition of council to council, and pope to pope, (A. D. 1553,) which prevailed for centuries in the Romish church, it would be no easy task to ascertain the real articles of its confession. The decrees of the council of Trent, however, together with the creed of Pope Pius IV, are now commonly understood to be the authoritative standards of its faith and worship. These, beside recognising the authority of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, embrace a multitude of dogmas which it is unnecessary particularly to specify, relating to traditions, the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, order, and matrimony, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, worshipping of images, purgatory, indulgences, &c, &c.

8. The Greek church has no public or established confession; but its creed, so far as can be gathered from its authorized catechisms, admits the doctrines of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, with the exception of the article in each concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, which it affirms to be "from the Father only, and not from the Father and the Son." It disowns the supremacy and infallibility of the pope, purgatory by fire, graven images, and the restriction of the sacrament to one kind; but acknowledges the seven sacraments of the catholics, the religious use of pictures, invocation of saints, transubstantiation, and masses and prayers for the dead.

9. Though the Romish church early appropriated to itself the exclusive title of catholic, or universal; and though, for many centuries, its unscriptural tenets pervaded the far greater 261part of Europe; not only were there always some individuals who adhered to the doctrines of genuine Christianity, but, long before the Protestant reformation, there appear to have been whole congregations who maintained, in considerable purity, the substance of the faith contained in Scripture. Such were the churches of the Waldenses in the valleys of Piedmont, whose confession, of so early a date as the beginning of the twelfth century, is still preserved. It consists of fourteen articles, of which the following is a copy, taken from the Cambridge MSS, and bearing date A. D. 1120:--“(1.) We believe and firmly hold all that which is contained in the twelve articles of the symbol, which is called the Apostles’ Creed, accounting for heresy whatsoever is disagreeing, and not consonant to the said twelve articles. (2.) We do believe that there is one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (3.) We acknowledge for the holy canonical Scriptures the books of the Holy Bible. [Here follows a list of the books of the Old and New Testament, exactly the same as those we have in our English authorized version. Then follows a list of “the books apocryphal, which,” with admirable simplicity they say, “are not received of the Hebrews. But we read them, as saith St. Jerom in his Prologue to the Proverbs, ‘for the instruction of the people, not to confirm the authority of the doctrine of the church.’”] (4.) The books above-said teach this, that there is one God, almighty, all-wise, and all-good, who has made all things by his goodness; for he formed Adam in his own image and likeness, but that by the envy of the devil, and the disobedience of the said Adam, sin has entered into the world, and that we are sinners in Adam and by Adam. (5.) That Christ was promised to our fathers who received the law, that so knowing by the law their sin, unrighteousness, and insufficiency, they might desire the coming of Christ, to satisfy for their sins, and accomplish the law by himself. (6.) That Christ was born in the time appointed by God the Father; that is to say, in the time when all iniquity abounded, and not for the cause of good works, for all were sinners; but that he might show us grace and mercy, as being faithful. (7.) That Christ is our life, truth, peace, and righteousness; also our pastor, advocate, sacrifice, and priest; who died for the salvation of all those that believe, and is risen for our justification. (8.) In like manner, we firmly hold that there is no other Mediator and Advocate with God the Father, save only Jesus Christ. And as for the virgin Mary, that she was holy, humble, and full of grace. And in like manner do we believe concerning all the other saints; namely, that, being in heaven, they wait for the resurrection of their bodies at the day of judgment. (9.) Item, We believe that, after this life, there are only two places, the one for the saved, and the other for the damned; the which two places we call paradise and hell, absolutely denying that purgatory invented by antichrist, and forged

contrary to the truth. (10.) Item, We have always accounted as an unspeakable abomination before God all those inventions of men; namely, the feasts and the vigils of saints, the water which they call holy: as likewise to abstain from flesh upon certain days, and the like; but especially their masses. (11.) We esteem for an abomination, and as antichristian, all those human inventions which are a trouble or prejudice to the liberty of the spirit. (12.) We do believe that the sacraments are signs of the holy thing, or visible forms of the invisible grace; accounting it good that the faithful sometimes use the said signs or visible forms, if it may be done. However, we believe and hold, that the above-said faithful may be saved without receiving the signs aforesaid, in case they have no place nor any means to use them. (13.) We acknowledge no other sacrament than baptism and the Lord's Supper. (14.) We ought to honour the secular powers by submission, ready obedience, and paying of tributes." These churches had, in modern times, another confession imposed upon them, after they began to receive pastors from Geneva, which is strongly tinged with Calvinism. It bears date A. D. 1655.

10. The first Protestant confession was that presented in 1530, to the diet of Augsburg, by the suggestion and under the direction of John, elector of Saxony. This wise and prudent prince, with the view of having the principal grounds on which the Protestants had separated from the Romish communion, distinctly submitted to that assembly, entrusted the duty of preparing a summary of them to the divines of Wittenberg. Nor was that task a difficult one; for the reformed doctrines had already been digested into seventeen articles, which had been proposed at the conferences both at Sultzbach and Smalcald, as the confession of faith to be adopted by the Protestant confederates. These, accordingly, were delivered to the elector by Luther, and served as the basis of the celebrated Augsburg confession, written "by the elegant and accurate pen of Melancthon:" a work which has been admired by many even of its enemies, for its perspicuity, piety, and erudition. It contains twenty-eight chapters, the leading topics of which are, the true and essential divinity of Christ; his substitution and vicarious sacrifice; original sin; human inability; the necessity, freedom, and efficacy of divine grace; consubstantiation; and particularly justification by faith, to establish the truth and importance of which was one of its chief objects. The last seven articles condemn and confute the Popish tenets of communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, private masses, auricular confession, legendary traditions, monastic vows, and the exorbitant power of the church. This confession is silent on the doctrine of predestination. This is the universal standard of orthodox doctrine among those who profess to be Lutherans, in which no authoritative alteration has ever been made.



11. The confession of Basle, originally presented, like the preceding, to the diet of Augsburg, but not published till 1534, consists of only twelve articles, which, in every essential point, agree with those of the Augsburg confession, except that it rejects the doctrine of consubstantiation; affirming that Christ is only spiritually present in the Lord's Supper, sacramentaliter nimirum, et per memorationem fidei; [that is to say sacramentally, and by faith;] and that it asserts the doctrine of predestination and infant baptism. But the more detailed creed of the whole Swiss Protestant churches is contained in the former and latter Helvetic confessions. The first was drawn up in 1536, by Bullinger, Myconius, and Grynæus, in behalf of the churches of Helvetia, and presented to an assembly of divines at Wittemberg, by whom it was cordially approved. But being deemed too concise, a second was prepared in 1556, by the pastors of Zurich; which was subscribed not only by all the Swiss Protestants, but by the churches of Geneva and Savoy, and by many of those in Hungary and Poland. They fully harmonize with each other, with only this difference, that the doctrine of predestination, and an approbation of the observance of such religious festivals, as the nativity, &c, are to be found in the latter confession only.

12. The Bohemic confession was compiled from various ancient confessions of the Waldenses who had settled in Bohemia, and approved of by Luther and Melancthon in 1532; but it was not published till 1535; when it was presented by the barons and other nobles to King Ferdinand. It extends to twenty articles, similar to those of the Waldensian confession, with the addition of others on the divinity of Christ, justification by faith in him, "without any human help or merit," predestination, and the absolute necessity of sanctification and good works.

13. The confession of the Saxon churches was composed in 1551 by Melancthon, at the desire of the pastors of Saxony and Misnia met in assembly at Wittemberg, in order to be presented to the council of Trent. It is contained in twenty-two articles; and while, like that of Augsburg, it is silent on the subject of predestination, it lays equal stress on the doctrine of justification by faith; and has a separate article entitled "Rewards," in which the doctrine of human merit, particularly as connected with future blessedness, is condemned and refuted.

14. Some account of the framing of the English Confession of Faith has been already given under the article Church of England and Ireland. The "Articles of Religion" are there said to have been amended and completed in the year 1571; and the Rev. Henry J. Todd, in his very able work on this subject, has shown their Melancthonian origin and character by extracts from the "Articles of Religion," "set out by the Convocation, and published

by the king's authority," in 1536;--from those of 1540;--from Cranmer's "Necessary Erudition of any Christian Man," published in 1543;--from the Homilies on Salvation, Faith, and Good Works, in 1547, which three were, according to Bishop Woolton's unimpeached testimony (in 1576) composed by Archbishop Cranmer;--from the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum," "composed under the superintendence of the same watchful primate, in 1551;--from the "Articles of Religion" formed in 1552, almost wholly by Cranmer;--from "Catechismus Brevis, Christianæ Disciplinæ Summam continens," in 1553, which was published in English, as well as Latin, and commonly called "Edward the Sixth's Catechism;," and from Bishop Jewel's celebrated "Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ," "published in 1562 by the queen's authority, thus recognised as a national Confession of Faith, and as such has been printed in the Corpus Confessionum Fidei." "Such," says Mr. Todd, "are the several public documents or declarations, produced or made before the establishment of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, from which I have given extracts, to which the framers of these Articles directed their attention, with the spirit of which they concur, and the words of which they almost literally adopt. There will also be found, as chronologically preceding these, considerable extracts from the Confession of Augsburg, the whole article from the Saxon Confession, De Remissione Peccatorum, et Justificatione, [respecting the forgiveness of sins, and justification,] and such passages in our Liturgy as concern the points which the Articles and Homilies exhibit." No one who has perused these documents will require any additional argument to convince him, that, in its very foundations, the English Confession of Faith was most explicitly in favour of general redemption. We cannot therefore be surprised at all the old orthodox divines of the church of England, from 1610 to 1660, refusing to be called Arminians; for they repeatedly declared that their own church openly professed similar doctrines to those promulgated by the Dutch professor, long before his name was known in the world. In this assertion they were perfectly correct; and by every important fact in our ecclesiastical history, as connected with doctrinal matters, their views are confirmed. If the Articles were actually of a Calvinistic complexion, as they are now often represented to be, what could have induced Whitaker and other learned Calvinists to waste so much valuable time and labour in fabricating the Lambeth Articles in 1595? Those worthies avowed, that the original Thirty-nine Articles were not doctrinal enough for their purpose.--When four choice divines, two of them professors of divinity at Cambridge, were sent to the synod of Dort as deputies from the English church, and one from the church of Scotland, though their political instructions went the full length of assisting in the condemnation and oppression of the Arminians, personally considered as a troublesome party in the republic, yet they had different instructions respecting their doctrines. On the second article, discussed in that synod,

“the extent of Christ’s redemption,” Balcanqual, the deputy from the church of Scotland, informs the English ambassador at the Hague, that a difference had arisen among the British deputies: “The question among us is, whether the words of Scripture, which are likewise the words of our confession, be to be understood of all particular men, or only of the elect who consist of all sorts of men? Dr. Davenant and Dr. Ward are of Martinius of Breme his mind, that it is to be understood of all particular men: the other three [Bishop Carleton, Dr. Goad, and Dr. Balcanqual] take the other exposition, which is that of the writers of the reformed churches.” The ambassador wrote home for instructions, and received orders for the British deputies “to have those conclusions concerning Christ’s death, and the application of it to us, couched in manner and terms as near as possibly may be to those which were used in the primitive church, by the fathers of that time, against the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, and not in any new phrase of the modern age; and that the same may be as agreeable to the confessions of the church of England and other reformed churches, and with as little distaste and umbrage to the Lutheran churches, as may be.” Archbishop Abbott expressed his approbation of their “cautelous moderation” in withholding their “hand from pressing in public any rigorous exclusive propositions in the doctrine of the extent of our Saviour Christ’s oblation.” The history of this affair, which cannot be here detailed, shows, that, however willing the three deputies were to condemn the remonstrants, the resistance of the two more moderate divines was approved by the authorities at home, and their opinions on this subject were recorded in such theses as no true Calvinist could consistently subscribe. During our civil troubles in 1643, the Assembly of Divines at Westminster revised the first fifteen of the Thirty-nine Articles “with a design,” as Neal in his “History of the Puritans” candidly declares, “to render their sense more express and determinate in favour of Calvinism.” This they found to be a hopeless task, as the ancient creed was too incorrigible to be bent to their views; and they found it much easier to frame one after their own hearts, some account of which the reader will find in a subsequent paragraph.--All these facts go to prove, that the best informed Calvinists have always viewed the English articles as not sufficiently high in doctrine, unless, as in the case of the seventeenth, they be allowed to interpret them by interpolations or qualifying epithets.

15. The confession of the reformed Gallican churches was prepared by order of a synod at Paris in 1559; and presented to Charles IX. in 1561, by the celebrated Beza, in a conference with that monarch at Poissy. It was published for the first time in 1566, with a preface by the French clergy to the pastors of all Protestant churches; and afterward, in 1571, it was solemnly ratified and subscribed in the national synod of Rochelle. It is extended to forty articles; but they are in general concise, and embrace the

usual topics of the other Protestant confessions, including the doctrines of election, and justification by faith only.

16. The Protestants in Scotland having presented a petition to parliament in 1560, requesting the public condemnation of Popery, and the legal acknowledgment of the reformed doctrine and worship, they were required to draw up a summary of the doctrines which they could prove to be consonant with Scripture, and which they were anxious to have established. The ministers on whom this duty was devolved, being well acquainted with the subject, prepared the required summary in the course of four days, and laid it before parliament, when, after having been read first before the Lords of the Articles, and afterward twice (the second time article by article) before the whole parliament, it received their sanction as the established system of belief and worship. It consists of twenty-five articles, and coincides with all the other Protestant confessions which affirm the doctrine of election, and reject that of consubstantiation; for although it is not so explicit as some of them respecting the unconditional nature of election, yet a distinct recognition of this doctrine pervades the whole of it; and though it has no separate article on justification, it no less plainly recognises this fundamental principle of the Protestant faith.

17. The tenets of Arminius having obtained considerable prevalence in Holland toward the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Calvinists, or Gomarists, as they were then called, appealed to a national synod, which was convened at Dort in 1618, by order of the states-general; and attended by ecclesiastical deputies from England, Switzerland, Bremen, Hesse, and the Palatinate, beside the clerical and lay representatives of the reformed churches in the United Provinces. The canons of this synod, contained in five chapters, relate to what are commonly called the five points; namely, particular and unconditional election; particular redemption, or the limitation of the saving effects of Christ's death to the elect only; the total corruption of human nature, and the total moral inability of man in his fallen state; the irresistibility of divine grace; and the final perseverance of the saints; all of which are declared to be the true and the only doctrines of Scripture.

18. The Remonstrants, as the Dutch Arminians are generally called, did not present a confession of faith to the synod of Dort, but only their sentiments on the five points enumerated in the preceding paragraph, with corresponding rejections of errors under each of those points. However, in the first year of their exile, they applied themselves diligently to this task, and soon produced an ample confession, principally composed by the celebrated Episcopius. In the preface they give copious reasons for such a record of their opinions; which Courcelles has thus expressed in a more

summary manner:--“They did not publish it for the purpose of making it a standard of schism, by which they might separate themselves from men who held other opinions; nor for the purpose of having it esteemed by those under their pastoral care as a secondary rule of faith;--which is in these days with many persons a most pernicious abuse of this kind of confessions. But it was published solely with the intention to stop the mouths of those who calumniously assert, that the Remonstrants cherish within their bosoms portentous dogmas 264 which they dare not divulge. For there is no cause for doubting, whether under such circumstances and for this purpose, it is not lawful for men to publish a confession of their faith, especially as St. Peter admonishes us ‘always to be ready to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us with meekness and fear.’” This confession is of a more practical character than any of the preceding: it inculcates, at great length, all the most important duties of Christianity, and, in the words of the preface, “directs all things to the practice of Christian piety. For we believe that true divinity is merely practical, and not either simply or for its greatest or chief part speculative; and therefore whatever things are delivered therein ought to be referred thither only,--that a man may be the more strongly and fitly inflamed and encouraged to a diligent performance of his duty, and keeping of the commandments of Jesus Christ.” In the English translator’s address to the reader in 1676, it is said, “Touching the worth of this book, as a summary of Christian religion, if Doctor Jeremy Taylor’s judgment be of credit with thee, I am credibly informed he should prefer it to be one of those two or three which, next the Holy Bible, he would have preserved from the supposed total destruction of books. A high encomium from the mouth of so learned and pious a divine!” But though its contents were chiefly practical, one expression in it, respecting the propriety of tolerating in a Christian community a man who denied the eternal generation of Jesus Christ, produced a controversy in Holland, as well as in this country, in which the famous Bishop Bull eminently distinguished himself. See Dort and Remonstrants.

19. The only other confession of which we shall take notice is that of the Westminster assembly, which met in 1643, and at which five ministers and three elders as commissioners from the general assembly of the church of Scotland attended, agreeably to engagements between the convention of estates there, and both houses of parliament in England. This confession is contained in thirty-three chapters, and in every point of doctrine, fully accords with the sentiments of the synod of Dort; and on some points going rather beyond it, as with respect to a supposed election of angels. It was approved and adopted by the general assembly in 1647; and two years after, ratified by act of parliament, as “the public and avowed confession of the church of Scotland.” By act of parliament in 1690, it was again declared to

be the national standard of faith in Scotland; and subscription to it as “the confession of his faith,” specially required of every person who shall be admitted “a minister or preacher within this church.” Subscription to it was also enjoined by the act of union in 1707, on all “professors, principals, regents, masters, and others bearing office,” in any of the Scottish universities.

CONFLAGRATION, a general burning of a city, or other considerable place. But the word is more ordinarily restrained to that grand period, or catastrophe of our world, wherein the face of nature is expected to be changed by a deluge of fire, as it was anciently by that of water. The ancient Chaldeans, Pythagoreans, Platonists, Epicureans, Stoics, Celts, and Etrurians, appear to have had a notion of the conflagration; though whence they should derive it, unless from the sacred books, it is difficult to conceive; except, perhaps, from the Phenicians, who themselves had it from the Jews. The Celts, whose opinions resembled those of the eastern nations, held, that after the burning of the world, a new period of existence would commence. The ancient Etrurians, or Tuscans, also concurred with other western and northern nations of Celtic origin, as well as with the Stoics, in asserting the entire renovation of nature after a long period, or great year, when a similar succession of events would again take place. The cosmogony of an ancient Etrurian, preserved by Suidas, limits the duration of the universe to a period of twelve thousand years; six thousand of which passed in the production of the visible world, before the formation of man. The Stoics also maintained that the world is liable to destruction from the prevalence of moisture or of drought; the former producing a universal inundation, and the latter, a universal conflagration. “These,” they say, “succeed each other in nature, as regularly as winter and summer.” The doctrine of conflagration is a natural consequence of the general system of Stoicism; for, since, according to this system, the whole process of nature is carried on in a necessary series of causes and effects, when that operative fire, which at first, bursting from chaos, gave form to all things, and which has since pervaded and animated all nature, shall have consumed its nutriment; that is, when the vapours, which are the food of the celestial fires, shall be exhausted, a deficiency of moisture must produce a universal conflagration. This grand revolution in nature is, after the doctrine of the Stoics, thus elegantly described by Ovid:--

“Esse quoque in fatis reminiscitur, affore tempus  
Quo mare, quo tellus, correptaque regia cœli  
Ardeat; et mundi moles operosa laboret.”  
Metamor. lib. i, 256.

or, as Dryden has translated the passage,--

“Rememb’ring in the fates a time when fire  
Should to the battlements of heaven aspire;  
When all his blazing worlds above should burn,  
And all the inferior globe to cinders turn.”

Seneca, speaking of the same event, says expressly, “Tempus advenerit quo sidera sideribus incurrent, et omni flagrante materia uno igne, quicquid nunc ex deposito lucet, ardebit;” that is, “the time will come when the world will be consumed, that it may be again renewed; when the powers of nature will be turned against herself, when stars will rush upon stars, and the whole material world, which now appears resplendent with beauty and harmony, will be destroyed in one general conflagration.” In this grand catastrophe of nature, all animated beings, (excepting the Universal Intelligence,) 265men, heroes, demons, and gods, shall perish together. Seneca, the tragedian, who was of the same school with the philosopher, writes to the same purpose:--

“Cœli regia concidens  
Certos atque obitus trahet:  
Atque omnes pariter deos  
Perdet mors aliqua, et chaos.”

“The mighty palace of the sky  
In ruin fall’n is doomed to lie;  
And all the gods, its wreck beneath,  
Shall sink in chaos and in death.”

The Pythagoreans also maintained the dogma of conflagration. To this purpose Hippasus, of Metapontum, taught that the universe is finite, is always changing, and undergoes a periodical conflagration. Philolaus, who flourished in the time of Plato, maintained that the world is liable to destruction both by fire and water. Mention of the conflagration is also several times made in the books of the Sibyls, Sophocles, Lucan, &c. Dr. Burnet, after F. Tachard and others, relates that the Siamese believe that the earth will at last be parched up with heat, the mountains melted down, and the earth’s whole surface reduced to a level, and then consumed with fire. And the Bramins of Siam do not only hold that the world shall be destroyed by fire, but also that a new earth shall be made out of the cinders of the old. The sacred Scriptures announce this general destruction of the world by fire in a variety of passages.

2. Various are the sentiments of authors on the subject of the conflagration; the cause whence it is to arise, and the effects it is to produce. Divines ordinarily account for it metaphysically; and will have it take its rise from a miracle, as a fire from heaven. Philosophers contend for its being produced from natural causes; and will have it effected according to the laws of mechanics: some think an eruption of a central fire sufficient for

the purpose; and add, that this may be occasioned several ways; namely, either by having its intensity increased, (which, again, may be effected either by being driven into less space by the encroachments of the superficial cold, or by an increase of the inflammability of the fuel whereon it is fed,) or by having the resistance of imprisoning earth weakened; which may happen either from the diminution of its matter, by the consumption of its central parts, or by weakening the cohesion of the constituent parts of the mass, by the excess or the defect of moisture. Others look for the cause of the conflagration in the atmosphere; and suppose that some of the meteors there engendered in unusual quantities, and exploded with unusual vehemence, from the concurrency of various circumstances, may be made to effect it, without seeking any farther. The astrologers account for it from a conjunction of all the planets in the sign Cancer; “as the deluge,” say they, “was occasioned by their conjunction in Capricorn.” This was an opinion adopted by the ancient Chaldeans. Lastly: others have recourse to a still more effectual and flaming machine; and conclude the world is to undergo its conflagration from the near approach of a comet, in its return from the sun. It is most natural to conclude, that, as the Scriptures represent the catastrophe as the work of a moment, no gradually operating natural cause will be employed to effect it, but that He who spake and the world was created, will again destroy it by the same word of his power; setting loose at once the all-devouring element of fire to absorb all others. Beyond this, all is conjecture.

CONFUSION OF TONGUES is a memorable event, which happened in the one hundred and first year, according to the Hebrew chronology, after the flood, B. C. 2247, at the overthrow of Babel; and which was providentially brought about, in order to facilitate the dispersion of mankind, and the population of the earth. Until this period, there had been one common language, which formed a bond of union, that prevented the separation of mankind into distinct nations.

2. There has been a considerable difference of opinion as to the nature of this confusion, and the manner in which it was effected. Some learned men, prepossessed with the notion that all the different idioms now in the world did at first arise from one original language, to which they may be reduced, and that the variety among them is no more than must naturally have happened in a long course of time by the mere separation of the builders of Babel, have maintained, that there were no new languages formed at the confusion; but that this event was accomplished by creating a misunderstanding and variance among the builders, without any immediate influence on their language. But this opinion, advanced by Le Clerc, &c, seems to be directly contrary to the obvious meaning of the word שפה, lip, used by the sacred historian; which, in other parts of Scripture signifies



speech, Psalm lxxxi, 5; Isaiah xxviii, 11; xxxiii, 19; Ezekiel iii, 5. It has been justly remarked, that unanimity of sentiment, and identity of language, are particularly distinguished from each other, in the history: "The people is one, and they have all one language," Gen. xi, 6. It has been also suggested, that if disagreement in opinion and counsel were the whole that was intended, it would have had a contrary effect; they would not have desisted from their project, but strenuously have maintained their respective opinions, till the greater number of them had compelled the minority either to fly or to submit. Others have imagined, that this was brought about by a temporary confusion of their speech, or rather of their apprehensions, causing them, while they continued together and spoke the same language, to understand the words differently: Scaliger is of this opinion. Others again account for this event, by the privation of all language, and by supposing that mankind were under a necessity of associating together, and of imposing new names on things by common consent. Another opinion ascribes the confusion to such an indistinct remembrance of the original language which they spoke before, as made them speak it very differently; so that by the various inflections, terminations, and pronunciations of divers dialects, they could no more understand one another, than they who understand Latin can understand those who speak French, Italian, or Spanish, though all these languages arise out of it. This opinion is adopted by Casaubon, and by Bishop Patrick in his Commentary, and is certainly much more probable than either of the former: and Mr. Shuckford maintains, that the confusion arose from small beginnings, by the invention of new words in either of the three families of Shem, Ham, and Japhet, which might contribute to separate them from one another; and that in each family new differences of speech might gradually arise, so that each of these families went on to divide and subdivide among themselves. Others, again, as Mr. Joseph Mede and Dr. Wotton, &c, not satisfied with either of the foregoing methods of accounting for the diversity of languages among mankind, have recourse to an extraordinary interposition of divine power, by which new languages were framed and communicated to different families by a supernatural infusion or inspiration; which languages have been the roots and originals from which the several dialects that are, or have been, or will be, spoken, as long as this earth shall last, have arisen, and to which they may with ease be reduced.

3. It is, however, unnecessary to suppose, that the primitive language was completely obliterated, and entire new modes of speech at once introduced. It was quite sufficient, if such changes only were effected, as to render the speech of different companies or different tribes unintelligible to one another, that their mutual coöperation in the mad attempt in which they had all engaged might be no longer practicable. The radical stem of the first

language might therefore remain in all, though new dialects were formed, bearing among themselves a similar relation with what we find in the languages of modern Europe, derived from the same parent stem, whether Gothic, Latin, or Sclavonian. In the midst of these changes, it is reasonable to suppose that the primitive language itself, unaltered, would still be preserved in some one at least of the tribes or families of the human race. Now in none of these was the transmission so likely to have taken place, as among that branch of the descendants of Shem, from which the patriarch Abraham proceeded. Upon these grounds, therefore, we may probably conclude, that the language spoken by Abraham, and by him transmitted to his posterity, was in fact the primitive language, modified indeed and extended in the course of time, but still retaining its essential parts far more completely than any other of the languages of men. If these conclusions are well founded, they warrant the inference, that, in the ancient Hebrew, there are still to be found the traces of the original speech. Whether this ancient Hebrew more nearly resembled the Chaldean, the Syrian, or what is now termed the Hebrew, it is unnecessary here to inquire; these languages, it has never been denied, were originally and radically the same, though, from subsequent modifications, they appear to have assumed somewhat different aspects.

CONGREGATIONALISTS, a denomination of Protestants who reject all church government, except that of a single congregation under the direction of one pastor, with their elders, assistants, or managers. In one particular, the Congregationalists differ from the Independents: the former invite councils, which, however, only tender their advice; but the latter are accustomed to decide all difficulties within themselves. See Independents.

CONSCIENCE is that principle, power, or faculty within us, which decides on the merit or demerit of our own actions, feelings, or affections, with reference to the rule of God's law. It has been called the moral sense by Lord Shaftesbury and Dr. Hutcheson. This appellation has been objected to by some, but has been adopted and defended by Dr. Reid, who says, "The testimony of our moral faculty, like that of the external senses, is the testimony of nature, and we have the same reason to rely upon it." He therefore considers conscience as an original faculty of our nature, which decides clearly, authoritatively, and instantaneously, on every object that falls within its province. "As we rely," says he, "upon the clear and distinct testimony of our eyes, concerning the colours and figures of the bodies about us, we have the same reason to rely, with security, upon the clear and unbiassed testimony of our conscience, with regard to what we ought and ought not to do." But Dr. Reid is surely unfortunate in illustrating the power of conscience by the analogy of the external senses. With regard to the intimations received through the organs of sense, there can be no difference

of opinion, and there can be no room for argument. They give us at once correct information, which reasoning can neither invalidate nor confirm. But it is surely impossible to say as much for the power of conscience, which sometimes gives the most opposite intimations with regard to the simplest moral facts, and which requires to be corrected by an accurate attention to the established order of nature, or to the known will of God, before we can rely with confidence on its decisions. It does not appear, that conscience can with propriety be considered as a principle distinct from that which enables us to pronounce on the general merit or demerit of moral actions. This principle, or faculty, is attended with peculiar feelings, when we ourselves are the agents; we are then too deeply interested to view the matter as a mere subject of reasoning; and pleasure or pain are excited, with a degree of intensity proportioned to the importance which we always assign to our own interests and feelings. In the case of others, our approbation or disapprobation is generally qualified, sometimes suspended, by our ignorance of the motives by which they have been influenced; but, in our own case, the motives and the actions are both before us, and when they do not correspond, we feel the same disgust with ourselves that we should feel toward another, <sup>267</sup>whose motives we knew to be vicious, while his actions are specious and plausible. But in our own case, the uneasy feeling is heightened in a tenfold degree, because self-contempt and disgust are brought into competition with the warmest self-love, and the strongest desire of self-approbation. We have then something of the feelings of a parent, who knows the worthlessness of the child he loves, and contemplates with horror the shame and infamy which might arise from exposure to the world.

2. Conscience, then, cannot be considered as any thing else than the general principle of moral approbation or disapprobation applied to our own feelings or conduct, acting with increased energy from the knowledge which we have of our motives and actions, and from the deep interest which we take in whatever concerns ourselves; nor can we think that they have deserved well of morals or philosophy, who have attempted to deduce our notions of right and wrong from any one principle. Various powers both of the understanding and of the will are concerned in every moral conclusion; and conscience derives its chief and most salutary influence from the consideration of our being continually in the presence of God, and accountable to him for all our thoughts, words, and actions. A conscience well informed, and possessed of sensibility, is the best security for virtue, and the most awful avenger of wicked deeds; an ill-informed conscience is the most powerful instrument of mischief; a squeamish and ticklish conscience generally renders those who are under its influence ridiculous.

Hic murus aheneus esto,

Nil conscire sibi, nulla pallescere culpa.

[Let a consciousness of innocence, and a fearlessness of any accusation, be thy brazen bulwark.]

3. The rule of conscience is the will of God, so far as it is made known to us, either by the light of nature, or by that of revelation. With respect to the knowledge of this rule, conscience is said to be rightly informed, or mistaken; firm, or wavering, or scrupulous, &c. With respect to the conformity of our actions to this rule when known, conscience is said to be good or evil. In a moral view, it is of the greatest importance that the understanding be well informed, in order to render the judgment or verdict of conscience a safe directory of conduct, and a proper source of satisfaction. Otherwise, the judgment of conscience may be pleaded, and it has actually been pleaded, as an apology for very unwarrantable conduct. Many atrocious acts of persecution have been perpetrated, and afterward justified, under the sanction of an erroneous conscience. It is also of no small importance, that the sensibility of conscience be duly maintained and cherished; for want of which men have often been betrayed into criminal conduct without self-reproach, and have deluded themselves with false notions of their character and state. See Moral Obligation.

CONSECRATION, a devoting or setting apart any thing to the worship or service of God. The Mosaical law ordained that all the first-born, both of man and beast, should be sanctified or consecrated to God. The whole race of Abraham was in a peculiar manner consecrated to his worship; and the tribe of Levi and family of Aaron were more immediately consecrated to the service of God, Exod. xiii, 2, 12, 15; Num. iii, 12; 1 Peter ii, 9. Beside the consecrations ordained by the sovereign authority of God, there were others which depended on the will of men, and were either to continue for ever or for a time only. David and Solomon devoted the Nethinims to the service of the temple for ever, Ezra viii, 20; ii, 58. Hannah, the mother of Samuel, offered her son to the Lord, to serve all his life-time in the tabernacle, 1 Sam. i, 11; Luke i, 15. The Hebrews sometimes devoted their fields and cattle to the Lord, and the spoils taken in war, Leviticus xxvii, 28, 29; 1 Chron. xviii, 11. The New Testament furnishes us with instances of consecration. Christians in general are consecrated to the Lord, and are a holy race, a chosen people, 1 Peter ii, 9. Ministers of the Gospel are in a peculiar manner set apart for his service; and so are places of worship; the forms of dedication varying according to the views of different bodies of Christians; and by some a series of ceremonies has been introduced, savouring of superstition, or at best of Judaism.

CONSUBSTANTIALISTS. This term was applied to the orthodox, or Athanasians, who believed the Son to be of the same substance with the

Father; whereas the Arians would only admit the Son to be of like substance with the Father.

CONSUBSTANTIATION, a tenet of the Lutheran church respecting the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Luther denied that the elements were changed after consecration, and therefore taught that the bread and wine indeed remain; but that together with them, there is present the substance of the body of Christ, which is literally received by communicants. As in red-hot iron it may be said two distinct substances, iron and fire, are united, so is the body of Christ joined with the bread. Some of his followers, who acknowledged that similes prove nothing, contented themselves with saying that the body and blood of Christ are really present in the sacrament in an inexplicable manner. See Lord's Supper.

CONVERSATIONS. These were held by the orientals in the gate of the city. Accordingly, there was an open space near the gate, which was fitted up with seats for the accommodation of the people, Gen. xix, 1; Psalm lxix, 12. Those who were at leisure occupied a position on these seats, and either amused themselves with witnessing those who came in and went out, and with any trifling occurrences that might offer themselves to their notice, or attended to the judicial trials, which were commonly investigated at public places of this kind, namely, the gate of the city, Gen. xix, 1; xxxiv, 20; Psalm xxvi, 4, 5; lxix, 12; 268cxxvii, 5; Ruth iv, 11; Isaiah xiv, 31; or held intercourse by conversation. Promenading, so fashionable and so agreeable in colder latitudes, was wearisome and unpleasant in the warm climates of the east, and this is probably one reason why the inhabitants of those climates preferred holding intercourse with one another, while sitting near the gate of the city, or beneath the shade of the fig tree and the vine, 1 Samuel xxii, 6; Micah iv, 4. The formula of assent in conversation was  $\Sigma\upsilon$  εἶπας, דברתכן, Thou hast said, or Thou hast rightly said. We are informed by the traveller Aryda, that this is the prevailing mode of a person's expressing his assent or affirmation to this day, in the vicinity of Mount Lebanon, especially where he does not wish to assert any thing in express terms. This explains the answer of the Saviour to the high priest Caiaphas in Matt. xxvi, 64, when he was asked whether he was the Christ, the Son of God, and replied,  $\Sigma\upsilon$  εἶπας, Thou hast said.

The English word conversation has now a more restricted sense than formerly; and it is to be noted that in several passages of our translation of the Bible it is used to comprehend our whole conduct.

CONVERSION, a change from one state or character to another. Conversion, considered theologically, consists in a renovation of the heart

and life, or a being turned from sin and the power of Satan unto God, Acts xxvi, 18; and is produced by the influence of divine grace upon the soul. This is conversion considered as a state of mind; and is opposed both to a careless and unawakened state, and to that state of conscious guilt and slavish dread, accompanied with struggles after a moral deliverance not yet attained, which precedes our justification and regeneration; both of which are usually understood to be comprised in conversion. But this is not the only Scriptural import of the term; for the first turning of the whole heart to God in penitence and prayer is generally termed conversion. In its stricter sense, as given above, it is, however, now generally used by divines.

CONVICTION, in general, is the assurance of the truth of any proposition. In a religious sense, it is the first degree of repentance, and implies an affecting sense of our guilt before God; and that we deserve and are exposed to his wrath.

COPPER. *תשנ*. Anciently, copper was employed for all the purposes for which we now use iron. Arms, and tools for husbandry and the mechanic arts, were all of this metal for many ages. Job speaks of bows of copper, Job xx, 24; and when the Philistines had Samson in their power, they bound him with fetters of copper. Our translators indeed say “brass;” but under that article their mistake is pointed out. In Ezra viii, 27, are mentioned “two vessels of copper, precious as gold.” The Septuagint renders it *σκεύη χαλκοῦ ζιλόδοτος*; the Vulgate and Castellio, following the Arabic, “*vasa æris fulgentis*,” and the Syriac, “vases of Corinthian brass.” It is more probable, however, that this brass was not from Corinth, but a metal from Persia or India, which Aristotle describes in these terms: “It is said that there is in India a brass so shining, so pure, so free from tarnish, that its colour differs nothing from that of gold. It is even said that among the vessels of Darius there were some respecting which the sense of smelling might determine whether they were gold or brass.” Bochart is of opinion that this is the chasmal of Ezekiel i, 27, the *χαλκολίθανον* of Rev. i, 15, and the electrum of the ancients.

Mr. Harmer quotes from the manuscript notes of Sir John Chardin a reference to a mixed metal in the east, and highly esteemed there; and suggests that this composition might have been as old as the time of Ezra, and be brought from those more remote countries into Persia, where these two basins were given to be conveyed to Jerusalem. Ezekiel, xxvii, 13, speaks of the merchants of Javan, Jubal, and Meshech, as bringing vessels of nehesh (copper) to the markets of Tyre. According to Bochart and Michaëlis, these were people situated toward Mount Caucasus, where copper mines are worked at this day. See Brass.

COPTS, a name given to the Christians of Egypt who do not belong to the Greek church, but are Monophysites, and in most respects Jacobites. Scaliger and Father Simon derive the name from Coptos, once a celebrated town of Egypt, and the metropolis of the Thebaid; but Volney and others are of opinion, that the name Copts is only an abbreviation of the Greek word Aigouptios, "an Egyptian." The Copts have a patriarch, whose jurisdiction extends over both Egypts, Nubia, and Abyssinia; who resides at Cairo, but who takes his title from Alexandria. He has under him eleven or twelve bishops, beside the abuna, or bishop of the Abyssinians, whom he appoints and consecrates. The rest of the clergy, whether secular or regular, are composed of the orders of St. Anthony, St. Paul, and St. Macarius, who have each their monasteries. Their arch-priests, who are next in degree to bishops, and their deacons, are said to be numerous; and they often confer the order of deacon even on children. Next to the patriarch is the bishop, or titular patriarch, of Jerusalem, who also resides at Cairo, because there are only few Copts at Jerusalem. He is, in reality, little more than bishop of Cairo; except that he goes to Jerusalem every Easter, and visits some other places in Palestine, which own his jurisdiction. To him belongs the government of the Coptic church, during the vacancy of the patriarchal see. The ecclesiastics are said to be, in general, of the lowest ranks of the people; and hence that great degree of ignorance which prevails among them. They have seven sacraments; baptism, the eucharist, confirmation, ordination, faith, fasting, and prayer. They admit only three œcumenical councils; those of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus. There are three Coptic liturgies; one attributed to St. Basil, another to St. Gregory, and the third to St. Cyril. At present, however, little more than the mere shadow of Christianity can be seen in Egypt; and, in point of numbers, not more than fifty thousand Christians in all can be found in this country. There are not more than three Christian churches at Cairo.

CORAL, ראמות, Job xxviii, 18; Ezek. xxvii, 16; a hard, cretaceous, marine production, resembling in figure the stem of a plant, divided into branches. It is of different colours,--black, white, and red. The latter is the sort emphatically called coral, as being the most valuable, and usually made into ornaments. This, though no gem, is ranked by the author of the book of Job, xxviii, 18, with the onyx and sapphire. Dr. Good observes, "It is by no means certain what the words here rendered 'corals and pearls,' and those immediately afterward rendered 'rubies and topaz,' really signified. Reiske has given up the inquiry as either hopeless or useless; and Schultens has generally introduced the Hebrew words themselves, and left the reader of the translation to determine as he may. Our common version is, in the

main, concurrent with most of the oriental renderings: and I see no reason to deviate from it.”

CORBAN, קרבן, Mark vii, 11; from the Hebrew קרב, to offer, to present. It denotes a gift, a present made to God, or to his temple. The Jews sometimes swore by corban, or by gifts offered to God, Matt. xxiii, 18. Theophrastus says that the Tyrians forbade the use of such oaths as were peculiar to foreigners, and particularly of corban, which, Josephus informs us, was used only by the Jews. Jesus Christ reproaches the Jews with cruelty toward their parents, in making a corban of what should have been appropriated to their use. For when a child was asked to relieve the wants of his father or mother, he would often say, “It is a gift,” corban, “by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me;” that is, I have devoted that to God which you ask of me; and it is no longer mine to give, Mark vii, 11. Thus they violated a precept of the moral law, through a superstitious devotion to Pharisaic observances, and the wretched casuistry by which they were made binding upon the conscience.

CORIANDEER, גז, Exod. xvi, 31; Num. xi, 7; a strongly aromatic plant. It bears a small round seed, of a very agreeable smell and taste. The manna might be compared to the coriander seed in respect to its form or shape, as it was to bdellium in its colour. See Manna.

CORINTH, a celebrated city, the capital of Achaia, situated on the isthmus which separates the Peloponnesus from Attica. This city was one of the best peopled and most wealthy of Greece. Its situation between two seas drew thither the trade of both the east and west. Its riches produced pride, ostentation, effeminacy, and all vices, the consequences of abundance. For its insolence to the Roman legates, it was destroyed by L. Mummius. In the burning of it, so many statues of different metals were melted together, that they produced the famous Corinthian brass. It was afterward restored to its former splendour by Julius Cæsar.

Christianity was first planted at Corinth by St. Paul, who resided here eighteen months, between the years 51 and 53; during which time he enjoyed the friendship of Aquila and his wife Priscilla, two Jewish Christians, who had been expelled from Italy, with other Jews, by an edict of Claudius. The church consisted both of Jews and of Gentiles; but St. Paul began, as usual, by preaching in the synagogue, until the Jews violently opposed him, and blasphemed the name of Christ; when the Apostle, shaking his garment, and declaring their blood to be upon their own heads, left them, and made use afterward of a house adjoining the synagogue, belonging to a man named Justus. The rage of the Jews, however, did not stop here; but, raising a tumult, they arrested Paul, and



hurrying him before the tribunal of the pro-consul Gallio, the brother of the famous Seneca, accused him of persuading men to worship God contrary to the law. But Gallio, who was equally indifferent both to Judaism and Christianity, and finding that Paul had committed no breach of morality, or of the public peace, refused to hear their complaint, and drove them all from the judgment seat. The Jews being thus disappointed in their malicious designs, St. Paul was at liberty to remain some time longer at Corinth; and after his departure, Apollos, a zealous and eloquent Jewish convert of Alexandria, was made a powerful instrument in confirming the church, and in silencing the opposition of the Jews, Acts xviii. How much it stood in need of such support, is evident from the Epistles of St. Paul; who cautions the Corinthians against divisions and party spirit; fornication, incest, partaking of meats offered to idols, thereby giving an occasion of scandal, and encouragement to idolatry; abusing the gifts of the Spirit, litigiousness, &c. The Corinthians, indeed, were in great danger: they lived at ease, free from every kind of persecution, and were exposed to much temptation. The manners of the citizens were particularly corrupt: they were, indeed, infamous to a proverb. In the centre of the city was a celebrated temple of Venus, a part of whose worship consisted in prostitution; for there a thousand priestesses of the goddess ministered to dissoluteness under the patronage of religion: an example which gave the Corinthians very lax ideas on the illicit intercourse of the sexes. Corinth also possessed numerous schools of philosophy and rhetoric; in which, as at Alexandria, the purity of the faith by an easy and natural process, became early corrupted.

There occurs a chronological difficulty in the visits of St. Paul to Corinth. In 2 Cor. xii, 14, and xiii, 1, 2, the Apostle expresses his design of visiting that city a third time; whereas only one visit before the date of the Second Epistle is noticed in the Acts, xviii, 1, about A. D. 51; and the next time that he visited Greece, Acts xx, 2, about A. D. 57, no mention is made of his going to Corinth. Mr. Horne observes on this subject, "It has been conjectured by Grotius, and Drs. Hammond and Paley, that his First Epistle virtually supplied the place of his 270presence; and that it is so represented by the Apostle in a corresponding passage, 1 Cor. v, 3. Admitting this solution to be probable, it is, however, far-fetched, and is not satisfactory as a matter of fact. Michaëlis has produced another, more simple and natural; namely, that Paul, on his return from Crete, visited Corinth a second time before he went to winter at Nicopolis. This second visit is unnoticed in the Acts, because the voyage itself is unnoticed. The third visit, promised in 2 Cor. xii, 14, and xiii, 1, 2, was actually paid on the Apostle's second return to Rome, when he took Corinth in his way, 2 Tim. iv, 20. 'Thus critically,' says Dr. Hales, 'does the book of the Acts

harmonize, even in its omissions, with the epistles; and these with each other, in the minute incidental circumstances of the third visit.”

About A. D. 268, the Heruli burned Corinth to ashes. In 525, it was again almost ruined by an earthquake. About 1180, Roger, king of Sicily, took and plundered it. Since 1458, it was till lately under the power of the Turks; and is so decayed, that its inhabitants amount to no more than about fifteen hundred, or two thousand; half Mohammedans, and half Christians. A late French writer, who visited this country, observes, “When the Cæsars rebuilt the walls of Corinth, and the temples of the gods rose from their ruins more magnificent than ever, an obscure architect was rearing in silence an edifice which still remains standing amidst the ruins of Greece. This man, unknown to the great, despised by the multitude, rejected as the offscouring of the world, at first associated himself with only two companions, Crispus and Gaius, and with the family of Stephanas. These were the humble architects of an indestructible temple, and the first believers at Corinth. The traveller surveys the site of this celebrated city; he discovers not a vestige of the altars of Paganism, but perceives some Christian chapels rising from among the cottages of the Greeks. The Apostle might still, from his celestial abode, give the salutation of peace to his children, and address them in the words, ‘Paul to the church of God, which is at Corinth.’”

CORINTHIANS, Epistles to. St. Paul left Corinth A. D. 53 or 54, and went to Jerusalem. From Ephesus he wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians, in the beginning of A. D. 56. In this epistle he reproves some who disturbed the peace of the church, complains of some disorders in their assemblies, of law suits among them, and of a Christian who had committed incest with his mother-in-law, the wife of his father, and had not been separated from the church. This letter produced in the Corinthians great grief, vigilance against the vices reproved, and a very beneficial dread of God’s anger. They repaired the scandal, and expressed abundant zeal against the crime committed, 2 Cor. vii, 9–11.

To form an idea of the condition of the Corinthian church, we must examine the epistles of the Apostle. The different factions into which they were divided, exalted above all others the chiefs, τοὺς ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀποστόλους, [the very chiefest Apostles,] 2 Cor. xi, 5; xii, 11, whose notions they adopted, and whose doctrines they professed to follow, and attempted to depreciate those of the opposite party. While, then, some called themselves disciples of Paul, Cephas, or Apollos, others assumed the splendid appellation of Christ’s party. Probably they affected to be the followers of James, the brother of our Lord, and thought thus to enter into a nearer discipleship with Jesus than the other parties. The controversy, as we shall see from the whole, related to the obligation of Judaism. The

advocates of it had appealed, even in Galatia, to Cephas and James, for the sake of opposing to Paul, who had banished Jewish ceremonies from Christianity, authorities which were not less admitted than his own. The question itself divided all these various parties into two principal factions: the partisans of Cephas and James were for the law; the friends of Paul adopted his opinion, as well as Apollos, who, with his adherents, was always in heart in favour of Paul, and never wished to take a part in a separation from him, 1 Cor. xvi, 12. The leaders of the party against Paul, these *ψευδαπόστολοι*, [false apostles,] as Paul calls them, and *μετασηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ*, [transformers of themselves into the apostles of Christ,] who declared themselves the promulgators and defenders of the doctrines of Cephas, and James, were, as may be easily conceived, converted Jews, 2 Cor. xi, 22, who had come from different places,--to all appearance from Palestine, *ἐρχόμενοι*, [the comers,] 2 Cor. xi, 4,--and could therefore boast of having had intercourse with the Apostles at Jerusalem, and of an acquaintance with their principles. They were not even of the orthodox Jews, but those who adhered to the doctrines of the Sadducees; and though they were even now converted to Christianity, while they spoke zealously in favour of the law, they were undermining the hopes of the pious, and exciting doubts against the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv, 35; so that Paul, from regard to the teachers, whose disciples they professed to be, was obliged to refute them from the testimony of James and Cephas, 1 Cor. xv, 5, 7. These, proud of their own opinions, 1 Cor. i, 17, not without private views, depreciated Paul's authority, and extolled their own knowledge, 1 Cor. ii, 12; 2 Cor. xi, 16, 17. Violently as the contest was carried on, they still did not withdraw from the same place of assembly for instruction and mutual edification; this, however, was even the cause of too many scandalous scenes and disorders. At the *ἀγάπαι*, love feasts, love and benevolence were no where to be seen. Instead of eating together, and refreshing their poor brethren out of that which they had brought with them, each one, as he came, ate his own, without waiting for any one else, and feasted often to excess, while the needy was fasting, 1 Cor. xi, 17. When also some were preparing for prayers or singing, others raised their voices to instruct, and commenced exercises in spiritual gifts, tongues, prophesyings, and interpretations, 1 Cor. xii, xiii, xiv; moreover, the women, to bring confusion to its highest pitch, took their 271 part in interlocutions and proposals of questions, 1 Cor. xiv, 34.

Such was the state of things as to the interior discipline of the assemblies and edification; but the exterior deportment, which the members of this society had maintained in civil life, soon disappeared also. Formerly, when differences arose among the believers, they were adjusted by the intervention of arbitrators from their own communion, and terminated

quietly. Now, as their mutual confidence in each other more and more decreased, they brought, to the disgrace of Christianity, their complaints before the Pagan tribunals, 1 Cor. vi, 1. But as to what concerned the main object, namely, the obligation of Judaism, it was so little confined simply to words and reasons, that each party rather strove to display its opposite principles in its conduct. One party gave to the other, as much as possible, motives for ill will and reproach. The Jews required circumcision as an indispensable act of religion; while Paul's disciples attempted to lay the foundation of a new doctrine respecting it, and to extinguish all traces of circumcision, 1 Cor. vii, 18. As the Jewish party observed and maintained a distinction of meats, that of Paul ate without distinction any thing sold in the markets, and even meats from the Heathen sacrifices, 1 Cor. x, 25, 28; viii, 1. Nor was this enough; they often made no scruple to be present at the sacrificial feasts. Among other things, they also took part in many scandalous practices which were common there, and fell, by means of their imprudence, into still greater crimes, 1 Cor. x, 20, 21; viii, 10. According to the Jewish custom, the women were obliged to appear veiled in the synagogues and public assemblies. The anti-judaists abolished this custom of the synagogue, 1 Cor. xi, 5, 6, 10; and herein imitated the Heathen practices. From despite to Judaism, which considered matrimonial offspring as a particular blessing of God, some embraced celibacy, which they justified by St. Paul's example, 1 Cor. vii, 7, 8; and this they also recommended to others, 1 Cor. vii, 1–25. Some went even so far, that, although married, they resolved to practise a continual continency, 1 Corinthians, vii, 3–5. These were the evils, both in his own party and in that of his opponents, which St. Paul had to remedy.

Paul, having understood the good effects of his first letter among the Corinthians, wrote a second to them, A. D. 57, from Macedonia, and probably from Philippi. He expresses his satisfaction at their conduct, justifies himself, and comforts them. He glories in his suffering, and exhorts them to liberality. Near the end of the year 57, he came again to Corinth, where he staid about three months, and whence he went to Jerusalem. Just before his second departure from Corinth, he wrote his Epistle to the Romans, probably in the beginning of A. D. 58.

CORMORANT, דָּגֵי יָם, Levit. xi, 17; Deut. xiv, 17; a large sea bird. It is about three feet four inches in length, and four feet two inches in breadth from the tips of the extended wings. The bill is about five inches long, and of a dusky colour; the base of the lower mandible is covered with a naked yellowish skin, which extends under the throat and forms a kind of pouch. It has a most voracious appetite, and lives chiefly upon fish, which it devours with unceasing gluttony. It darts down very rapidly upon its prey; and the Hebrew, and the Greek name, καταράκτης, [a cataract,] are

expressive of its impetuosity. The word תִּרְסָן, which in our version of Isaiah xxxiv, 11, is rendered cormorant, is the pelican.

CORNER. Amos iii, 12. Sitting in the corner is a stately attitude. The place of honour is the corner of the room, and there the master of the house sits and receives his visitants.

COUNCIL sometimes denotes any kind of assembly; sometimes that of the sanhedrim; and, at other times, a convention of pastors met to regulate ecclesiastical affairs. It may be reasonably supposed that as Christianity spreads, circumstances would arise which would make consultation necessary among those who had embraced the Gospel, or at least among those who were employed in its propagation. A memorable instance of this kind occurred not long after the ascension of our Saviour. In consequence of a dispute which had arisen at Antioch concerning the necessity of circumcising Gentile converts, it was determined that "Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and elders about this question."--"And the Apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter," Acts xv, 6. After a consultation, they decided the point in question; and they sent their decree, which they declared to be made under the direction of the Holy Ghost, to all the churches, and commanded that it should be the rule of their conduct. This is generally considered as the first council; but it differed from all others in this circumstance, that its members were under the especial guidance of the Spirit of God. The Gospel was soon after conveyed into many parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa; but it does not appear that there was any public meeting of Christians for the purpose of discussing any contested point, till the middle of the second century. From that time councils became frequent; but as they consisted only of those who belonged to particular districts or countries, they were called provincial or national councils. The first general council was that of Nice, convened by the emperor Constantine, A. D. 325; the second general council was held at Constantinople, in the year 381, by order of Theodosius the Great; the third, at Ephesus, by order of Theodosius, Junior, A. D. 431; and the fourth at Chalcedon, by order of the emperor Marcian, A. D. 451. These, as they were the first four general councils, so they were by far the most eminent. They were caused respectively by the Arian, Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian controversies, and their decrees are in high esteem both among Papists and orthodox Protestants; but the deliberations of most councils were disgraced by violence, disorder, and intrigue, and their decisions were usually made under the influence of some ruling party. Authors are not agreed about the number of general councils; Papists usually reckon eighteen, but Protestant writers will not allow that nearly so many had a right to that name. The last general council was that held at Trent, for the

purpose of checking the progress of the reformation. It first met by the command of Pope Paul III, A. D. 1545; it was suspended during the latter part of the pontificate of his successor, Julius III, and the whole of the pontificates of Marcellus II, and Paul IV, that is, from 1552 to 1562, in which year it met again by the authority of Pope Pius IV, and it ended, while he was pope, in the year 1563. Provincial councils were very numerous: Baxter enumerates four hundred and eighty-one, and Dufresnoy many more.

2. Of the eighteen councils denominated "general" by the Papists, four have already been enumerated; and they with the next four constitute the eight eastern councils, which alone, according to the "Body of Civil Law," each of the popes of Rome, on his elevation to the pontificate, solemnly professes to maintain. The fifth was convened at Constantinople, A. D. 556, by the emperor Justinian; the sixth, also at Constantinople, in 681, in which the emperor Constantine IV, himself presided; the seventh at Nice, in 787, by the empress Irene; and the eighth, at Constantinople, in 870, by the emperor Basilius. It is matter of historical record, and therefore cannot be denied, that the convening of all these councils appertained solely to the respective emperors; that they alone exercised authority on such occasions; that the bishop of Rome was never thought to possess any, although his power may be said to have been set up between the fifth and sixth general councils; nor did the bishop himself, *pro tempore*, think himself entitled to an authority of the kind. The other councils which the Romish church dignifies with the title of "general," are the ten western ones, which are here subjoined:--(9.) The first council of Lateran, held under Pope Calixtus, A. D. 1123; (10.) the second of Lateran, under Innocent II, in 1139; (11.) the third of Lateran, under Alexander III, in 1179, the decrees of which were intended to extirpate the Albigenses, as well as the Waldenses, who were variously called Leonists, or poor men of Lyons; (12.) the fourth of Lateran, under Innocent III, in 1215, which incited Christian Europe to engage in a crusade for the recovery of the Holy Land, and whose canons obtruded on the church the monstrous doctrines of transubstantiation and auricular confession, the latter being ranked among the duties prescribed by the law of Christ; (13.) the first of Lyons, under Innocent IV, in 1245; (14.) the second of Lyons, under Gregory X, in 1274; (15.) that of Vienne, under Clement V, in 1311; (16.) that of Florence, under Eugenius IV, in 1439; (17.) the fifth of Lateran, under the infamous Julius II; and (18.) the council of Trent, of which an account is given in the preceding paragraph, and which grounds its fame on its opposition to the progress of the reformation under Luther. Though, according to Bellarmine, these eighteen alone are recognised by the Romish church œcumenical or universal councils, yet some of them did not deserve even the more restricted appellation of "general." For the council of Trent itself,

in some of its sessions, could scarcely number more than forty or fifty ecclesiastics, and, of those, not one eminent for profound theological or classical knowledge. The lawyers who attended, says Father Paul, “knew little of religion, while the few divines were of less than ordinary sufficiency.” Some of the other councils which are not acknowledged by the Papists to be “general” with respect to all their sessions, (as those of Basle and Constance,) are in part received by them, and in part rejected. Bellarmine and other celebrated writers of his church, are dubious about determining whether or not “the fifth of Lateran” was really a general council, and leave it as a thing discretionary with the faithful either to retain or reject it; if it be rejected, the only refuge which they have, is to receive in its place the council of Constance, held under John XXIII, in 1414, which is disclaimed by the Italian clergy but admitted by those of France, and which is rendered infamous in the annals of religion and humanity by its cruel and treacherous conduct toward those two early Protestant martyrs, John Huss and Jerome of Prague; “who went to the stake,” says, Æneas Sylvius, “as if it had been to a banquet, without uttering a complaint that could betray the least weakness of mind. When they began to burn, they sung a hymn, which even the crackling of the flames could not interrupt. Never did any philosopher suffer death with so much courage, as they endured the fire.” But this acknowledgment of Constance as one of the eighteen is resisted *vi et armis*, by the crafty Cisalpine ecclesiastics, because one of the earliest acts of that council declared the representatives of the church in general council assembled to be superior to the sovereign pontiff, not only when schism prevailed, but at all other times whatsoever.

3. A general council being composed of men every one of whom is fallible, they must also be liable to error when collected together; and that they actually have erred is sufficiently evident from this fact, that different general councils have made decrees directly opposite to each other, particularly in the Arian and Eutychian controversies, which were upon subjects immediately “pertaining unto God.” Indeed, neither the first general councils themselves, nor those who defended their decisions, ever pretended to infallibility; this was a claim of a much more recent date, suited to the dark ages in which it was asserted and maintained, but now considered equally groundless and absurd in the case of general councils as in that of popes. If God had been pleased to exempt them from a possibility of error, he would have announced that important privilege in his written word; but no such promise or assurance is mentioned in the New Testament 273If infallibility belonged to the whole church collectively, or to any individual part of it, it must be so prominent and conspicuous that no mistake or doubt could exist upon the subject; and above all, it must have prevented those dissensions, contests, heresies, and schisms, which have abounded among Christians from the days of the

Apostles to the present time; and of which that very church, which is the asserter and patron of this doctrine, has had its full share.

The Scriptures being the only source from which we can learn the terms of salvation, it follows that things ordained by general councils as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, as the church of England has well said, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture. It is upon this ground we receive the decisions of the first four general councils, in which we find the truths revealed in the Scriptures, and therefore we believe them. We reverence the councils for the sake of the doctrines which they declared and maintained, but we do not believe the doctrines upon the authority of the councils.

COVENANT. The Greek word *διαθήκη* occurs often in the Septuagint, as the translation of a Hebrew word, which signifies covenant: it occurs also in the Gospels and the Epistles; and it is rendered in our English Bibles sometimes covenant, sometimes testament. The Greek word, according to its etymology, and according to classical use, may denote a testament, a disposition, as well as a covenant; and the Gospel may be called a testament, because it is a signification of the will of our Saviour ratified by his death, and because it conveys blessings to be enjoyed after his death. These reasons for giving the dispensation of the Gospel the name of a testament appeared to our translators so striking, that they have rendered *διαθήκη* more frequently by the word testament, than by the word covenant. Yet the train of argument, where *διαθήκη* occurs, generally appears to proceed upon its meaning a covenant; and therefore, although, when we delineate the nature of the Gospel, the beautiful idea of its being a testament, is not to be lost sight of, yet we are to remember that the word testament, which we read in the Gospels and Epistles, is the translation of a word which the sense requires to be rendered covenant. A covenant implies two parties, and mutual stipulations. The new covenant must derive its name from something in the nature of the stipulations between the parties different from that which existed before; so that we cannot understand the propriety of the name, new, without looking back to what is called the old, or first. On examining the passages in Gal. iii, in 2 Cor. iii, and in Heb. viii-x, where the old and the new covenant are contrasted, it will be found that the old covenant means the dispensation given by Moses to the children of Israel; and the new covenant the dispensation of the Gospel published by Jesus Christ; and that the object of the Apostle is to illustrate the superior excellence of the latter dispensation. But, in order to preserve the consistency of the Apostle's writings, it is necessary to remember that there are two different lights in which the former dispensation may be viewed. Christians appear to draw the line between the old and the new covenant, according to the light in which they view



that dispensation. It may be considered merely as a method of publishing the moral law to a particular nation; and then with whatever solemnity it was delivered, and with whatever cordiality it was accepted, it is not a covenant that could give life. For, being nothing more than what divines call a covenant of works, a directory of conduct requiring by its nature entire personal obedience, promising life to those who yielded that obedience, but making no provision for transgressors, it left under a curse “every one that continued not in all things that were written in the book of the law to do them.” This is the essential imperfection of what is called the covenant of works, the name given in theology to that transaction, in which it is conceived that the supreme Lord of the universe promised to his creature, man, that he would reward that obedience to his law, which, without any such promise, was due to him as the Creator.

No sooner had Adam broken the covenant of works, than a promise of a final deliverance from the evils incurred by the breach of it was given. This promise was the foundation of that transaction which Almighty God, in treating with Abraham, condescends to call “my covenant with thee,” and which, upon this authority, has received in theology the name of the Abrahamic covenant. Upon the one part, Abraham, whose faith was counted to him for righteousness, received this charge from God, “Walk before me and be thou perfect;” upon the other part, the God whom he believed, and whose voice he obeyed, beside promising other blessings to him and his seed, uttered these significant words, “In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.” In this transaction, then, there was the essence of a covenant; for there were mutual stipulations between two parties; and there was superadded, as a seal of the covenant, the rite of circumcision, which, being prescribed by God, was a confirmation of his promise to all who complied with it, and being submitted to by Abraham, was, on his part, an acceptance of the covenant.

The Abrahamic covenant appears, from the nature of the stipulations, to be more than a covenant of works; and, as it was not confined to Abraham, but extended to his seed, it could not be disannulled by any subsequent transactions, which fell short of a fulfilment of the blessing promised. The law of Moses, which was given to the seed of Abraham four hundred and thirty years after, did not come up to the terms of that covenant even with regard to them, for, in its form it was a covenant of works, and to other nations it did not directly convey any blessing. But although the Mosaic dispensation did not fulfil the Abrahamic covenant, it was so far from setting that covenant aside, that it cherished the expectation of its being fulfilled: for it continued the rite of circumcision, which was the seal of the covenant; and in those ceremonies which it enjoined, there was a shadow, a type, an obscure representation, of the promised blessing, Luke i, 72, 73.

Here, then, is another view of the Mosaic dispensation. "It was added, because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made," Gal. iii, 19. By delivering a moral law, which men felt themselves unable to obey; by denouncing judgments which it did not of itself provide any effectual method of escaping; and by holding forth, in various oblations, the promised and expected Saviour; "it was a schoolmaster to bring men unto Christ." The covenant made with Abraham retained its force during the dispensation of the law, and was the end of that dispensation.

The views which have been given furnish the ground upon which we defend that established language which is familiar to our ears, that there are only two covenants essentially different, and opposite to one another, the covenant of works, made with the first man, intimated by the constitution of human nature to every one of his posterity, and having for its terms, "Do this and live;"--and the covenant of grace, which was the substance of the Abrahamic covenant, and which entered into the constitution of the Sinaitic covenant, but which is more clearly revealed, and more extensively published in the Gospel. This last covenant, which the Scriptures call new in respect to the mode of its dispensation under the Gospel, although it is not new in respect of its essence, has received, in the language of theology, the name of the covenant of grace, for the two following obvious reasons: because, after man had broken the covenant of works, it was pure grace or favour in the Almighty to enter into a new covenant with him; and, because by the covenant there is conveyed that grace which enables man to comply with the terms of it. It could not be a covenant unless there were terms,--something required, as well as something promised or given,--duties to be performed, as well as blessings to be received. Accordingly, the tenor of the new covenant, founded upon the promise originally made to Abraham, is expressed by Jeremiah in words which the Apostle to the Hebrews has quoted as a description of it: "I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people," Heb. viii, 10:--words which intimate on one part not only entire reconciliation with God, but the continued exercise of all the perfections of the Godhead in promoting the happiness of his people, and the full communication of all the blessings which flow from his unchangeable love; on the other part, the surrender of the heart and affections of his people, the dedication of all the powers of their nature to his service, and the willing uniform obedience of their lives. But, although there are mutual stipulations, the covenant retains its character of a covenant of grace, and must be regarded as having its source purely in the grace of God. For the very circumstances which rendered the new covenant necessary, take away the possibility of there being any merit upon our part: the faith by which the covenant is accepted

is the gift of God; and all the good works by which Christians continue to keep the covenant, originate in that change of character which is the fruit of the operation of his Spirit.

Covenants were anciently confirmed by eating and drinking together; and chiefly by feasting on a sacrifice. In this manner, Abimelech, the Philistine, confirmed the covenant with Isaac, and Jacob with his father Laban, Gen. xxvi, 26–31; xxxi, 44–46, 54. Sometimes they divided the parts of the victim, and passed between them, by which act the parties signified their resolution of fulfilling all the terms of the engagement, on pain of being divided or cut asunder as the sacrifice had been, if they should violate the covenant, Gen. xv, 9, 10, 17, 18; Jer. xxxiv, 18. Hence the Hebrew word *charat*, which properly signifies to divide, is applied allusively in Scripture to the making of a covenant. When the law of Moses was established, the people feasted in their peace-offerings on a part of the sacrifice, in token of their reconciliation with God, Deut. xii, 6, 7. See Circumcision.

COURT, an entrance into a palace or house. (See House.) The great courts belonging to the temple of Jerusalem were three; the first called the court of the Gentiles, because the Gentiles were allowed to enter so far, and no farther; the second was the court of Israel, because all the Israelites, provided they were purified, had a right of admission into it; the third was that of the priests, where the altar of burnt-offerings stood, where the priests and Levites exercised their ministry. Common Israelites, who were desirous of offering sacrifices, were at liberty to bring their victims as far as the inner part of the court; but they could not pass a certain line of separation, which divided it into two; and they withdrew as soon as they had delivered their sacrifices and offerings to the priests, or had made their confession with the ceremony of laying their hands upon the head of the victim, if it were a sin-offering. Before the temple was built, there was a court belonging to the tabernacle, but not near so large as that of the temple, and encompassed only with pillars, and veils hung with cords.

CRANE. In Isaiah xxxviii, 14, and Jer. viii, 7, two birds are mentioned, the *סִיס* and the *עגור*. The first in our version is translated crane, and the second swallow; but Bochart exactly reverses them, and the reasons he adduces are incontrovertible. Aristophanes curiously observes, that “it is time to sow when the crane migrates clamouring into Africa; she also bids the mariner suspend his rudder and take his rest, and the mountaineer to provide himself with raiment;” and Hesiod, “When thou hearest the voice of the crane, clamouring annually from the clouds on high, recollect that this is the signal for ploughing, and indicates the approach of showery winter.”

Where do the cranes or winding swallows go,  
Fearful of gathering winds and falling snow?  
275 Conscious of all the coming ills, they fly  
To milder regions and a southern sky.

Prior.

The Prophet Jeremiah mentions this bird, thus intelligent of the seasons by an instinctive and invariable observation of their appointed times, as a circumstance of reproach to the chosen people of God, who, although taught by reason and religion, “knew not the judgment of the Lord.”

CREATION, in its primary import, signifies the bringing into being something which did not exist before. The term is therefore most generally applied to the original production of the materials whereof the visible world is composed. It is also used in a secondary or subordinate sense, to denote those subsequent operations of the Deity upon the matter so produced, by which the whole system of nature, and all the primitive genera of things, received their forms, qualities, and laws. The accounts of the creation of the world which have existed among different nations, are called Cosmogonies. Moses’s is unquestionably the most ancient; and had it no other circumstance to recommend it, its superior antiquity alone would give it a just claim to our attention. It is evidently Moses’s intention to give a history of man, and of religion, and an account of creation. In the way in which he has detailed it, it would have been foreign to his plan, had it not been necessary to obviate that most ancient and most natural species of idolatry, the worship of the heavenly bodies. His first care, therefore, is to affirm decidedly, that God created the heavens and the earth; and then he proceeds to mention the order in which the various objects of creation were called into existence. First of all, the materials, of which the future universe was to be composed, were created. These were jumbled together in one indigested mass, which the ancients called chaos, and which they conceived to be eternal; but which Moses affirms to have been created by the power of God. The materials of the chaos were either held in solution by the waters, or floated in them, or were sunk under them; and they were reduced into form by the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters. Light was the first distinct object of creation: fishes were the first living things; man was last in the order of creation.

2. The account given by Moses is distinguished by its simplicity. That it involves difficulties which our faculties cannot comprehend, is only what might be expected from a detail of the operations of the omnipotent mind, which can never be fully understood but by the Being who planned them. Most of the writers who come nearest to Moses in point of antiquity have favoured the world with cosmogonies; and there is a wonderful coincidence in some leading particulars between their accounts and his.

They all have his chaos; and they all state water to have been the prevailing principle before the arrangement of the universe began. The systems became gradually more complicated, as the writers receded farther from the age of primitive tradition; and they increased in absurdity in proportion to the degree of philosophy which was applied to the subject. The problem of creation has been said to be, "Matter and motion being given, to form a world;" and the presumption of man has often led him to attempt the solution of this intricate question. But the true problem was, "Neither matter nor motion being given, to form a world." At first, the cosmogonists contented themselves with reasoning on the traditional or historical accounts they had received; but it is irksome to be shackled by authority; and after they had acquired a smattering of knowledge, they began to think that they could point out a much better way of forming the world than that which had been transmitted to them by the consenting voice of antiquity. Epicurus was most distinguished in this hopeful work of invention; and produced a cosmogony on the principle of a fortuitous concourse of atoms, whose extravagant absurdity has hitherto preserved it from oblivion. From his day to ours, the world has been annoyed with systems; but these are now modified by the theories of chemists and geologists, whose speculations, in so far as they proceed on the principle of induction, have sometimes been attended with useful results; but, when applied to solve the problem of creation, will serve, like the systems of their forerunners, to demonstrate the ignorance and the presumption of man.

3. The early cosmogonies are chiefly interesting from their resemblance to that of Moses; which proves that they have either been derived from him, or from some ancient prevailing tradition respecting the true history of creation. The most ancient author next to Moses, of whose writings any fragments remain, is Sanchoniatho, the Phenician. His writings were translated by Philo Byblius; and portions of this version are preserved by Eusebius. These writings come to us rather in an apocryphal form; they contain, however, no internal evidence which can affect their authenticity; they pretty nearly resemble the traditions of the Greeks, and are, perhaps, the parent stock from which these traditions are derived. The notions detailed by Sanchoniatho are almost translated by Hesiod, who mentions the primeval chaos, and states  $\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ , or love, to be its first offspring. Anaxagoras was the first among the Greeks who entertained tolerably accurate notions on the subject of creation: he assumed the agency of an intelligent mind in the arrangement of the chaotic materials. These sentiments gradually prevailed among the Greeks; from whom they passed to the Romans, and were generally adopted, notwithstanding the efforts which were made to establish the doctrines of Epicurus by the nervous poetry of Lucretius. Ovid has collected the orthodox doctrines which prevailed on the subject, both among Greeks and Romans; and has

expressed them with uncommon elegance and perspicuity in the first chapter of his "Metamorphoses." There is so striking a coincidence between his account and that of Moses that one would almost think that he was translating from the first chapter of Genesis; and there can be no doubt that the Mosaic writings were well known at that time, both among the Greeks and Romans. Megasthenes, who lived in the time of Seleucus Nicanor, affirms, that all the doctrines of the Greeks respecting the creation, and the constitution of nature, were current among the Bramins in India, and the Jews in Syria. He must, of course, have been acquainted with the writings of the latter, before he could make the comparison. Juvenal talks of the writings of Moses as well known:--

Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses.

[Whatever Moses has transmitted in his mystic volume.]

We are therefore inclined to think that Ovid actually copied from the Bible; for he adopts the very order detailed by Moses. Moses mentions the works of creation in the following order: the separation of the sea from the dry land; the creation of the heavenly bodies; of marine animals; of fowls and land animals; of man. Observe now the order of the Roman poet:--

Ante mare et terras, et, quod tegit omnia, cœlum,  
Unus erat toto naturæ vultus in orbe,  
Quem dixere chaos, rudis, indigestaque moles.  
Hanc Deus, et melior litem natura diremit.  
Nam cœlo terras, et terras abscidit undis;  
Et liquidum spisso secrevit ab aëre cœlum.  
Neu regio foret ulla suis animalibus orba;  
Astra tenent cœleste solum, formæque deorum;  
Cesserunt nitidis habitandæ piscibus undæ:  
Terra feras cepit, volucres agitabilis aër.  
Sanctius his animal, mentisque capacius altæ  
Deerat adhuc, et quod dominari in cætera posset:  
Natus homo est.

"Before the seas, and this terrestrial ball,  
And heav'n's high canopy, that covers all,  
One was the face of nature; if a face:  
Rather, a rude and indigested mass:  
A lifeless lump, unfashion'd, and unframed,  
Of jarring seeds; and justly chaos named.  
But God, or nature, while they thus contend,  
To these intestine discords put an end;  
Then earth from air, and seas from earth were driv'n,  
And grosser air sunk from ethereal heav'n.  
Thus when the God, whatever god was he,

Had form'd the whole, and made the parts agree,  
 That no unequal portions might be found,  
 He moulded earth into a spacious round.  
 Then, every void of nature to supply,  
 With forms of gods he fills the vacant sky:  
 New herds of beasts he sends, the plains to share:  
 New colonies of birds, to people air;  
 And to their oozy beds the finny fish repair.  
 A creature of a more exalted kind  
 Was wanting yet, and then was man design'd:  
 Conscious of thought, of more capacious breast,  
 For empire form'd, and fit to rule the rest:  
 Whether with particles of heav'nly fire  
 The God of nature did his soul inspire," &c.

Dryden.

Here we see all the principal objects of creation mentioned exactly in the same order which Moses had assigned to them in his writings; and when we consider what follows;--the war of the giants; the general corruption of the world; the universal deluge; the preservation of Deucalion and Pyrrha; their sacrifices to the gods on leaving the vessel in which they had been preserved;--there can scarcely remain a doubt that Ovid borrowed, either directly or at second hand, from Moses. What he says, too, is perfectly consistent with the received notions on the subject, though it is probable that they had never before been so regularly methodised. This train of reasoning would lead us to conclude that Ovid, and indeed the whole Heathen world, derived their notions respecting the creation, and the early history of mankind, from the sacred Scriptures: and it shows how deficient their own resources were, when the pride of philosophy was forced to borrow from those whom it affected to despise. With regard to the western mythologists, then, there can be little doubt that their cosmogonies, at least such of them as profess to be historical, and not theoretical, are derived from Moses; and the same may be affirmed with regard to the traditions of the east: as they were the same with those of Greece in the time of Megasthenes, whose testimony to this effect is quoted both by Clemens Alexandrinus and Strabo, we may naturally conclude that they had the same origin.

4. The Hindoo mythology has grown, in the natural uninterrupted progress of corruption, to such monstrous and complicated absurdity, that in many cases it stands unique in extravagance. In the more ancient Hindoo writings, however, many sublime sentiments occur; and in the "Institutes of Menu," many passages are found relating to the creation, which bear a strong resemblance to the account given by Moses. They are thus given in an advertisement, prefixed to the fifth volume of the "Asiatic Researches,"

and are intended as a supplement to a former treatise on the Hindoo religion:--

“This universe existed only in the first divine idea, yet unexpanded, as if involved in darkness, imperceptible, undefinable, undiscoverable by reason, and undiscovered by revelation, as if it were wholly immersed in sleep. When the sole self-existing Power, himself undiscerned, but making this world discernible, with five elements and other principles of nature, appeared with undiminished glory, expanding his idea, or dispelling the gloom. He, whom the mind alone can perceive, whose essence eludes the external organs, who has no visible parts, who exists from eternity, even he, the soul of all beings, whom no being can comprehend, shone forth in person. He, having willed to produce various beings from his own divine substance, first with a thought created the waters. The waters are called nara, because they are the production of Nara, or the Spirit of God; and since they were his first ayana, or place of motion, he thence is called Narayana, or moving on the waters. From that which is, the first cause, not the object of sense, existing every where in substance, not existing to our perception, without beginning or end, was produced the divine male. He framed the heaven above, and the earth beneath; in the midst he placed the subtile ether, the eight regions, and the permanent receptacle of waters. He framed all creatures. He, too, first assigned to all creatures distinct names, distinct acts, and distinct occupations. He gave being to time, and the divisions of time; to the stars also, and the planets; to rivers, oceans, and mountains; to level plains, and uneven valleys. For the sake of distinguishing 277actions, he made a total difference between right and wrong. Having divided his own substance, the mighty Power became half male, half female. He whose powers are incomprehensible, having created this universe, was again absorbed in the spirit, changing the time of energy for the time of repose.”

In these passages we have evidently a philosophical comment on the account of creation given by Moses, or as transmitted from the same source of primitive tradition. We also see in these passages the rudiments of the Platonic philosophy, the eternal ideas in the divine mind, &c; and were any question to arise respecting the original author of these notions, we should have little hesitation in giving it against the Greeks. They were the greatest plagiarists both in literature and philosophy, and they have scarcely an article of literary property which they can call their own, except their poetry. Their sages penetrated into Egypt and India, and on their return stigmatized the natives of these countries as barbarians, lest they should be suspected of stealing their inventions.



5. The Chaldean cosmogony, according to Berosus, when divested of allegory, seems to resolve itself into this, that darkness and water existed from eternity; that Belus divided the humid mass, and gave birth to creation; that the human mind is an emanation from the divine nature. The cosmogony of the ancient Persians is very clumsy. They introduce two eternal principles, the one good, called Oromasdes, the other evil, called Arimanius; and they make these two principles contend with each other in the creation and government of the world. Each has his province, which he strives to enlarge; and Mithras is the mediator to moderate their contentions. This is the most inartificial plan that has been devised to account for the existence of evil, and has the least pretensions to a philosophical basis. The Egyptian cosmogony, according to the account given of it by Plutarch, seems to bear a strong resemblance to the Phenician, as detailed by Sanchoniatho. According to the Egyptian account, there was an eternal chaos, and an eternal spirit united with it, whose agency at last arranged the discordant materials, and produced the visible system of the universe. The cosmogony of the northern nations, as may be collected from the Edda, supposes an eternal principle prior to the formation of the world. The Orphic Fragments state every thing to have existed in God, and to proceed from him. The notion implied in this maxim is suspected to be pantheistic, that is, to imply the universe to be God; which, however, might be a more modern perversion. Plato supposed the world to be produced by the Deity, uniting eternal, immutable ideas, or forms, to variable matter. Aristotle had no cosmogony, because he supposed the world to be without beginning and without end. According to the Stoical doctrine, the divine nature, acting on matter, first produced moisture, and then the other elements, which are reciprocally convertible.

CRETE, an island in the Mediterranean, now called Candia, Titus i, 5. Nature had endowed this island with all that renders man happy; the inhabitants, likewise, had formerly a constitution which was renowned and frequently compared with that of the Spartans; but at this time, and even long before, all, even laws and morals, had sunk very low. The character of this nation was mutable, prone to quarrelling, to civil disturbances and frays, to robberies and violences. Avaricious and base to a degree of sordid greediness, they considered nothing as ignoble which gratified this inclination. Thence arose their treachery, their false and deceitful disposition, which had passed into a common proverb. Even in the times of purer morals they were decidedly addicted to wine; and their propensity to incontinence was frequently censured and noticed by the ancients. Religion itself was one cause of the many excesses of this nation. Many deities were born among them; they also showed their tombs and catacombs, and celebrated the feasts and mysteries of all. They therefore had continually holydays, diversions, and idle times, and one of their native

poets (Diodorus calls him Θεολόγος) gave them the testimony which Paul found to be so true, Titus i, 12. Jews also had established themselves among them, who according to all appearance could have improved here but very little in morality. The Apostle seems to have considered them a more dangerous people than the inhabitants themselves.

CRIMSON, 2 כרמיל, Chron. ii, 7, iii, 14, the name of a colour. Bochart supposes it to be the cochlea purpuraria, or purple from a kind of shell-fish taken near Mount Carmel. But as the name of the mount is said to mean a vineyard, one may rather suppose the colour to signify that of grapes; like the redness of the vesture of him who trod the wine-press, Isa. lxiii, 1, 2. What our version renders crimson, Isa. i, 18; Jer. iv, 30, should be scarlet.

CROSS, an ancient instrument of capital punishment. The cross was the punishment inflicted by the Romans, on servants who had perpetrated crimes, on robbers, assassins, and rebels; among which last Jesus was reckoned, on the ground of his making himself King or Messiah, Luke xxiii, 1–5, 13–15. The words in which the sentence was given were, “Thou shalt go to the cross.” The person who was subjected to this punishment was then deprived of all his clothes excepting something around the loins. In this state of nudity he was beaten, sometimes with rods, but more generally with whips. Such was the severity of this flagellation, that numbers died under it. Jesus was crowned with thorns, and made the subject of mockery; but insults of this kind were not among the ordinary attendants of crucifixion. They were owing, in this case, merely to the petulant spirit of the Roman soldiers, Matt. xxvii, 29; Mark xv, 17; John xix, 2, 5. The criminal, having been beaten, was subjected to the farther suffering of being obliged to carry the cross himself to the place of punishment, which was commonly a hill, near the public way, and out of the city. The place of crucifixion at Jerusalem was a hill to the north-west of the city. The cross, σταυρός, a post, otherwise called the unpropitious or infamous tree, consisted of a piece of wood erected perpendicularly, and intersected by another at right angles near the top, so as to resemble the letter T. The crime for which the person suffered was inscribed on the transverse piece near the top of the perpendicular one.

There is no mention made in ancient writers of any thing on which the feet of the person crucified rested. Near the middle, however, of the perpendicular beam, there projected a piece of wood, on which he sat, and which answered as a support to the body, since the weight of the body might otherwise have torn away the hands from the nails driven through them. The cross, which was erected at the place of punishment, being there firmly fixed in the ground, rarely exceeded ten feet in height. The victim, perfectly naked, was elevated to the small projection in the middle: the

hands were then bound by a rope round the transverse beam, and nailed through the palm.

The assertion that the persons who suffered crucifixion were not in some instances fastened to the cross by nails through the hands and feet, but were merely bound to it by ropes, cannot be proved by the testimony of any ancient writer whatever. That the feet, as well as the hands, were fastened to the cross by means of nails, is expressly asserted in the play of Plautus, entitled "Mostellaria," compared with Tertullian against the Jews, and against Marcion. In regard to the nailing of the feet, it may be farthermore observed, that Gregory Nazianzen has asserted, that one nail only was driven through both of them; but Cyprian, (*de passione*), who had been a personal witness to crucifixions, and is, consequently, in this case, the better authority, states, on the contrary, that two nails or spikes were driven, one through each foot. The crucified person remained suspended in this way till he died, and the corpse had become putrid. While he exhibited any signs of life, he was watched by a guard; but they left him when it appeared that he was dead. The corpse was not buried, except by express permission, which was sometimes granted by the emperor on his birth day, but only to a very few. An exception, however, to this general practice was made by the Romans in favour of the Jews, on account of Deut. xxi, 22, 23; and in Judea, accordingly, crucified persons were buried on the same day. When, therefore, there was not a prospect that they would die on the day of the crucifixion, the executioners hastened the extinction of life, by kindling a fire under the cross, so as to suffocate them with the smoke, or by letting loose wild beasts upon them, or by breaking their bones upon the cross with a mallet, as upon an anvil. The Jews, in the times of which we are speaking, namely, while they were under the jurisdiction of the Romans, were in the habit of giving the criminal, before the commencement of his sufferings, a medicated drink of wine and myrrh, Prov. xxxi, 6. The object of this was to produce intoxication, and thereby render the pains of the crucifixion less sensible to the sufferer. This beverage was refused by the Saviour for the obvious reason, that he chose to die with the faculties of his mind undisturbed and unclouded, Matt. xxvii, 34; Mark xv, 23. It should be remarked, that this sort of drink, which was probably offered out of kindness, was different from the vinegar which was subsequently offered to the Saviour by the Roman soldiers. The latter was a mixture of vinegar and water, denominated *posca*, and was a common drink for the soldiers in the Roman army, Luke xxiii, 36; John xix, 29.

2. Crucifixion was not only the most ignominious, it was likewise the most cruel, mode of punishment: so very much so, that Cicero is justified in saying, in respect to crucifixion, "*Ab oculis, auribusque et omni cogitatione hominum, removendum esse.*" [That it ought neither to be seen,

heard of, nor even thought of by men.] The sufferings endured by a person on whom this punishment is inflicted are narrated by George Gottlieb Richter, a German physician, in a "Dissertation on the Saviour's Crucifixion." The position of the body is unnatural, the arms being extended back, and almost immovable. In case of the least motion, an extremely painful sensation is experienced in the hands and feet, which are pierced with nails, and in the back, which is lacerated with stripes. The nails, being driven through the parts of the hands and feet which abound in nerves and tendons, create the most exquisite anguish. The exposure of so many wounds to the open air brings on an inflammation, which every moment increases the poignancy of the suffering. In those parts of the body which are distended or pressed, more blood flows through the arteries than can be carried back in the veins. The consequence is, that a greater quantity of blood finds its way from the aorta into the head and stomach, than would be carried there by a natural and undisturbed circulation. The blood vessels of the head become pressed and swollen, which of course causes pain, and a redness of the face. The circumstance of the blood being impelled in more than ordinary quantities into the stomach is an unfavourable one also, because it is that part of the system which not only admits of the blood being stationary, but is peculiarly exposed to mortification. The aorta, not being at liberty to empty, in the free and undisturbed way as formerly, the blood which it receives from the left ventricle of the heart, is unable to receive its usual quantity. The blood of the lungs, therefore, is unable to find a free circulation. This general obstruction extends its effects likewise to the right ventricle, and the consequence is, an internal excitement, and exertion, and anxiety, which are more intolerable than the anguish of death itself. All the large vessels about the heart, and all the veins and arteries in that part of the system, on account of the accumulation and pressure of blood, are the source of inexpressible misery. The degree of anguish is gradual in its increase; and the person crucified is able to live under it commonly till the third, and sometimes till the seventh, day. Pilate, therefore, being surprised at the speedy termination of the Saviour's life, inquired in respect to the truth of it of the centurion himself, who commanded the soldiers, Mark xv, 44. In order to bring their life to a more speedy termination, so that they might be buried on the same day, the bones of the two thieves were broken with mallets, John xix, 31–37; and in order to ascertain this point in respect to Jesus, namely, whether he was really dead, or whether he had merely fallen into a swoon, a soldier thrust his lance into his side; but no signs of life appeared, John xix, 31–37.

3. Our Saviour says, that whosoever will be his disciple must take up his cross and follow him, Matt. xvi, 24: by which is meant, that his disciples must be willing to suffer for him, in any way in which God, in the course of his providence, may call them to suffer; even to endure martyrdom, if

called to it. The cross is also often put for the whole of Christ's sufferings, Eph. ii, 16; Heb. xii, 2; and the doctrine of his perfect atonement, Gal. vi, 14.

CROWN is a term properly taken for a cap of state worn on the heads of sovereign princes, as a mark of regal dignity. In Scripture there is frequent mention made of crowns; and the use of them seems to have been very common among the Hebrews. The high priest wore a crown, which was girt about his mitre, or the lower part of his bonnet, and was tied about his head. On the forepart was a plate of gold, with these words engraven on it: "Holiness to the Lord," Exod. xxviii, 36; xxix, 6. New-married persons of both sexes wore crowns upon their wedding day, Cant., iii, 11; and, alluding to this custom, it is said that when God entered into covenant with the Jewish nation, he put a beautiful crown upon their head, Ezekiel xvi, 12. The first crowns were no more than a bandelet drawn round the head, and tied behind, as we see it still represented on medals, &c. Afterward, they consisted of two bandelets; by degrees they took branches of trees of divers kinds, &c; at length they added flowers; and Claudius Saturninus says there was not any plant of which crowns had not been made.

There was always a difference, either in matter or form, between the crowns of kings and great men, and those of private persons. The crown of a king was generally a white fillet bound about his forehead, the extremities whereof being tied behind the head, fell back on the neck. Sometimes they were made of gold tissue, adorned with jewels. That of the Jewish high priest, which is the most ancient of which we have any description, was a fillet of gold placed upon his forehead, and tied with a ribbon of a hyacinth colour, or azure blue. The crown, mitre, and diadem, royal fillet and tiara, are frequently confounded. Crowns were bestowed on kings and princes, as the principal marks of their dignity. David took the crown of the king of the Ammonites from off his head: the crown weighed a talent of gold, and was moreover enriched with jewels, 2 Sam. xii, 30; 1 Chron. xx, 2. The Amalekite who valued himself on killing Saul, brought this prince's crown unto David, 2 Sam. i, 10. The crown was placed upon the head of young King Josiah, when he was presented to the people, in order to be acknowledged by them, 2 Chron. xxiii, 11. Baruch says that the idols of the Babylonians wore golden crowns, Baruch vi, 9. Queens, too, wore diadems among the Persians. King Ahasuerus honoured Vashti with this mark of power; and, after her divorce, the same favour was granted to Esther, chap. ii, 17. The elders, in Rev. iv, 10, are said to "cast their crowns before the throne." The allusion is here to the tributary kings dependent upon the Roman emperors. Herod took off his diadem in the presence of Augustus, till ordered to replace it. Tiridates did homage to Nero by laying the ensigns of royalty at the foot of his statue.

Pilate's guard platted a crown of thorns, and placed it on the head of Jesus Christ, Matt. xxvii, 29, with an intention to insult him, under the character of the king of the Jews. See Thorn. In a figurative sense, a crown signifies honour, splendour, or dignity, Lam. v, 16; Phil. iv, 1; and is also used for reward, because conquerors, in the Grecian games, were crowned, 1 Corinthians ix, 25.

CRYSTAL, קרָה. This word is translated "crystal" in Ezek. i, 22; and "frost," Gen. xxxi, 40; Job xxxvii, 10; Jeremiah xxxvi, 30; and "ice," Job vi, 16; xxxviii, 29; Psalm cxlvii, 17; κρυσαλλος, Rev. iv, 6; xxii, 1. Crystal is supposed to have its name from its resemblance to ice. The Greek word, κρύσταλλος, is formed from κρύος, ice, and ζαλάσσομαι, to concrete. The word, זְכוּרִית, is translated crystal, in Job xxviii, 17. Dr. Good observes, "We are not certain of the exact signification, farther than that it denotes some perfectly transparent and hyaline gem."

CUBIT, a measure used among the ancients. The Hebrews call it אַמָּא, the mother of other measures: in Greek πῆχυς. A cubit originally was the distance from the elbow to the extremity of the middle finger: this is the fourth part of a well proportioned man's stature. The common cubit is eighteen inches. The Hebrew cubit, according to Bishop Cumberland and M. Pelletier, is twenty-one inches; but others fix it at eighteen inches. The Talmudists observe, that the Hebrew cubit was larger by one quarter than the Roman. Lewis Capellus and others have asserted that there were two sorts of cubits among the Hebrews; one sacred, the other common; the sacred containing three feet, the common containing a foot and a half. Moses assigns to the Levites a thousand sacred cubits of land round about their cities, Num. xxxv, 4; and in the next verse he gives them two thousand common ones. The opinion, however, is very probable, that the cubit varied in different districts and cities, and at different times, &c.

CUCUMBER, קשאים, σίκκος, cucumis, Num. xi, 5, the fruit of a plant very common in our gardens. Tournefort mentions six kinds, of which the white and green are most esteemed. 280They are very plentiful in the east, especially in Egypt, and much superior to ours. Maillet, in describing the vegetables which the modern Egyptians have for food, tells us, that melons, cucumbers, and onions are the most common; and Celsius and Alpinus describe the Egyptian cucumbers as more agreeable to the taste and of more easy digestion than the European.

CULDEES, a body of religious, who chiefly resided in Scotland, Ireland, and some of the adjacent isles. The name has been also written Keldees and Kyldees. Various etymons have been given of it. Two of these seem to

have superior claims to attention. It may be deduced either from Irish ceile, or, gille, a servant, and De, Dia, God; or from cuil, ceal, in Welsh cel, a sequestered corner, a retreat. The latter seems to derive support from the established sense of kil, retained in the names of so many places, which, in an early age, have been consecrated to religion. It is more than probable that Christianity had found its way into Scotland before the close of the second century; and that it continued to be professed by a few scattered individuals even before the arrival of Ninian, in the beginning of the fifth. But we have no proof of the existence of any religious societies observing a particular institute, till the year 563, when Columba landed in Hii, or Iona; which, in honour of him, was afterward called I-colum-kill; that is, the isle of Colum, or Columba, of the cells. He was born in Ireland, A. D. 521; and, after founding many seminaries of religion there, prompted by zeal for the propagation of Christianity, set sail for Scotland with twelve companions. According to Bede, having converted the northern Picts, he received from Brudi, their king, the island of Hii in possession, for the purpose of erecting a monastery. Here he almost constantly resided till the year 597, when he died. He made occasional visits to the mainland, proceeding even as far as to Inverness: also to Ireland, where he was held in high estimation. As he was himself much devoted to the study of the Holy Scriptures, he taught his disciples to confirm their doctrines by testimonies brought from this unpolluted fountain, and declared that only to be the divine counsel which he found there. His followers, faithful to his instructions, “would receive those things only which are contained in the writings of the Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles, diligently observing the works of piety and purity.” They lived, indeed, according to a certain institute, which, it is said, was composed by their venerable instructor. But there was this remarkable distinction between them and those societies properly called monastic, that they were not associated expressly for the purpose of observing this rule. While they seem to have reckoned something of this kind necessary for the preservation of order, and for the attainment of habits of diligence, their great design was, by the instruction of those committed to their charge, to train them up for the work of the ministry. Hence it has been justly observed, that the Culdean fraternities may more properly be viewed as colleges than as monasteries; as being in fact, the seminaries of the church both in North Britain and in Ireland. There were also Culdees in Wales; and, for many ages, the Christians of that country held the same doctrines, and observed the same rites, with their Scottish and Irish brethren. The presbyters not only acted as the ministers of religion to those in their vicinity, but were still instructing others, and sending forth missionaries whenever they had a call, or any prospect of success.

2. In each regular establishment of the Culdees, it would appear that there were twelve brethren, with one who presided over them. Their ecclesiastical government has been viewed as materially the same with the Presbyterian. Their president, or abbot, was not a bishop, but a presbyter; to whose authority, as we learn from Bede, even the bishops of the district were subject. In their meetings, all matters were settled by plurality of voices. The members of this council had the general designation of seniores, or elders. To them, collectively, belonged the trial of the gifts of those who had been educated in their seminaries, when they were to be employed in the public ministry; from them they received ordination and mission, and to them they were amenable in the discharge of their office. Those whom they thus employed are, by ancient writers, often denominated bishops. But that they attached to this designation no dignity superior to that of presbyter, appears incontrovertible from their being afterward called to account, and sometimes censured by the fraternity. It has been asserted by the friends of diocesan episcopacy, that a bishop must always have resided at Iona for the purpose of conferring ordination. But there is not the slightest evidence of this. The contrary appears from all the records of these early ages. We learn from the Saxon Chronicle, that "there was always an abbot at Hii, but no bishop." It is a singular fact, that those who were first acknowledged as bishops in the northern parts of England, and were indeed instrumental in the introduction of Christianity there, were not only trained up at Iona, but received all their authority from the council of seniors in that island. This was the case with respect to Cormac, the bishop of the Northumbrians, as well as Aidan, Finan, and Colman, who succeeded each other in this mission. From the testimony of Bede, it is evident that by means of Scottish missionaries, or of those whom they had instructed and ordained, not only the Northumbrians, but the Middle-Angles, the Mercians and East-Saxons, all the way to the river Thames, that is, the inhabitants of by far the greatest part of the country now called England, were converted to Christianity; and for some time acknowledged subjection to the ecclesiastical government of the Scots. The latter lost their influence merely because their missionaries chose rather to give up their charges than to submit to the prevailing influence of the church of Rome, to which the Saxons of the west and of Kent had subjected themselves.

2813. Their doctrines were not less unpalatable than their mode of government to the friends of the church of Rome. In England, in a very early period, the adherents of the Popish missionary Augustine were viewed by the delegates from Iona in the light of heretics. They accordingly refused to hold communion with them. Matters were carried so high in support of the Roman authority in the synod of Stroneschalch, now Whitby, in England, A. D. 662, that Colman, the Scottish bishop of Lindisfarne, left his bishopric, and with his adherents returned to Scotland. Thus, as Bede



informs us, “the Catholic institution daily increasing, all the Scots who resided among the Angles, either conformed to them or returned to their own country.” It was decreed in the council of Cealhythe, A. D. 816, that no Scottish priest should be allowed to perform any duty of his function in England. But in Scotland the Culdean doctrine had taken deeper root; and, although equally offensive to the votaries of Rome, kept its ground for several centuries. The Popish writers themselves celebrate the piety, the purity, the humility, and even the learning, of the Culdees; but while they were displeased with the simplicity, or what they deemed the barbarism, of their worship, they charged them with various deviations from the faith of the Catholic church. It was not the least of these, that they did not observe Easter at the proper time. They did not acknowledge auricular confession; they rejected penance and authoritative absolution; they made no use of chrism in baptism; confirmation was unknown; they opposed the doctrine of the real presence; they withstood the idolatrous worship of saints and angels, dedicating all their churches to the Holy Trinity; they denied the doctrine of works of supererogation; they were enemies to the celibacy of the clergy, themselves living in the married state. One sweeping charge brought against them is, that they preferred their own opinions to “the statutes of the holy fathers.”

4. The Scots, having received the Christian faith by the labours of the Culdees, long withstood the errors and usurpations of Rome. It was not till the twelfth century that their influence began to decline. The difference between the lower classes of society in England and those of the same description in Scotland, both with respect to religious knowledge and moral conduct, is generally considered to be very striking. Some writers, whose attention has been arrested by this singular circumstance, and who could not be influenced by local attachments, have ascribed the disparity to the relative influence, however remote it may seem, of the doctrine and example of the Culdees. Notwithstanding their great disinterestedness and diligence in propagating the Gospel in England, these good men, it has been remarked, within thirty years after the commencement of their mission, were obliged to give way to the adherents of Rome; whereas the Scots, it is certainly known, enjoyed the benefit of their labours for more than seven centuries, and seem to have still retained their predilection for the doctrines and modes which they so early received.

CUMMIN, כמון, Isaiah xxviii, 25, 27; κύμνον, Matt. xxiii, 23. This is an umbelliferous plant, in appearance resembling fennel, but smaller. Its seeds have a bitterish warm taste, accompanied with an aromatic flavour, not of the most agreeable kind. An essential oil is obtained from them by distillation. The Jews sowed it in their fields, and when ripe threshed out

the seeds with a rod, Isaiah xxviii, 25, 27. The Maltese sow it, and collect the seeds in the same manner.

CUP. This word is taken in a twofold sense; proper, and figurative. In a proper sense, it signifies a vessel, such as people drink out of at meals, Gen. xl, 13. It was anciently the custom, at great entertainments, for the governor of the feast to appoint to each of his guests the kind and proportion of wine which they were to drink, and what he had thus appointed them it was deemed a breach of good manners either to refuse or not to drink up; hence a man's cup, both in sacred and profane authors, came to signify the portion, whether of good or evil, which happens to him in this world. Thus, to drink "the cup of trembling," or of "the fury of the Lord," is to be afflicted with sore and terrible judgments, Isaiah li, 17; Jeremiah xxv, 15–29; Psalm lxxv, 8. What Christ means by the expression, we cannot be at a loss to understand, since in two remarkable passages, Luke xxii, 42, and John xviii, 11, he has been his own interpreter. *Lethale poculum bibere*, "to drink the deadly cup," or cup of death, was a common phrase among the Jews; and from them, we have reason to believe, our Lord borrowed it.

Cup of Blessing, 1 Corinth. x, 16, is that which was blessed in entertainments of ceremony, or solemn services; or, rather, a cup over which God was blessed for having furnished its contents; that is, for giving to men the fruit of the vine. Our Saviour, in the Last Supper, blessed the cup, and gave it to each of his Apostles to drink, Luke xxii, 20.

Cup of Salvation, Psalm cxvi, 13, a phrase of nearly the same import as the former, a cup of thanksgiving, of blessing the Lord for his saving mercies. We see, in 2 Macc. vi, 27, that the Jews of Egypt, in their festivals for deliverance, offered cups of salvation. The Jews have at this day cups of thanksgiving, which are blessed, in their marriage ceremonies, and in entertainments made at the circumcision of their children. Some commentators think that "the cup of salvation" was a libation of wine poured on the victim sacrificed on thanksgiving occasions, according to the law of Moses, Exod. xxix, 40.

CURSE. To curse, signifies to imprecate, to call for mischief upon, or wish evil to, any one. Noah cursed his grandson Canaan, Gen. ix, 25; Jacob cursed the fury of his two sons, Gen. xlix, 7; Moses enjoins the people of Israel to denounce curses against the violaters of the law, Deut. xxvii, 15, 16, &c. Joshua pronounced a curse upon him who should undertake to rebuild Jericho. These curses were such as were either ordained by God himself, and pronounced by men under the influence of his Spirit; or they were predictions of certain evils which would happen to individuals, or to a people, uttered in the form of imprecations. They were not the effects of

passion, impatience, or revenge; and, therefore, were not things condemned by God in his law, like the cursing mentioned, Exodus xxi, 17, xxii, 28, Leviticus xix, 14.

CUSH, the eldest son of Ham, and father of Nimrod, Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah, and Sabtecha; and the grandfather of Sheba and Dedan. The posterity of Cush, spread over great part of Asia and Africa, were called Cushim, or Cushites; and by the Greeks and Romans, and in our Bible, Ethiopians.

Cush, Cutha, Cuthea, Cushan, Ethiopia, Land of Cush, the country or countries peopled by the descendants of Cush; whose first plantations were on the gulf of Persia, in that part which still bears the name of Chuzestan, and from whence they spread over India and great part of Arabia; particularly its western part, on the coast of the Red Sea; invaded Egypt, under the name of Hyc-Sos, or shepherd-kings; and thence passed, as well probably as by the straits of Babelmandel, into Central Africa, and first peopled the countries to the south of Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, and parts farther to the south and west. The indiscriminate use of the term Ethiopia in our Bible, for all the countries peopled by the posterity of Cush, and the almost exclusive application of the same term by the Greek and Roman writers to the before mentioned countries of Africa, have involved some portions of both sacred and profane history in almost inextricable confusion. The first country which bore this name, and which was doubtless the original settlement, was that which is described by Moses as encompassed by the river Gihon, or Gyndes; which encircles a great part of the province of Chuzestan in Persia. In process of time, the increasing family spread over the vast territory of India and Arabia: the whole of which tract, from the Ganges to the borders of Egypt, then became the land of Cush, or Asiatic Ethiopia, the Cusha Dweepa within, of Hindoo geography. Until dispossessed of this country, or a great part of it, by the posterity of Abraham, the Ishmaelites and Midianites, they, by a farther dispersion, passed over into Africa; which, in its turn, became the land of Cush, or Ethiopia, the Cusha Dweepa without, of the Hindoos: the only country so understood after the commencement of the Christian æra. Even from this last refuge, they were compelled, by the influx of fresh settlers from Arabia, Egypt, and Canaan, to extend their migrations still farther westward, into the heart of the African continent; where only in the woolly-headed negro, the genuine Cushite is to be found.

Herodotus relates that Xerxes had, in the army prepared for his Grecian expedition, both Oriental and African Ethiopians: and adds, that they resembled each other in every outward circumstance except their hair; that of the Asiatic Ethiopians being long and straight, while the hair of those of

Africa was curled. This is a very remarkable fact; and leads to the question, How came this singular distinction between people of the same stock? Did it arise from change of climate and of habits? or from some original difference in a particular branch of the great family of Cush? The former appears by far the more probable. It is not likely that a people descended from a common parent should naturally be distinguished by such a peculiar difference; but that it might be acquired by change of soil and condition, we have every reason to believe. We have something exactly analogous to it, in the change which the hair of animals undergoes when removed from their native state. But a modern writer has furnished us with a fact which will go farther than either theory or analogy. Dr. Prichard, in his researches into the Physical History of Man, relates, on the authority of Dr. S. S. Smith, of the negroes settled in the southern districts of the United States of America, that the field-slaves, who live on the plantations, and retain pretty nearly the rude manners of their African progenitors, preserve in the third generation much of their original structure, though their features are not so strongly marked as those of imported slaves. But the domestic servants of the same race, who are treated with lenity, and whose condition is little different from that of the lower class of white people, in the third generation have the nose raised, the mouth and lips of moderate size, the eyes lively and sparkling, and often the whole composition of the features extremely agreeable. "The hair grows sensibly longer in each succeeding race, and extends to three, four, and sometimes to six or eight inches."

About four hundred years before Christ, Herodotus, in his second book which treats of Egypt, makes frequent mention of Ethiopia; meaning exclusively the Ethiopia above Egypt. In the time of our Saviour, (and indeed from that time forward,) by Ethiopia, was meant, in a general sense, the countries south of Egypt, then but imperfectly known: of one of which, that Candace was queen whose eunuch was baptized by Philip.

From a review of the history of this remarkable people, we may see that those writers must necessarily be wrong who would confine the Ethiopians to either Arabia or Africa. Many parts of Scripture history cannot possibly be understood, without supposing them to have settlements in both; which Herodotus expressly asserts was the case. In fine, we may conclude, that in the times of the prophets, and during the transactions recorded in the second books of Kings and Chronicles, the Cushites, still retaining a part of their ancient territories in Arabia, had crossed the Red Sea in great numbers, and obtained extensive possessions in Africa; where, being, in a farther course of time, altogether expelled from the east by the Ishmaelites, &c, their remains are now concentrated. It is to be observed, however, that the Cushites probably at the time of 283their expulsion from Egypt, migrated, or sent colonies into several other parts, particularly to Phenicia,

Colchis, and Greece; where, in process of time, they became blended with the other inhabitants of those countries, the families of Javan, Meshek, and Tubal, and their distinctive character totally lost.

CYPRESS, תרזה, Isa. xlv, 14; and κypάρισσος, Ecclus. xxiv, 13; 1, 10; a large evergreen tree. The wood is fragrant, very compact, and heavy. It scarcely ever rots, decays, or is worm-eaten; for which reason the ancients used to make the statues of their gods with it. The unperishable chests which contain the Egyptian mummies were of cypress. The gates of St. Peter's church at Rome, which had lasted from the time of Constantine to that of Pope Eugene IV, that is to say eleven hundred years, were of cypress, and had in that time suffered no decay. But Celsius thinks that Isaiah speaks of the ilex, a kind of oak; and Bishop Lowth, that the pine is intended. The cypress, however, was more frequently used, and more fit for the purpose which the prophet mentions, than either of these trees.

CYPRUS, a large island in the Mediterranean, situated between Cilicia and Syria. Its inhabitants were plunged in all manner of luxury and debauchery. Their principal deity was Venus. The Apostles Paul and Barnabas landed in the isle of Cyprus, A. D. 44, Acts xiii, 4. While they continued at Salamis, they preached Jesus Christ in the Jewish synagogues; from thence they visited all the cities of the island, preaching the Gospel. At Paphos, they found Bar-Jesus, a false prophet, with Sergius Paulus, the governor: Paul struck Bar-Jesus with blindness; and the proconsul embraced Christianity. Some time after, Barnabas went again into this island with John, surnamed Mark, Acts xv, 39. Barnabas is considered as the principal Apostle, and first bishop, of Cyprus; where it is said he was martyred, being stoned to death by the Jews of Salamis.

CYRENE was a city of Lybia in Africa, which, as it was the principal city of that province, gave to it the name of Cyrenaica. This city was once so powerful as to contend with Carthage for preëminence. In profane writers, it is mentioned as the birthplace of Eratosthenes the mathematician, and Callimachus the poet; and in holy writ, of Simon, whom the Jews compelled to bear our Saviour's cross, Matt. xxvii, 32; Luke xxiii, 26. At Cyrene resided many Jews, a great part of whom embraced the Christian religion; but others opposed it with much obstinacy. Among the most inveterate enemies of Christianity, Luke reckons those of this province, who had a synagogue at Jerusalem, and excited the people against St. Stephen, Acts xi, 20.

CYRENIUS, governor of Syria, Luke ii, 1, 2. Great difficulties have been raised on the history of the taxing under Cyrenius, for the different solutions of which we must refer to the commentators.

It may be observed on the passage in Luke ii, 1, 2, That the word οἰκθμένη, rendered all the world, sometimes signifies the whole of a country, region, or district, as perhaps Acts xi, 28, and certainly Luke xxi, 26. The expression, “all the country,” is peculiarly proper in this place, because Galilee, as well as Judea, was included, and perhaps all other parts in which were Jews. The word ἀπογραφῆ, which is rendered taxing, should have been translated enrolment; as a taxation did not always really follow such enrolment, though such enrolment generally preceded a taxation. The difficulty of the passage is in the word πρώτη, first, because, ten or eleven years after, there was actually a taxation, which, as a decisive mark of subjection to the Roman power, was very mortifying to the Jewish nation. To this taxation Gamaliel alludes, “Judas of Galilee rose up in the days of the taxing,” Acts v, 37, when mobs and riots were frequent, under pretence of liberty.

The narrative of St. Luke may be combined in the following order, which is probably not far from its true import: “In those days Cæsar Augustus,” who was displeased with the conduct of Herod, and wished him to feel his dependence on the Roman empire, “issued a decree that the whole land” of Judea “should be enrolled,” as well persons as possessions, that the true state of the inhabitants, their families, and their property, might be known and recorded. Accordingly, “all were enrolled,” but the taxation did not immediately follow this enrolment, because Augustus was reconciled to Herod; and this accounts for the silence of Josephus on an assessment not carried into effect. “And this was the first assessment (or enrolment) of Cyrenius, governor of Syria. And all went to be enrolled, each to his own city;” and, as the emperor’s order was urgent, and Cyrenius was known to be active in the despatch of business, even Mary, though far advanced “in her pregnancy, went with Joseph, and while they waited” for their turn to be enrolled, “Mary was delivered of Jesus.” It is not, however, improbable, that Mary had some small landed estate, for which her appearance was necessary. Jesus, therefore, was enrolled with Mary and Joseph, as Julian the Apostate expressly says.

An officer being sent from Rome to enrol and assess the subjects of a king, implied that such king was dependent on the Roman emperor, and demonstrates that the sceptre was departed from Judah. This occurrence, added to the alarm of Herod on the inquiry of the Magi respecting the birthplace of the Messiah, might sufficiently exasperate Herod, not merely to slay the infants of Bethlehem, but to every act of cruelty. Hence, after such an occurrence, all Jerusalem might well be alarmed with Herod, Matt. ii, 3; and the priests, &c, study caution in their answers to him. This occurrence would quicken the attention of all who expected temporal

redemption in Israel, as it would extremely mortify every Jewish national feeling.

The overruling providence of God appointed, that, at the time of Christ's birth, there should be a public, authentic, and general production of titles, pedigrees, &c, which should 284prove that Jesus was descended from the house and direct family line of David; and that this should be proved judicially on such a scrutinizing occasion. This occurrence brought about the birth of the Messiah, at the very place appointed by prophecy long before, though the usual residence of Joseph and Mary was at Nazareth.

CYRUS, son of Cambyses the Persian, and of Mandane, daughter of Astyages, king of the Medes. At the age of thirty, Cyrus was made general of the Persian troops, and sent, at the head of thirty thousand men, to assist his uncle, Cyaxares, whom the Babylonians were preparing to attack. Cyaxares and Cyrus gave them battle, and dispersed them. After this, Cyrus carried the war into the countries beyond the river Halys; subdued Cappadocia; marched against Cræsus, king of Lydia, defeated him, and took Sardis, his capital. Having reduced almost all Asia, Cyrus repassed the Euphrates, and turned his arms against the Assyrians: having defeated them, he laid siege to Babylon, which he took on a festival day, after having diverted the course of the river which ran through it. On his return to Persia, he married his cousin, the daughter and heiress of Cyaxares; after which he engaged in several wars, and subdued all the nations between Syria and the Red Sea. He died at the age of seventy, after a reign of thirty years. Authors differ much concerning the manner of his death.

2. We learn few particulars respecting Cyrus from Scripture; but they are more certain than those derived from other sources. Daniel, in the remarkable vision in which God showed him the ruin of several great empires which preceded the birth of the Messiah, represents Cyrus as "a ram which had two horns, both high, but one rose higher than the other, and the higher came up last. This ram pushed westward, and northward, and southward, so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great," Daniel viii, 3, 4, 20. The two horns signify the two empires which Cyrus united in his person, that of the Medes and that of the Persians. In another place, Daniel compares Cyrus to a bear, with three ribs in its mouth, to which it was said, "Arise, devour much flesh." Cyrus succeeded Cambyses in the kingdom of Persia, and Darius the Mede (by Xenophon called Cyaxares, and Astyages in the Greek of Dan. xiii, 65,) also in the kingdom of the Medes, and the empire of Babylon. He was monarch, as he speaks "of all the earth," Ezra i, 1, 2; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 22, 23, when he permitted the Jews to return into their own country, A. M. 3466, B. C. 538.

He had always a particular regard for Daniel, and continued him in his great employments.

3. The prophets foretold the exploits of Cyrus. Isaiah, xlv, 28, particularly declares his name, above a century before he was born. Josephus says, that the Jews of Babylon showed this passage to Cyrus; and that, in the edict which he granted for their return, he acknowledged that he received the empire of the world from the God of Israel. The peculiar designation by name, which Cyrus received, must be regarded as one of the most remarkable circumstances in the prophetic writings. He was the heir of a monarch who ruled over one of the poorest and most inconsiderable kingdoms of Asia, but whose hardy inhabitants were at that time the bravest of the brave; and the providential circumstances in which he was placed precluded him from all knowledge of this oracular declaration in his favour. He did not become acquainted with the sacred books in which it was contained, nor with the singular people in whose possession it was found, till he had accomplished all the purposes for which he had been raised up, except that of saying to Jerusalem, as the “anointed” vicegerent of Heaven, “Thou shalt be inhabited;” and to the cities of Judah, “Ye shall be built, and I will raise up their ruins.” The national pride of the Jews during the days of their unhallowed prosperity, would hinder them from divulging among other nations such prophecies as this, which contained the most severe yet deserved reflections upon their wicked practices and ungrateful conduct; and it was only when they were captives in Babylon that they submitted to the humiliating expedient of exhibiting, to the mighty monarch whose bondmen they had become, the prophetic record of their own apostasy and punishment, and of his still higher destination, as the rebuilder of Jerusalem. No temptation therefore could be laid before the conqueror in early life to excite his latent ambition to accomplish this very full and explicit prophecy; and the facts of his life, as recorded by historians of very opposite sentiments and feelings, all concur in developing a series of consecutive events, in which he acted no insignificant part; which, though astonishing in their results, differ greatly from those rapid strides perceptible in the hurried career of other mighty men of war in the east; and which, from the unbroken connection in which they are presented to us, appear like the common occurrences of life naturally following each other, and mutually dependent. Yet this consideration does not preclude the presence of a mighty Spirit working within him; which, according to Isaiah, said to him, “I will gird thee, though thou hast not known me.” Concerning the genius, or guardian angel, of Socrates many learned controversies have arisen; but, though a few of the disputants have endeavoured to explain it away, the majority of them have left the Greek philosopher in possession of a greater portion of inspiration than, with marvellous inconsistency, some of them are willing to accord to the Jewish



prophets. In this view it is highly interesting to recollect that the elegant historian who first informed his refined countrymen of this moral prodigy, is he who subsequently introduced them to an acquaintance with the noble and heroic Cyrus. The didactic discourses and the comparatively elevated morality which Xenophon embodied in his "Memoirs of Socrates," are generally admitted to have been purposely illustrated in his subsequent admirable production, the *Cyropædia*, or "Education of Cyrus;" the basis of which is true history adorned and refined by philosophy, and exhibiting for universal imitation the life and actions of a prince who was cradled in the ancient Persian school of the Pischadians, the parent of the Socratic. Isaiah describes, in fine poetic imagery, the Almighty going before Cyrus to remove every obstruction out of his way:--

"I will go before thee, and level mountains,  
I will burst asunder the folding-doors of brass,  
And split in twain the bars of iron.  
Even I will give thee the dark treasures,  
And the hidden wealth of secret places:  
That thou mayest know, that I the Lord,  
Who call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel."

According to Herodotus, Babylon was famous for its brazen gates and doors; a hundred were in the city walls, beside those which led to the river, and others which belonged to the temple of Belus. When Sardis and Babylon were taken by Cyrus, they were the wealthiest cities in the world. Cræsus gave an exact inventory of his immense treasures to Cyrus, and they were removed from Sardis in waggons. Pliny gives the following account of the wealth which Cyrus obtained by his conquests in Asia: "He found thirty-four thousand pounds' weight of gold, beside vessels of gold, and gold wrought into the leaves of a platanus and of a vine; five hundred thousand talents of silver, and the cup of Semiramis, which weighed fifteen talents. The Egyptian talent, according to Varro, was equal to eighty pounds." Mr. Brerewood estimates the value of the gold and silver in this enumeration at 126,224,000l. sterling. Other particulars relating to him, and the accomplishment of prophecy in his conquest of that large city, will be found under the article Babylon. It is the God of Israel who, in these sublime prophecies, confounds the omens and prognostics of the Babylonian soothsayers or diviners, after they had predicted the stability of that empire; and who announces the restoration of Israel, and the rebuilding of the city and temple of Jerusalem, through Cyrus his "shepherd" and his "anointed" messenger. Chosen thus by God to execute his high behests, he subdued and reigned over many nations,--the Cilicians, Syrians, Paphlagonians, Cappadocians, Phrygians, Lydians, Carians, Phenicians, Arabians, Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Bactrians, &c.

"I am He who frustrateth the tokens of the impostors,  
 And maketh the diviners mad; &c.  
 Who saith to the abyss, [Babylon,]  
 'Be desolate, and I will dry up thy rivers:'  
 Who saith to Cyrus, 'He is my shepherd,  
 And shall perform all my pleasure.'  
 Thus saith the Lord to his anointed,  
 To Cyrus whom I hold by the right hand,  
 To subdue before him nations,  
 And ungird the loins of kings,  
 To open before him [palace] folding-doors;  
 Even [river] gates shall not be shut:  
 For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel my chosen,  
 I have surnamed thee;" &c.

4. Herodotus has painted the portrait of Cyrus in dark colours, and has been followed in many particulars by Ctesias, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plato, Strabo, Justin, and others; in opposition to the contrary accounts of Æschylus, Xenophon, Josephus, the Persian historians, and, apparently, the Holy Scriptures. The motive for this conduct of Herodotus is probably to be found in his aversion to Cyrus, for having been the enslaver of his country. The Greek historian was a man of free and independent spirit, and could never brook the mention of the surrender of his native city, Halicarnassus, to the troops of Cyrus. But, allowing that heartlessness and cruelty are too often the accompaniments of mighty conquerors, and that very few escape their direful contagion; yet, when the worst is told about Cyrus, abundance of authentic facts remain to attest his worth, and to elevate his character above the standard of ordinary mortals. Xenophon informs us, that the seven last years of his full sovereignty this prince spent in peace and tranquillity at home, revered and beloved by all classes of his subjects. In his dying moments he was surrounded by his family, friends, and children; and delivered to them the noblest exhortations to the practice of piety, virtue, and concord. This testimony is in substance confirmed by the Persian historians, who relate, that, after a long and bloody war, Khosru, or Cyrus, subdued the empire of Turan, and made the city of Balk, in Chorasán, a royal residence, to keep in order his new subjects; that he repaid every family in Persia proper the amount of their war-taxes, out of the immense spoils which he had acquired by his conquests; that he endeavoured to promote peace and harmony between the Turanians and Iranians; that he regulated the pay of his soldiery, reformed civil and religious abuses throughout the provinces, and, at length, after a long and glorious reign, resigned the crown to his son Lohorasp, and retired to solitude, confessing that he had lived long enough for his own glory, and that it was then time for him to devote the remainder of his days to God. Saadi, in his Gulistan, copies the wise inscription which

Cyrus ordered to be inscribed on his crown: "What avails a long life spent in the enjoyment of worldly grandeur, since others, mortal like ourselves, will one day trample under foot our pride! This crown, handed down to me from my predecessors, must soon pass in succession upon the head of many others." In the last book of the "Cypædia" we find the following devout thanksgivings to the gods: "I am abundantly thankful for being truly sensible of your care, and for never being elated by prosperity above my condition. I beseech you to prosper my children, wife, friends, and country. And for myself, I ask, that such as is the life ye have vouchsafed to me, such may be my end." The reflections of Dr. Hales on this passage are very judicious: "Here, Xenophon, a polytheist himself, represents Cyrus praying to the gods in the plural number; but that he really prayed to one 286only, the patriarchal God, worshipped by his venerable ancestors, the Pischdadians, may appear from the watchword, or signal, which he gave to his soldiers before the great battle, in which Evil Merodach was slain:

ZEYΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ ΚΑΙ ἩΓΕΜΩΝ.

"JOVE, OUR SAVIOUR AND LEADER."

Who this god was, we learn from the preamble of his famous proclamation, permitting the Jews to return from the Babylonian captivity: 'The Lord, the God of heaven, hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem,' &c, Ezra i, 1, 2. But where did the Lord, (Iahoh, or Jove) so charge him?--In that signal prophecy of Isaiah, predicting his name and his actions, about B. C. 712, above a century before his birth; a prophecy which was undoubtedly communicated to him by the venerable Prophet Daniel, the Archimagus, who saw the beginning of the Babylonish captivity, and also its end, here foretold to be effected by the instrumentality of Cyrus."

5. Pliny notices the tomb of Cyrus at Passagardæ in Persia. Arrian and Strabo describe it; and they agree with Curtius, that Alexander the Great offered funeral honours to his shade there; that he opened the tomb, and found, not the treasures he expected, but a rotten shield, two Scythian bows, and a Persian scymetar. And Plutarch records the following inscription upon it, in his life of Alexander:--"O man, whoever thou art, and whenever thou comest, (for come, I know, thou wilt,) I am Cyrus, the founder of the Persian empire. Envy me not the little earth that covers my body." Alexander was much affected at this inscription, which set before him, in so striking a light, the uncertainty and vicissitude of worldly things. And he placed the crown of gold which he wore, upon the tomb in which the body lay, wondering that a prince so renowned, and possessed of such immense treasures, had not been buried more sumptuously than if he had been a private person. Cyrus, indeed, in his last instructions to his children, desired that "his body, when he died, might not be deposited in gold or

silver, nor in any other sumptuous monument, but committed, as soon as possible, to the ground.”

The observation which Dr. Hales here makes, is worthy of record:--“This is a most signal and extraordinary epitaph. It seems to have been designed as a useful memento mori, [memento of death,] for Alexander the Great, in the full pride of conquest, “whose coming” it predicts with a prophetic spirit, “For come I know thou wilt.” But how could Cyrus know of his coming?--Very easily. Daniel the Archimagus, his venerable friend, who warned the haughty Nebuchadnezzar, that “head of gold,” or founder of the Babylonian empire, that it should be subverted by “the breast and arms of silver,” Dan. ii, 37, 39, or “the Mede and the Persian,” Darius and Cyrus, as he more plainly told the impious Belshazzar, Dan. v, 28, we may rest assured, communicated to Cyrus also, the founder of the Persian empire, the symbolical vision of the goat, with the notable horn in his forehead, Alexander of Macedon coming swiftly from the west, to overturn the Persian empire, Daniel viii, 5, 8, under the last king Codomannus, the fourth from Darius Nothus, as afterward more distinctly explained, Dan. xi, 1, 4. Cyrus, therefore, decidedly addresses the short-lived conqueror, O man, whoever thou art, &c.

“Juvenal, in that noble satire, the tenth, verse 168, has a fine reflection on the vanity of Alexander’s wild ambition to conquer worlds, soon destined himself to be confined in a narrow coffin; by a pointed allusion to the epitaph on the tomb of Cyrus:--

Unus Pellæo Juveni non sufficit orbis;  
Æstuat, infelix angusto limite mundi:  
Cum tamen a figulis munitam intraverit urbem,  
Sarcophago contentus erit.--Mors sola fatetur  
Quantula sint hominum corpuscula!”  
‘A single globe suffices not the Pellæan youth;  
Discontented, he scorns the scanty limits of the world;  
As if within a prison’s narrow bounds confined:  
But when he shall enter the brick-walled city, [Babylon,]  
A coffin will content him.--The epitaph alone owns,  
How small are the diminutive bodies of men!’

“The emotion of Alexander, on visiting the tomb, and reading the inscription, is not less remarkable. He evidently applied to himself, as the destroyer, the awful rebuke of the founder of the Persian empire, for violating the sanctity of his tomb, from motives of profane curiosity, and perhaps of avarice. And we may justly consider the significant act of laying down his golden crown upon the tomb itself, as an amende honorable, a homage due to the offended shade of the pious and lowly-minded Cyrus

the Great.” These reflections must close our account of one of the most remarkable characters that ever appeared among the eastern conquerors.

DAGON, דַּגּוֹן, corn, from דָּג, or דַּג, a fish, god of the Philistines. It is the opinion of some that Dagon was represented like a woman, with the lower parts of a fish, like a triton or syren. Scripture shows clearly that the statue of Dagon was human, at least, the upper part of it, 1 Sam. v, 4, 5. A temple of Dagon at Gaza was pulled down by Samson, Judges xvi, 23, &c. In another, at Ashdod, the Philistines deposited the ark of God, 1 Sam. v, 1–3. A city in Judah was called Beth-Dagon; that is, the house, or temple, of Dagon, Joshua xv, 41; and another on the frontiers of Asher, Joshua xix, 27.

DALMANUTHA. St. Mark says that Jesus Christ embarked with his disciples on the lake of Tiberias, and came to Dalmanutha, Mark viii, 10, but St. Matthew calls it Magdala, Matt. xv, 39. It seems that Dalmanutha was near to Magdala, on the western side of the lake.

DALMATIA, a part of old Illyria, lying along the gulf of Venice. Titus preached here, 2 Tim. iv, 10.

DAMASCUS, a celebrated city of Asia, and anciently the capital of Syria, may be accounted one of the most venerable places in the world for its antiquity. It is supposed to have been founded by Ux, the son of Aram; and is, at least, known to have subsisted in the time of Abraham, Gen. xv, 2. It was the residence of the Syrian kings, during the space of three centuries; and experienced a number of vicissitudes in every period of its history. Its sovereign, Hadad, whom Josephus calls the first of its kings, was conquered by David, king of Israel. In the reign of Ahaz, it was taken by Tiglath Pileser, who slew its last king, Rezin, and added its provinces to the Assyrian empire. It was taken and plundered, also, by Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, the generals of Alexander the Great, Judas Maccabeus, and at length by the Romans in the war conducted by Pompey against Tigranes, in the year before Christ, 65. During the time of the emperors, it was one of their principal arsenals in Asia, and is celebrated by the emperor Julian as, even in his day, “the eye of the whole east.” About the year 634, it was taken by the Saracen princes, who made it the place of their residence, till Bagdad was prepared for their reception; and, after suffering a variety of revolutions, it was taken and destroyed by Tamerlane, A. D. 1400. It was repaired by the Mamelukes, when they gained possession of Syria; but was wrested from them by the Turks, in 1506; and since that period has formed the capital of one of their pachalics. The modern city is delightfully situated about fifty miles from the sea, in a fertile and extensive plain, watered by the river which the Greeks called

Chrysorrhoras, or “Golden River,” but which is known by the name of Barrady, and of which the ancient Abana and Pharpar are supposed to have been branches. The city is nearly two miles in length from its north-east to its north-west extremity; but of very inconsiderable breadth, especially near the middle of its extent, where its width is much contracted. It is surrounded by a circular wall, which is strong, though not lofty; but its suburbs are extensive and irregular. Its streets are narrow; and one of them, called Straight, mentioned in Acts ix, 11, still runs through the city about half a mile in length. The houses, and especially those which front the streets, are very indifferently built, chiefly of mud formed into the shape of bricks, and dried in the sun; but those toward the gardens, and in the squares, present a more handsome appearance. In these mud walls, however, the gates and doors are often adorned with marble portals, carved and inlaid with great beauty and variety; and the inside of the habitation, which is generally a large square court, is ornamented with fragrant trees and marble fountains, and surrounded with splendid apartments, furnished and painted in the highest style of luxury. The market places are well constructed, and adorned with a rich colonnade of variegated marble. The principal public buildings are, the castle, which is about three hundred and forty paces in length; the hospital, a charitable establishment for the reception of strangers, composing a large quadrangle lined with a colonnade, and roofed in small domes covered with lead; and the mosque, the entrance of which is supported by four large columns of red granite; the apartments in it are numerous and magnificent, and the top is covered with a cupola ornamented with two minarets.

Damascus is surrounded by a fruitful and delightful country, forming a plain nearly eighty miles in circumference; and the lands, most adjacent to the city, are formed into gardens of great extent, which are stored with fruit trees of every description. “No place in the world,” says Mr. Maundrell “can promise to the beholder at a distance a greater voluptuousness;” and he mentions a tradition of the Turks, that their prophet, when approaching Damascus, took his station upon a certain precipice, in order to view the city; and, after considering its ravishing beauty and delightful aspect, was unwilling to tempt his frailty by going farther; but instantly took his departure with this remark, that there was but one paradise designed for man, and that, for his part, he was resolved not to take his in this world. The air or water of Damascus, or both, are supposed to have a powerful effect in curing the leprosy, or, at least, in arresting its progress, while the patient remains in the place.

The Rev. James Conner visited Damascus in 1820, as an agent of the Church Missionary Society. He had a letter from the archbishop of Cyprus to Seraphim, patriarch of Antioch, the head of the Christian church in the

east, who resides at Damascus. This good man received Mr. Conner in the most friendly manner; and expressed himself delighted with the system and operations of the Bible Society. He undertook to encourage and promote, to the utmost of his power, the sale and distribution of the Scriptures throughout the patriarchate; and, as a proof of his earnestness in the cause, he ordered, the next day, a number of letters to be prepared, and sent to his archbishops and bishops, urging them to promote the objects of the Bible Society in their respective stations.

DAMN, and DAMNATION, are words synonymous with condemn and condemnation. Generally speaking, the words are taken to denote the final and eternal punishment of the ungodly. These terms, however, sometimes occur in the New Testament in what may be termed a less strict, or secondary sense. Thus, when the Apostle says to the Romans, "He that doubteth," namely, the lawfulness of what he is doing, "is damned if he eat," Rom. xiv, 23; the meaning is, he stands condemned in his own mind. Again: when St. Paul tells the Corinthians, that "he that eateth and drinketh" of the Lord's Supper "unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself," 1 Cor. xi, 29; the original word, κριμα, there is thought by many to import no more than temporal judgments, and that the Apostle explains himself in the same sense when he says, "For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and many sleep," or die. This is at least one mode of interpreting the "damnation" of which St. Paul here speaks; but probably the true sense is the bringing guilt upon the conscience, and thereby a liability, without remission, to future judgment.

288DAN, the fifth son of Jacob, Gen. xxx, 1–6. Dan had but one son, whose name was Hushim, Gen. xlvi, 23; yet he had a numerous posterity; for, on leaving Egypt, this tribe consisted of sixty-two thousand seven hundred men able to bear arms, Num. i, 38. Of Jacob's blessing Dan, see Gen. xlix, 16, 17. They took Laish, Judges xviii, 1; Joshua xix, 47. They called the city Dan, after their progenitor. The city of Dan was situated at the northern extremity of the land of Israel: hence the phrase, "from Dan to Beersheba," denoting the whole length of the land of promise. Here Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, set up one of his golden calves, 1 Kings xii, 29; and the other at Bethel.

DANCING. It is still the custom in the east to testify their respect for persons of distinction by music and dancing. When Baron Du Tott, who was sent by the French government to inspect their factories in the Levant, approached an encampment of Turcomans, between Aleppo and Alexandretta, the musicians of the different hordes turned out, playing and dancing before him all the time he and his escort were passing by their camp. Thus, it will be recollected, "the women came out of all the cities of

Israel, singing and dancing, to meet King Saul, with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music,” when he returned in triumph from the slaughter of the Philistines. In the oriental dances, in which the women engage by themselves, the lady of highest rank in the company takes the lead, and is followed by her companions, who imitate her steps, and if she sings, make up the chorus. The tunes are extremely gay and lively, yet with something in them wonderfully soft. The steps are varied according to the pleasure of her who leads the dance, but always in exact time. This statement may enable us to form a correct idea of the dance, which the women of Israel performed under the direction of Miriam, on the banks of the Red Sea. The prophetess, we are told, “took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her, with timbrels and dances.” She led the dance, while they imitated her steps, which were not conducted according to a set, well-known form, as in this country, but extemporaneous. The conjecture of Mr. Harmer is extremely probable, that David did not dance alone before the Lord, when he brought up the ark, but, as being the highest in rank, and more skilful than any of the people, he led the religious dance of the males.

DANIEL was a descendant of the kings of Judah, and is said to have been born at Upper Bethoron, in the territory of Ephraim. He was carried away captive to Babylon when he was about eighteen or twenty years of age, in the year 606 before the Christian æra. He was placed in the court of Nebuchadnezzar, and was afterward raised to situations of great rank and power, both in the empire of Babylon and of Persia. He lived to the end of the captivity, but being then nearly ninety years old, it is most probable that he did not return to Judea. It is generally believed that he died at Susa, soon after his last vision, which is dated in the third year of the reign of Cyrus. Daniel seems to have been the only prophet who enjoyed a great share of worldly prosperity; but amidst the corruptions of a licentious court he preserved his virtue and integrity inviolate, and no danger or temptation could divert him from the worship of the true God. The book of Daniel is a mixture of history and prophecy: in the first six chapters is recorded a variety of events which occurred in the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius; and, in particular, the second chapter contains Nebuchadnezzar’s prophetic dream concerning the four great successive monarchies, and the everlasting kingdom of the Messiah, which dream God enabled Daniel to interpret. In the last six chapters we have a series of prophecies, revealed at different times, extending from the days of Daniel to the general resurrection. The Assyrian, the Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman empires, are all particularly described under appropriate characters; and it is expressly declared that the last of them was to be divided into ten lesser kingdoms; the time at which Christ was to appear is precisely fixed; the rise and fall of antichrist, and the duration of his power, are exactly



determined; and the future restoration of the Jews, the victory of Christ over all his enemies, and the universal prevalence of true religion, are distinctly foretold, as being to precede the consummation of that stupendous plan of God, which “was laid before the foundation of the world,” and reaches to its dissolution. Part of this book is written in the Chaldaic language, namely, from the fourth verse of the second chapter to the end of the seventh chapter; these chapters relate chiefly to the affairs of Babylon, and it is probable that some passages were taken from the public registers. This book abounds with the most exalted sentiments of piety and devout gratitude; its style is clear, simple, and concise; and many of its prophecies are delivered in terms so plain and circumstantial, that some unbelievers have asserted, in opposition to the strongest evidence, that they were written after the events which they describe had taken place. With respect to the genuineness and authenticity of the book of Daniel, there is abundance both of external and internal evidence; indeed all that can well be had or desired in a case of this nature: not only the testimony of the whole Jewish church and nation, who have constantly received this book as canonical, but of Josephus particularly, who recommends him as the greatest of the prophets; of the Jewish Targums and Talmuds, which frequently cite and appeal to his authority; of St. Paul and St. John, who have copied many of his prophecies; and of our Saviour himself, who cites his words, and styles him, “Daniel the prophet.” Nor is the internal less powerful and convincing than the external evidence; for the language, the style, the manner of writing, and all other internal marks and characters, are perfectly agreeable to that age; and finally he appears plainly and undeniably to have been a prophet by the exact accomplishment of his prophecies.

DARIUS was the name of several princes in history, some of whom are mentioned in Scripture.

1. Darius the Mede, spoken of in Daniel v, 31; ix, 1; xi, 1, &c, was the son of Astyages, king of the Medes, and brother to Mandane, the mother of Cyrus, and to Amyit, the mother of Evil-merodach, and grandmother of Belshazzar. Darius the Mede, therefore, was uncle by the mother’s side to Evil-merodach and Cyrus. The Septuagint, in Daniel vii, give him the name of Artaxerxes; the thirteenth, or apocryphal chapter of Daniel, calls him Astyages; and Xenophon designates him by the name of Cyaxares. He succeeded Belshazzar, king of Babylon, his nephew’s son, or his sister’s grandson, in the year of the world, 3448, according to Calmet, or in 3468, according to Usher. Daniel does not inform us of any previous war between them; but the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah supply this deficiency. Isa. xiii, xiv, xlv, xlvi, xlvi; Jer. I, li.

2. Darius, the son of Hystaspes, has been supposed by some, on the authority of Archbishop Usher and Calmet, to be the Ahasuerus of Scripture, and the husband of Esther. But Dr. Prideaux thinks, that Ahasuerus was Artaxerxes Longimanus. This prince recovered Babylon after a siege of twenty months. This city, which had been formerly the capital of the east, revolted from Persia, taking advantage of the revolutions that happened, first at the death of Cambyses, and afterward on the massacre of the Magi. The Babylonians employed four years in preparations, and when they thought that their city was furnished with provisions for a long time, they raised the standard of rebellion. Darius levied an army in great haste, and besieged Babylon. The Babylonians shut themselves up within their walls, whose height and thickness secured them from assault; and as they had nothing to fear but famine, they assembled all their women and children, and strangled them, each reserving only his most beloved wife, and one servant. Thus was fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, xlvii, 7–9. Some believe that the Jews were either expelled by the Babylonians, as being too much in the interest of Darius; or that, in obedience to the frequent admonitions of the prophets, they quitted that city when they saw the people determined to rebel, Isa. xlvi, 20; Jer. l, 8; li, 6–9; Zech. xi, 6, 7. Darius lay twenty months before Babylon, without making any considerable progress; but, at length, Zopyrus, one of his generals, obtained possession of the city by stratagem. Darius ordered the hundred gates of brass to be taken away, according to the prediction of Jeremiah, li, 58, “Thus saith the Lord, The broad walls of Babylon shall be utterly broken, and her high gates shall be burnt with fire, and the people shall labour in vain.” This is related in Herodotus.

3. Darius Codomanus was of the royal family of Persia, but very remote from the crown. He was in a low condition, when Bagoas, the eunuch, who had procured the destruction of two kings, Ochus and Arses, placed him on the throne. His true name was Codoman, and he did not take that of Darius till he was king. He was descended from Darius Nothus, whose son, Ostanes, was father to Arsames, that begat Codomanus. He was at first only a courier to the emperor Ochus. But one day when he was at this prince’s army, one of their enemies challenged the bravest of the Persians. Codomanus offered himself for the combat, and overcame the challenger, and was made governor of Armenia. From this situation, Bagoas placed him on the throne of Persia. Alexander the Great invaded the Persian empire, and defeated Darius in three successive battles. After the third battle, Darius fled toward Media, in hopes of raising another army. At Ecbatana, the capital of Media, he gathered the remains of his forces, and some new levies. Alexander having wintered at Babylon and Persepolis, took the field in search of Darius, who quitted Ecbatana, with an intention of retreating into Bactria; but, changing his resolution, Darius stopped

short, and determined to hazard a battle, though his army at this time consisted only of forty thousand men. While he was preparing for this conflict, Bessus, governor of Bactria, and Nabazanes, a grandee of Persia, seized him, loaded him with chains, forced him into a covered chariot, and fled, carrying him with them toward Bactria. If Alexander pursued them, they intended to purchase their peace by delivering Darius into his hands; but if not, to kill him, seize the crown, and renew the war. Eight days after their departure, Alexander arrived at Ecbatana, and set out in pursuit of them, which he continued for eleven days: at length he stopped at Rages, in Media, despairing to overtake Darius. Thence he went into Parthia, where he learned what had happened to that unfortunate prince. After a precipitate march of many days, he overtook the traitors, who, seeing themselves pressed, endeavoured to compel Darius to get upon horseback, and save himself with them; but he refusing, they stabbed him in several places, and left him expiring in his chariot. He was dead when Alexander arrived, who could not forbear weeping at so sad a spectacle. Alexander covered Darius with his own cloak, and sent him to Sisygambis his wife, that she might bury him in the tombs of the kings of Persia. Thus were verified the prophecies of Daniel, viii, who had foretold the destruction of the Persian monarchy, under the symbol of a ram, which butted with its horns westward, northward, and southward, and which nothing could resist; but a goat which had a very large horn between his eyes, and which denoted Alexander the Great, came from the west, and overran the world without touching the earth; springing forward with impetuosity, the goat ran against the ram with all his force, attacked him with fury, struck him, broke his two horns, trampled him under foot, and no one could rescue the ram. Nothing can be clearer than these prophecies.

290DARKNESS, the absence of light. "Darkness was upon the face of the deep," Gen. i, 2; that is, the chaos was immersed in thick darkness, because light was withheld from it. The most terrible darkness was that brought on Egypt as a plague; it was so thick as to be, as it were, palpable; so horrible, that no one durst stir out of his place; and so lasting, that it endured three days and three nights, Exod. x, 21, 22; Wisdom xvii, 2, 3. The darkness at our Saviour's death began at the sixth hour, or noon, and ended at the third hour, or three o'clock in the afternoon. Thus it lasted almost the whole time he was on the cross; compare Matt. xxvii, 45, with John xix, 14, and Mark xv, 25. Origen, Maldonatus, Erasmus, Vatablus, and others, were of opinion that this darkness covered Judea only; which is sometimes called the whole earth; that is, the whole country. Chrysostom, Euthymius, Theophylact, and others, thought it extended over a hemisphere. Origen says it was caused by a thick mist, which precluded the sight of the sun. That it was preternatural is certain, for, the moon being at full, a natural eclipse of the sun was impossible. Darkness is sometimes used

metaphorically for death. "The land of darkness" is the grave, Job x, 22; Psalm cvii, 10. It is also used to denote misfortunes and calamities: "A day of darkness" is a day of affliction, Esther xi, 8. "Let that day be darkness; let darkness stain it,"--let it be reckoned among the unfortunate days, Job iii, 4, 5. The expressions, "I will cover the heavens with darkness;" "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood," &c, signify very great political calamities, involving the overthrow of kings, princes, and nobles, represented by the luminaries of heaven. In a moral sense, darkness denotes ignorance and vice; hence "the children of light," in opposition to "the children of darkness," are the righteous distinguished from the wicked.

DAVID, the celebrated king of Israel, was the youngest son of Jesse, of the tribe of Judah, and was born 1085 years before Christ. The following is an abstract of his history: He was chosen of God to be king of Israel, and at his command was anointed to this dignity by the hands of Samuel, a venerable prophet, in the room of Saul; who had been rejected for his disobedience to the divine orders, in feloniously seizing, to his own use the prey of an enemy, which God, the supreme King of Israel, had devoted to destruction. He was introduced to court as a man expert in music, a singularly valiant man, a man of war, prudent in matters, of a comely person, and one favoured of the Lord. By his skill in music, he relieved Saul under a melancholy indisposition that had seized him, was highly beloved by his royal master, and made one of his guards. In a war with the Philistines he accepted the challenge of a gigantic champion, who defied the armies of Israel, and being skilful at the sling, he slew him with a stone, returned safely with his head, and thus secured to his prince an easy victory over his country's enemies. The reputation he gained, by this glorious action, raised an incurable jealousy and resentment against him, in the mind of the king his master; who made two unsuccessful attempts to murder him. In his exalted station, and amidst the dangers that encompassed him, he behaved with singular prudence, so that he was in high esteem both in the court and camp. The modesty and prudence of his behaviour, and his approved courage and resolution, gained him the confidence and friendship of Jonathan, the king's eldest son, "who loved him as his own soul," became his advocate with his father, and obtained from him a promise, confirmed by an oath, that he would no more attempt to destroy him. But Saul's jealousy returned by a fresh victory David gained over the Philistines; who, finding the king was determined to seek his life, retired from court, and was dismissed in peace by Jonathan, after a solemn renewal of their friendship, to provide for his own safety. In this state of banishment, there resorted to him companies of men, who were uneasy in their circumstances, oppressed by their creditors, or discontented with Saul's tyrannical government, to the number of six hundred men.

These he kept in the most excellent order, and by their valour he gained signal advantages for his country; but never employed them in rebellion against the king, or in a single instance to distress or subvert his government. On the contrary such was the veneration he paid him, and such the generosity of his temper, that though it was thrice in his power to have him cut off, he spared him, and was determined never to destroy him, whom God had constituted the king of Israel. His friendship with Jonathan, the king's son, was a friendship of strict honour, for he never seduced him from his allegiance and filial duty. Being provoked by a churlish farmer, who evil treated and abused his messengers, he, in the warmth of his temper, swore he would destroy him and his family; but was immediately pacified by the address and prudence of a wife, of whom the wretch was unworthy: her he sent in peace and honour to her family, and blessed for her advice, and keeping him from avenging himself with his own hand. Being forced to banish himself into an enemy's country, he was faithful to the prince who protected him: and, at the same time, mindful of the interest of his own nation, he cut off many of those who had harassed and plundered his fellow subjects. When pressed by the king, into whose dominions he retired, to join in a war against his own country and father-in-law, he prudently gave him such an answer as his situation required; neither promising the aid demanded of him, nor tying up his hands from serving his own prince, and the army that fought under him; only assuring him in general, that he had never done any thing that could give him just reason to think he would refuse to assist him against his enemies. Upon the death of Saul, he cut off the Amalekite who came to make a merit of having slain him; and by the immediate direction of God, who had promised him the succession, went up to Hebron, where, on a free election, he was 291 anointed king over the house of Judah; and after about a seven years' contest, he was unanimously chosen king by all the tribes of Israel, "according to the word of the Lord by Samuel." As king of Israel, he administered justice and judgment to all his people, was a prince of courage, and great military prudence and conduct; had frequent wars with the neighbouring nations, to which he was generally forced by their invading his dominions, and plundering his subjects. Against them he never lost a battle; he never besieged a city without taking it; nor, as for any thing that can be proved, used any severities against those he conquered, beyond what the law of arms allowed, his own safety required, or the cruelties of his enemies rendered just, by way of retaliation; enriching his people by the spoils he took, and providing large stores of every thing necessary for the magnificent temple he intended to erect, in honour of the God of Israel. Having rescued Jerusalem out of the hands of the Jebusites, he made it the capital of his kingdom, and the place of his residence; and being willing to honour it with the presence of the ark of God, he brought it to Jerusalem in triumph, and divesting himself of his

royal robes, out of reverence to God, he clothed himself in the habit of his ministers, and with them expressed his joy by dancing and music; contemned only by one haughty woman; whom, as a just punishment of her insolence, he seems ever after to have separated from his bed. Though his crimes were heinous, and highly aggravated, in the affair of Uriah and Bathsheba, he patiently endured reproof, humbly submitted to the punishment appointed him, deeply repented, and obtained mercy and forgiveness from God, though not without some severe marks of his displeasure, for the grievous offences of which he had been guilty. A rebellion was raised against him by his son Absalom. When forced by it to depart from Jerusalem, a circumstance most pathetically described by the sacred historian, he prevented the just punishment of Shimei, a wretch who cursed and stoned him. When restored to his throne, he spared him upon his submission, and would not permit a single man to be put to death in Israel upon account of this treason. He, with a noble confidence, made the commander of the rebel forces general of his own army, in the room of Joab, whom he intended to call to an account for murder and other crimes. After this, when obliged, by the command of God, to give up some of Saul's family to justice, for the murder of the Gibeonites, he spared Mephibosheth, Micah, and his family, the male descendants of Saul and Jonathan, who alone could have any pretence to dispute the crown with him, and surrendered only Saul's bastard children, and those of his daughter by Adriel, who had no right or possible claim to the throne, and could never give him any uneasiness in the possession of it; and thus showed his inviolable regard for his oaths, his tenderness to Saul, and the warmth of his gratitude and friendship to Jonathan. In the close of his life, and in the near prospect of death, to demonstrate his love of justice, he charged Solomon to punish with death Joab, for the base murder of two great men, whom he assassinated under the pretence of peace and friendship. To this catalogue of his noble actions must be added, that he gave the most shining and indisputable proofs of an undissembled reverence for, and sincere piety to, God; ever obeying the direction of his prophets, worshipping him alone, to the exclusion of all idols, throughout the whole of his life, and making the wisest settlement to perpetuate the worship of the same God, through all succeeding generations.

To this abstract a few miscellaneous remarks may be added.

1. When David is called "the man after God's own heart," a phrase which profane persons have often perverted, his general character, and not every particular of it, is to be understood as approved by God; and especially his faithful and undeviating adherence to the true religion, from which he never deviated into any act of idolatry.

2. He was chosen to accomplish to their full extent the promises made to Abraham to give to his seed, the whole country from the river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates. He had succeeded to a kingdom distracted with civil dissension, environed on every side by powerful and victorious enemies, without a capital, almost without an army, without any bond of union between the tribes. He left a compact and united state, stretching from the frontier of Egypt to the foot of Lebanon, from the Euphrates to the sea. He had crushed the power of the Philistines, subdued or curbed all the adjacent kingdoms: he had formed a lasting and important alliance with the great city of Tyre. He had organized an immense disposable force; for every month 24,000 men, furnished in rotation by the tribes, appeared in arms, and were trained as the standing militia of the country. At the head of his army were officers of consummate experience, and, what was more highly esteemed in the warfare of the time, extraordinary personal activity, strength, and valour. The Hebrew nation owed the long peace of Solomon the son's reign to the bravery and wisdom of the father.

3. As a conqueror he was a type of Christ, and the country "from the river to the ends of the earth," was also the prophetic type of Christ's dominion over the whole earth.

4. His inspired psalms not only place him among the most eminent prophets; but have rendered him the leader of the devotions of good men, in all ages. The hymns of David excel no less in sublimity and tenderness of expression than in loftiness and purity of religious sentiment. In comparison with them the sacred poetry of all other nations sinks into mediocrity. They have embodied so exquisitely the universal language of religious emotion, that they have entered with unquestioned propriety into the ritual of the higher and more perfect religion of Christ. The songs which cheered the solitude of the desert caves of Engedi, or resounded from the voice of the 292 Hebrew people as they wound along the glens or the hill sides of Judea, have been repeated for ages in almost every part of the habitable world, in the remotest islands of the ocean, among the forests of America or the sands of Africa. How many human hearts have these inspired songs softened, purified, exalted! Of how many wretched beings have they been the secret consolation! On how many communities have they drawn down the blessings of Divine providence, by bringing the affections into unison with their deep devotional fervour, and leading to a constant and explicit recognition of the government, rights, and mercies of God!

DAY. The Hebrews, in conformity with the Mosaic law, reckoned the day from evening to evening. The natural day, that is, the portion of time from sunrise to sunset, was divided by the Hebrews, as it is now by the Arabians,

into six unequal parts. These divisions were as follows:--1. The break of day. This portion of time was, at a recent period, divided into two parts, in imitation of the Persians; the first of which began when the eastern, the second, when the western, division of the horizon was illuminated. The authors of the Jerusalem Talmud divided it into four parts; the first of which was called in Hebrew אֵילַת הַשָּׁחַר, which occurs in Psalm xxii, 1, and corresponds to the phrase, λίαν πρωῶ, in the New Testament, Mark xvi, 2; John xx, 1. 2. The morning or sunrise. 3. The heat of the day. This began about nine o'clock, Gen. xviii, 1; 1 Sam. xi, 11. 4. Midday. 5. The cool of the day; literally, the wind of the day. This expression is grounded on the fact, that a wind commences blowing regularly a few hours before sunset, and continues till evening, Gen. iii, 8. 6. The evening. This was divided into two parts, עֶרְבַיִם; the first of which began, according to the Caraites and Samaritans, at sunset, the second, when it began to grow dark. But, according to the rabbins, the first commenced just before sunset, the second, precisely at sunset. The Arabians agree with the Caraites and Samaritans; and in this way the Hebrews appear to have computed, previous to the captivity.

The mention of שָׁעָה, hours, occurs first in Daniel iii, 6, 15; v, 5. They were first measured by gnomons, which merely indicated the meridian; afterward, by the hour-watch, σκιαθέρικον; and subsequently still, by the clepsydra, or instrument for measuring time by means of water. The hour-watch or dial, otherwise called the sun-dial, is mentioned in the reign of King Hezekiah, 2 Kings xx, 9, 10; Isaiah xxxviii, 8. Its being called "the sundial of Ahaz" renders it probable that Ahaz first introduced it from Babylon; whence, also, Anaximenes, the Milesian, brought the first skiathericon into Greece. This instrument was of no use during the night, nor indeed during a cloudy day. In consequence of this defect, the clepsydra was invented, which was used in Persia as late as the seventeenth century in its simplest form. The clepsydra was a small circular vessel, constructed of thinly-beaten copper or brass, and having a small perforation through the bottom. It was placed in another vessel, filled with water. The diameter of the hole in the bottom of the clepsydra was such, that it filled with water in three hours, and sunk. It was necessary that there should be a servant to tend it, who should take it up when it had sunk, pour out the water, and place it again empty on the surface of the water in the vase.

The hours of principal note in the course of the day were the third, the sixth, and the ninth. These hours, it would seem, were consecrated by Daniel to prayer, Dan. vi, 10; Acts ii, 15; iii, 1; x, 9. The day was divided into twelve hours, which, of course, varied in length, being shorter in the winter and longer in the summer, John xi, 9. In the winter, therefore, the clepsydras were so constructed that the water might sink them more rapidly. The hours



were numbered from the rising of the sun, so that, at the season of the equinox, the third corresponded to the ninth of our reckoning; the sixth, to our twelfth; and the ninth, to three o'clock in the afternoon. At other seasons of the year, it is necessary to observe the time when the sun rises, and reduce the hours to our time accordingly. We observe, therefore, that the sun in Palestine, at the summer solstice, rises at five of our time, and sets about seven. At the winter solstice, it rises about seven, and sets about five.

Before the captivity, the night was divided into three watches. The first, which continued till midnight, was denominated the commencing or first watch, Lam. ii, 19. The second was denominated the middle watch, and continued from midnight till the crowing of the cock. The third, called the morning watch, extended from the second to the rising of the sun. These divisions and names appear to have owed their origin to the watches of the Levites in the tabernacle and temple, Exod. xiv, 24; 1 Sam. xi, 11. In the time of Christ, however, the night, in imitation of the Romans, was divided into four watches. According to the English mode of reckoning they were as follows: 1. The evening, from twilight to nine o'clock. 2. The midnight, from nine to twelve. 3. The cock crowing, from twelve to three. 4. From three o'clock till daybreak. A day is used in the prophetic Scripture for a year: "I have appointed thee each day for a year," Ezek. iv, 6. See Cock.

DEACON, from the Greek word διάκονος, in its proper and primitive sense, denotes a servant who attends his master, waits on him at table, and is always near his person to obey his orders, which was accounted a more creditable kind of service than that which is imported by the word δοῦλος a slave; but this distinction is not usually observed in the New Testament. Our Lord makes use of both terms in Matt. xx, 26, 27, though they are not distinctly marked in our translation: "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your deacon; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." The appointment of deacons in the first Christian church is distinctly recorded, 293Acts vi, 1–16. The number of disciples having greatly increased in Jerusalem, the Greeks, or Hellenistic Jews, began to murmur against the Hebrews, complaining that their widows were neglected in the daily distribution of the church's bounty. The twelve Apostles, who hitherto had discharged the different offices of Apostle, presbyter, and deacon, upon the principle that the greater office always includes the less, now convened the church, and said unto them, "It is not reasonable that we should leave the ministration of the word of God, and serve tables: look ye out, therefore, among yourselves, seven men of good report, full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business; but we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word." And the saying pleased the whole multitude; and

they (the multitude) chose Stephen, and six others, whom they set before the Apostles, &c.

The qualifications of deacons are stated by the Apostle Paul, 1 Tim. iii, 8–12. There were also, in the primitive churches females invested with this office, who were termed deaconesses. Of this number was Phœbe, a member of the church of Cenchrea, mentioned by St. Paul, Rom. xvi, 1. “They served the church,” says Calmet, “in those offices which the deacons could not themselves exercise, visiting those of their own sex in sickness, or when imprisoned for the faith. They were persons of advanced age, when chosen; and appointed to the office by imposition of hands.” It is probably of these deaconesses that the Apostle speaks, where he describes the ministering widows, 1 Tim. v, 5–10.

DEAD. See Burial.

Dead, Mournings for the. The ancient Israelites, in imitation of the Heathen, from whom they borrowed the practice, frequently cut themselves with knives and lancets, scratched their faces, or pricked certain parts of their bodies with needles. These superstitious practices were expressly forbidden in their law: “Ye are the children of the Lord your God: ye shall not cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead.” The bereaved Greeks tore, cut off, and sometimes shaved, their hair; they reckoned it a duty which they owed to the dead, to deprive their heads of the greatest part of their honours, or, in the language of Scripture, made a baldness between their eyes. The same custom prevailed among the ancient Persians, and the neighbouring states. When the patriarch Job was informed of the death of his children, and the destruction of his property, he arose and rent his mantle, and shaved his head, and fell down upon the ground and worshipped; and in the prophecies of Jeremiah, we read of eighty men who were going to lament the desolations of Jerusalem, having their beards shaven, and their clothes rent, and having cut themselves, in direct violation of the divine law, with offerings and incense in their hand, to bring them to the house of the Lord, Jer. xii, 5. Shaving, however, was, on some occasions, a sign of joy; and to let the hair grow long, the practice of mourners, or persons in affliction. Joseph shaved himself before he went into the palace, Gen. xli, 14; and Mephibosheth let his hair grow during the time David was banished from Jerusalem, but shaved himself on his return. In ordinary sorrows they only neglected their hair, or suffered it to hang down loose upon their shoulders; in more poignant grief they cut it off; but in a sudden and violent paroxysm, they plucked it off with their hands. Such a violent expression of sorrow is exemplified in the conduct of Ezra, which he thus describes: “And when I heard this thing I rent my garment and my mantle, and plucked off the hair

of my head, and of my beard, and sat down astonished," Ezra ix, 3. The Greeks, and other nations around them, expressed the violence of their sorrow in the same way; for in Homer, Ulysses and his companions, bewailing the death of Elpenor, howled and plucked off their hair. Mourners withdrew as much as possible from the world; they abstained from banquets and entertainments; they banished from their houses as unsuitable to their circumstances, and even painful to their feelings, musical instruments of every kind, and whatever was calculated to excite pleasure, or that wore an air of mirth and gaiety. Thus did the king of Persia testify his sorrow for the decree, into which his wily courtiers had betrayed him, and which, without the miraculous interposition of Heaven, had proved fatal to his favourite minister: "Then the king went to his palace, and spent the night fasting; neither were instruments of music brought before him," Dan. vi, 18.

2. Oriental mourners divested themselves of all ornaments, and laid aside their jewels, gold, and every thing rich and splendid in their dress. This proof of humiliation and submission Jehovah required of his offending people in the wilderness: "Therefore, now put off thy ornaments from thee, that I may know what to do unto thee. And the children of Israel stripped themselves of their ornaments by the Mount Horeb," Exodus xxxiii, 5, 6. Long after the time of Moses, that rebellious nation again received a command of similar import: "Strip you, and make you bare, and gird sackcloth upon your loins," Isaiah xxxii, 11. The garments of the mourner were always black. Progne, having notice of Philomela's death, lays aside her robes, beaming with a profusion of gold, and appears in sable vestments; and Althæa, when her brethren were slain by Meleager, exchanged her glittering robes for black:--

"Et auratas mutavit vestibus atris." Ovid.

These sable vestments differed from their ordinary dress, not only in colour, but also in value, being made of cheap and coarse stuff, as appears from these lines of Terence:--

"Texentem telam studiose ipsam offendimus

Mediocriter vestitam veste lugubri

Ejus anus causa, opinor, quæ erat mortua."

"We found her busy at the loom, in a cheap mourning habit, which she wore I suppose for the old woman's death." In Judea, the mourner was clothed in sackcloth of hair, and by consequence, 294in sable robes; and penitents, by assuming it, seemed to confess that their guilt exposed them to death. Some of the eastern nations, in modern times, bury in linen; but Chardin informs us, that others still retain the use of sackcloth for that purpose. To sit in sackcloth and ashes, was a frequent expression of

mourning in the oriental regions; and persons overwhelmed with grief, and unable to sustain the weight of their calamities, often threw themselves upon the earth, and rolled in the dust; and the more dirty the ground was, the better it served to defile them, and to express their sorrow and dejection. In this way Tamar signified her distress, after being dishonoured by Amnon, "She put ashes on her head;" and when Mordecai understood that the doom of his nation was sealed, he "rent his clothes, and put on sackcloth with ashes." Our Lord alludes to the same custom, in that denunciation: "Wo unto thee, Chorazin! wo unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, in sackcloth and ashes," Matt. xi, 21. Intimately connected with this, is the custom of putting dust upon the head. When the armies of Israel were defeated before Ai, "Joshua rent his clothes, and fell to the earth upon his face, he and the elders of Israel, and put dust upon their heads." The mourner sometimes laid his hands upon his head; for the prophet, expostulating with his people, predicts their humiliation in these words: "Yea, thou shalt go forth from him, and thine hands upon thine head; for the Lord hath rejected thy confidences, and thou shalt not prosper in them," Jer. ii, 37. In both these cases, the head of the mourner was uncovered; but they sometimes adopted the opposite custom, and covered their heads in great distress, or when they were loaded with disgrace and infamy.

3. To cover the lips was a very ancient sign of mourning; and it continues to be practised among the Jews of Barbary to this day. When they return from the grave to the house of the deceased, the chief mourner receives them with his jaws tied up with a linen cloth, in imitation of the manner in which the face of the dead is covered; and by this the mourner is said to testify that he was ready to die for his friend. Muffled in this way, the mourner goes for seven days, during which the rest of his friends come twice every twenty-four hours to pray with him. This allusion is perhaps involved in the charge which Ezekiel received when his wife died, to abstain from the customary forms of mourning: "Forbear to cry; make no mourning for the dead; bind the tire of thy head upon thee, and put on thy shoes upon thy feet, and cover not thy lips, and eat not the bread of men," Ezekiel xxiv, 17.

4. Sitting on the ground was a posture which denoted severe distress. Thus the prophet represents the elders of Israel, after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the captivity of those whom the sword had spared: "The elders of the daughter of Zion sit upon the ground, and keep silence; they have cast up dust upon their heads; they have girded themselves with sackcloth; the virgins of Jerusalem hang down their heads to the ground," Lam. ii, 10. Judea is represented on several coins of Vespasian and Titus,

as a solitary female in this very posture of sorrow and captivity sitting upon the ground. It is remarkable, that we find Judea represented as a sorrowful woman sitting on the ground, in a passage of the prophet, where the same calamity which was recorded on the medals of these Roman emperors is foretold: "And she being desolate shall sit upon the ground," Isaiah iii, 26.

5. Chardin informs us that when the king of Persia dies, his physicians and astrologers lose their places, and are excluded from the court; the first, because they could not cure their sovereign, and the last, because they did not give previous notice of his death. This whimsical custom he supposes has descended to modern times from a very remote antiquity; and to have been the true reason that Daniel was absent when Belshazzar saw the hand writing his doom on the wall. If the conjecture of that intelligent traveller be well founded, the venerable prophet had been forced by the established etiquette of the court to retire from the management of public affairs at the death of Nebuchadnezzar; and had remained in a private station for twenty-three years, neglected or forgotten, till the awful occurrence of that memorable night rendered his assistance necessary, and brought him again into public notice. This accounts in a very satisfactory manner, as well for Belshazzar's ignorance of Daniel, as for the recollection of Nitocris, the queen-mother, who had long known his character and abilities during the reign of her husband. This solution of the difficulty is at least ingenious.

6. It was a custom among the Jews to visit the sepulchres of their deceased friends three days; for so long they supposed their spirits hovered about them; but when once they perceived their visage begin to change, as it would in that time in those warm countries, all hopes of a return to life were then at an end. But it appears from an incident in the narrative of the raising of Lazarus, that in Judea they were accustomed to visit the graves of their deceased relations after the third day, merely to lament their loss, and give vent to their grief. If this had not been a common practice, the people that came to comfort the sisters of Lazarus would not so readily have concluded, when Mary, on the fourth day, went hastily out to meet her Saviour, "She goeth to the grave to weep there." The Turkish women continue to follow this custom: they go before sunrising on Friday, the stated day of their worship, to the grave of the deceased, where, with many tears and lamentations, they sprinkle their monuments with water and flowers.

DEAD SEA. This was anciently called the Sea of the Plain, Deut. iii, 17; iv, 49, from its situation in the great hollow or plain of the Jordan; the Salt Sea, Deut. iii, 17; Joshua xv, 5, from the extreme saltness of its waters; and the East Sea, Ezek. xlvi, 18; Joel ii, 20, from its situation relative to Judea, and in contradistinction to the West Sea, or Mediterranean. It is

likewise called by Josephus, and by the Greek and Latin writers generally, *Lacus Asphaltites*, from the bitumen found in it; and the Dead Sea, its more frequent modern appellation, from a tradition, commonly though erroneously received, that no living creature could exist in its saline and sulphureous waters. It is at present known in Syria by the names of *Almotanah* and *Bahar Loth*: and occupies what may be considered as the southern extremity of the vale of Jordan; forming, in that direction, the western boundary to the Holy Land. The Dead Sea is about seventy miles in length, and twenty in breadth at its broadest part; having, like the Caspian, no visible communication with the ocean. Its depth seems to be altogether unknown; nor does it appear that a boat has ever navigated its surface. Toward its southern extremity, however, in a contracted part of the lake, is a ford, about six miles over, made use of by the Arabs: in the middle of which they report the water to be warm; indicating the presence of warm springs beneath. In general, toward the shore, it is shallow; and rises and falls with the seasons, and the quantity of water carried into it by seven streams, which fall into this their common receptacle, the chief of which is the Jordan.

The water now covering these ruins occupies what was formerly the vale of *Siddim*; a rich and fruitful valley, in which stood the five cities, called the cities of the plain, namely, *Sodom*, *Gomorrah*, *Admah*, *Zeboim*, and *Bela* or *Zoar*: the four first of which were destroyed, while the latter, being “a little city,” was preserved at the intercession of *Lot*; to which he fled for refuge from the impending catastrophe, and where he remained in safety during its accomplishment.

The specific gravity of the waters of the Dead Sea is supposed to have been much exaggerated by the ancient writers, but their statements are now proved to be by no means very wide of the truth. *Pliny* says, that no living bodies would sink in it; and *Strabo*, that persons who went into it were borne up to their middle. *Van Egmont* and *Heyman* state, that, on swimming to some distance from the shore, they found themselves, to their great surprise, lifted up by the water. “When I had swam to some distance,” says the latter, “I endeavoured to sink to the bottom, but could not; for the water kept me continually up, and would certainly have thrown me upon my face, had I not put forth all the strength I was master of, to keep myself in a perpendicular posture; so that I walked in the sea as if I had trod on firm ground, without having occasion to make any of the motions necessary in treading fresh water; and when I was swimming, I was obliged to keep my legs the greatest part of the time out of the water. My fellow traveller was agreeably surprised to find that he could swim here, having never learned. But this proceeded from the gravity of the water, as this certainly does from the extraordinary quantity of salt in it.” *Mr. Joliffe* says,

he found it very little more buoyant than other seas, but he did not go out of his depth. "The descent of the beach," he says, "is so gently gradual, that I must have waded above a hundred yards to get completely out of my depth, and the impatience of the Arabians would not allow of time sufficient for this." Captain Mangles says: "The water is as bitter and as buoyant as the people have reported. Those of our party who could not swim, floated on its surface like corks. On dipping the head in, the eyes smarted dreadfully." With regard to the agents employed in this catastrophe, there might seem reason to suppose that volcanic phenomena had some share in producing it; but Chateaubriand's remark is deserving of attention. "I cannot," he says, "coincide in opinion with those who suppose the Dead Sea to be the crater of a volcano. I have seen Vesuvius, Solfatara, Monte Nuovo in the lake of Fusino, the peak of the Azores, the Mamalif opposite to Carthage, the extinguished volcanoes of Auvergne; and remarked in all of them the same characters; that is to say, mountains excavated in the form of a tunnel, lava, and ashes, which exhibited incontestable proofs of the agency of fire." After noticing the very different shape and position of the Dead Sea, he adds: "Bitumen, warm springs, and phosphoric stones are found, it is true, in the mountains of Arabia; but then, the presence of hot springs, sulphur, and asphaltos is not sufficient to attest the anterior existence of a volcano." The learned Frenchman inclines to adopt the idea of Professors Michaëlis and Busching, that Sodom and Gomorrah were built upon a mine of bitumen; that lightning kindled the combustible mass, and that the cities sunk in the subterraneous conflagration. M. Malte Brun ingeniously suggests, that the cities might themselves have been built of bituminous stones, and thus have been set in flames by the fire of heaven. We learn from the Mosaic account, that the Vale of Siddim, which is now occupied by the Dead Sea, was full of "slime pits," or pits of bitumen. Pocke says: "It is observed, that the bitumen floats on the water, and comes ashore after windy weather; the Arabs gather it up, and it serves as pitch for all uses, goes into the composition of medicines, and is thought to have been a very great ingredient in the bitumen used in embalming the bodies in Egypt: it has been much used for cerecloths, and has an ill smell when burnt. It is probable that there are subterraneous fires, that throw up this bitumen at the bottom of the sea, where it may form itself into a mass, which may be broken by the motion of the water occasioned by high winds; and it is very remarkable, that the stone called the stone of Moses, found about two or three leagues from the sea, which burns like a coal, and turns only to a white stone, and not to ashes, has the same smell, when burnt, as this pitch; so that it is probable, a stratum of the stone under the Dead Sea is one part of the matter that feeds the subterraneous fires, and 296that this bitumen boils up out of it." To give force to this last conjecture, however, it would be requisite to ascertain, whether bitumen is capable of being detached from this stone, in

a liquid state, by the action of fire. The stone in question is the black feited limestone, used at Jerusalem in the manufacture of rosaries and amulets, and worn as a charm against the plague. The effluvia which it emits on friction, is owing to a strong impregnation of sulphuretted hydrogen. If the buildings were constructed of materials of this description, with quarries of which the neighbouring mountains abound, they would be easily susceptible of ignition by lightning. The Scriptural account, however, is explicit, that "the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from heaven;" which we may safely interpret as implying a shower of inflamed sulphur, or nitre. At the same time it is evident, that the whole plain underwent a simultaneous convulsion, which seems referable to the consequences of a bituminous explosion. In perfect accordance with this view of the catastrophe, we find the very materials, as it were, of this awful visitation still at hand in the neighbouring hills; from which they might have been poured down by the agency of thunder storms, directed by the hand of offended Heaven. Captains Irby and Mangles collected, on the southern coast, lumps of nitre and fine sulphur, from the size of a nutmeg up to that of a small hen's egg, which, it was evident from their situation, had been brought down by the rain: "their great deposit must be sought for," they say, "in the cliff." These cliffs then were probably swept by the lightnings, and their flaming masses poured in a deluge of fire upon the plain.

DEBORAH, a prophetess, wife of Lapidoth, judged the Israelites, and dwelt under a palm tree between Ramah and Bethel, Judges iv, 4, 5. She sent for Barak, directed him to attack Sisera, and, in the name of God, promised him victory; but Barak refusing to go, unless she went with him, she told him, that the honour of this expedition would be given to a woman, and not to him. After the victory, Deborah and Barak sung a fine thanksgiving song, the composition probably of Deborah alone, which is preserved, Judges v.

DEBTS. In nothing, perhaps, do the Israelitish laws deviate so far from our own, as in regard to matters of debt. Imprisonment was unknown among the Hebrews, who were equally free from those long and expensive modes of procedure with which we are acquainted, for the recovery of debts. Their laws in this respect were simple, but efficient. Where pledges were lodged with a creditor for the payment of a debt, which was not discharged, the creditor was allowed to appropriate the pledge to his own benefit, without any interposition of a magistrate, and to keep it as rightfully as if it had been bought with the sum which had been lent for it. But, beside the pledge, every Israelite had various pieces of property, on which execution for debt might readily be made; as (1.) His hereditary land, the produce of which might be attached till the year of jubilee: (2.) His houses, which, with the



sole exception of those of the Levites, might be sold in perpetuity, Lev. xxv, 29, 30: (3.) His cattle, household furniture, and ornaments, appear also liable to be taken in execution. See Job xxiv, 3; Proverbs xxii, 27. From Deut. xv, 1–11, we see that no debt could be exacted from a poor man in the seventh year; because the land lying fallow, he had no income whence to pay it: (4.) The person of the debtor, who might be sold, along with his wife and children, if he had any. See Lev. xxv, 39; Job xxiv, 9; 2 Kings iv, 1; Isaiah l, 1; Nehemiah v. We have no intimation, in the writings of Moses, that suretyship was practised among the Hebrews in cases of debt. In the Proverbs of Solomon, however, there are many admonitions respecting it. Where this warranty was given, the surety was treated with the same severity as if he had been the actual debtor; and if he could not pay, his very bed might be taken from under him, Prov. xxii, 27. There is a reference to the custom observed in contracting this obligation in Prov. xvii, 18: “A man void of understanding striketh hands,” &c; and also in Prov. xxii, 26: “Be not thou one of them that strike hands,” &c. It is to be observed that the hand was given, not to the creditor, but to the debtor, in the creditor’s presence. By this act the surety intimated that he became in a legal sense one with the debtor, and rendered himself liable to pay the debt.

2. We have above noticed the practice of lending on pledge; but as this was liable to considerable abuse, the following judicial regulations were adopted: (1.) The creditor was not allowed to enter the house of the debtor to fetch the pledge, but was obliged to stand without the door, and wait till it was brought to him, Deut. xxiv, 10, 11. This law was wisely designed to restrain avaricious and unprincipled persons from taking advantage of their poor brethren in choosing their own pledges. (2.) The upper garment, which served by night for a blanket, Exod. xxii, 25, 26; Deut. xxiv, 12, 13, and mills and millstones, if taken in pledge, were to be restored to the owner before sunset. The reason of this law was, that these articles were indispensable to the comfortable subsistence of the poor; and for the same reason, it is likely that it extended to all necessary utensils. Such a restoration was no loss to the creditor; for he had it in his power at last, by the aid of summary justice, to lay hold of the whole property of the debtor; and if he had none, of his person: and, in the event of non-payment, as before stated, to take him for a bond slave.

DECALOGUE, the ten principal commandments, Exod. xx, 1, &c, from the Greek δεκά ten, and λόγοι words. The Jews call these precepts, the ten words.

DECAPOLIS, a country in Palestine, so called, because it contained ten principal cities; some situated on the west, and some on the east side of Jordan, Matt. iv, 25; Mark v, 20.

DEDICATION, a religious ceremony, whereby any person or thing was set apart to the service of God, and the purposes of religion. 297 Dedications of persons, temples, and houses, were frequent among the Jews. See Consecration.

DEFILEMENT. Under the law, many were those blemishes of person and conduct, which were considered as defilements: some were voluntary, others involuntary; some were inevitable, and the effect of nature itself, others arose from personal transgression. Under the Gospel, defilements are those of the heart, of the mind, the temper, and conduct. The ceremonial uncleannesses of the law are superseded as religious rites; though many of them claim attention as usages of health, decency, and civility.

DEGREES. Psalms of Degrees is a name given to fifteen psalms, from the cxx, to the cxxxiv, inclusive. The Hebrew text calls them a song of ascents. Junius and Tremellius translate the Hebrew a song of excellences, or an excellent song, from the excellent matter they contain. Some call them psalms of elevation, because they were sung with an exalted voice, or because at every psalm the voice was raised; but the translation of psalms of degrees has more generally obtained. Some think that they were called psalms of degrees, because they were sung upon the fifteen steps of the temple; but they are not agreed where these steps were. Others are of opinion, that they were so denominated, because sung in a gallery, which was in the court of Israel, where the Levites sometimes read the law. Calmet thinks, that they were called songs of degrees, or of ascent, because they were composed on occasion of the deliverance of the Jews from the captivity of Babylon, either to implore this deliverance from God, or to return thanks for it after it had been obtained; and that the Hebrews used the term to go up, when they spoke of their journeying from Babylon to Jerusalem. Others are of opinion, that these psalms were sung during the time of service, while the flesh, &c, were consuming on the altar, and while the fume and smoke ascended toward heaven; and that the title Psalms of Ascent seems to favour this supposition. The point is involved in entire obscurity; and, after all, the title of these Psalms may be only a musical direction to the temple choir.

DEISTS. This term appears to have had an honourable origin, being of the same import as Theists, designating those who believe in the existence of a supreme intelligent cause, in opposition to the Epicureans, and other Atheistical philosophers. The name, in modern times, is said to have been first assumed about the middle of the sixteenth century, by some persons on the continent, in order to avoid the imputation of Atheism. Peter Viret, a divine of that century, mentions it as a new name assumed by those who

rejected Christianity. Lord Edw. Herbert, baron of Cherbury, in the seventeenth century, has been regarded as the first Deistical writer in this country, or at least, the first who reduced Deism to a system; affirming the sufficiency of reason and natural religion, and rejecting divine revelation as unnecessary and superfluous. His system, however, embraced these five articles:--1. The being of God. 2. That he is to be worshipped. 3. That piety and moral virtue are the chief parts of worship. 4. That God will pardon our faults on repentance. And, 5. That there is a future state of rewards and punishment. Some have divided all Deists into two classes--those who admit a future state, and those who deny it. But Dr. S. Clarke, taking the term in the most extensive sense, arranges them under four classes:--1. Those who admit a Supreme Being, but deny that he concerns himself with the conduct or affairs of men; maintaining, with Lucretius, that God

“Ne’er smiles at good, nor frowns at wicked, deeds.”

2. Those who admit not only the being but the providence of God, with respect to the natural world; but who allow no difference between moral good and evil, nor that God takes any notice of our moral conduct. 3. Such as believe in the natural attributes of God, and his all-governing providence; yet deny the immortality of the soul, or any future state. 4. Such as admit the existence of God, his providence, and the obligations of natural religion; but so far only as these things are discoverable by the light of nature, without any divine revelation. Some of the Deists have attempted to overthrow the Christian dispensation, by opposing to it what they call the absolute perfection of natural religion. Others, as Blount, Collins, and Morgan, have endeavoured to gain the same purpose, by attacking particular parts of the Christian scheme, by explaining away the literal sense and meaning of certain passages, or by placing one portion of the sacred canon in opposition to the other. A third class, wherein we meet with the names of Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke, advancing farther in their progress, expunge from their creed the doctrine of future existence, deny or controvert all the moral perfections of the Deity, and wholly reject the Scriptures.

The Deists of the present day are distinguished by their zealous efforts to diffuse the principles of infidelity among the common people. Hume, Bolingbroke, and Gibbon, addressed themselves solely to the more polished classes of the community; but of late the writings of Paine, Carlile, and others, have diffused infidelity among the lower orders of society, and clothed it in the dress of vulgar ridicule, the more effectually to destroy in the common people all reverence for sacred things. Among the disciples of this school, Deism has led to the most disgusting Atheism. Thus “evil men and seducers wax worse and worse.”

DELUGE signifies, in general, any great inundation; but more particularly that universal flood by which the whole inhabitants of this globe were destroyed, except Noah and his family. According to the most approved systems of chronology, this remarkable event happened in the year 1656 after the creation, or about 2348 before the Christian æra. Of so general a calamity, from which only a single family of all who lived then on the face of the earth was preserved, we might naturally expect to find some memorials in the traditionary records of Pagan history, as well as in the sacred volume, where its peculiar cause, and the circumstances which attended it, are so distinctly and so fully related. Its magnitude and singularity could scarcely fail to make an indelible impression on the minds of the survivors, which would be communicated from them to their children, and would not be easily effaced from the traditions even of their latest posterity. A deficiency in such traces of this awful event, though perhaps it might not serve entirely to invalidate our belief of its reality, would certainly tend considerably to weaken its claim to credibility; it being scarcely probable that the knowledge of it should be utterly lost to the rest of the world, and confined to the documents of the Jewish nation alone. What we might reasonably expect has, accordingly, been actually and completely realized. The evidence which has been brought from almost every quarter of the world to bear upon the reality of this event, is of the most conclusive and irresistible kind; and every investigation, whether etymological or historical, which has been made concerning Heathen rites and traditions, has constantly added to its force, no less than to its extent.

And here, it were injustice to the memory of ingenuity and erudition almost unexampled in modern times, were we not to mention the labours of Bryant, the learned analysist of ancient mythology, whose patience and profoundness of research have thrown such new and convincing light on this subject. Nor must we forget his ardent and successful disciple, Mr. Faber, who, in his "Dissertation on the Mysteries of the Cabiri," has in travelling over similar ground with his illustrious master at once corrected some of his statements, and greatly strengthened his general conclusions. As the basis of their system, however, rests on a most extensive etymological examination of the names of the deities and other mythological personages worshipped and celebrated by the Heathen, compared with the varied traditions respecting their histories, and the nature of the rites and names of the places that were sacred to them, we cannot do more, in the present article, than shortly state the result of their investigations, referring for the particular details, to the highly original treatises already mentioned. According to them, the memory of the deluge was incorporated with almost every part of the Gentile mythology and worship; Noah, under a vast multitude of characters, being one of their first

deities, to whom all the nations of the Heathen world looked up as their founder; and to some circumstance or other in whose history, and that of his sons and the first patriarchs, most, if not all, of their religious ceremonies may be considered as not indistinctly referring. Traces of these, neither vague nor obscure, they conceive to be found in the history and character, not only of Deucalion, but of Atlas, Cronus, or Saturn, Dionusos, Inachus, Janus, Minos, Zeus, and others among the Greeks; of Isis, Osiris, Sesostris, Oannes, Typhon, &c, among the Egyptians; of Dagon, Agruerus, Sydyk, &c, among the Phenicians; of Astarte, Derceto, &c, among the Assyrians; of Buddha, Menu, Vishnu, &c, among the Hindus; of Fohi, and a deity represented as sitting upon the lotos in the midst of waters, among the Chinese; of Budo and Iakusi among the Japanese, &c. They discover allusions to the ark, in many of the ancient mysteries, and traditions with respect to the dove and the rainbow, by which several of these allegorical personages were attended, which are not easily explicable, unless they be supposed to relate to the history of the deluge. By the celebrated Ogdoas of the Egyptians, consisting of eight persons sailing together in the sacred baris or ark, they imagine the family of Noah, which was precisely eight in number, to have been designated; and in the rites of Adonis or Thammuz, in particular, they point out many circumstances which seem to possess a distinct reference to the events recorded in the sixth and seventh chapters of Genesis. With regard to this system, we shall only farther observe, that, after every reasonable deduction is made from it, which the exuberant indulgence of fancy occasionally exhibited by its authors appears to render necessary, it contains so much that is relevant and conclusive, that it induces the conviction that it has a solid foundation in truth and fact; it being scarcely possible to conceive, that a mere hypothesis could be supported by evidence so varied, so extensive, and in many particulars so demonstrative, as that which its framers have produced.

Beside, however, the allusions to the deluge in the mythology and religious ceremonies of the Heathen, to which we have thus concisely adverted, there is a variety of traditions concerning it still more direct and circumstantial, the coincidence of which, with the narrative of Moses, it will require no common degree of skeptical hardihood to deny. We are informed by one of the circumnavigators of the world, who visited the remote island of Otaheite, that some of the inhabitants being asked concerning their origin, answered, that their supreme God having, a long time ago, been angry, dragged the earth through the sea, when their island was broken off and preserved. In the island of Cuba, the people are said to believe that the world was once destroyed by water by three persons, evidently alluding to the three sons of Noah. It is even related, that they have a tradition among them, that an old man, knowing that the deluge was approaching, built a large ship, and went into it with a great number of

animals; and that he sent out from the ship a crow, which did not immediately come back, staying to feed on the carcasses of dead animals, but afterward returned with a green branch in its mouth. The author who gives the above account likewise affirms that it was reported by the inhabitants of Castella del Oro, in Terra Firma, that during a universal deluge, one man, and his children, were the only persons who escaped, by means of a canoe, and that from them the world was afterward peopled. According to the Peruvians, in consequence of a general inundation, occasioned by violent and continued rains, a universal destruction of the human species took place, a few persons only excepted, who escaped into caves on the tops of the mountains, into which they had previously conveyed a stock of provisions, and a number of live animals, lest when the waters abated, the whole race should have become extinct. Others of them affirm, that only six persons were saved, by means of a float or raft, and that from them all the inhabitants of the country are descended. They farther believe, that this event took place before there were any incas or kings among them, and when the country was extremely populous. The Brazilians not only preserve the tradition of a deluge, but believe that the whole race of mankind perished in it, except one man and his sister; or, according to others, two brothers with their wives, who were preserved by climbing the highest trees on their loftiest mountains; and who afterward became the heads of two different nations. The memory of this event they are even said to celebrate in some of their religious anthems or songs. Acosta, in his history of the Indies, says, that the Mexicans speak of a deluge in their country, by which all men were drowned; and that it was afterward peopled by viracocha, who came out of the lake Titicaca; and, according to Herrera, the Machoachans, a people comparatively in the neighbourhood of Mexico, had a tradition, that a single family was formerly preserved in an ark amid a deluge of waters; and that along with them, a sufficient number of animals were saved to stock the new world. During the time that they were shut up in the ark, several ravens were sent out, one of which brought back the branch of a tree. Among the Iroquois it is reported that a certain spirit, called by them Otkon, was the creator of the world; and that another being, called Messou, repaired it after a deluge, which happened in consequence of Otkon's dogs having one day while he was hunting with them lost themselves in a great lake, which, in consequence of this, overflowed its banks, and in a short time covered the whole earth.

Passing from the more remote western to the eastern continent, nearer to the region where Noah is generally supposed to have lived, we find the traditions respecting the deluge still more particular and minute. According to Josephus, there were a multitude of ancient authors who concurred in asserting that the world had once been destroyed by a flood: "This deluge,"

says he, "and the ark are mentioned by all who have written barbaric histories, one of whom is Berossus the Chaldean." Eusebius informs us, that Melo, a bitter enemy of the Jews, and whose testimony is on this account peculiarly valuable, takes notice of the person who was saved along with his sons from the flood, having been, after his preservation, driven away from Armenia, whence he retired to the mountainous parts of Syria. Abydenus, after giving an account of the deluge from which Xisuthrus, the Chaldean Noah, was saved, concludes with asserting, in exact concurrence with Berossus, that the ark first rested on the mountains of Armenia, and that its remains were used by the natives as a talisman; and Plutarch mentions the Noachic dove being sent out of the ark, and returning to it again, as an intimation to Deucalion that the storm had not yet ceased.

This, however, is by no means all: Sir W. Jones, speaking of one of the Chinese fables, says, "Although I cannot insist with confidence, that the rainbow mentioned in it alludes to the Mosaic narrative of the flood, nor build any solid argument on the divine person Niuva, of whose character, and even of whose sex the historians of China speak very doubtfully; I may nevertheless assure you, after full inquiry and consideration, that the Chinese believe the earth to have been wholly covered with water, which, in works of undisputed authenticity, they describe as flowing abundantly, then subsiding, and separating the higher from the lower age of mankind." Still more coincident even than this with the Mosaic account, is the Grecian history of the deluge, as preserved by Lucian, a native of Samosata on the Euphrates; and its authority is the more incontrovertible, on account of his being an avowed derider of all religions. The antediluvians, according to him, had gradually become so hardened and profligate, as to be guilty of every species of injustice. They paid no regard to the obligation of oaths; were insolent, inhospitable, and unmerciful. For this reason they were visited with an awful calamity. Suddenly the earth poured forth a vast quantity of water, the rain descended in torrents, the rivers overflowed their banks, and the sea rose to a prodigious height, so that "all things became water," and all men were destroyed except Deucalion. He alone, for the sake of his prudence and piety, was reserved to a second generation. In obedience to a divine nomination, he entered, with his sons and their wives, into a large ark, which they had built for their preservation; and immediately swine, and horses, and lions, and serpents, and all other animals which live on earth, came to him by pairs, and were admitted by him into the ark. There they became perfectly mild and innoxious, their natures being changed by the gods, who created such a friendship between them, that they all sailed peaceably together, so long as the waters prevailed over the surface of the globe.

Scarcely less remarkable is the Hindoo tradition. It is contained in the ancient poem of the Bhavagat; and forms the subject of the first Purana, entitled Matsya, or "The Fish." The following is Sir William Jones's abridgment of it; and the identity of the event which it describes, with that of the Hebrew historian, is too obvious to require any particular illustration: "The demon Hayagriva, having purloined the Vedas from the custody of Brahma, while he was reposing at the close of the sixth Manwantara, the whole race of men became corrupt, except the seven Rishis, and Satyavrata, who then reigned in Dravira, a maritime 300region to the south of Carnata. This prince was performing his ablutions in the river Critimala, when Vishnu appeared to him in the shape of a small fish, and after several augmentations of bulk in different waters, was placed by Satyavrata in the ocean, where he thus addressed his amazed votary: 'In seven days all creatures who have offended me shall be destroyed by a deluge, but thou shalt be secured in a capacious vessel miraculously formed; take therefore all kinds of medicinal herbs, and esculent grain for food, and, together with the seven holy men, your respective wives, and pairs of all animals, enter the ark without fear: then shalt thou know God face to face, and all thy questions shall be answered.' Saying this, he disappeared; and after seven days the ocean began to overflow the coasts, and the earth to be flooded by constant showers, when Satyavrata, meditating on the deity, saw a large vessel moving on the waters. He entered it, having in all respects conformed to the instructions of Vishnu; who in the form of a vast fish, suffered the vessel to be tied with a great sea serpent, as with a cable, to his measureless horn. When the deluge had ceased, Vishnu slew the demon, and recovered the Vedas, instructed Satyavrata in divine knowledge, and appointed him the seventh Menu, by the name of Vaivaswata."

When we thus meet with some traditions of a deluge in almost every country, though the persons saved from it are said, in those various accounts to have resided in different districts widely separated from each other, we are constrained to allow that such a general concurrence of belief could never have originated merely from accident. While the mind is in this situation, Scripture comes forward, and, presenting a narrative more simple, better connected, and bearing an infinitely greater resemblance to authentic history, than any of those mythological accounts which occur in the traditions of Paganism, immediately flashes the conviction upon the understanding, that this must be the true history of those remarkable facts which other nations have handed down to us, only through the medium of allegory and fable. By the evidence adduced in this article, indeed, the moral certainty of the Mosaic history of the flood appears to be established on a basis sufficiently firm to bid defiance to the cavils of skepticism. "Let the ingenuity of unbelief first account satisfactorily for this universal



agreement of the Pagan world; and she may then, with a greater degree of plausibility, impeach the truth of the Scriptural narrative of the deluge." The fact, however, is not only preserved in the traditions of all nations, as we have already seen; but after all the philosophical arguments which were formerly urged against it, philosophy has at length acknowledged that the present surface of the earth must have been submerged under water. "Not only," says Kirwan, "in every region of Europe, but also of both the old and new continents, immense quantities of marine shells, either dispersed or collected, have been discovered." This and several other facts seem to prove, that at least a great part of the present earth was, before the last general convulsion to which it has been subjected, the bed of an ocean which, at that time, was withdrawn from it. Other facts seem also to prove with sufficient evidence, that this was not a gradual retirement of the waters which once covered the parts now inhabited by men; but a violent one, such as may be supposed from the brief but emphatic relation of Moses. The violent action of water has left its traces in various undisputed phenomena. Stratified mountains of various heights exist in different parts of Europe, and of both continents; in and between whose strata, various substances of marine, and some vegetables of terrestrial, origin, repose either in their natural state, or petrified. To overspread the plains of the arctic circle with the shells of Indian seas, and with the bodies of elephants and rhinoceri, surrounded by masses of submarine vegetation; to accumulate on a single spot, as at La Bolca, in promiscuous confusion, the marine productions of the four quarters of the globe; what conceivable instrument would be efficacious but the rush of mighty waters? These facts, about which there is no dispute, and which are acknowledged by the advocates of each of the prevailing geological theories, give a sufficient attestation to the deluge of Noah, in which "the fountains of the great deep were broken up," and from which precisely such phenomena might be expected to follow. To this may be added, though less decisive in proof, yet certainly strong as presumptive evidence, that the very aspect of the earth's surface exhibits interesting marks both of the violent action, and the rapid subsidence, of waters; as well as affords a most interesting instance of the divine goodness in converting what was ruin itself into utility and beauty. The great frame-work of the varied surface of the habitable earth was probably laid by a more powerful agency than that of water; either when on the third day the waters under the heavens were gathered into one place, and the crust of the primitive earth was broken down to receive them, so that "the dry land might appear;" by those mighty convulsions which appear to have accompanied the general deluge; but the rounding, so to speak, of what was rugged, where the substance was yielding, and the graceful undulations of hill and dale which so frequently present themselves, were probably effected by the retiring waters. The flood has passed away; but the soils which it deposited remain; and the valleys

through which its last streams were drawn off to the ocean, with many an eddy and sinuous course, still exist, exhibiting visible proofs of its agency, and impressed with forms so adapted to the benefit of man, and often so gratifying to the finest taste, that, when the flood “turned,” it may be said to have “left a blessing behind it.”

The objections once made to the fact of a general deluge have, indeed, been greatly weakened by the progress of philosophical knowledge; and may be regarded as nearly given up, like the former notion of the high 301 antiquity of the race of men, founded on the Chinese and Egyptian chronologies and pretended histories. Philosophy has even at last found out that there is sufficient water in the ocean, if called forth, to overflow the highest mountains to the height given by Moses,—a conclusion which it once stoutly denied. Keill formerly computed that twenty-eight oceans would be necessary for that purpose; but we are now informed “that a farther progress in mathematical and physical knowledge has shown the different seas and oceans to contain, at least, forty-eight times more water than they were then supposed to do; and that the mere raising of the temperature of the whole body of the ocean to a degree no greater than marine animals live in, in the shallow seas between the tropics, would so expand it as more than to produce the height above the mountains stated in the Mosaic account.” As to the deluge of Noah, therefore, infidelity has almost entirely lost the aid of philosophy in framing objections to the Scriptures.

DEMONIAC, a human being possessed with and actuated by some spiritual malignant being of superior power. The word demon is used by Pagan writers often in a good sense, and is applied to their divinities; but the demons of holy writ are malignant spirits. We are not informed very particularly about their origin or destiny; but we find them represented as πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, and πνεύματα πονηρὰ, unclean and evil spirits; and we must consider them as in league with the devil, as the subjects of his dominion, and the instruments of his will. They were the immediate agents in all possessions; and to expel or restrain them, or to cure the diseases which they were supposed to occasion, was one of the miraculous gifts of the early times.

2. On this subject an ardent controversy was agitated about the middle and toward the end of the last century, between Dr. Farmer and his opponents. In this controversy, of which we shall attempt to give a short view, it was contended, on the one hand, that the demoniacal cases recorded in the books of the New Testament, were instances of real possession; and, on the other, that they were merely diseases, set forth under the notion of possessions, in conformity with the belief which was prevalent at the time. By the one party, the language of holy writ was interpreted literally; and

by the other it was considered as figurative, and used in the way of accommodation to the existing opinions. The leading asseveration of Dr. Farmer, upon the general question, is, that miracles, or works surpassing the power of men, are never performed without a divine interposition; and by a divine interposition he means, either the immediate agency of the Deity himself, or of beings empowered and commissioned by him. And the proof of this asseveration, he tells us, may very easily be found, if we consider that, on any other supposition, it is impossible to show that a religion supported by miracles is really from God. For the miracles in question, or works surpassing the power of human beings, may have been performed by evil spirits, acting independently of the Divinity, thwarting his purposes, and marring the operation of his goodness. Should it be said that, from the tendency of the miracle itself, and a fortiori, from the tendency of the miracle and religion when taken together, we may easily infer the character of the being from whom the whole scheme proceeds,--to this also Dr. Farmer is ready with his answer. "With regard to doctrines," says he "of a moral or useful tendency, it is not, in all cases, easy for the bulk of mankind, or even for the wise and learned, to form a certain judgment concerning them. What to men appeared to have a tendency to promote virtue and happiness, superior beings, who discerned its remotest effects, might know to be a curse rather than a blessing, and give it countenance from a motive of malevolence. On the other hand, a doctrine really subservient to the cause of piety and virtue, men might judge to be prejudicial to it. And were the sanctity of the doctrine ever so apparent, it would not (on the principles of those with whom we are here arguing) certainly follow from hence, that the miracles recommending it were wrought by God; inasmuch as other beings, from motives unknown to us, might interest themselves in favour of such a doctrine." In one word, according to this author, we do not know whether the tendency of the miracle, or of the religion, be good or not; and therefore we can form no accurate idea of the character really belonging to the being from whom the revelation proceeds. To our eyes the system may appear well calculated to promote our happiness, but it may have been the contrivance of wicked spirits. According to the sense and discernment of men, the miracle is useful in itself, but we cannot be sure whether it may not have been performed by one of the rebellious angels "who kept not their first estate." In conformity with these opinions, Dr. Farmer maintains that there is not an instance recorded in sacred Scripture, where a miracle has been wrought, and where there is not sufficient reason to believe that the effect was produced either by the Deity himself, or by agents commissioned and empowered to act in his name. Hence he considers the Egyptian magicians as jugglers; the witch of Endor, as a ventriloquist; and, completing the system, he has written an elaborate dissertation to prove, that when Christ was "tempted of the devil," as the Evangelist Matthew expresses it, that

apostate angel was not really present; and that the whole transaction took place in a vision or a dream.

With regard to the demoniacs of the New Testament, this writer and his followers contend that, among the Jews, certain diseases, such as madness and epilepsy, were usually ascribed to the agency of evil spirits. This was the current notion and belief of the country. Upon this notion the ordinary phraseology was built. Our Lord and his Apostles adapted their instructions to this prevailing notion, and used the language which had been formed upon it; just as Moses, in his account of the 302creation, adapts himself to the popular astronomy of his time, instead of laying before us the true system of the heavenly bodies. He speaks, not in relation to what is physically correct, but in relation to what was believed. He finds his instructions upon the ideas already entertained by the people to whom the revelation was first communicated: and Christ and his Apostles do the very same thing. They speak of the demoniacs, not according to the real state of the case, but according to the notions which the Jews entertained of it. Not a few of those demoniacs appear to have been persons of a disordered understanding, subject to attacks of mania; some of them were afflicted with the epilepsy, or falling sickness, some were deaf, and others were dumb. When a demon is said to enter into a man, the meaning is, that his madness is about to show itself in a violent paroxysm; when a demon is said to speak, it is only the unhappy victim of the disease himself that speaks; and when a demon or devil is expelled, the exact truth of the case, as well as the whole of the miracle, is nothing more than that the disease is cured. Occasionally, too, say those who contend against the reality of demoniacal possessions, the language of the sacred books confirms the explanation which has just been given. Thus, in the tenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, we find the Jews saying of Christ, "He hath a devil, and is mad," as if the expressions were perfectly equivalent; and the person who is represented, in the seventeenth chapter of Matthew, as a lunatic, is spoken of by St. Mark as vexed with a dumb spirit. It is farther argued on this side of the question, that the instances of possession recorded in the books of the New Testament have all the features and appearance of ordinary diseases. The madness shows itself in these cases, just as it shows itself in the cases which occur among ourselves in the present day: it is now melancholy, and the patient is silent and sullen, and now it vents itself in bursts of anger and ferocious resentment. And the epilepsy of the sacred books is the epilepsy of all our systems of nosology: the phenomena of the diseases are precisely the same. Nor does this, say they, detract from the very high character which Christ undoubtedly sustains in the inspired writings, or diminish the value of his miracles as the evidences of our religion; since it must be allowed, that to cure a disease with a word or a touch is an effort of power far beyond the reach of any human being. And

let it be remembered, that those who deny the expulsion of demons are ready to admit that diseases were miraculously cured. There is a miracle in either case; and, in either case, it is a sufficient proof of our Saviour's mission, and an adequate support of the Christian faith.

3. To these statements and reasonings, the advocates of possessions have not been slow to reply. They call in question the truth of Dr. Farmer's leading asseveration; namely, "that extraordinary works have never been performed without a divine interposition;" and contend, that as human beings have a certain sphere and agency allotted them, so it is reasonable to believe that malignant spirits have a wider sphere, and an agency less controlled; and that within this sphere, and in the exercise of this agency, they perform actions, the tendency of which is to thwart the purposes of the divine beneficence, and to introduce confusion and misery into the world. They argue, too, that the devil himself, the chief of the apostate spirits, is often represented in holy writ as exerting his malignity in opposition to the designs of infinite goodness; and in the case of our first parents, as a remarkable example, he tempted them to disobedience, and led them to their fall. It was in consequence of his machinations, that they brought down upon themselves the wrath of Heaven, and were driven from the garden in which "the Lord had placed them." The advocates of possessions contend still farther, that the revelation which is made to us in sacred Scripture is addressed to our understandings; that it is not only in our power, but that it is our indispensable duty, to examine it, and to judge of it; that the tendency of any miracle, or system of doctrine, is a sufficient evidence of the character belonging to him who performs the miracle, or publishes the doctrine; that good actions are demonstrative of the quality of goodness; and, in short, that a religion calculated to make us happy must have proceeded from a Being who has consulted and provided for our happiness. Nor is this a matter so abstruse and remote from human apprehension, that we can form no opinion about it. "For," say they, "if any thing connected with Christianity be plain, it seems to be that the tendency of the religion is beneficent; and that it is no less pure in its character than blessed in its effects. The very miracles recorded in Scripture are proofs of goodness. They must have been wrought by a good being. And," they continue, "we think ourselves entitled to hold our religion as true, and to regard it as in the highest degree beneficial, though we must allow, at the same time, that the magicians of Egypt performed many wonderful works by the agency of wicked spirits; that the sorceress of Endor was in league with the powers of darkness, and that Christ was literally tempted 'of the devil,' in the wilderness of Judea."

4. With regard to the more specific question of demoniacal possessions, they answer, that though God has often been pleased to accommodate

himself to our apprehension by adopting the current language of the countries, where the revelation was first published; yet the account of the creation given by Moses is not altogether an instance in point. For, say they, while it is granted that the true system of the universe is not laid before us in the first chapter of Genesis, it ought to be remembered that the statements in that chapter are exceedingly general; and that, while the whole truth is not told, it being no part of the revelation to tell it, there is, at the same time, no error directly inculcated. In the demoniacal cases, however, the conduct of the inspired writers, and, indeed, of Christ himself, is widely different. 303 They positively and directly inform us, that a demon “enters into” a man, and “comes out” of him; they represent the demons as speaking, and reasoning, and hoping, and fearing, as having inclinations and aversions peculiar to themselves, and distinct from those of the person who is the subject of the possession; they tell us of one unhappy sufferer who was vexed with many devils; and, in the case of the demoniac of Gadara, they assure us that the devils were “cast out” of the man, and were permitted, at their own request, to “enter into” a herd of swine which were feeding in the neighbourhood, and that immediately the herd ran violently down a steep place, and were drowned in the sea. Who ever heard of swine afflicted with madness as a natural disease? Or, when and where has the epilepsy, or falling sickness, been predicable of the sow? For, it must be carefully observed that the disease of the man, the affection of the human sufferer, whatever that affection might have been, was clearly transferred from him to the animals in question. Beside, as various instances are recorded in Scripture, and as several cases are given at considerable length, might we not expect, if possessions were really nothing more than ordinary diseases, that the truth would be somewhere told or hinted at? that, within the compass of the sacred canon, something would be said, or something insinuated, which would lead us to understand that the language, though inaccurate and improper, was used in accommodation to the popular belief? Might we not expect that Christ himself would have declared, in one unequivocal affirmation, or in some intelligible way, the exact truth of the case? Or, at all events, when the Holy Ghost had descended upon the Apostles on the day of pentecost, and when the full disclosure of the revelation appears to have been made, might it not reasonably have been looked for that the popular error would have been rectified, and the language reduced from its figurative character to a state of simple correctness? What conceivable motive could influence our Saviour, or his Apostles, to sanction the delusion of the multitude? And does it not strike at the root of the Christian religion itself, to have it thought, for a single moment, that its “Author and Finisher,” who came to enlighten and to reform the world, should have, on so many occasions, not only countenanced, but confirmed, an opinion which he must have known to be “the reverse of the truth”?

Let us then, say they, beware how we relinquish the literal sense of holy writ, in search of allegorical or figurative interpretations. And if, upon any occasion, we think it proper to do so, let us consider well the grounds and reasons upon which our determination is built. It is evident that the devil and his angels, according to all that we can learn of them in the sacred books, are real beings; that the demons of the New Testament are malignant spirits; and that they act upon the same principles, and even under the authority of Satan himself, who is otherwise called Beelzebub, and the prince of the devils. Nay, in these very cases of possession, the chief of the apostate angels is clearly set forth as acting either in his own person, or by means of his infernal agents. And it is on this supposition alone that we can explain the language of Christ in that remarkable declaration which he makes to the Pharisees and rulers of the Jews, and which we find recorded in the twelfth chapter of the Gospel by St. Matthew. “The Pharisees heard it,” observes the Evangelist, “and they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand; and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself: how shall then his kingdom stand?”

5. On this subject of diseases it is also to be observed, that the inspired writers uniformly make a distinction between diseases occurring in the ordinary course of nature, and diseases occasioned by the agency of evil spirits. “There is every where,” says Bishop Porteus, “a plain distinction made between common diseases and demoniacal possessions, which shows that they are totally different things. In the fourth chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew, where the very first mention is made of these possessions, it is said that our Lord’s fame went throughout all Syria, and that they brought unto him ‘all sick people, that were taken with divers diseases and torments,’ and those ‘which were possessed with devils,’ and he healed them. Here those that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those possessed with devils, are mentioned as distinct and separate persons: a plain proof that the demoniacal possessions were not natural diseases: and the very same distinction is made in several other passages of holy writ. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the demoniacs were persons really possessed with evil spirits; and although it may appear strange to us, yet we find, from Josephus and other historians, that it was in those times no uncommon case.”

6. We may conclude, from the argument on both sides of the question, that the only reason which can be urged for departing from the obvious sense of Scripture is, that cases of possession involve a philosophical mystery.

This, truly, is a very insufficient ground, and especially when we consider that if we better knew the nature of spirits, and of our own frame, the philosophy might appear all on the opposite side, and no doubt would do so. But no one who admits the Scriptures to decide this question, can consistently stand upon that objectionable ground of interpretation to which he is forced by denying the plain and consistent sense of innumerable passages. If he admits this error, he must admit many others; for a Bible, so interpreted, may be made to mean any thing.

DESTRUCTIONISTS, a denomination of Christians who believe that the final punishment threatened in the Gospel to the wicked and impenitent, consists not in eternal misery, <sup>304</sup>but in a total extinction of being; and that the sentence of annihilation shall be executed with more or less previous torment, in proportion to the greater or less guilt of the criminal. This doctrine is largely maintained in the sermons of the late Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich; Mr. S. Bourn, of Birmingham; and many others. In defence of the system, Mr. Bourn argues, that there are many passages of Scripture, in which the ultimate punishment to which wicked men shall be adjudged is defined, in the most precise and intelligible terms, to be an everlasting destruction, proceeding from Him who is equally able to destroy as to create; and who, by our Lord himself, is said to be “able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” By the “everlasting punishment of the wicked,” therefore, Mr. B. understands “everlasting destruction,” literally speaking, “from the presence of the Lord,” which is “the second death;” from which there can be no resurrection, and which is set in opposition to “eternal life.” In speaking of the images used to illustrate this subject, Mr. B. remarks, that the wicked are compared to combustible materials, as brands, tares, &c, which the fire utterly consumes: so Sodom and Gomorrah suffer “the vengeance of eternal fire,” that is, they are destroyed for ever; and the phrases, “the worm that dieth not, and the fire which is not quenched,” are placed in opposition to entering into life, and denote the termination of existence, Mark ix, 43.

To all this it may be answered: 1. That annihilation, as a punishment, admits of no degrees. 2. If we connect with this a previous state of torment, (as Mr. Winchester says, “for ages of ages,”) annihilation must be rather a relief from punishment, than the punishment itself. 3. That annihilation is rather a suspension than an exertion of divine power. 4. That the punishment of impenitent men is described as the same with that of the fallen angels, who are not annihilated, Matt. xxv, 41, but remain in expectation of future punishment, “Art thou come to torment us before the time?” Matt. viii, 29. 5. In the state of future punishment, there is said to be “weeping and gnashing of teeth,” Matt. xxiv, 51. 6. As the happiness of saints in the future state consists not merely in being, but in well being, or



happiness; so the punishment of the wicked requires the idea of eternal suffering to support the contrast. It might be added, that annihilation, as far as we know, forms no part of the divine economy. One thing is also certain and indisputable: the strong language of Scripture is intended to deter men from sin; and whoever attempts to remove the barrier, offers insult to the divine wisdom, and trifles with his own destiny. But the capital argument is, that it is unscriptural:--“Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched,” is, like many others, a declaration, to which no dexterity of interpretation can give any other good sense, than the continuance of conscious punishment.

DEVIL, Diabolus, an evil angel. The word is formed from the French diable, of the Latin diabolus, which comes from the Greek διάβολος, which, in its ordinary acceptation, signifies calumniator, traducer, or false accuser, from the verb διαβάλλειν, to calumniate, &c; or from the ancient British diafol. Dr. Campbell observes, that, though the word is sometimes, both in the Old Testament and the New, applied to men and women, as traducers, it is, by way of eminence, employed to denote that apostate angel, who is exhibited to us, particularly in the New Testament, as the great enemy of God and man. In the two first chapters of Job, it is the word in the Septuagint by which the Hebrew שטן, Satan, or adversary, is translated. Indeed, the Hebrew word in this application, as well as the Greek, has been naturalized in most modern languages. Thus we say, indifferently, the devil, or Satan; only the latter has more the appearance of a proper name, as it is not attended with the article. There is, however, this difference between the import of such terms, as occurring in their native tongues, and as modernized in translations. In the former, they always retain somewhat of their primitive meaning, and, beside indicating a particular being, or class of beings, they are of the nature of appellatives, and make a special character or note of distinction in such beings. Whereas, when thus Latinized or Englished, they answer solely the first of these uses, as they come nearer the nature of proper names. Διάβολος is sometimes applied to human beings; but nothing is more easy than to distinguish this application from the more frequent application to the arch-apostate. One mark of distinction is, that, in this last use of the term, it is never found in the plural. When the plural is used, the context always shows that it refers to human beings, and not to fallen angels. It occurs in the plural only thrice, and that only in the epistles of St. Paul, 1 Tim. iii, 11; 2 Tim. iii, 3; Titus ii, 3. Another criterion whereby the application of this word to the prince of darkness may be discovered, is its being attended with the article. The term almost invariably is ὁ διάβολος. The excepted instances occur in the address of Paul to Elymas the sorcerer, Acts xiii, 10; and that of our Lord to the Pharisees, John viii, 44. The more doubtful cases are those in 1 Peter v, 8, and Rev. xx, 2. These are all the examples in which the word, though

used indefinitely or without the article, evidently denotes our spiritual and ancient enemy; and the examples in which it occurs in this sense with the article, are too numerous to be recited.

2. That there are angels and spirits, good and bad, says an eminent writer; that at the head of these last, there is one more considerable and malignant than the rest, who, in the form, or under the name, of a serpent, was deeply concerned in the fall of man, and whose head, in the language of prophecy, the Son of Man was one day to bruise; that this evil spirit, though that prophecy be in part fulfilled, has not yet received his death's wound, but is still permitted, for ends to us unsearchable, and in ways which we cannot particularly explain, to have a certain degree of power in this world, 305 hostile to its virtue and happiness,—all this is so clear from Scripture, that no believer, unless he be previously “spoiled by philosophy and vain deceit,” can possibly entertain a doubt of it. Certainly, among the numerous refinements of modern times, there is scarcely any thing more extraordinary than the attempt that has been made, and is still making, to persuade us that there really exists no such being in the world as the devil; and that when the inspired writers speak of such a being, all that they mean is, to personify the evil principle! A bold effort unquestionably; and could its advocates succeed in persuading men into the universal belief of it, they would do more to promote his cause and interest in the world than he himself has been able to effect since the seduction of our first parents. But to be armed against this subtle stratagem, let us attend to the plain doctrine of divine revelation respecting this matter. In the Old Testament, particularly in the first two chapters of Job, this evil spirit is called Satan; and in the New Testament, he is spoken of under various titles, which are also descriptive of his power and malignity; as for example, he is called, “the prince of this world,” John xii, 31; “the prince of the power of the air,” Eph. ii, 2; “the god of this world,” 2 Cor. iv, 4; “the dragon, that old serpent, the devil,” Rev. xx, 2; “the wicked one,” 1 John v, 19. He is represented as exercising a sovereign sway over the human race in their natural state, or previous to their being enlightened, regenerated, and sanctified by the Gospel, Eph. ii, 2, 3. His kingdom is described as a kingdom of darkness; and the influence which he exercises over the human mind is called “the power,” or energy, “of darkness,” Col. i, 13. Hence believers are said to be “called out of darkness into marvellous light,” 1 Peter ii, 9. Farther, he is said to go about “as a roaring lion, seeking its prey, that he may destroy men's souls,” 1 Peter v, 8. Christ says, “He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him; when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of that which is his own, for he is a liar, and the father of it,” John viii, 44. We are also taught that this grand adversary of God and man has a numerous band of fallen spirits under his control; and that both he and they are reserved under a sentence of

condemnation unto the judgment of the great day, Jude 6; and that “everlasting fire,” or perpetual torment, “is prepared for the devil and his angels,” Matt. xxv, 41. In these various passages of Scripture, and many others which might be added, the existence of the devil is expressly stated; but if, as our modern Sadducees affirm, nothing more is intended in them than a personification of the abstract quality of evil, the Bible, and especially the New Testament, must be eminently calculated to mislead us in matters which intimately concern our eternal interests. If, in inferring from them the existence of evil spirits in this world, we can be mistaken, it will not be an easy matter to show what inference deduced from Scripture premises may safely be relied on. It ought not, however, to surprise Christians that attempts of this kind should be made. St. Paul tells us, that in his day there were “false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ; and no wonder,” says he, “for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light,” 2 Cor. xi, 13, 14.

3. To the notion, that the Jews derived their opinions on this subject from the oriental philosophy, and that like the Persians they set up a rival god; it may be replied, that the Jewish notion of the devil had no resemblance to what the Persians first, and the Manicheans afterward, called the evil principle; which they made in some sort coördinate with God, and the first source of all evil, as the other is of good. For the devil, in the Jewish system, is a creature as much as any other being in the universe, and is liable to be controlled by omnipotence,—an attribute which they ascribed to God alone.

4. The arguments from philosophy against the existence of evil spirits are as frail as that which is pretended to be grounded upon criticism. For that there is nothing irrational in the notion of superior beings, is plain from this: that if there be other beings below us, there may be others above us. If we have demonstration of one Being at least who is invisible, there may be many other created invisible and spiritual beings. If we see men sometimes so bad as to delight in tempting others to sin and ruin, there may exist a whole order of fallen beings who may have the same business and the same malignant pleasure; and if we see some men furiously bent upon destroying truth and piety, this is precisely what is ascribed to these evil spirits. It is one of the serious circumstances of our probation on earth, that we should be exposed to this influence of Satan, and we are therefore called to “watch and pray that we enter not into temptation.”

5. The establishment of the worship of devils so general in some form throughout a great part of the Heathen world, is at once a painful and a curious subject, and deserves a more careful investigation than it has received. In modern times, devil-worship is seen systematized in Ceylon,

Burmah, and many parts of the East Indies; and an order of devil-priests exists, though contrary to the Buddhist religion, against the temples of which it sets up rival altars.

Mr. Ives, in his *Travels through Persia*, gives the following curious account of devil-worship: "These people (the Sanjacks, a nation inhabiting the country about Mosul, the ancient Nineveh) once professed Christianity, then Mohammedanism, and last of all devilism. They say it is true that the devil has at present a quarrel with God; but the time will come when, the pride of his heart being subdued, he will make his submission to the Almighty; and, as the Deity cannot be implacable, the devil will receive a full pardon for all his transgressions, and both he, and all those who paid him attention during his disgrace, will be admitted into the blessed mansions. This is the foundation of their hope, and this chance for heaven they esteem to be a better one than that of trusting to their own merits, or the merits of the leader of any other religion whatsoever. The person of the devil they look on as sacred; and when they affirm any thing solemnly, they do it by his name. All disrespectful expressions of him they would punish with death, did not the Turkish power prevent them. Whenever they speak of him, it is with the utmost respect; and they always put before his name a certain title corresponding to that of highness or lord." The worshippers of the devil mentioned by Ives were also found by Niebuhr in the same country, in a village between Bagdad and Mosul, called Abd-el-asis, on the great Zab, a river which empties itself into the Tigris. This village, says he, is entirely inhabited by people who are called Isidians, and also Dauâsin. As the Turks allow the free exercise of religion only to those who possess sacred books, that is, the Mohammedans, Christians, and Jews, the Isidians are obliged to keep the principles of their religion very secret. They therefore call themselves Mohammedans, Christians, or Jews, according to the party of him who inquires what their religion is. Some accuse them of worshipping the devil under the name of Tschellebi; that is, Lord. Others say that they show great reverence for the sun and fire, that they are unpolished Heathens, and have horrid customs. I have also been assured that the Dauâsins do not worship the devil; but adore God alone as the Creator and Benefactor of all mankind. They will not speak of Satan, nor even have his name mentioned. They say that it is just as improper for men to take a part in the dispute between God and a fallen angel, as for a peasant to ridicule and curse a servant of the pacha who has fallen into disgrace; that God did not require our assistance to punish Satan for his disobedience; it might happen that he might receive him into favour again; and then we must be ashamed before the judgment seat of God, if we had, uncalled for, abused one of his angels: it was therefore the best not to trouble one's self about the devil; but endeavour not to incur God's displeasure ourselves. When the Isidians go to Mosul, they are not detained

by the magistrates, even if they are known. The vulgar, however, sometimes attempt to extort money from them. When they offer eggs or butter to them for sale, they endeavour first to get the articles into their hands, and then dispute about the price, or for this or other reasons to abuse Satan with all their might; on which the Dauâsin is often polite enough to leave every thing behind, rather than hear the devil abused. But in the countries where they have the upper hand, nobody is allowed to curse him, unless he chooses to be beaten, or perhaps even to lose his life.

DEUTERONOMY, from δεύτερος, second, and νομὸς, law; the last book of the Pentateuch or five books of Moses. As its name imports, it contains a repetition of the civil and moral law, which was a second time delivered by Moses, with some additions and explanations, as well to impress it more forcibly upon the Israelites in general, as in particular for the benefit of those who, being born in the wilderness, were not present at the first promulgation of the law. It contains also a recapitulation of the several events which had befallen the Israelites since their departure from Egypt, with severe reproaches for their past misconduct, and earnest exhortations to future obedience. The Messiah is explicitly foretold in this book; and there are many remarkable predictions interspersed in it, particularly in the twenty-eighth, thirtieth, thirty-second, and thirty-third chapters, relative to the future condition of the Jews. The book of Deuteronomy finishes with an account of the death of Moses, which is supposed to have been added by his successor, Joshua.

DEW. Dews in Palestine are very plentiful, like a small shower of rain every morning. Gideon filled a basin with the dew which fell on a fleece of wool, Judges vi, 38. Isaac, blessing Jacob, wished him the dew of heaven, which fattens the fields, Gen. xxvii, 28. In those warm countries where it seldom rains, the night dews supply the want of showers. Isaiah speaks of rain as if it were a dew, Isaiah xviii, 4. Some of the most beautiful and illustrative of the images of the Hebrew poets are taken from the dews of their country. The reviving influence of the Gospel, the copiousness of its blessings, and the multitude of its converts, are thus set forth.

DIADEM. See Crown.

DIAL is not mentioned in Scripture before the reign of Ahaz. Interpreters differ concerning the form of the dial of Ahaz, 2 Kings xx. The generality of expositors think that it was a staircase so disposed, that the sun showed the hours upon it by the shadow. Others suppose that it was a pillar erected in the middle of a very level and smooth pavement, on which the hours were engraven. According to these authors, the lines marked in this pavement are what the Scripture calls degrees. Grotius describes it as

follows: "It was a concave hemisphere, and in the midst was a globe, the shadow of which fell on the different lines engraven in the concavity of the hemisphere; these lines were twenty-eight in number." This description answers pretty nearly to that kind of dial, which the Greeks called scapha, a boat or hemisphere, the invention (rather introduction) of which, Vitruvius ascribes to Berosus the Chaldean. It would seem, indeed, that the most ancient sun dial known is in the form of a half circle, hollowed into the stone, and the stone cut down to an angle. This kind of dial was invented in Babylon, and was very probably the same as that of Ahaz.

DIAMOND, יהלם. Exod. xxviii, 18; xxix, 11; Ezek. xxviii, 13. This has from remote antiquity been considered as the most valuable, or, more properly, the most costly substance in nature. The reason of the high estimation in which it was held by the ancients was its rarity and its extreme hardness and brilliancy. It filled the sixth place in the high priest's breastplate, and on it was engraven the name of Naphtali.

307DIANA, a celebrated goddess of the Heathens, who was honoured principally at Ephesus, Acts xix. She was one of the number of the twelve superior deities, and was called by the several names of Hebe, Trivia, and Hecate. In the heavens she was the moon, upon earth she was called Diana, and in hell Hecate. She was worshipped in Palestine, Jeremiah vii, 18; xlv, 17, 18.

DIONYSIUS, the Areopagite, a convert of St. Paul, Acts xvii, 34. Chrysostom declares Dionysius to have been a citizen of Athens; which is credible, because the judges of the Areopagus generally were so. After his conversion, Dionysius was made the first bishop of Athens; having laboured, and suffered much in the Gospel, he is said to have been burnt at Athens, A. D. 95. The works attributed to Dionysius are generally reputed spurious.

DIRECTORY, an ecclesiastical instrument, containing directions for the conduct of religious worship, drawn up by the assembly of divines, by order of parliament, in 1645. It was intended to supply the use of the Common Prayer Book, which had been abolished. It orders the reverent observation of public worship, prayer, singing of psalms, the reading and exposition of the Scriptures, &c. It enjoins no forms, but recommends the Lord's prayer as a model of devotion; directs that the Lord's Supper may be received sitting; that the Sabbath day be strictly observed; but puts down all saints' days, consecrations of churches, and private or lay baptisms. This Directory, which was formerly bound with the Westminster confession of faith, is still, in effect, the plan of worship among the Dissenters, and especially the Presbyterians.

**DISCIPLE.** The proper signification of this word is a learner; but it signifies in the New Testament, a believer, a Christian, a follower of Jesus Christ. Disciple is often used instead of Apostle in the Gospels; but, subsequently, Apostles were distinguished from disciples. The seventy-two who followed our Saviour from the beginning, are called disciples; as are others who were of the body of believers and bore no office. In subsequent times, the name disciple, in the sense of learner, was sometimes given to the *κατηχομενοι*, “*auditores*,” persons who, in the primitive church, were receiving a preparatory instruction in Christianity. They were divided into two classes, those who received private instruction, and those who were admitted to the congregations, and were under immediate preparation for baptism. The church readers were, in some places, appointed to instruct the catechumens; and at Alexandria, where often learned men presented themselves for instruction, the office of catechist was filled by learned laymen, and these catechists laid the foundation of an important theological school.

**DISEASES.** In the primitive ages of the world, diseases, in consequence of the great simplicity in the mode of living, were but few in number. At a subsequent period the number was increased by the accession of diseases that had been previously unknown. Epidemics also, diseases somewhat peculiar in their character, and still more fearful in their consequences, soon made their appearance, some infesting one period of life, and some another; some limiting their ravages to one country, and some to another. Prosper Alpinus mentions the diseases which are prevalent in Egypt, and in other countries in the same climate: they are ophthalmies, leprosy, inflammations of the brain, pains in the joints, the hernia, the stone in the reins and bladder, the phthisic, hectic, pestilential and tertian fevers, weakness of the stomach, obstructions in the liver, and the spleen. Of these diseases, ophthalmies, pestilential fevers, and inflammations of the brain, are epidemics; the others are of a different character. The leprosy prevails in Egypt, in the southern part of Upper Asia, and in fact may be considered a disease endemic in warm climates generally. Accordingly, it is not at all surprising, if many of the Hebrews, when they left Egypt, were infected with it; but the assertion of Manetho, that they were all thus infected, and were in consequence of the infection, driven out by force, in which he is precipitately and carelessly followed by Strabo, Tacitus, by Justin Trogus, and others more recent, is a mere dream without any foundation. The appearance of the disease externally is not always the same. The spot is commonly small, and resembling in its appearance the small red spot that would be the consequence of a puncture from a needle, or the pustules of a ringworm. The spots for the most part make their appearance very suddenly, especially if the infected person, at the period when the disease

shows itself externally, happens to be in great fear, or to be moved with anger, Num. xii, 10; 2 Chron. xxvi, 19. They commonly exhibit themselves in the first instance on the face, about the nose and eyes; and gradually increase in size for a number of years, till they become, as respects the extent of surface which they embrace on the skin, as large as a pea or bean; they are then called שאת. The white spot or pustule, בהרת, morphea alba, and also the dark spot, ספחה, morphea nigra, are indications of the existence of the real leprosy, Lev. xiii, 2, 39; xiv, 56. From these it is necessary to distinguish the spot, which, whatever resemblance there may be in form, is so different in its effects, called בהק, and also the harmless sort of scab, which occurs under the word, מטפחה, Lev. xiii, 6–8, 29. Moses, in the thirteenth chapter of Leviticus, lays down very explicit rules for the purpose of distinguishing between those spots which are proofs of the actual existence of the leprosy, and those spots which are harmless and result from some other cause. Those spots which are the genuine effects and marks of the leprosy gradually dilate themselves, till at length they cover the whole body. Not only the skin is subject to a total destruction, but the body is affected in every part. The pain, it is true, is not very great, but there is a great debility of the system, and great uneasiness and grief, so much so, as almost to drive the victim of the disease to self-destruction.

3082. Moses acted the part of a wise legislator in making those laws which have come down to us concerning the inspection and separation of leprosy persons. The object of these laws will appear peculiarly worthy, when it is considered, that they were designed, not wantonly to fix the charge of being a leper upon an innocent person, and thus to impose upon him those restraints and inconveniences which the truth of such a charge naturally implies, but to ascertain, in the fairest and most satisfactory manner, and to separate those, and those only, who were truly and really leprosy. As this was the prominent object of his laws that have come down to us on this subject, namely, to secure a fair and impartial decision on a question of this kind, he has not mentioned those signs of leprosy which admitted of no doubt, but those only which might be the subject of contention; and left it to the priests, who also fulfilled the office of physicians, to distinguish between the really leprosy, and those who had only the appearance of being such. We find mention, in the rules laid down by Moses for the purpose of ascertaining the true tokens of leprosy, of a cutaneous disorder which is denominated by him bohak. The words of Moses, which may be found in Lev. xiii, 38, 39, are as follows: “If a man or woman have white spots on the skin, and the priest see that the colour of these spots is faint and pale, it is, in this case, the bohak that has broken out on the skin, and they are clean.” A person, accordingly, who was attacked with this disease, the bohak, was not declared unclean; and the reason of it was, that it is not only harmless in itself, but is free from that infectious and hereditary character



which belongs to the true leprosy. "The bohak" says Mr. Niebuhr, "is neither infectious nor dangerous. A black boy at Mocha, who was attacked with this sort of leprosy, had white spots here and there on his body. It was said that the use of sulphur had for some time been of service to this boy, but had not altogether removed the disease." He then adds the following extract from the papers of a Dr. Foster: "May 15th, 1763, I myself saw a case of the bohak in a Jew at Mocha. The spots in this disease are of unequal size. They have no shining appearance, nor are they perceptibly elevated above the skin; and they do not change the colour of the hair. Their colour is an obscure white or somewhat reddish. The rest of the skin of this patient was blacker than that of the people of the country was in general, but the spots were not so white as the skin of an European when not sunburnt. The spots, in this species of leprosy, do not appear on the hands, nor about the navel, but on the neck and face; not, however, on that part of the head where the hair grows very thick. They gradually spread, and continue sometimes only about two months; but in some cases, indeed, as long as two years, and then disappear, by degrees, of themselves. This disorder is neither infectious nor hereditary, nor does it occasion any inconvenience." "That all this," remarks Michaëlis, "should still be found exactly to hold at the distance of three thousand five hundred years from the time of Moses, ought certainly to gain some credit to his laws, even with those who will not allow them to be of divine authority." The pestilence, in its effects, is equally terrible with the leprosy, and is much more rapid in its progress; for it terminates the existence of those who are infected with it almost immediately, and at the farthest within three or four days. The Gentiles were in the habit of referring back the pestilence to the agency and interference of that being, whatever it might be, whether idol or spirit, whom they regarded as the divinity. The Hebrews, also, every where attribute it to the agency either of God himself, or of that legate or angel, whom they denominate מלאך.

3. The palsy of the New Testament is a disease of very wide import. Many infirmities, as Richter has demonstrated, were comprehended under the word which is rendered palsy in the New Testament. 1. The apoplexy, a paralytic shock, which affected the whole body. 2. The hemiplegy, which affects and paralyzes only one side of the body. 3. The paraplegy, which paralyzes all the parts of the system below the neck. 4. The catalepsy, which is caused by a contraction of the muscles in the whole or a part of the body, for example, in the hands, and is very dangerous. The effects upon the parts seized are very violent and deadly. For instance: when a person is struck with it, if his hand happens to be extended, he is unable to draw it back. If the hand is not extended when he is struck with the disease, he is unable to extend it: it appears diminished in size, and dried up in appearance. Hence the Hebrews were in the habit of calling it "a withered

hand,” 1 Kings xiii, 4–6; Zech. xi, 17; Matt. xii, 10–13; John v, 3. 5. The cramp, in oriental countries, is a fearful malady, and by no means unfrequent. It originates from the chills of the night. The limbs, when seized with it, remain immovable, sometimes turned in, and sometimes out, in the same position as when they were first seized. The person afflicted resembles those undergoing the torture βασανιζομένοι, and experiences nearly the same exquisite sufferings. Death follows the disease in a few days, Matt. viii, 6, 8; Luke vii, 2; 1 Macc. ix, 55–58.

DISPENSATIONS, Divine. These are otherwise called “the ways of God,” and denote those schemes or methods which are devised and pursued by the wisdom and goodness of God, in order to manifest his perfections and will to mankind, for the purpose of their instruction, discipline, reformation, and advancement in rectitude of temper and conduct, in order to promote their happiness. These are the grand ends of the divine dispensations; and in their aptitude to promote these ends consist their excellence and glory. The works or constitutions of nature are, in a general sense, divine dispensations, by which God condescends to display to us his being and attributes, and thus to lead us to the acknowledgment, adoration, and love, of our Creator, Father, and Benefactor. The sacred Scriptures reveal and record other dispensations of divine providence, which have been directed to the promotion of the religious principles, moral conduct, and true happiness of mankind. These have varied in several ages of the world, and have been adapted by the wisdom and goodness of God to the circumstances of his intelligent and accountable creatures. In this sense the various revelations which God has communicated to mankind at different periods, and the means he has used, as occasion has required, for their discipline and improvement, have been justly denominated divine dispensations. Accordingly, we read in the works of theological writers of the various dispensations of religion; that of the patriarchs, that of Moses, and that of Christ, called the dispensation of grace, the perfection and ultimate object of every other. All these were adapted to the conditions of the human race at these several periods; all, in regular succession, were mutually connected and rendered preparatory one to the other; and all were subservient to the design of saving the world, and promoting the perfection and happiness of its rational and moral inhabitants. See Covenant.

DISPERSION OF MANKIND. See Division of the Earth.

DIVINATION, a conjecture or surmise, formed concerning future events, from things which are supposed to presage them. The eastern people were always fond of divination, magic, the curious arts of interpreting dreams, and of obtaining a knowledge of future events. When Moses published the law, this disposition had long been common in Egypt and the neighbouring

countries. To prevent the Israelites from consulting diviners, fortune tellers, interpreters of dreams, &c, he forbade them, under very severe penalties, to consult persons of this description, and promised to them the true spirit of prophecy as infinitely superior. He commanded those to be stoned who pretended to have a familiar spirit, or the spirit of divination, Deut. xviii, 9, 10, 15. The writings of the prophets are full of invectives against the Israelites who consulted diviners, and against false prophets who by such means seduced the people.

2. Different kinds of divination have passed for sciences, as 1. Aëromancy, divining by the air. 2. Astrology, by the heavens. 3. Augury, by the flight and singing of birds, &c. 4. Cheiromancy, by inspecting the lines of the hand. 5. Geomancy, by observing cracks or clefts in the earth. 6. Haruspicy, by inspecting the bowels of animals. 7. Horoscopy, a branch of astrology, marking the position of the heavens when a person is born. 8. Hydromancy, by water. 9. Physiognomy, by the countenance. 10. Pyromancy, a divination made by fire.

3. The kinds of divination, to which superstition in modern times has given belief, are not less numerous, or less ridiculous, than those which were practised in the days of profound ignorance. The divining rod, which is mentioned in Scripture, is still in some repute in the north of England, though its application is now confined principally to the discovery of veins of lead ore, seams of coal, or springs. In order that it may possess the full virtue for this purpose, it should be made of hazel. Divination by Virgilian, Horatian, or Bible lots, was formerly very common; and the last kind is still practised. The works are opened by chance, and the words noticed which are covered by the thumb: if they can be interpreted in any respect relating to the person, they are reckoned prophetic. Charles I. is said to have used this kind of divination to ascertain his fate. The ancient Christians were so much addicted to the *sortes sanctorum*, or divining by the Bible, that it was expressly forbidden by a council. Divination by the speal, or blade bone of a sheep, is used in Scotland. In the Highlands it is called *sleina-reached*, or reading the speal bone. It was very common in England in the time of Drayton, particularly among the colony of Flemings settled in Pembrokeshire. Camden relates of the Irish, that they looked through the bare blade bone of a sheep; and if they saw any spot in it darker than ordinary, they believed that somebody would be buried out of the house. The Persians used this mode of divination.

4. Of all attempts to look into futurity by such means, as well as resorting to charms and other methods of curing diseases, and discovering secrets, we may say, that they are relics of Paganism, and argue an ignorance, folly,

or superstition, dishonourable to the Christian name; and are therefore to be reprov'd and discourag'd.

**DIVISION OF THE EARTH.** The prophecy of Noah, says Dr. Hales, was uttered long after the deluge. It evidently alludes to a divine decree for the orderly division of the earth among the three primitive families of his sons, because it notices the “tents of Shem” and the “enlargement of Japheth,” Genesis ix, 20–27. This decree was probably promulgated about the same time by the venerable patriarch. The prevailing tradition of such a decree for this threefold division of the earth, is intimated both in the Old and New Testament. Moses refers to it, as handed down to the Israelites, “from the days of old, and the years of many generations; as they might learn from their fathers and their elders,” and farther, as conveying a special grant of the land of Palestine, to be the lot of the twelve tribes of Israel:--

“When the Most High divided to the nations their settlements,  
When he separated the sons of Adam,  
He assigned the boundaries of the peoples [of Israel]  
According to the number of the sons of Israel:  
For the portion of the Lord is his people,  
Jacob is the lot of his inheritance,” Deut. xxxii, 7–9.

And this furnishes an additional proof of the justice of the expulsion of the Canaanites, as usurpers, by the Israelites, the rightful possessors of the land of Palestine, under Moses, Joshua, and their successors, when the original grant was renewed to Abraham, Gen. xv, 13–21. And the knowledge of this divine decree may satisfactorily account for the panic terror with which the devoted nations of Canaan were struck at the miraculous passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites, and approach to their confines, so finely described by Moses:--

“The nations shall hear [this] and tremble,  
Sorrow shall seize the inhabitants of Palestine.  
Then shall the dukes of Edom be amazed,  
Dismay shall possess the princes of Moab,  
The inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away:  
Fear and terror shall fall upon them,  
By the greatness of thine arm they shall be petrified,  
Till thy people pass over [Jordan] O Lord,  
Till the people pass over, whom thou hast redeemed.”  
Exodus xv, 14–16.

St. Paul, also, addressing the Athenians, refers to the same decree, as a well-known tradition in the Heathen world: “God made of one blood every nation of men to dwell upon the whole face of the earth; having appointed the predetermined seasons and boundaries of their dwellings,” Acts xvii,

26. Here he represents mankind as all of “one blood,” race, or stock, “the sons of Adam” and of Noah in succession; and the seasons and the boundaries of their respective settlements, as previously regulated by the divine appointment. And this was conformable to their own geographical allegory; that Chronus, the god of time, or Saturn, divided the universe among his three sons, allotting the heaven to Jupiter, the sea to Neptune, and hell to Pluto. But Chronus represented Noah, who divided the world among his three sons, allotting the upper regions of the north to Japheth, the maritime or middle regions to Shem, and the lower regions of the south to Ham. According to the Armenian tradition recorded by Abulfaragi, Noah distributed the habitable earth from north to south between his sons, and gave to Ham the region of the blacks, to Shem the region of the tawny, fuscorum, and to Japheth the region of the ruddy, rubrorum: and he dates the actual division of the earth in the hundred and fortieth year of Peleg, B. C. 2614, or five hundred and forty-one years after the deluge, and one hundred and ninety-one years after the death of Noah, in the following order:--“To the sons of Shem was allotted the middle of the earth, namely, Palestine, Syria, Assyria, Samaria, Singar, [or Shinar,] Babel, [or Babylonia,] Persia, and Hegiaz; [Arabia;] to the sons of Ham, Teimen, [or Idumea, Jer. xlix, 7,] Africa, Nigritia, Egypt, Nubia, Ethiopia, Scindia, and India; [or India west and east of the river Indus;] to the sons of Japheth, also, Garbia, [the north,] Spain, France, the countries of the Greeks, Sclavonians, Bulgarians, Turks, and Armenians.” In this curious and valuable geographical chart, Armenia, the cradle of the human race, was allotted to Japheth, by right of primogeniture; and Samaria and Babel to the sons of Shem; the usurpation of these regions, therefore, by Nimrod, and of Palestine by Canaan, was in violation of the divine decree. Though the migration of the primitive families began at this time, B. C. 2614, or about five hundred and forty-one years after the deluge, it was a length of time before they all reached their respective destinations. The “seasons,” as well as the “boundaries” of their respective settlements were equally the appointment of God; the nearer countries to the original settlement being planted first, and the remoter in succession. These primitive settlements seem to have been scattered and detached from each other according to local convenience. Even so late as the tenth generation after the flood in Abraham’s days, there were considerable tracts of land in Palestine unappropriated, on which he and his nephew, Lot, freely pastured their cattle without hinderance or molestation. That country was not fully peopled till the fourth generation after, at the exode of the Israelites from Egypt. And Herodotus represents Scythia as an uninhabited desert, until Targitorus planted the first colony there, about a thousand years, at most, before Darius Hystaspes invaded Scythia, or about B. C. 1508. The orderly settlements of the three primitive families are recorded in that most venerable and valuable geographical chart, the tenth chapter of Genesis, in

which it is curious to observe how long the names of the first settlers have been preserved among their descendants, even down to the present day:--

1. Japheth, the eldest son of Noah, Gen. x, 21, and his family, are first noticed, Gen. x, 2–5. The name of the patriarch himself was preserved among his Grecian descendants, in the proverb, τοῦ Ἰάπετου πρεσβύτερος, older than Japetus, denoting the remotest antiquity. The radical part of the word Ἰάπετ, evidently expresses Japheth. (1.) Gomer, his eldest son, was the father of the Gomerians. These, spreading from the regions north of Armenia and Bactriana, Ezek. xxxviii, 6, extended themselves westward over nearly the whole continent of Europe; still retaining their paternal denomination, with some slight variation, as Cimmerians, in Asia; Cimbri and Umbri, in Gaul and Italy; and Cymri, Cambri, and Cumbri, in Wales and Cumberland at the present day. They are also identified by ancient authors with the Galatæ of Asia Minor, the Gaels, Gauls, and Celtæ, of Europe, who likewise spread from the Euxine Sea, to the Western Ocean; and from the Baltic to Italy southward, and first planted the British Isles. Josephus remarks, that the Galatæ were called Γομαρεῖς, Gomariani, from their ancestor Gomar. See the numerous authorities adduced in support of the identity of the Gomerians and Celts, by that learned and ingenious antiquary, Faber, in his “Origin of Pagan Idolatry.” Of Gomer’s sons, Ashkenaz appears to have settled on the coasts of the Euxine Sea, which from him seems to have received its primary denomination of Ἄξενος, Axenus, nearly resembling Ashkenaz; but forgetting its etymology in process of time, the Greeks considered it as a compound term in their own language, Α-ξένος, signifying inhospitable; and thence metamorphosed it into Εὐ-ξένος, Eu-xenus, “very hospitable.” His precise settlement is represented in Scripture as contiguous to Armenia, westward; for the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Ashkenaz, are noticed together, Jer. li, 27. Riphath, the second son of Gomer, seems to have given name to the Riphean mountains of the north of Asia; and Togarmah, the third son, may be traced 311 in the Trocmi of Strabo, the Trogmi of Cicero, and Trogmades of the council of Chalcedon, inhabiting the confines of Pontus and Cappadocia. (2.) Magog, Tubal, and Mesech, sons of Japhet, are noticed together by Ezekiel, as settled in the north, Ezek. xxxviii, 2, 14, 15. And as the ancestors of the numerous Slavonic and Tartar tribes, the first may be traced in the Mongogians, Monguls, and Moguls; the second, in the Tobolski, of Siberia; and the third, Mesech, or Mosoc, in the Moschici, Moscow, and Muscovites. (3.) Madai was the father of the Medes, who are repeatedly so denominated in Scripture, 2 Kings xvii, 6; Isa. xiii, 17; Jer. li, 11; Dan. v, 28, &c. (4.) From Javan was descended the Javanians, or Ἰάονες of the Greeks, and the Yavanas of the Hindus. Greece itself is called Javan by Daniel, xi, 2; and the people Ἰάονες by Homer in his “Iliad.” These aboriginal Ἰάονες of Greece are not to be confounded, as is usually

the case, with the later Ἴωνες, who invaded and subdued the Javanian territories, and were of a different stock. The accurate Pausanias states, that the name of Ἴωνες, was comparatively modern, while that of Ἰόωνες is acknowledged to have been the primitive title of the barbarians who were subdued by the Ἴωνες. Strabo remarks that Attica was formerly called both Ionia and Ias, or Ian; while Herodotus asserts, that the Athenians were not willing to be called Ἴωνες; and he derives the name from Ἴων, the son of Zuth, descended from Deucalion or Noah. And this Ion is said by Eusebius to have been the ringleader in the building of the tower of Babel, and the first introducer of idol worship, and Sabianism, or adoration of the sun, moon, and stars. This would identify Ion with Nimrod. And the Ionians appear to have been composed of the later colonists, the Palli, Pelasgi, or roving tribes from Asia, Phenicia, and Egypt, who, according to Herodotus, first corrupted the simplicity of the primitive religion of Greece, and who, by the Hindus, were called Yonigas, or worshippers of the yoni or dove. This critical distinction between the Iaones and the Iones, the Yavanas, and the Yonigas, we owe to the sagacity of Faber. Of Javan's sons, Elishah and Dodon, may be recognized in Elis and Dodona, the oldest settlements of Greece; Kittim, in the Citium of Macedonia, and Chittim, or maritime coasts of Greece and Italy, Num. xxiv, 24; and Tarshish, in the Tarsus of Cilicia, and Tartessus of Spain.

2. Ham and his family are next noticed, Gen. x, 6–20. The name of the patriarch is recorded in the title frequently given to Egypt, “The land of Ham,” Psalm cv, 23, &c. (1.) Of his sons, the first and most celebrated appears to have been Cush, who gave name to the land of Cush, both in Asia and Africa; the former still called Chusistan by the Arabian geographers, and Susiana by the Greeks, and Cusha Dwipa Within, by the Hindus; the other, called Cusha Dwipa Without. And the enterprising Cushim or Cuthim, of Scripture, in Asia and Europe, assumed the title of Getæ, Guiths, and Goths; and of Scuths, Scuits, and Scots; and of Sacas, Sacasenas, and Saxons. The original family settlement of Abraham was “Ur of the Chasdim,” or Chaldees, Gen. xi, 28, who are repeatedly mentioned in Scripture, Isa. xiii, 9; Dan. ix, 1, &c. According to Faber's ingenious remark, it may more properly be pronounced Chus-dim, signifying Godlike Cushites. It is highly improbable that they were so named from Chesed, Abraham's nephew, Gen. xxii, 22, who was a mere boy, if born at all, when Abraham left Ur, and was an obscure individual, never noticed afterward. Of Cush's sons, Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Sabtacha, and Raamah; and the sons of Raamah, Sheba, and Dedan, seem to have settled in Idumea and Arabia, from the similar names of places there; and of his descendants, Nimrod, the mighty hunter, first founded the kingdom of Babylon, and afterward of Assyria, invading the settlements of the Shemites, contrary to the divine decree. His posterity were probably

distinguished by the title of Chusdim, Isaiah xxiii, 13. (2.) The second son of Ham was Misr, or Mizraim. He settled in Egypt, whence the Egyptians were universally styled in Scripture, Mizraim, or Mizraites, in the plural form. But the country is denominated in the east, to this day, “the land of Misr;” which, therefore, seems to have been the name of the patriarch himself. The children of Misr, like their father, are denominated in Scripture by the plural number. Of these, the Ludim and Lehabim were probably the Copto-Libyans, Ezek. xxx, 5; the Naphtuhim occupied the sea coast, which by the Egyptians was called Nephthus; whence, probably, originated the name of the maritime god Neptune. The Pathrusim occupied a part of Lower Egypt, called from them Pathros, Isa. xi, 11. The Caphtorim and the Casluhim, whose descendants were the Philistim of Palestine, occupied the district which lies between the delta of the Nile and the southern extremity of Palestine, Deut. ii, 23; Amos ix, 7. (3.) Phut is merely noticed, without any mention of his family. But the tribes of Phut and Lud are mentioned together, with Cush, or Ethiopia, Jer. xlvi, 9; Ezek. xxx, 5; and Jerom notices a district in Libya, called Regio Phutensis, or the land of Phut. (4.) Canaan has been noticed already; and the original extent of the land of Canaan is carefully marked by Moses. Its western border, along the Mediterranean Sea, extended from Sidon, southward, to Gaza; its southern border from thence, eastward, to Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, the cities of the plain, afterward covered by the Dead Sea, or Asphaltite Lake; its eastern border extending from thence northward, to Laish, Dan, or the springs of the Jordan; and its northern border, from thence to Sidon, westward. Of Canaan’s sons, Sidon, the eldest, occupied the north-west corner, and built the town of that name, so early celebrated for her luxury and commerce in Scripture, Judges xviii, 7; 1 Kings v, 6; and by Homer, who calls the Sidonians, πολυδαίδαλοι, skilled in many arts. And Tyre, so flourishing afterward, though boasting of her own antiquity, Isa. xxiii, 7, is styled, “a daughter of Sidon,” or a colony from thence, 312Isa. v, 12. Heth, his second son, and the Hittites, his descendants appear to have settled in the south, near Hebron, Gen. xxiii, 3–7; and next to them, at Jerusalem, the Jebusites, or descendants of Jebus, both remaining in their original settlements till David’s days; 2 Sam. xi, 3; v, 6–9. Beyond the Jebusites, were settled the Emorites, or Amorites, Num. xiii, 29, who extended themselves beyond Jordan, and were the most powerful of the Canaanite tribes, Gen. xv, 16; Num. xxi, 21, until they were destroyed by Moses and Joshua, with the rest of the devoted nations of Canaan’s family.

3. Shem and his family are noticed last, Gen. x, 21–30. His posterity were confined to middle Asia. (1.) His son Elam appears to have been settled in Elymais, or southern Persia, contiguous to the maritime tract of Chusistan, Dan. viii, 2. (2.) His son Ashur planted the land thence called Assyria, which soon became a province of the Cushite, or Cuthic empire, founded



by Nimrod. (3.) Arphaxad, through his grandson, Eber, branched out into the two houses of Peleg and Joktan. Peleg probably remained in Chaldea, or southern Babylonia, at the time of the dispersion; for there we find his grandson, Terah, and his family, settled at “Ur of the Chaldees,” Gen. xi, 31. Of the numerous children of Joktan, it is said by Moses, that “their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the east.” Faber is inclined to believe that they were the ancestors of the great body of the Hindus, who still retain a lively tradition of the patriarch Shem, Shama, or Sharma; and that the land of Ophir, abounding in gold, so called from one of the sons of Joktan, lay beyond the Indus, eastward. (4.) Lud was probably the father of the Ludim or Lydians, of Asia Minor; for this people had a tradition that they were descended from Lud or Lydus, according to Josephus. (5.) The children of Aram planted the fertile country north of Babylonia, called Aram Naharaim, “Aram between the two rivers,” the Euphrates and the Tigris, thence called by the Greeks, Mesopotamis, Gen. xxiv, 10, and Padan Aram, the level country of Aram, Gen. xxv, 20. This country of Aram is frequently rendered Syria in Scripture, Judges x, 6; Hosea xii, 12, &c; which is not to be confounded with Palestine Syria, into which they afterward spread themselves, still retaining their original name of Ἀραμιοι, or Arameans, noticed by Homer in his “Iliad.”

4. Upon this distribution of Noah’s posterity we shall only observe, that the Deity presided over all their counsels and deliberations, and that he guided and settled all mankind according to the dictates of his all-comprehending wisdom and benevolence. To this purpose, the ancients themselves, according to Pindar, retained some idea that the dispersion of men was not the effect of chance, but that they had been settled in different countries by the appointment of Providence, Gen. xi, 8, 9; Deut. xxii, 8. This dispersion, and that confusion of languages with which it originated, was intended, by the counsel of an all-wise Providence, to counteract and defeat the scheme which had been projected by the descendants of Noah, for maintaining their union, implied in their proposing to make themselves a name, שם, which Schultens, in Job i, 1, derives from the Arabic verb שמח, or שמח, to be high elevated, or eminent. By this scheme, which seems to have been a project of state policy, for keeping all men together under the present chiefs and their successors, a great part of the earth must, for a long time, have been uninhabited, and overrun with wild beasts. The bad effects which this project would have had upon the minds, the morals, and religion of mankind, was, probably, the chief reason why God interposed to frustrate it as soon as it was formed. It had manifestly a direct tendency to tyranny, oppression, and slavery. Whereas in forming several independent governments by a small body of men, the ends of government, and the security of liberty and property, would be much better attended to, and

more firmly established; which, in fact, was really the case; if we may judge of the rest by the constitution of one of the most eminent, the kingdom of Egypt, Gen. xlvii, 15–27. The Egyptians were masters of their persons and property, till they sold them to Pharaoh for bread; and then their servitude amounted to no more than the fifth part of the produce of the country, as an annual tax payable to the king. By this event, considered as a wise dispensation of Providence, bounds were set to the contagion of wickedness; evil example was confined, and could not extend its influence beyond the limits of one country; nor could wicked projects be carried on, with universal concurrence, by many small colonies, separated by the natural boundaries of mountains, rivers, barren deserts, and seas, and hindered from associating together by a variety of languages, unintelligible to each other. Moreover, in this dispersed state, they could, whenever God pleased, be made reciprocal checks upon each other, by invasions and wars, which would weaken the power, and humble the pride, of corrupt and vicious communities. This dispensation was, therefore, properly calculated to prevent a second universal degeneracy; God dealing in it with men as rational agents, and adapting his scheme to their state and circumstances.

**DIVORCE.** As the ancient Hebrews paid a stipulated price for the privilege of marrying, they seemed to consider it the natural consequence of making a payment of that kind, that they should be at liberty to exercise a very arbitrary power over their wives, and to renounce or divorce them whenever they chose. This state of things, as Moses himself very clearly saw, was not equitable as respected the woman, and was very often injurious to both parties. Finding himself, however, unable to overrule feelings and practices of very ancient standing, he merely annexed to the original institution of marriage a very serious admonition to this effect, viz. that it would be less criminal for a man to desert his father and mother, than without adequate cause to desert his wife, Gen. ii, 14, compared with Malachi ii, 11–16. He also laid a restriction upon the power of the husband as far as this, that he would not permit him to repudiate the wife without giving her a bill of divorce. He farther enacted in reference to this subject that the husband might receive the repudiated wife back, in case she had not in the meanwhile been married to another person; but if she had been thus married, she could never afterward become the wife of her first husband; a law, which the faith due to the second husband clearly required, Deut. xxiv, 1–4, compare Jer. iii, 1, and Matt. i, 19; xix, 8. The inquiry, “What should be considered an adequate cause of divorce,” was left by Moses to be determined by the husband himself. He had liberty to divorce her, if he saw in her any thing naked, any thing displeasing or improper, any thing so much at war with propriety, and a source of so much dissatisfaction as to be, in the estimation of the husband, sufficient ground for separation. These expressions, however, were sharply contested as to

their meaning in the later times of the Jewish nation. The school of Hillel contended, that the husband might lawfully put away the wife for any cause, even the smallest. The mistake committed by the school of Hillel in taking this ground was, that they confounded moral and civil law. It is true, as far as the Mosaic statute or the civil law was concerned, the husband had a right thus to do; but it is equally clear, that the ground of just separation must have been, not a trivial, but a prominent and important one, when it is considered, that he was bound to consult the rights of the woman, and was amenable to his conscience and his God. The school of Shammai explained the phrase, nakedness of a thing, to mean actual adultery. Our Lord agreed with the school of Shammai as far as this, that the ground of divorce should be one of a moral nature, and not less than adultery; but he does not appear to have agreed with them in their opinion in respect to the Mosaic statute. On the contrary, he denied the equity of that statute, and in justification of Moses maintained, that he permitted divorces for causes below adultery, only in consequence of the hardness of the people's hearts, Matt. v, 31, 32; xviii, 1–9; Mark x, 2–12; Luke xvi, 18. Wives, who were considered the property of their husbands, did not enjoy by the Mosaic statutes a reciprocal right, and were not at liberty to dissolve the matrimonial alliance by giving a bill of divorce to that effect. In the latter periods, however, of the Jewish state, the Jewish matrons, the more powerful of them at least, appear to have imbibed the spirit of the ladies of Rome, and to have exercised in their own behalf the same power that was granted by the Mosaic law only to their husbands, Mark vi, 17–29; x, 12.

DOCETÆ, the advocates of an early heresy, which taught that Christ acted and suffered, not in reality, but in appearance. They were so denominated from δοκεῖν, to appear. See Gnostics.

DOCTORS, or Teachers, of the law, a class of men in great repute among the Jews. They had studied the law of Moses in its various branches, and the numerous interpretations which had been grafted upon it in later times; and, on various occasions, they gave their opinion on cases referred to them for advice. Nicodemus, himself a doctor (διδάσκαλος, teacher) of the law, comes to consult Jesus, whom he compliments in the same terms as he was accustomed to receive from his scholars: “Rabbi, we know that thou art διδάσκαλος, a competent teacher from God.” Doctors of the law were chiefly of the sect of the Pharisees; but they are sometimes distinguished from that sect, Luke v, 17.

DOG, כלב, an animal well known. By the law of Moses, the dog was declared unclean, and was held in great contempt among the Jews, 1 Sam. xvii, 43; xxiv, 14; 2 Sam. ix, 8; 2 Kings viii, 13. Yet they had them in considerable numbers in their cities. They were not, however, shut up in

their houses or courts, but forced to seek their food where they could find it. The Psalmist compares violent men to dogs, who go about the city in the night, prowl about for their food, and growl, and become clamorous if they be not satisfied, Psalm lix, 6, 14, 15. Mr. Harmer has illustrated this by quotations from travellers into the east. The Turks also reckon the dog a filthy creature, and therefore drive him from their houses; so that with them dogs guard rather the streets and districts, than particular houses, and live on the offals that are thrown abroad. In 1 Sam. xxv, 3, Nabal is said to have been “churlish and evil in his manners; and he was of the house of Caleb;” but Caleb here is not a proper name. Literally, it is, “He was the son of a dog;” and so the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic render it,—he was irritable, snappish, and snarling as a dog. The irritable disposition of the dog is the foundation of that saying, “He that passeth by, and meddleth with strife belonging not to him, is like one that taketh a dog by the ears,” Prov. xxvi, 17; that is, he wantonly exposes himself to danger.

In 1 Kings xxi, 23, it is said, “The dogs shall eat Jezebel.” Mr. Bruce, when at Gondar, was witness to a scene in a great measure similar to the devouring of Jezebel by dogs. He says, “The bodies of those killed by the sword were hewn to pieces, and scattered about the streets, being denied burial. I was miserable, and almost driven to despair, at seeing my hunting dogs, twice let loose by the carelessness of my servants, bringing into the court yard the heads and arms of slaughtered men, and which I could no way prevent but by the destruction of the dogs themselves.” He also adds, that upon being asked by the king the reason of his dejected and sickly appearance, among other reasons, he informed him, “it was occasioned by an execution of three men, which he had lately seen; because the hyænas, allured into the streets by the quantity of carrion, would not let him pass by night in safety from the palace; and because the dogs fled into his house, to eat 314pieces of human carcasses at their leisure.” This account illustrates also the readiness of the dogs to lick the blood of Ahab, 1 Kings xxii, 38; in conformity to which is the expression of the Prophet Jeremiah, xv, 3, “I will appoint over them the sword to slay, and the dogs to tear.”

2. The dog was held sacred by the Egyptians. This fact we learn from Juvenal, who complains, in his fifteenth satire,

Oppida tota canem vencentur, nemo Dianam.  
 “Thousands regard the hound with holy fear,  
 Not one, Diana.”  
 Gifford.

The testimony of the Latin poet is confirmed by Diodorus, who, in his first book, assures us that the Egyptians highly venerate some animals, both during their life and after their death; and expressly mentions the dog as

one object of this absurd adoration. To these witnesses may be added Herodotus, who says, that when a dog expires, all the members of the family to which he belonged worship the carcass; and that, in every part of the kingdom, the carcasses of their dogs are embalmed, and deposited in consecrated ground. The idolatrous veneration of the dog by the Egyptians is shown in the worship of their dog-god Anubis, to whom temples and priests were consecrated, and whose image was borne in all religious ceremonies. Cynopolis, the present Minieh, situated in the lower Thebais, was built in honour of Anubis. The priests celebrated his festivals there with great pomp. "Anubis," says Strabo, "is the city of dogs, the capital of the Cynopolitan prefecture. These animals are fed there on sacred aliments, and religion has decreed them a worship." An event, however, related by Plutarch, brought them into considerable discredit with the people. Cambyses, having slain the god Apis, and thrown his body into the field, all animals respected it except the dogs, which alone ate of his flesh. This impiety diminished the popular veneration. Cynopolis was not the only city where incense was burned on the altars of Anubis. He had chapels in almost all the temples. On solemnities, his image always accompanied those of Isis and Osiris. Rome, having adopted the ceremonies of Egypt, the emperor Commodus, to celebrate the Isiac feasts, shaved his head, and himself carried the dog Anubis.

3. In Matt. vii, 6, we have this direction of our Saviour: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they," the swine, "trample them under their feet, and," the dogs, "turn again and tear you." It was customary, not only with the writers of Greece and Rome, but also with the eastern sages, to denote certain classes of men by animals supposed to resemble them among the brutes. Our Saviour was naturally led to adopt the same concise and energetic method. By dogs, which were held in great detestation by the Jews, he intends men of odious character and violent temper; by swine, the usual emblem of moral filth, he means the sensual and profligate; and the purport of his admonition is, that as it is a maxim with the priests not to give any part of the sacrifices to dogs, so it should be a maxim with you not to impart the holy instruction with which you are favoured, to those who are likely to blaspheme and to be only excited by it to rage and persecution. It is, however, a maxim of prudence not of cowardice; and is to be taken along with other precepts of our Lord, which enjoin the publication of truth, at the expense of ease and even life.

DORT, Synod of. See Synods.

DOVE, יונה. This beautiful genus of birds is very numerous in the east. In the wild state they generally build their nests in the holes or clefts of rocks,

or in excavated trees; but they are easily taught submission and familiarity with mankind; and, when domesticated, build in structures erected for their accommodation, called “dove-cotes.” They are classed by Moses among the clean birds; and it appears from the sacred as well as other writers, that doves were always held in the highest estimation among the eastern nations. Rosenmuller, in a note upon Bochart, derives the name from the Arabic, where it signifies mildness, gentleness, &c. The dove is mentioned in Scripture as the symbol of simplicity, innocence, gentleness, and fidelity, Hosea vii, 11; Matt. x, 16.

The following extract from Morier’s *Persian Travels* illustrates a passage in Isaiah: “In the environs of the city, to the westward, near the Zainderood, are many pigeon houses, erected at a distance from habitations, for the sole purpose of collecting pigeons’ dung for manure. They are large round towers, rather broader at the bottom than the top, and crowned by conical spiracles, through which the pigeons descend. Their interior resembles a honey-comb, pierced with a thousand holes, each of which forms a snug retreat for a nest. More care appears to have been bestowed upon their outside than upon that of the generality of the dwelling houses; for they are painted and ornamented. The extraordinary flights of pigeons which I have seen alight upon one of these buildings afford, perhaps, a good illustration for the passage in Isaiah lx, 8: ‘Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?’ Their great numbers, and the compactness of their mass, literally look like a cloud at a distance, and obscure the sun in their passage.”

The first mention of the dove in the Scripture is Genesis viii, 8, 10–12, where Noah sent one from the ark to ascertain if the waters of the deluge had assuaged. She was sent forth thrice. The first time she speedily returned; having, in all probability, gone but a little way from the ark, as she must naturally be terrified at the appearance of the waters. After seven days, being sent out a second time, she returned with an olive leaf plucked off, whereby it became evident that the flood was considerably abated, and had sank below the tops of the trees; and thus relieved the fears and cheered the heart of Noah and his family. And hence the olive branch has ever been among the forerunners of peace, and chief of those emblems by which a happy state of renovation and restoration to prosperity has been signified to mankind. At the end of other seven days, the dove, being sent out a third time, returned no more; from which Noah conjectured that the earth was so far drained as to afford sustenance for the birds and fowls; and he therefore removed the covering of the ark, which probably gave liberty to many of the fowls to fly off; and these circumstances afforded him the greater facility for making arrangements for disembarking the other

animals. Doves might be offered in sacrifice, when those who were poor could not bring a more costly offering.

DOWRY. See Bride.

DRACHMA. The value of a common drachma was sevenpence, English. A didrachma, or double drachma, made very near half a shekel; and four drachmas made nearly a shekel.

DRAGON. This word is frequently to be met with in our English translation of the Bible. It answers generally to the Hebrew תָּנִין, תַּנִּין, תַּנִּים; and these words are variously rendered dragons, serpents, sea-monsters, and whales. The Rev. James Hurdis, in a dissertation relative to this subject, observes, that the word translated “whales,” in Gen. i, 21, occurs twenty-seven times in Scripture; and he attempts, with much ingenuity, to prove that it every where signifies the crocodile. That it sometimes has this meaning, he thinks is clear from Ezekiel xxix, 3: “Behold, I am against thee, Pharaoh king of Egypt, the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers.” For, to what could a king of Egypt be more properly compared than the crocodile? The same argument he draws from Isaiah li, 9: “Art thou not he that hath cut Rahab, [Egypt,] and wounded the dragon?” Among the ancients the crocodile was the symbol of Egypt, and appears so on Roman coins. Some however have thought the hippopotamus intended; others, one of the larger species of serpents.

DRAUGHTS, stupifying potions. At the time of execution, they gave the malefactor a grain of frankincense in a cup of wine, in order to stupify and render him less sensible of pain. This custom is traced to the charge of the wise man: “Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine to those that be of heavy hearts,” Prov. xxxiv, 6. The prophet makes an allusion to the powerful effects of this stupifying draught, in that prediction which announces the judgments of God upon the empire of Babylon: “Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations to whom I send thee to drink it. And they shall drink, and be moved, and be mad, because of the sword that I will send among them,” Jer. xxv, 15, 16. The Jews, according to the custom of their country, gave our Lord wine mingled with myrrh at his crucifixion. See Cross.

DREAMS. The easterns, in particular the Jews, greatly regarded dreams, and applied for their interpretation to those who undertook to explain them. The ancient Greeks and Romans had the same opinion of them, as appears from their most eminent writers. We see the antiquity of this attention to dreams in the history of Pharaoh’s butler and baker, Gen. xl. Pharaoh himself, and Nebuchadnezzar, are instances. God expressly condemned to

death all who pretended to have prophetic dreams, and to foretel futurities, even though what they foretold came to pass, if they had any tendency to promote idolatry, Deut. xiii, 1–3. But the people were not forbidden, when they thought they had a significative dream, to address the prophets of the Lord, or the high priest in his ephod, to have it explained. Saul, before the battle of Gilboa, consulted a woman who had a familiar spirit, “because the Lord would not answer him by dreams, nor by prophets,” 1 Sam. xxviii, 6, 7. The Lord himself sometimes discovered his will in dreams, and enabled persons to explain them. He informed Abimelech in a dream, that Sarah was the wife of Abraham, Gen. xx, 3, 6. He showed Jacob the mysterious ladder in a dream, Gen. xxviii, 12, 13; and in a dream an angel suggested to him a means of multiplying his flocks, Genesis xxxi, 11, 12, &c. Joseph was favoured very early with prophetic dreams, whose signification was easily discovered by Jacob, Gen. xxxvii, 5. God said, that he spake to other prophets in dreams, but to Moses face to face. The Midianites gave credit to dreams, as appears from that which a Midianite related to his companion; and from whose interpretation Gideon took a happy omen, Judges vii, 13, 15. The Prophet Jeremiah exclaims against impostors who pretended to have had dreams, and abused the credulity of the people: “They prophesy lies in my name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him tell it faithfully, saith the Lord,” Jer. xxiii, 25, 28, 29. The Prophet Joel promises from God, that in the reign of the Messiah, the effusion of the Holy Spirit should be so copious, that the old men should have prophetic dreams, and the young men should receive visions, Joel ii, 28.

DRESS. See Habits.

DROMEDARY. This name answers to two words in the original, בכר, and feminine בכרה, Isa. lx, 6; Jer. ii, 24; and אהשתרנים, Esther viii, 10, “young dromedaries;” probably the name in Persian. The dromedary is a race of camels chiefly remarkable for its prodigious swiftness. The most observable difference between it and the camel is, that it has but one protuberance on the back; and instead of the slow solemn walk to which that animal is accustomed, it will go as far in one day as the camel in three. For this reason it is used to carry messengers where haste is required. The animal is governed by a bridle, which, being usually fastened to a ring fixed in the nose, may very well illustrate the expression, 2 Kings xix, 28, of turning back Sennacherib by putting a hook into his nose; and may farther indicate his swift retreat.

DUST, or ashes, cast on the head was a sign of mourning, Josh. vii, 6: sitting in the dust, a sign of affliction, Lam. iii, 29; Isaiah xlvii, 1. The



dust also denotes the grave, Gen. iii, 19; Job vii, 21; Psalm xxii, 15. It is put for a great multitude, Gen. xiii, 16; Numbers xxiii, 10. It signifies a low or mean condition, 1 Sam. ii, 8; Nahum iii, 18. To shake or wipe off the dust of a place from one's feet, marks the renouncing of all intercourse with it in future. God threatens the Jews with rain of dust, &c; Deut. xxviii, 24. An extract from Sir T. Roe's embassy may cast light on this: "Sometimes, in India, the wind blows very high in hot and dry seasons, raising up into the air a very great height, thick clouds of dust and sand. These dry showers most grievously annoy all those among whom they fall; enough to smite them all with present blindness; filling their eyes, ears, nostrils, and mouths too, if not well guarded; searching every place, as well within as without, so that there is not a little key-hole of any trunk or cabinet, if it be not covered, but receives this dust; add to this, that the fields, brooks, and gardens, suffer extremely from these terrible showers."

2. In almost every part of Asia, those who demand justice against a criminal throw dust upon him, signifying that he deserves to lose his life, and be cast into the grave; and that this is the true interpretation of the action, is evident from an imprecation in common use among the Turks and Persians, "Be covered with earth!" "Earth be upon thy head." We have two remarkable instances of casting dust recorded in Scripture: the first is that of Shimei, who gave vent to his secret hostility to David, when he fled before his rebellious son, by throwing stones at him, and casting dust, 2 Sam. xvi, 13. It was an ancient custom, in those warm and arid countries, to lay the dust before a person of distinction, and particularly before kings and princes, by sprinkling the ground with water. To throw dust into the air while a person was passing, was therefore an act of great disrespect; to do so before a sovereign prince, an indecent outrage. But it is clear that Shimei meant more than disrespect and outrage to an afflicted king, whose subject he was: he intended to signify by that action, that David was unfit to live, and that the time was at last arrived to offer him a sacrifice to the ambition and vengeance of the house of Saul. This view of his conduct is confirmed by the behaviour of the Jews to the Apostle Paul, when they seized him in the temple, and had nearly succeeded in putting him to death: they cried out, "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live; and as they cried out and cast off their clothes, and threw dust into the air, the chief captain commanded him to be brought into the castle," Acts xxii, 23. A great similarity appears between the conduct of the Jews on this occasion, and the behaviour of the peasants in Persia, when they go to court to complain of the governors, whose oppressions they can no longer endure. They carry their complaints against their governors by companies, consisting of several hundreds, and sometimes of a thousand; they repair to that gate of the palace nearest to which their prince is most likely to be, where they set themselves to make the most horrid cries, tearing their

garments, and throwing dust into the air, and demanding justice. The king, upon hearing these cries, sends to know the occasion of them: the people deliver their complaints in writing, upon which he informs them that he will commit the cognizance of the affair to such a one as he names; and in consequence of this, justice is usually obtained.

EAGLE, נִשֵּׁר, Exod. xix, 4; Lev. xi, 13. The name is derived from a verb which signifies to lacerate, or tear in pieces. The eagle has always been considered as the king of birds, on account of its great strength, rapidity and elevation of flight, natural ferocity, and the terror it inspires into its fellows of the air. Its voracity is so great that a large extent of territory is requisite for the supply of proper sustenance; and providence has therefore constituted it a solitary animal: two pair of eagles are never found in the same neighbourhood, though the genus is dispersed through every quarter of the world. Its sight is quick, strong, and piercing, to a proverb. In Job xxxix, 27, the natural history of the eagle is finely drawn up:--

Is it at thy voice that the eagle soars?  
And therefore maketh his nest on high?  
The rock is the place of his habitation.  
He abides on the crag, the place of strength.  
Thence he pounces upon his prey.  
His eyes discern afar off.

Even his young ones drink down blood;  
And wherever is slaughter, there is he.

Alluding to the popular opinion that the eagle assists its feeble young in their flight, by bearing them up on its own pinions, Moses represents Jehovah as saying, "Ye have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself," Exod. xix, 4. Scheuchzer has quoted from an ancient poet, the following beautiful paraphrase on this passage:--

Ac velut alituum princeps, fulvusque tonantis  
Armiger, implumes, et adhuc sine robore natos  
Sollicita refovet cura, pinguisque ferinæ  
Indulget pastus: mox ut cum viribus alæ  
Vesticipes crevere, vocat se blandior aura,  
Expansa invitat pluma, dorsoque morantes  
Excipit, attollitque humeris, plausuque secundo  
Fertur in arva, timens oneri, et tamen impete presso  
Remigium tentans alarum, incurvaque pinnis  
Vela legens, humiles tranat sub nubibus oras.  
Hinc sensim supra alta petit, jam jamque sub astra  
Erigitur, cursusque leves citus urget in auras,

Omnia pervolitans late loca, et agmine fœtus  
Fertque refertque suos vario, moremque volandi  
Addocet: illi autem, longa assuetudine docti,  
Paulatim incipiunt pennis se credere cœlo  
Impavidi: tantum a teneris valet addere curam.

[And as the king of birds, and tawny armour-bearer of the Thunderer, cherishes with anxious care his unfledged, and as yet feeble young, and gratifies their appetite with rich prey: presently when their downy wings have increased in strength, a milder air calls them forth, with expanded plumage he invites them, and receives them hesitating on his back, and sustains them on his shoulders, and with easy flight is borne over the fields, fearing for his burden, and yet with a moderated effort trying the rowing of their wings, and furling with his pinions his curved sails, he glides through the low regions beneath the clouds. Hence by degrees he soars aloft, and now he mounts to the starry heaven, and swiftly urges his rapid flight through the air, sweeping widely over space, and in his gyrations bearing his offspring to and fro, teaches them the art of flying:-- but they, taught by long practice, gradually begin to trust themselves fearlessly on their wings: So much does it avail to train the young with care.]

2. When Balaam delivered his predictions respecting the fate that awaited the nations which he then particularized, he said of the Kenites, "Strong is thy dwelling, and thou puttest thy nest in a rock," Num. xxiv, 21; alluding to that princely bird, the eagle, which not only delights in soaring to the loftiest heights, but chooses the highest rocks, and most elevated mountains, as desirable situations for erecting its nest, Hab. ii, 9; Obad. 4. What Job says concerning the eagle, which is to be understood in a literal sense, "Where the slain are, there is he," our Saviour turns into a fine parable: "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together," Matt. xxiv, 28; that is, Wherever the Jews are, who have corruptly fallen from God, there will be the Romans, who bore the eagle as their standard, to execute vengeance upon them, Luke xvii, 37.

3. The swiftness of the flight of the eagle is alluded to in several passages of Scripture; as, "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from afar, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth," Deut. xxviii, 49. In the affecting lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan, their impetuous and rapid career is described in forcible terms: "They were swifter than eagles; they were stronger than lions," 2 Sam. i, 23. Jeremiah when he beheld in vision the march of Nebuchadnezzar, cried, "Behold, he shall come up as clouds, and his chariots shall be as a whirlwind. His horses are swifter than eagles. Wo unto us, for we are spoiled," Jer. iv, 13. To the wide-expanded wings of the eagle, and the rapidity of his flight, the same prophet

beautifully alludes in a subsequent chapter, where he describes the subversion of Moab by the same ruthless conqueror: "Behold, he shall fly as an eagle, and spread his wings over Moab," Jer. xlvi, 40. In the same manner he describes the sudden desolations of Ammon in the next chapter; but, when he turns his eye to the ruins of his own country, he exclaims, in still more energetic language, "Our persecutors are swifter than the eagles of the heavens," Lament. iv, 19. Under the same comparison the patriarch Job describes the rapid flight of time: "My days are passed away, as the eagle that hasteth to the prey," Job ix, 26. The surprising rapidity with which the blessings of common providence sometimes vanish from the grasp of the possessor is thus described by Solomon: "Riches certainly make themselves wings: they fly away as an eagle toward heaven," Prov. xxiii, 5. The flight of this bird is as sublime as it is rapid and impetuous. None of the feathered race soar so high. In his daring excursions he is said to leave the clouds of heaven, and regions of thunder, and lightning, and tempest, far beneath him, and to approach the very limits of ether. There is an allusion to this lofty soaring in the prophecy of Obadiah, concerning the pride of Moab: "Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring thee down, saith the Lord," Obad. 4. The prophet Jeremiah pronounces the doom of Edom in similar terms: "O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill; though thou shouldest make thy nest high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord," Jer. xlix, 16. The eagle lives and retains its vigour to a great age; and, after moulting, renews its vigour so surprisingly, as to be said, hyperbolically, to become young again, Psalm ciii, 5, and Isaiah xl, 31. It is remarkable that Cyrus, compared, in Isaiah xlvi, 11, to an eagle, (so the word translated "ravenous bird" should be rendered,) had an eagle for his ensign according to Xenophon, who uses, without knowing it, the identical word of the prophet, with only a Greek termination to it: so exact is the correspondence between the prophet and the historian, the prediction and the event. Xenophon and other ancient historians inform us that the golden eagle with extended wings was the ensign of the Persian monarchs long before it was adopted by the Romans; and it is very probable that the Persians borrowed the symbol from the ancient Assyrians, in whose banners it waved, till imperial Babylon bowed her head to the yoke of Cyrus. If this conjecture be well founded, it discovers the reason why the sacred writers, in describing the victorious march of the Assyrian armies, allude so frequently to the expanded eagle. Referring to the Babylonian monarch, the prophet Hosea proclaimed in the ears of all Israel, the measure of whose iniquities was nearly full, "He shall come as an eagle against the house of the Lord," Hosea viii, 1. Jeremiah predicted a similar calamity: "Thus saith the Lord, Behold, he shall fly as an eagle, and spread his wings over Moab," Jer. xlvi, 40; and the same figure was employed to denote the destruction that overtook the house of

Esau: "Behold, he shall come up and fly as the eagle, and spread his wings over Bozrah," xlix, 22. The words of these prophets received a full accomplishment in the irresistible impetuosity and complete success with which the Babylonian monarchs, and particularly Nebuchadnezzar, pursued their plans of conquest. Ezekiel denominates him, with great propriety, "a great eagle with great wings," because he was the most powerful monarch of his time, and led into the field more numerous and better appointed armies, (which the prophet calls, by a beautiful figure, "his wings," the wings of his army,) than perhaps the world had ever seen. The Prophet Isaiah, referring to the same monarch, predicted the subjugation of Judea in these terms: "He shall pass through Judah. He shall overflow, and go over. He shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings" (the array of his army) "shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel," Isaiah viii, 8. The king of Egypt is also styled by Ezekiel, "a great eagle, with great wings, and many feathers;" but he manifestly gives the preference to the king of Babylon, by adding, that he had "long wings, full of feathers, which had divers colours;" that is, greater wealth, and a more numerous army.

EAR, the organ of hearing. The Scripture uses the term figuratively. Uncircumcised ears are ears inattentive to the word of God. To signify God's regard to the prayers of his people, the Psalmist says, "His ears are open to their cry," Psalm xxxiv, 15. Among the Jews, the slave, who renounced the privilege of being made free from servitude in the sabbatical year, submitted to have his ear bored through with an awl; which was done in the presence of some judge, or magistrate, that it might appear a voluntary act. The ceremony took place at his master's door, and was the mark of servitude and bondage. The Psalmist says, in the person of the Messiah, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened." Heb. "Thou hast digged my ears." This either means, Thou hast opened them, removed impediments, and made them attentive; or, thou hast pierced them, as those of such servants were pierced, who chose to remain with their masters; and therefore imports the absolute and voluntary submission of Messiah to the will of the Father. "Make the ears of this people heavy," Isaiah vi, 10; that is, render their minds inattentive and disobedient; the prophets being said often to do that of which they were the innocent occasion.

EAR-RINGS and nose-jewels were favourite ornaments among the eastern females. Both are frequently mentioned in Scripture. Thus the Prophet Ezekiel: "And I put a jewel on thy forehead," or, as it should have been rendered, on thy nose. This ornament was one of the presents which the servant of Abraham gave to Rebecca, in the name of his master: "I put," said he, "the ear-ring upon her face;" more literally, I put the ring on her

nose. They wore ear-rings beside; for the household of Jacob, at his request, when they were preparing to go up to Bethel, gave him all the ear-rings which were in their ears, and he hid them under the oak which was by Shechem. Sir John Chardin says, "It is the custom in almost all the east for the women to wear rings in their noses, in the left nostril, which is bored low down in the middle. These rings are of gold, and have commonly two pearls and one ruby between them, placed in the ring; I never saw a girl, or young woman in Arabia, or in all Persia, who did not wear a ring after this manner in her nostril." Some writers contend, that by the nose-jewel, we are to understand rings, which women attached to their forehead, and let them fall down upon their nose; but Chardin, who certainly was a diligent observer of eastern customs, no where saw this frontal ring in the east, but every where the ring in the nose. His testimony is supported by Dr. Russel, who describes the women in some of the villages about Aleppo, and all the Arabs and Chinganas, (a sort of gipsies,) as wearing a large ring of silver or gold, through the external cartilage of their right nostril. It is worn, by the testimony of Egmont, in the same manner by the women of Egypt. Two words are used in the Scriptures to denote these ornamental rings, נֶזֶם and עֲגִיל. Mr. Harmer seems to think they properly signified ear-rings; but this is a mistake; the sacred writers use them promiscuously for the rings both of the nose and of the ears. That writer, however, is probably right in supposing that nezem is the name of a much smaller ring than agil. Chardin observed two sorts of rings in the east; one so small and close to the ear, that there is no vacuity between them; the other so large, as to admit the fore finger between it and the ear; these last are adorned with a ruby and a pearl on each side, strung on the ring. Some of these ear-rings had figures upon them, and strange characters, which he believed were talismans or charms; but which were probably the names and symbols of their false gods. We know from the testimony of Pliny, that rings with the images of their gods were worn by the Romans. The Indians say, they are preservatives against enchantment; upon which Chardin hazards a very probable conjecture, that the ear-rings of Jacob's family were perhaps of this kind, which might be the reason of his demanding them, that he might bury them under the oak before they went up to Bethel.

EARTH is used for that gross element which sustains and nourishes us by producing plants and fruits; for the continent as distinguished from the sea, "God called the dry land earth," Gen. i, 10; for the terraqueous globe, and its contents, men, animals, plants, metals, waters, &c. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof", Psalm xxiv, 1; for the inhabitants of the earth, or continent, "The whole earth was of one language," Genesis xi, 1; for Judea, or the whole empire of Chaldea and Assyria. Thus Cyrus says, Ezra i, 2, "The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth." The restriction of the term "earth" to Judea is more common in

Scripture than is usually supposed; and this acceptation of it has great effect on several passages, in which it ought to be so understood.

Earth in a moral sense is opposed to heaven, and to what is spiritual. "He that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from above is above all," John iii, 31. "If ye then be risen with Christ, set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth," Col. iii, 1, 2.

**EARTHQUAKE.** The Scripture speaks of several earthquakes. One happened in the twenty-seventh year of Uzziah, king of Judah, in the year of the world 3221. This is mentioned in Amos i, 1, and in Zechariah xiv, 5. Josephus says that its violence divided a mountain, which lay west of Jerusalem, and drove one part of it four furlongs. A very memorable earthquake is that which happened at our Saviour's death, Matt. xxvii, 51. Many have thought that this was perceived throughout the world. Others are of opinion that it was felt only in Judea, or even in the temple at Jerusalem. St. Cyril of Jerusalem says, that the rocks upon mount Calvary were shown in his time, which had been rent asunder by this earthquake. Maundrell and Sandys testify the same, and say that they examined the breaches in the rock, and were convinced that they were the effects of an earthquake. It must have been terrible, since the centurion and those with him were so affected by it, as to acknowledge the innocence of our Saviour, Luke xxiii, 47. Phlegon, Adrian's freedman, relates that, together with the eclipse, which happened at noon day, in the fourth year of the two hundred and second Olympiad, or A. D. 33, a very great earthquake was also felt, principally in Bythynia. The effects of God's power, wrath, and vengeance are compared to earthquakes, Psalm xviii, 7; xlvi, 2; cxiv, 4. An earthquake signifies also, in prophetic language, the dissolution of governments and the overthrow of states.

**EAST,** one of the four cardinal points of the world; namely, that particular point of the horizon in which the sun is seen to rise. The Hebrews express the east, west, north, and south by words which signify before, behind, left, and right, according to the situation of a man who has his face turned toward the east. By the east, they frequently describe, not only Arabia Deserta, and the lands of Moab and Ammon, which lay to the east of Palestine, but also Assyria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and Chaldea, though they are situated rather to the north than to the east of Judea. Balaam, Cyrus, and the wise men who visited Bethlehem at the time Christ was born, are said to come from the east, Num. xxiii, 7; Isaiah xlvi, 11; Matt. ii, 1.

**EASTER,** the day on which the Christian church commemorates our Saviour's resurrection. Easter is a word of Saxon origin, and imports a

goddess of the east. This goddess was Astarte, in honour of whom sacrifices were annually offered about the passover time of the year, the spring; and hence the Saxon name “æaster” became attached by association of ideas to the Christian festival of the resurrection.

EATING. The ancient Hebrews did not eat indifferently with all persons: they would have esteemed themselves polluted and dishonoured by eating with people of another religion, or of an odious profession. In Joseph’s day they neither ate with the Egyptians, nor the Egyptians with them, Gen. xliii, 32; nor, in our Saviour’s time, with the Samaritans, John iv, 9. The Jews were scandalized at Christ’s eating with publicans and sinners, Matt. ix, 11. As there were several sorts of meats, the use of which was prohibited, they could not conveniently eat with those who partook of them, fearing to receive pollution by touching such food, or if by accident any particles of it should fall on them. The ancient Hebrews, at their meals, had each his separate table. Joseph, entertaining his brethren in Egypt, seated them separately, each at his particular table; and he himself sat down separately from the Egyptians, who ate with him; but he sent to his brethren portions out of the provisions which were before him, Gen. xliii, 31, &c. Elkanah, Samuel’s father, who had two wives, distributed their portions to them separately, 1 Sam. i, 4, 5. In Homer, each guest has his little table apart; and the master of the feast distributes meat to each. We are assured that this is still practised in China; and that many in India never eat out of the same dish, nor on the same table, with another person, believing that they cannot do so without sin; and this, not only in their own country, but when travelling, and in foreign lands.

The ancient manners which we see in Homer we see likewise in Scripture, with regard to eating, drinking, and entertainments: we find great plenty, but little delicacy; and great respect and honour paid to the guests by serving them plentifully. Joseph sent his brother Benjamin a portion five times larger than those of his other brethren. Samuel set a whole quarter of a calf before Saul. The women did not appear at table in entertainments with the men: this would have been an indecency; as it is at this day throughout the east. The present Jews, before they sit down to table, carefully wash their hands: they speak of this ceremony as essential and obligatory. After meals they wash them again. When they sit down to table, the master of the house, or the chief person in the company, taking bread, breaks it, but does not wholly separate it; then, putting his hand on it, he recites this blessing: “Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, the King of the world, who producest the bread of the earth.” Those present answer, “Amen.” Having distributed the bread among the guests, he takes the vessel of wine in his right hand, saying, “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the world, who hast produced the fruit of the vine.” They then



repeat the twenty-third Psalm. Buxtorf, and Leo of Modena, who have given particular accounts of the Jewish ceremonies, differ in some circumstances: the reason is, Buxtorf wrote principally the ceremonies of the German Jews, and Leo, those of the Italian Jews. They take care that, after meals, there shall be a piece of bread remaining on the table; the master of the house orders a glass to be washed, fills it with wine, and, elevating it, says, "Let us bless Him of whose benefits we have been partaking:" the rest answer, "Blessed be He who has heaped his favours on us, and by his goodness has now fed us." Then he recites a pretty long prayer, wherein he thanks God for his many benefits vouchsafed to Israel; beseeches him to pity Jerusalem and his temple, to restore the throne of David, to send Elias and the Messiah, to deliver them out of their long captivity, &c. All present answer, "Amen;" and then recite Psalm xxxiv, 9, 10. Then, giving the glass with the little wine in it to be drunk round, he drinks what is left, and the table is cleared. See Banquets.

Partaking of the benefits of Christ's passion by faith is also called eating, because this is the support of our spiritual life, John vi, 53, 56. Hosea reproaches the priests of his time with eating the sins of the people, Hosea iv, 8; that is, feasting on their sin offerings, rather than reforming their manners. John the Baptist is said to have come "neither eating nor drinking," Matt. xi, 18; that is, as other men did; for he lived in the wilderness, on locusts, wild honey, and water, Matt. iii, 4; Luke i, 15. This is expressed, in Luke vii, 33, by his neither eating "bread," nor drinking "wine." On the other hand, the Son of Man is said, in Matt. xi, 19, to have come "eating and drinking;" that is, as others did; and that too with all sorts of persons, Pharisees, publicans, and sinners.

EBAL, a celebrated mountain in the tribe of Ephraim, near Shechem, over against Mount Gerizim. These two mountains are within two hundred paces of each other, and separated by a deep valley, in which stood the town of Shechem. The two mountains are much alike in magnitude and form, being of a semi-circular figure, about half a league in length, and, on the sides nearest Shechem, nearly perpendicular. One of them is barren; the other, covered with a beautiful verdure. Moses commanded the Israelites, as soon as they should have passed the river Jordan, to go directly to Shechem, and divide the whole multitude into two bodies, each composed of six tribes; one company to be placed on Ebal, and the other on Gerizim. The six tribes that were on Gerizim were to pronounce blessings on those who should faithfully observe the law of the Lord, and the six others on Mount Ebal were to pronounce curses against those who should violate it, Deut. xi, 29, &c; xxvii, and xxviii; Joshua viii, 30, 31.

This consecration of the Hebrew commonwealth is thought to have been performed in the following manner: The heads of the first six tribes went up to the top of Mount Gerizim, and the heads of the other six tribes to the top of Mount Ebal. The priests, with the ark, and Joshua at the head of the elders of Israel, took their station in the middle of the valley which lies between the two mountains. The Levites ranged themselves in a circle about the ark; and the elders, with the people, placed themselves at the foot of the mountain, six tribes on a side. When they were thus disposed in order, the priests turned toward Mount Gerizim, on the top of which were the six heads of the six tribes who were at the foot of the same mountain, and pronounced, for example, these words:--"Blessed be the man that maketh not any graven images." The six princes who were upon the top of the mountain, and the six tribes who were below at its foot, answered, "Amen." Afterward, the priests, turning toward Mount Ebal, upon which were the princes of the other six tribes, cried, with a loud voice, "Cursed be the man that maketh any graven image;" and were answered by the princes opposite to them and their tribes, "Amen." The Scripture, at first view, seems to intimate that there were six tribes upon one mountain, and six on the other; but beside that it is by no means probable that the tribes of the Israelites, who were so numerous, should be able to stand on the summits of these two mountains, it would not have been possible for them to have seen the ceremony, nor to have heard the blessings and curses in order to answer them. Moreover, the Hebrew participle, in the original, signifies, near, over against, as well as at the top, Joshua viii, 33. Accordingly, we may say, that neither Joshua, nor the priests or tribes, went up to the top of the mountains, but the heads only, who in their persons might represent all the tribes.

EBENEZER, the name of that field wherein the Israelites were defeated by the Philistines, when the ark of the Lord was taken, 1 Sam. iv, 1; also a memorial stone set up by Samuel to commemorate a victory over the Philistines. The word signifies the stone of help; and it was erected by the prophet, saying, "Hitherto the Lord hath helped us."

EBIONITES, a sect of the first two or three centuries; but it is not certain whether they received their name from a leader of the name of Ebion, (whom Dr. Lardner considers as a disciple of Cerinthus,) or from the meaning of the Hebrew word ebion, which implies poverty; and if the latter, whether they assumed the name, as affecting to be poor, like the Founder of Christianity; or whether it was conferred on them by way of reproach, as being of the lower orders. The use of the term, also, according to Dr. Horsley, was various and indefinite. Sometimes it was the peculiar name of those sects that denied both the divinity of our Lord, and his miraculous conception. Then its meaning was extended, to take in another

party; who admitted the miraculous conception of Jesus, but still denied his divinity, and questioned his previous existence. At last, it seems, the Nazarites, whose error was rather a superstitious severity in their practice, than any deficiency in their faith, were included by Origen in the infamy of the appellation. Dr. Priestley, claiming the Ebionites as Jewish Unitarians, considers the ancient Nazarenes, that is, the first Jewish converts, as the true Ebionites; these, he thinks, were called Nazarenes, from their attachment to Jesus of Nazareth; and Ebionites, from their poor and mean condition, just as some of the reformers were called Beghards, or beggars. The Doctor cites the authorities of Origen and Epiphanius, to prove that both these denominations related to the same people, differing only, like the Socinians, in receiving or rejecting the fact of the miraculous conception; and neither, as he assures us, were reckoned heretics by any writers of the two first centuries. To this Dr. Horsley replies, that both Jews and Heathens called the first Christians Nazarenes, in allusion to the mean and obscure birthplace of their Master, Jesus of Nazareth, Matthew ii, 23; Acts x, 38; but insists, and answers every pretended proof to the contrary, that the term Nazarenes was never applied to any distinct sect of Christians before the final destruction of Jerusalem by Adrian. Dr. Semler, a German writer, gives the following opinion: "Those who more rigidly maintained the Mosaic observances, and who were numerous in Palestine, are usually called Ebionites and Nasaræans. Some believe that they ought not to be reckoned heretics; others think that they were united in doctrine, differing only in name; others place them in the second century. It is of little consequence whether we distinguish or not the Nazarenes, or Nazaræans from the Ebionites. It is certain that both these classes were tenacious of the Mosaic ceremonies, and more inclined to the Jews than to the Gentiles, though they admitted the Messiahship of Jesus in a very low and Judaizing manner. The Ebionites held in execration the doctrine of the Apostle Paul." Dr. J. Pye Smith, who quotes this passage from Dr. Semler, adds, "Such, it is apprehended, on grounds of reasonable probability, was the origin of Unitarianism; the child of Judaism misunderstood, and of Christianity imperfectly received."

2. On this controversy great light has, however, been since thrown by Dr. Burton. It is well known to those who have studied the Unitarian controversy, that it has been often asserted that the Cerinthians and Ebionites were the teachers of genuine Christianity, and that the doctrine of Christ's divinity, and of universal redemption through his blood, were the inventions of those who corrupted the preaching of the Apostles. If this were so, we must convict all the fathers, not merely of ignorance and mistake, but of deliberate and wilful falsehood. To suppose that the fathers of the second century were ignorant of what was genuine and what was false in Christianity, would be a bold hypothesis; but if Irenæus, the

disciple of Polycarp, asserted, as a matter of fact, that St. John wrote his Gospel to refute the errors of Cerinthus, it is idle, or something worse, to say that Irenæus did not know for certain if the fact was really so. As far, then, as the testimony of the fathers is concerned, the Cerinthians and Ebionites were decidedly heretics. The Unitarians, on the other hand, maintain that the Ebionites were the true and genuine believers; and it is easy to see that the preference was given to these teachers, because they held that Jesus was born of human parents. Never, I conceive, was there a more unfortunate and fatal alliance formed than that between the Ebionites and modern Unitarians. We find the Ebionites referred to, as if they agreed in every point with the Socinian or Unitarian creed; and yet it may almost be asserted, that in not one single point do their sentiments exactly coincide. If a real Ebionite will declare himself, we are not afraid to meet him. Let him avow his faith; let him believe of Christ as Ebion or Cerinthus taught; let him adopt the ravings of the Gnostics; we shall then know with whom we have to combat; we may gird on the sword of Irenæus, and meet him in the field. But let him not select a few ingredients only from the poison; let him not take a part only of their infatuated system. If he will lean on that broken reed, let him talk no more of Ebion or Cerinthus only; but let him say boldly, either that the Gnostics agreed with the Apostles, or that the Gnostics preached the true Gospel, while the Apostles were in error.

3. We can hardly suppose the Unitarians to be ignorant that the Ebionites and Cerinthians were a branch of the Gnostics. If the fact be denied, the whole of this discussion might as well at once be closed. We know nothing of Cerinthus and Ebion, but from the writings of the fathers. If it had not been for them, we should never have known that these persons believed Jesus to be born of human parents: the same fathers unanimously add, that in this point they differed from the preceding Gnostics, though agreeing with them on other points. If we are to receive the testimony of the fathers in one particular, but to reject it in every other, I need not say that argument is useless. But the fact can never be denied nor evaded. The Cerinthians, to whom some Unitarians have appealed, did not ascribe the creation of the world to God, but to an inferior being. Like the rest of the Gnostics, who engrafted that philosophy on Judaism, the Cerinthians and Ebionites retained some of the Jewish ceremonies, though they rejected some of the Jewish Scriptures. Many of them taught that the restraints of morality were useless; and the Cerinthians, it is well known, promised to their followers a millennium of sensual indulgence. With respect to their notions concerning Christ, it is true that they believed Jesus to be born of human parents; and this fact is referred to, as if it proved the falsehood of what is called the miraculous conception of Jesus. But it is plain that this tenet is mentioned by the fathers, as being opposed to that of the other Gnostics,

who held that the body of Jesus was an illusive phantom. Such had hitherto been the belief of all the Gnostics. But Cerinthus and Ebion, who were perhaps more rational in their speculations, and who lived after the publication of the three first Gospels, could not resist the evidence that Jesus was actually born, and that he had a real, substantial body. This is the meaning of the statement, that Cerinthus and Ebion believed Jesus to be born of human parents. It shows that they were not Docetæ. But because there were other Gnostics who were more irrational and visionary than themselves, we are not immediately to infer that their own notion concerning the birth of Christ was the true one. They believed, at least, many of them believed, that Jesus was born in the ordinary way; that Joseph was his parent as well as Mary. But they could hardly help believing so; for they agreed with all the Gnostics in thinking (though it might seem as if this point had been forgotten) that Jesus and Christ were separate persons: they believed, as I have already stated, that Christ descended upon Jesus at his baptism, and quitted him before his crucifixion. They were therefore almost compelled to believe that Jesus, who was wholly distinct from Christ, had nothing divine in his nature, and nothing miraculous in his birth; in the same manner that they believed that the death of Jesus, from whom Christ had then departed, was like the death of any ordinary mortal, and that no atonement was made by it. But are we on these grounds to reject the miraculous conception and the atonement of Christ? Or are the Unitarians to quote these Gnostics as holding the human nature of Jesus, and to forget that by Jesus they meant a person wholly different from Christ?

4. We are told, indeed, that the first part of St. Matthew's Gospel is spurious, because the Ebionites rejected it. Undoubtedly they did. They read in it that Jesus Christ was born, not Jesus only; and that he was born of a virgin. They therefore rejected this part of St. Matthew's Gospel; or rather, by mutilating and altering the whole of it, they composed a new gospel of their own to suit their purpose; and yet this is the only authority which is quoted for rejecting the commencement of St. Matthew's Gospel. The fact, that some even of the Ebionites believed the miraculous conception, speaks infinitely more in favour of the genuineness of that part of the Gospel, and of the truth of the doctrine itself, than can be inferred on the contrary side from those who denied the doctrine, and mutilated the Gospel. Those other Ebionites appear in this respect to have agreed with the first Socinians, and to have held that Jesus was born of a virgin, though they did not believe in his preëxistence or divinity. But the miraculous conception was so entirely contrary to all preconceived opinions, and the more simple doctrine of the other Ebionites and Cerinthians was so much more suited to the Gnostic system, which separated Jesus from Christ, that the evidence must have been almost irresistible, which led one part of the

Ebionites to embrace a doctrine contrary to all experience, contrary to the sentiments of their brethren, and hardly reconcilable with other parts of their own creed. The testimony, therefore, of these Ebionites, in favour of the miraculous conception, is stronger, perhaps, than even that of persons who received the whole of the Gospel, and departed in no points from the doctrine of the Apostles. If the Apostles had preached, according to the statement of the Unitarians, that Jesus Christ was a mere human being, born in the ordinary way, what could possibly have led the Gnostics to rank him immediately with their Æons, whom they believed to have been produced by God, and to have dwelt with him from endless ages in the pleroma? There literally was not one single heretic in the first century, who did not believe that Christ came down from heaven: they invented, it is true, various absurdities to account for his union with the man Jesus; but the fair and legitimate inference from this fact would be, that the Apostles preached that in some way or other the human nature was united to the divine. So far from the Socinian or Unitarian doctrine being supported by that of the Cerinthians and Ebionites, I have no hesitation in saying, that not one single person is recorded in the whole of the first century who ever imagined that Christ was a mere man. It has been observed, that one branch of the Ebionites resembled the first Socinians, that is, they believed in the miraculous conception of Jesus, though they denied his preëxistence; but this was because they held the common notion of the Gnostics, that Jesus and Christ were two separate persons; and they believed in the preëxistence and divine nature of Christ, which Socinus and his followers uniformly denied.

ECBATANA, a city of Media, which, according to Herodotus, was built by Dejoces, king of the Medes. It was situated on a gentle declivity, distant twelve stadia from Mount Orontes, and was in compass one hundred and fifty stadia, and, next to Nineveh and Babylon, was one of the strongest and most beautiful cities of the east. After the union of Media with Persia, it was the summer residence of the Persian kings. Sir R. K. Porter, in his Travels, says, "Having for a few moments gazed at the venerable mountain, (Orontes, at the foot of which Ecbatana was built,) and at the sad vacuum at its base; what had been Ecbatana, being now shrunk to comparative nothingness; I turned my eye on the still busy scene of life which occupied the adjacent country; the extensive plain of Hamadan, and its widely extending hills. On our right, the receding vale was varied, at short distances, with numberless castellated villages rising from amidst groves of the noblest trees; while the great plain itself stretched northward and eastward to such far remoteness, that its mountain boundaries appeared like clouds upon the horizon. This whole tract seemed one carpet of luxuriant verdure, studded with hamlets, and watered by beautiful rivulets. On the south-west, Orontes, or Elwund, (by whichever name we may designate

this most towering division of the mountain,) presents itself, in all the stupendous grandeur of its fame and form. Near to its base, appear the dark coloured dwellings of Hamadan, crowded thickly on each other; while the gardens of the inhabitants with their connecting orchards and woods, fringe the entire slope of that part of the mountain.” “The site of the modern town, like that of the ancient, is on a gradual ascent, terminating near the foot of the eastern side of the mountain; but there all trace of its past appearance would cease, were it not for two or three considerable elevations, and overgrown irregularities on and near them, which may have been the walls of the royal fortress, with those of the palaces, temples, and theatres, seen no more. I passed one of these heights, standing to the south-west, as I entered the city, and observed that it bore many vestiges of having been strongly fortified. The sides and summit are covered with large remnants of ruined walls of a great thickness, and also of towers, the materials of which were sun-dried bricks. It has the name of the Inner Fortress, and certainly holds the most commanding station near the plain.” Of the interior of the city, the same author says, “The mud alleys, which now occupy the site of the ancient streets or squares, are narrow, interrupted by large holes or hollows in the way, and heaps of the fallen crumbled walls of deserted dwellings. A miserable bazaar or two are passed through in traversing the town; and large lonely spots are met with, marked by broken low mounds over older ruins; with here and there a few poplars, or willow trees, shadowing the border of a dirty stream, abandoned to the meanest uses; which, probably, flowed pellucid and admired, when these places were gardens, and the grass-grown heap some stately dwelling of Ecbatana. In one or two spots I observed square platforms, composed of large stones; the faces of many of which were chiselled all over into the finest arabesque fretwork, while others had, in addition, long inscriptions in the Arabic character. They had evidently been tomb-stones of the inhabitants, during the caliph rule in Persia. But when we compare relics of the seventh century, with the deep antiquity of the ruins on which they lie, these monumental remains seem but the register of yesterday.” Here is shown the tomb of Mordecai and Esther; as well as that of Avicenna, the celebrated Arabian physician. The sepulchre of the former stands near the centre of the city of Hamadan: the tombs are covered by a dome, on which is the following inscription in Hebrew: “This day, 15th of the month Adar, in the year 4474 from the creation of the world, was finished the building of this temple over the graves of Mordecai and Esther, by the hands of the good-hearted brothers, Elias and Samuel, the sons of the deceased Ismael of Kashan.” This inscription, the date of which proves the dome to have been built eleven hundred years, was sent by Sir Gore Ouseley to Sir John Malcolm, who has given it in his History of Persia; who also says that the tombs, which are of a black coloured wood, are evidently of very great antiquity, but in good preservation, as the wood has not perished, and the

inscriptions are still very legible. Sir R. K. Porter has given a more particular description of this tomb. He says, "I accompanied the priest through the town, over much ruin and rubbish, to an enclosed piece of ground, rather more elevated than any in its immediate vicinity. In the centre was the Jewish tomb; a square building of brick, of a mosque-like form, with a rather elongated dome at the top. The whole seems in a very decaying state, falling fast to the mouldering condition of some wall fragments around, which, in former times, had been connected with, and extended the consequence of, the sacred enclosure. The door that admitted us into the tomb, is in the ancient sepulchral fashion of the country, very small; consisting of a small stone of great thickness, and turning on its own pivots from one side. Its key is always in possession of the head of the Jews resident at Hamadan." "On passing through the little portal, which we did in an almost doubled position, we entered a small arched chamber, in which are seen the graves of several rabbies: probably, one may cover the remains of the pious Ismael; and, not unlikely, the others may contain the bodies of the first rebuilders after the sacrilegious destruction by Timour. Having 'trod lightly by their graves,' a second door of such very confined dimensions presented itself at the end of this vestibule, we were constrained to enter it on our hands and knees, and then standing up, we found ourselves in a larger chamber, to which appertained the dome. Immediately under its concave, stand two sarcophagi, made of a very dark wood, carved with great intricacy of pattern, and richness of twisted ornament, with a line of inscription in Hebrew running round the upper ledge of each. Many other inscriptions, in the same language, are cut on the walls; while one of the oldest antiquity, engraved on a slab of white marble, is let into the wall itself." This inscription is as follows: "Mordecai, beloved and honoured by a king, was great and good. His garments were as those of a sovereign. Ahasuerus covered him with this rich dress, and also placed a golden chain around his neck. The city of Susa rejoiced at his honours, and his high fortune became the glory of the Jews." The inscription which encompasses the sarcophagus of Mordecai, is to this effect: "It is said by David, Preserve me, O God! I am now in thy presence. I have cried at the gate of heaven, that thou art my God; and what goodness I have received from thee, O Lord! Those whose bodies are now beneath in this earth, when animated by thy mercy were great; and whatever happiness was bestowed upon them in this world, came from thee, O God! Their grief and sufferings were many, at the first; but they became happy, because they always called upon thy holy name in their miseries. Thou liftedst me up, and I became powerful. Thine enemies sought to destroy me, in the early times of my life; but the shadow of thy hand was upon me, and covered me, as a tent, from their wicked purposes!--Mordecai." The following is the corresponding inscription on the sarcophagus of Esther: "I praise thee, O God, that thou hast created me! I know that my sins merit



punishment, yet I hope for mercy at thy hands; for whenever I call upon thee, thou art with me; thy holy presence secures me from all evil. My heart is at ease, and my fear of thee increases. My life became, through thy goodness, at the last, full of peace. O God, do not shut my soul out from thy divine presence! Those whom thou lovest, never feel the torments of hell. Lead me, O merciful Father, to the life of life; that I may be filled with the heavenly fruits of paradise!--Esther." The Jews at Hamadan have no tradition of the cause of Esther and Mordecai having been interred at that place; but however that might be, there are sufficient reasons for believing the validity of their interment in this spot. The strongest evidence we can have of the truth of any historical fact, is, its commemoration by an annual festival. It is well known, that several important events in Jewish history are thus celebrated; and among the rest, the feast of Purim is kept on the 13th and 14th of the month Adar, to commemorate the deliverance obtained by the Jews, at the intercession of Esther, from the general massacre ordered by Ahasuerus, and the slaughter they were permitted to make of their enemies. Now on this same festival, in the same day and month, Jewish pilgrims resort from all quarters to the sepulchre of Mordecai and Esther; and have done so for centuries,--a strong presumptive proof that the tradition of their burial in this place rests on some authentic foundation.

ECCLESIASTES, a canonical book of the Old Testament, of which Solomon was the author, as appears from the first sentence. The design of this book is to show the vanity of all sublunary things; and from a review of the whole, the author draws this pertinent conclusion, "Fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is the whole of man;"--his whole wisdom, interest, and happiness, as well as his whole duty. Ecclesiastes, according to a modern author, is a dialogue, in which a man of piety disputes with a libertine who favoured the opinion of the Sadducees. His reason is, that there are passages in it which seem to contradict each other, and could not, he thinks, proceed from the same person. But this may be accounted for by supposing that it was Solomon's method to propose the objections of infidels and sensualists, and then to reply to them.

ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY, the rules by which churches are governed, as to their spiritual concerns. The reformers having renounced the pope as antichrist, and having laid it down as their fundamental principle, that Scripture is the only rule of faith, and that it is the privilege of every man to interpret it according to his own judgment, had to consider in what manner the churches which they had formed were to be regulated; and there soon arose among them upon this point diversity of sentiment. Melancthon and the earliest reformers viewed with veneration the hierarchy which had so long subsisted, as also many of the ceremonies which for ages had been

observed; and they expressed their readiness to continue that distinction of pastors which their researches into the history of the church had enabled them to trace back to the early ages of Christianity. But while they declared in favour of this form of ecclesiastical polity, they did so, not upon the ground that it was of divine institution, or positively required by the author of Christianity as inseparable from a church; but on the ground, that taking into estimation every thing connected with it, it appeared to them eminently adapted to carry into effect that renovation of piety, and that religious influence, which they were so eager to promote. They thus made ecclesiastical polity a matter of expediency, or of prudential regulation; the one thing in their view, binding upon all Christians, being to strengthen the practical power of religion. That this is a just representation of the state of opinion among the first Protestants, will be placed beyond a doubt by a few quotations from the confession of Augsburg, and from the works of some of the most eminent divines who then flourished. Speaking of this subject, the compilers of the confession declare, "that they were most desirous to preserve the ecclesiastical polity, and those degrees in the church which had been introduced by human authority, knowing that, for wise and good purposes, the discipline, as described in the canons, had been introduced by the fathers." "We wish," they add, "to testify that we would willingly preserve the ecclesiastical and canonical polity, if the bishops would cease to act with cruelty against our churches." And once again they remark, that they had often declared that they venerated not only the ecclesiastical power which was instituted in the Gospel, but that they approved of the ecclesiastical polity which had subsisted, and wished, as much as was in their power, to preserve it. It is quite plain from these passages, that the framers of that confession, and those who adhered to it as the standard of their faith, viewed ecclesiastical polity as a matter of human appointment; and that, although they venerated that form of it which had long existed, they looked upon themselves as at liberty, under peculiar circumstances, to depart from it. The truth, accordingly, is, that a great part of the Lutheran churches, as we shall afterward find, did introduce many deviations from that model for which their founders had expressed respect and admiration; although episcopacy was in several places continued.

2. In consequence, however, of the exertions of Calvin, what were denominated the reformed churches deemed it expedient wholly to change this form of polity, and to introduce again the equality among pastors which had existed in the primitive times. That celebrated theologian, resting upon the undisputed fact, that in the Apostolic age no distinction subsisted between bishops and presbyters, thought himself at liberty to frame a system of polity upon this principle, persuaded that, by doing so, he would most effectually guard against those abuses that had given rise to the Papal tyranny which Protestants had abjured. He accordingly introduced his

scheme where he had influence to do so; and he employed all the vigour of his talents in pressing upon distant churches the propriety of regulating, in conformity with his sentiments, their ecclesiastical government. But, while he was firmly persuaded that an equality among pastors was agreeable to the Apostolic practice, he has shown that he did not conceive this equality to be so absolutely required by Scripture, that there could in no case be a departure from it. He was, in fact, convinced that all the purposes of religion might be accomplished under a form of polity in which it was not recognised: "Wherever," he says, "the preaching of the Gospel is heard with reverence, and the sacraments are not neglected, there at that time there is a church." Speaking of faithful pastors, he describes them to be "those who by the doctrine of Christ lead men to true piety, who properly administer the sacred mysteries, and who preserve and exercise right discipline." In tracing the progress of the 325hierarchy, he observes, that "those to whom the office of teaching was assigned were denominated presbyters; that to avoid the dissensions often arising among equals, they chose one of their number to preside, to whom the title of bishop was exclusively given; and that the practice, as the ancients admitted, was introduced by human consent, from the necessity of the times." That this exaltation of the bishop, and, of course, this departure from parity, did not, in his estimation, render the church unchristian, is apparent from what he says of it after the change was introduced: "Such was the severity of these times, that all the ministers were led to discharge their duty as the Lord required of them." Even after archbishops and patriarchs had arisen, he merely says, in recording their introduction, "This arrangement was calculated to preserve discipline."

3. What Calvin thus taught in his "Institutes," he confirmed in many of the interesting letters which he wrote to various eminent persons. In these letters he speaks with the highest respect of the church of England, where the distinction of clerical orders was preserved. He corresponds with the highest dignitaries of that church in a style which he assuredly would not have adopted, had he considered them as upholding an antichristian polity; and he repeatedly avows the principle, that, in regulating the government of the church, attention must be paid to the circumstances in which its members were placed. Beza, who was warmly attached to presbytery, and who upon every occasion, strenuously defended it, still admits that the human order of episcopacy was useful, as long as the bishops were good; and he professes all reverence for those modern bishops who strive to imitate the primitive ones in the reformation of the church according to the word of God: adding that it was a calumny against him, and those who entertained his sentiments, to affirm, as some had done, that they wished to prescribe their form of government to all other churches. In the excellent letter which he addressed to Grindal, bishop of London, and in which he

pleads the cause of those ministers who scrupled to use the ceremonies which their brethren approved, he bears his testimony to the conformity of the church of England in doctrine with his church, expresses himself with the highest respect of the prelate to whom he was writing, and concludes by asking his prayers in his own behalf, and in that of the church of Geneva; all of which is quite inconsistent with the tenet, that presbytery is absolutely prescribed by divine authority.

4. The same general principle was avowed by the most eminent English divines. Cranmer explicitly declared, that bishops and priests were of the same order at the commencement of Christianity; and this was the opinion of several of his distinguished contemporaries. Holding this maxim, their support of episcopacy must have proceeded from views of expediency, or, in some instances, from a conviction which prevailed very generally at this early period, that it belonged to the supreme civil magistrate to regulate the spiritual no less than the political government; an idea involving in it that no one form of ecclesiastical polity is of divine institution. At a later period, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, we find the same conviction, that it was no violation of Christianity to choose different modes of administering the church. Archbishop Whitgift, who distinguished himself by the zeal with which he supported the English hierarchy, frequently maintains, that the form of discipline is not particularly, and by name, set down in Scripture; and he also plainly asserts, "that no form of church government is, by the Scriptures, prescribed or commanded to the church of God." This principle is admirably illustrated and confirmed by the venerable Hooker, in the third book of his work on ecclesiastical polity; and another divine of the English church, who lived about the same period, has laid down what he conceives to be an unquestionable position, "that all churches have not the same form of discipline; neither is it necessary that they should, because it cannot be proved that any particular form of church government is enjoined by the word of God." We have, indeed, a succession of testimonies from the introduction of the reformation down through the reign of Elizabeth,--testimonies given by the primates, and bishops, and theologians, who have been venerated as the luminaries of the church of England, that the divine right or institution of episcopacy constituted no part of their faith; and this is confirmed by their correspondence with reformed divines, who did not live under the episcopal model, but who, notwithstanding, were often consulted as to the ecclesiastical arrangements which the convocation should adopt. The same general sentiment is to be traced in those churches which had reverted to the primitive equality among the ministers of Christ. In the second Helvetic confession, which was approved by many churches, it is taught, that bishops and presbyters in the beginning governed the church with equal power, none exalting himself above another; the inequality which soon was introduced

originating from the desire of preserving order. Various passages from Cyprian and Jerom are quoted in confirmation of this; and the article thus concludes: "Wherefore no one can be lawfully hindered from returning to the ancient constitution of the church of God, and to adopt it in preference to what custom has introduced." Had the compilers believed that this ancient constitution was of divine obligation, they would have expressed themselves much more strongly with respect to it; and instead of representing the return to it as what ought not to be hindered, they would have enjoined it, as what it was a violation of the law of God to neglect.

5. The reformation in Scotland, conducted by Knox, who had spent a considerable part of his life at Geneva, and who had imbibed the opinions of Calvin, proceeded upon those views of polity which that reformer had adopted. Still, however, he authorized a modification of these opinions, accommodated to the state of his native country; for although the title of bishop was not used, superintendents, with powers little inferior to those committed to prelates in England, were sanctioned by the first Book of Discipline; and these superintendents were classed, in the acts of different general assemblies, among the necessary ministers of the church. The necessity must have arisen out of the circumstances of the period when the book was framed; for the polity which it prescribed was said to be only for a time; and the office of superintendent, as has been strenuously urged by some of the most zealous defenders of presbytery, was not intended to be permanent. The Lutheran church, with the exception of those branches of it established in Denmark and Sweden, has adopted a kind of intermediate constitution between episcopacy and presbytery. While it holds that there is no divine law creating a distinction among ministers, it yet contends that such a distinction is on many accounts expedient; and accordingly a diversity in point of rank and privileges has been universally introduced, approaching in different places, more or less, to the hierarchy which subsisted before the reformation. But, although it has thus regulated its own practice, it unambiguously admits, that as the Gospel is silent as to any particular form of polity, different forms may be chosen, without any breach of Christian union.

6. It appears from the statement which has now been given, that all Protestants immediately after the reformation, while they abjured the papal supremacy, were united in holding that the mode of administering the church might be varied, some of them being attached to episcopacy, others to presbytery; but all founding this attachment upon the judgment which they had formed as to the tendency or utility of either of these modes of government. An idea soon was avowed by some of the reformers, that the whole regulation of the church pertained to the magistrate; this branch of power being vested in him no less than that of administering the civil

government; and to this opinion the name of Erastianism, from Erastus, who first defended it, was given. Cranmer, in an official reply which he made to certain questions that had been submitted for his consideration, declared, "that the civil ministers under the king's majesty be those that shall please his highness for the time to put in authority under him; as, for example, the lord chancellor, lord great master, &c; the ministers of God's word under his majesty be the bishops, parsons, vicars, and such other priests as be appointed by his highness to that ministration; as, for example, the bishop of Canterbury, &c. All the said officers and ministers, as well of the one sort as the other, be appointed, assigned, and elected in every place by the laws and orders of kings and princes." By the great majority of Protestants, however, the tenets of Erastus were condemned; for they maintained that the Lord Jesus had conveyed to his church a spiritual power quite distinct from the temporal; and that it belonged to the ministers of religion to exercise it, for promoting the spiritual welfare of the Christian community. But, while they disputed as to this point, they agreed in admitting there was no model prescribed in the New Testament for a Christian church, as there had been in the Mosaical economy for the Jewish church; and that it was a branch of the liberty of the disciples of Christ, or one of their privileges, to choose the polity which seemed to them best adapted for extending the power and influence of religion.

ECLECTICS, a sect of ancient philosophers, who professed to select whatever was good and true from all the other philosophical sects. The Eclectic philosophy was in a flourishing state at Alexandria when our Saviour was upon earth. Its founders formed the design of selecting from the doctrines of all former philosophers such opinions as seemed to approach nearest the truth, and of combining them into one system. They held Plato in the highest esteem; but did not scruple to join with his doctrines whatever they thought conformable to reason in the tenets of other philosophers. Potamon, a Platonist, appears to have been the projector of this plan. The Eclectic system was brought to perfection by Ammonius Saccas, who blended Christianity with his philosophy, and founded the sect of the Ammonians, or New Platonists, in the second century. The moral doctrine of the Alexandrian school was as follows:-- The mind of man, originally a portion of the Divine Being, having fallen into a state of darkness and defilement, by its union with the body, is to be gradually emancipated from the chains of matter, and rise by contemplation to the knowledge and vision of God. The end of philosophy, therefore, is the liberation of the soul from its corporeal imprisonment. For this purpose, the Eclectic philosophy recommends abstinence, with other voluntary mortifications, and religious exercises. In the infancy of the Alexandrian school, not a few of the professors of Christianity were led, by the pretensions of the Eclectic sect, to imagine that a coalition might, with

great advantage, be formed between its system and that of Christianity. This union appeared the more desirable, when several philosophers of this sect became converts to the Christian faith. The consequence was, that Pagan ideas and opinions were by degrees mixed with the pure and simple doctrines of the Gospel. See Platonism.

ECLIPSE. The word eclipse, ἔκλειψις, signifies failure, namely, of light. An eclipse of the sun is caused by the intervention of the moon, at new, or in conjunction with the sun, intercepting his light from the earth, either totally or partially. An eclipse of the moon is caused by the intervention of the earth, intercepting the sun's light from the moon, when full, or in opposition to the sun, either totally or partially. The reason why the sun is not eclipsed every new moon, nor the moon at every full, is owing to the inclination of the moon's orbit to the plane of the ecliptic, or earth's orbit, in an angle of about five degrees and a half; in consequence of which, the moon is generally too much elevated above the plane of the ecliptic, or too much depressed below it, for her disk to touch the earth's shadow at full, or for her shadow, or her penumbra, to touch the earth's disk at new. An eclipse, therefore, of either luminary can only take place when they are within their proper limits, or distances, from the nodes or intersections of both orbits. And because the limits of solar eclipses are wider than those of lunar, in general there will be more eclipses of the sun than of the moon. In any year, the number of eclipses of both luminaries cannot be less than two, and these will both be of the sun, nor more than seven: the usual number is four; and it is very rare to have more than six. But though solar eclipses happen oftener, lunar are more frequently observed in any particular place. For an eclipse of the moon is visible to the inhabitants of half the globe at the same instant; whereas, an eclipse of the sun is visible only within that part of the earth's surface, traversed by the moon's total shadow, and by her penumbra, or partial shadow. But her total shadow, when she is nearest to the earth, cannot cover a space of more than a hundred and fifty-eight geographical miles in diameter, nor at her mean distance more than seventy-nine, and at her greatest distance may not touch the earth at all. In the two former cases, the sun will be eclipsed in the places covered by the shadow totally, or by the penumbra partially: in the last it may be annular, but not total. Without the reach of the shadow, and within the limits of the penumbra, which cannot cover more than four thousand five hundred and fifty-two miles of the earth's surface, there will be a partial eclipse of the sun, and without these limits no eclipse at all. Hence lunar eclipses are more frequently noticed by historians than solar; and Diogenes Laertius may be credited when he relates, that, during the period in which the Egyptians had observed eight hundred and thirty-two eclipses of the moon, they had only observed three hundred and seventy-three of the sun. In the midst of a total lunar eclipse, the moon's disk is

frequently visible, and of a deep red or copperish colour. This, in the poetic language of sacred prophecy, is expressed by “the moon’s being turned into blood,” Joel ii, 31. This remarkable phenomenon is caused by the sun’s lateral rays in their passage through the dense atmosphere of the earth, being inflected into the shadow by refraction, and falling pretty copiously upon the moon’s disk, are reflected from thence to the eye of the spectator. If the earth had no atmosphere, the moon’s disk would then be as black as in a solar eclipse. A total eclipse of the moon may occasion a privation of her light for an hour and a half, during her total immersion in the shadow; whereas, a total eclipse of the sun can never last in any particular place above four minutes, when the moon is nearest to the earth, and her shadow thickest. Hence it appears, that the darkness which “overspread the whole land of Judea,” at the time of our Lord’s crucifixion, was preternatural, “from the sixth until the ninth hour,” or from noon till three in the afternoon, in its duration, and also in its time, about full moon, when the moon could not possibly eclipse the sun. It was accompanied by an earthquake, which altogether struck the spectators, and among them the centurion and Roman guard, with great fear, and a conviction, that Jesus was the Son of God, Matt, xxvii, 51–54.

Eclipses, says Dr. Hales, are justly reckoned among the surest and most unerring characters of chronology; for they can be calculated with great exactness backward as well as forward; and there is such a variety of distinct circumstances of the time when, and the place where, they were seen; of the duration, or beginning, middle, or end of every eclipse, and of the quantity, or number of digits eclipsed; that there is no danger of confounding any two eclipses together, when the circumstances attending each are noticed with any tolerable degree of precision. Thus, to an eclipse of the moon incidentally noticed by the great Jewish chronologer, Josephus, shortly before the death of Herod the Great, we owe the determination of the true year of our Saviour’s nativity. During Herod’s last illness, and not many days before his death, there happened an eclipse of the moon on the very night that he burned alive Matthias, and the ringleaders of a sedition, in which the golden eagle, which he had consecrated and set up over the gate of the temple, was pulled down and broken to pieces by these zealots. This eclipse happened, by calculation, March 13, U. C. 750, B. C. 4. But it is certain from Scripture, that Christ was born during Herod’s reign; and from the visit of the magi to Jerusalem “from the east,” ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, from the Parthian empire, to inquire for the true “born King of the Jews,” whose star they had seen “at its rising,” ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, and also from the age of the infants massacred at Bethlehem, “from two years old and under,” Matt, ii, 1–16. It is no less certain, that Jesus could not have been born later than B. C. 5, which is the year assigned to the nativity by Chrysostom, Petavius and Prideaux.



EDEN, Garden of, the residence of our first parents in their state of purity and blessedness. The word Eden in the Hebrew denotes “pleasure” or “delight:” whence the name has been given to several places which, from their situation, were pleasant or delightful. Thus the Prophet Amos, i, 5, speaks of an Eden in Syria, which is generally considered to have been in the valley of Damascus, where a town called Eden is mentioned by Pliny and Ptolemy, and where the tomb of Abel is pretended to be shown. This has in consequence been selected by some as the site of the garden of Eden. By others, the garden has been placed on the eastern side of mount Libanus; and by others again, in Arabia Felix, where traces of the word Eden are found. But the opinion which has been most generally received on this subject is that which places the garden on the Lower Euphrates; between the junction of that river with the Tigris and the gulf of Persia. This is Dr. Well’s opinion; in which he is supported by Huetius, Grotius, Marinus, and Bochart. To this it is replied, that, according to this scheme, the garden was intersected by a great branch of the Euphrates, in the lower and broadest part of its course; which will give it an extent absolutely irreconcilable with the idea of Adam’s “dressing” it by his own manual labour, or even of overlooking it: beside that all communication would be cut off between its different parts by a stream half a mile in width. Its local features, too, if in this situation, must have been of the most uninteresting kind; the whole of that region, as far as the sight can reach, being a dead, monotonous, sandy, or marshy flat, without a single undulation to relieve the eye, or give any of the beauties which the imagination involuntarily paints to itself as attendant on a spot finished by the hand of God as the residence of his creatures in a state of innocence; whose minds may be supposed to be tuned to the full enjoyment of the grand and beautiful in nature. How different will be the aspect and arrangement of this favoured spot, if it be placed where only, according to the words of Moses, it can be placed; namely, at the heads or fountains of the rivers described, instead of their mouths.

The country of Eden, therefore, according to others, was some where in Media, Armenia, or the north of Mesopotamia; all mountainous tracts, and affording, instead of the sickening plains of Babylonia, some of the grandest, as well as the richest scenery in the world. A river or stream rising in some part of this country, entered the garden; where it was parted into four others, in all probability, by first falling into a basin or lake, from which the other streams issued at different points, taking different directions, and growing into mighty rivers; although at their sources in the garden, they would be like all other rivers, mere brooks, and forming no barrier to a free communication between the parts of the garden. Dr. Wells, in order to support his hypothesis of the situation of Eden on the lower

parts of the Euphrates and Tigris, after giving these rivers a distribution which has now no existence, makes the Pison and Gihon to be parts of the Tigris and Euphrates themselves: an arrangement at perfect disagreement with the particular description of Moses; beside, that the Gihon thus called, instead of compassing the whole land of Cush, can only be said to skirt an extreme corner of it. It appears, indeed, that in the time of Alexander, the Euphrates pursued a separate course to the sea; or, at least, that a navigable branch of it was carried in that direction: in the mouth of which, at Diridotis, Nearchus anchored with his fleet. But what reliance can be placed on the ever shifting channels of a river flowing through an alluvial soil, and over a perfect level divertible at the pleasure of the people inhabiting its banks? Or, what theory can be founded on their distribution, which will not be as unstable as the streams themselves? This very channel, so essential to the hypothesis which places Eden in this situation, was annihilated by the Orcheni, a neighbouring people; who directed the stream to water their own land, and thus gave it a shorter course into the Tigris, which it has ever since preserved. But it is only the lower parts of the Euphrates and Tigris, as they creep through the plains of Babylonia, which are thus inconstant: higher up in their courses, they flow over more solid strata, and in deeper valleys, unchanged by time. It is here that their conformity with the Mosaic account is to be sought; and it is here that they may be found, in the exact condition in which they were left by the deluge, and, indeed, according to Moses, in which they existed before that event. It is true, that the heads of the four rivers, above described, cannot now be found sufficiently near, to recognise thence the exact situation of paradise; but they all arise from the same mountainous region; and the springs of the Euphrates and Tigris, as already mentioned, are even now nearly interwoven. Mr. Faber supposes the lake Arsissa to cover the site of Eden; and that the change which carried the heads of the rivers to a greater distance from it, was occasioned by the deluge. But it is far more probable that this change, if we may infer from the account given by Moses that the courses of all the streams remained unaltered by the flood, may have taken place at man's expulsion from the garden: when God might choose to obliterate this fair portion of his works, unfitted for any thing but the residence of innocence; and to blot at once from the face of the earth, like the guilty cities of the plain, both the site and the memorial of man's transgression,--an awful event, which would add tenfold horrors to the punishment.

EDOM, a province of Arabia, which derives its name from Edom, or Esau, who there settled in the mountains of Seir, in the land of the Horites, south-east of the Dead Sea. His descendants afterward extended themselves throughout Arabia Petrea, and south of Palestine, between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. During the Babylonish captivity, and when Judea

was almost deserted, they seized the south of Judah, and advanced to Hebron. Hence that tract of Judea, which they inhabited, retained the name of Idumea in the time of our Saviour, Mark iii, 8. Under Moses and Joshua, and even under the kings of Judah, the Idumeans were confined to the east and south of the Dead Sea, in the land of Seir; but afterward they extended their territories more to the south of Judah. The capital of east Edom was Bozrah; and that of south Edom, Petra, or Jectael. The Edomites, or Idumeans, the posterity of Esau, had kings long before the Jews. They were first governed by dukes or princes, and afterward by kings, Gen. xxxvi, 31. They continued independent till the time of David, who subdued them, in completion of Isaac's prophecy, that Jacob should rule Esau, Gen. xxvii, 29, 30. The Idumeans bore this subjection with great impatience; and at the end of Solomon's reign, Hadad, the Edomite, who had been carried into Egypt during his childhood, returned into his own country, where he procured himself to be acknowledged king, 1 Kings xi, 22. It is probable, however, that he reigned only in east Edom; for Edom south of Judea continued subject to the kings of Judah, till the reign of Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, against whom it rebelled, 2 Chron. xxi, 8. Jehoram attacked Edom, but did not subdue it. Amaziah king of Judah, took Petra, killed a thousand men, and compelled ten thousand more to leap from the rock, upon which stood the city of Petra, 2 Chron. xxv, 11, 12. But these conquests were not permanent. Uzziah took Elath on the Red Sea, 2 Kings xiv, 22; but Rezin, king of Syria, retook it. Some think that Esarhaddon, king of Syria, ravaged this country, Isaiah xxi, 11–17; xxxiv, 6. Holofernes subdued it, as well as other nations around Judea, Judith iii, 14. When Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem, the Idumeans joined him, and encouraged him to rase the very foundations of that city. This cruelty did not long continue unpunished. Five years after the taking of Jerusalem, Nebuchadnezzar humbled all the states around Judea, and in particular Idumea. John Hyrcanus entirely conquered the Idumeans, whom he obliged to receive circumcision and the law. They continued subject to the later kings of Judea till the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. They even came to assist that city when besieged, and entered it in order to defend it. However, they did not continue there till it was taken, but returned into Idumea loaded with booty. The prophecies respecting Edom are numerous and striking; and the present state of the country as described by modern travellers has given so remarkable an attestation to the accuracy of their fulfilment, that a few extracts from Mr. Keith's work, in which this is pointed out, may be fitly introduced:--

2. There are numerous prophecies respecting Idumea, that bear a literal interpretation, however hyperbolical they may appear. "My sword shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. From generation to generation it shall lie waste, none shall pass through it

for ever and ever. But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it; the owl also and the raven shall dwell in it: and he shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness. They shall call the nobles thereof to the kingdom; but none shall be there, and all her princes shall be nothing. And thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof; and it shall be a habitation of dragons, and a court for owls. Seek ye out of the book of the Lord and read; no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate; for my mouth it hath commanded, and his Spirit it hath gathered them. And he hath cast the lot for them, and his hand hath divided it unto them by line; they shall possess it for ever, from generation to generation shall they dwell therein," Isa. xxxiv, 5, 10–17. "I have sworn by myself, saith the Lord, that Bozrah" (the strong or fortified city) "shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste, and a curse; and all the cities thereof shall be perpetual wastes. Lo, I will make thee small among the Heathen, and despised among men. Thy terribleness hath deceived thee, and the pride of thine heart, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill: though thou shouldest make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord. Also Edom shall be a desolation; every one that goeth by shall be astonished, and shall hiss at all the plagues thereof. As in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the neighbour cities thereof, saith the Lord, no man shall abide there, neither shall a son of man dwell in it," Jer. xlix, 13–18. "Thus saith the Lord God, I will stretch out mine hand upon Edom, and will cut off man and beast from it, and I will make it desolate from Teman." "I laid the mountains of Esau and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness. Whereas Edom saith, We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the Lord of hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The border of wickedness," Malachi i, 3, 4.

Is there any country once inhabited and opulent, so utterly desolate? There is, and that land is Idumea. The territory of the descendants of Esau affords as miraculous a demonstration of the inspiration of the Scriptures as the fate of the children of Israel. A single extract from the Travels of Volney will be found to be equally illustrative of the prophecy and of the fact: "This country has not been visited by any traveller, but it well merits such an attention; for, from the report of the Arabs of Bakir, and the inhabitants of Gaza, who frequently go to Maan and Karak, on the road of the pilgrims, there are, to the south-east of the lake Asphaltites, (Dead Sea,) within three days' journey, upward of thirty ruined towns absolutely deserted. Several of them have large edifices, with columns that may have belonged to the ancient temples, or at least to Greek churches. The Arabs sometimes make use of them to fold their cattle in; but in general avoid them on account of the enormous scorpions with which they swarm. We cannot be surprised at

these traces of ancient population, when we recollect that this was the country of the Nabatheans, the most powerful of the Arabs, and of the Idumeans, who, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, were almost as numerous as the Jews, as appears from Josephus, who informs us, that on the first rumour of the march of Titus against Jerusalem, thirty thousand Idumeans instantly assembled, and threw themselves into that city for its defence. It appears that, beside the advantages of being under a tolerably good government, these districts enjoyed a considerable share of the commerce of Arabia and India, which increased their industry and population. We know that as far back as the time of Solomon, the cities of Astioum Gaber (Ezion Geber) and Ailah (Elloth) were highly frequented marts. These towns were situated 330 on the adjacent gulf of the Red Sea, where we still find the latter yet retaining its name, and perhaps the former in that of El Akaba, or 'the end of the sea.' These two places are in the hands of the Bedouins, who, being destitute of a navy and commerce, do not inhabit them. But the pilgrims report that there is at El Akaba a wretched fort. The Idumeans, from whom the Jews only took their ports at intervals, must have found in them a great source of wealth and population. It even appears that the Idumeans rivalled the Tyrians, who also possessed a town, the name of which is unknown, on the coast of Hedjaz, in the desert of Tih, and the city of Faran, and, without doubt, El-Tor, which served it by way of port. From this place the caravans might reach Palestine and Judea, (through Idumea,) in eight or ten days. This route, which is longer than that from Suez to Cairo, is infinitely shorter than that from Aleppo to Bassorah." Evidence, which must have been undesigned, which cannot be suspected of partiality, and which no illustration can strengthen, and no ingenuity pervert, is thus borne to the truth of the most wonderful prophecies. That the Idumeans were a populous and powerful nation long posterior to the delivery of the prophecies; that they possessed a tolerably good government, even in the estimation of Volney; that Idumea contained many cities; that these cities are now absolutely deserted; and that their ruins swarm with enormous scorpions; that it was a commercial nation, and possessed highly frequented marts; that it forms a shorter route than the ordinary one to India; and yet that it had not been visited by any traveller; are facts all recorded, and proved by this able but unconscious commentator.

3. A greater contrast cannot be imagined than the ancient and present state of Idumea. It was a kingdom previous to Israel, having been governed first by dukes or princes, afterward by eight successive kings, and again by dukes, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel, Gen. xxxvi, 31, &c. Its fertility and early cultivation are implied not only in the blessings of Esau, whose dwelling was to be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; but also in the condition proposed by

Moses to the Edomites, when he solicited a passage for the Israelites through their borders, that “they would not pass through the fields nor through the vineyards;” and also in the great wealth, especially in the multitudes of flocks and herds, recorded as possessed by an individual inhabitant of that country, at a period, in all probability even more remote, Gen. xxvii, 39; Num. xx, 17; Job xlii, 12. The Idumeans were, without doubt, both an opulent and a powerful people. They often contended with the Israelites, and entered into a league with their other enemies against them. In the reign of David they were indeed subdued and greatly oppressed, and many of them even dispersed throughout the neighbouring countries, particularly Phenicia and Egypt. But during the decline of the kingdom of Judah, and for many years previous to its extinction, they encroached upon the territories of the Jews, and extended their dominion over the south-western part of Judea.

4. There is a prediction which, being peculiarly remarkable as applicable to Idumea, and bearing reference to a circumstance explanatory of the difficulty of access to any knowledge respecting it, is entitled, in the first instance, to notice: “None shall pass through it for ever and ever. I will cut off from Mount Seir him that passeth out, and him that returneth,” Isa. xxxiv, 10; Ezek. xxxv, 7. The ancient greatness of Idumea must, in no small degree, have resulted from its commerce. Bordering with Arabia on the east, and Egypt on the southwest, and forming from north to south the most direct and most commodious channel of communication between Jerusalem and her dependencies on the Red Sea, as well as between Syria and India, through the continuous valleys of El Ghor, and El Araba, which terminated on the one extremity at the borders of Judea, and on the other at Elath and Ezion Geber on the Elanitic gulf of the Red Sea, Idumea may be said to have formed the emporium of the commerce of the east. A Roman road passed directly through Idumea, from Jerusalem to Akaba, and another from Akaba to Moab; and when these roads were made, at a time long posterior to the date of the predictions, the conception could not have been formed, or held credible by man, that the period would ever arrive when none would pass through it. Above seven hundred years after the date of the prophecy, Strabo relates that many Romans and other foreigners were found at Petra by his friend Athenodorus, the philosopher, who visited it. The prediction is yet more surprising when viewed in conjunction with another, which implies that travellers would “pass by” Idumea: “Every one that goeth by shall be astonished.” And the Hadj routes (routes of the pilgrims) from Damascus and from Cairo to Mecca, the one on the east and the other toward the south of Idumea, along the whole of its extent, go by it, or touch partially on its borders, without passing through it. The truth of the prophecy, though hemmed in thus by apparent impossibilities and

contradictions, and with extreme probability of its fallacy in every view that could have been visible to man, may yet be tried.

5. "Edom shall be a desolation. From generation to generation it shall lie waste," &c. Judea, Ammon, and Moab, exhibit so abundantly the remains and the means of an exuberant fertility, that the wonder arises in the reflecting mind, how the barbarity of man could have so effectually counteracted for so many generations the prodigality of nature. But such is Edom's desolation, that the first sentiment of astonishment on the contemplation of it is, how a wide extended region, now diversified by the strongest features of desert wildness, could ever have been adorned with cities, or tenanted for ages by a powerful and opulent people. Its present aspect would belie its ancient history, were not that history corroborated by "the many vestiges of former cultivation," 331 by the remains of walls and paved roads, and by the ruins of cities still existing in this ruined country. The total cessation of its commerce; the artificial irrigation of its valleys wholly neglected; the destruction of all the cities, and the continued spoliation of the country by the Arabs, while aught remained that they could destroy; the permanent exposure, for ages, of the soil unsheltered by its ancient groves, and unprotected by any covering from the scorching rays of the sun; the unobstructed encroachments of the desert, and of the drifted sands from the borders of the Red Sea; the consequent absorption of the water of the springs and streamlets during summer,—are causes which have all combined their baneful operation in rendering Edom "most desolate, the desolation of desolations." Volney's account is sufficiently descriptive of the desolation which now reigns over Idumea; and the information which Seetzen derived at Jerusalem respecting it is of similar import. He was told, that at the distance of two days' journey and a half from Hebron, he would find considerable ruins of the ancient city of Abde, and that for all the rest of the journey he would see no place of habitation; he would meet only with a few tribes of wandering Arabs. From the borders of Edom, Captains Irby and Mangles beheld a boundless extent of desert view, which they had hardly ever seen equalled for singularity and grandeur. And the following extract, descriptive of what Burckhardt actually witnessed in the different parts of Edom, cannot be more graphically abbreviated than in the words of the prophet. Of its eastern boundary, and of the adjoining part of Arabia Petrea, strictly so called, Burckhardt writes: "It might, with truth, be called Petrea, not only on account of its rocky mountains, but also of the elevated plain already described, which is so much covered with stones, especially flints, that it may with great propriety be called a stony desert, although susceptible of culture; in many places it is overgrown with wild herbs, and must once have been thickly inhabited; for the traces of many towns and villages are met with on both sides of the Hadj road between Maan and Akaba, as well

as between Maan and the plains of the Hauran, in which direction are also many springs. At present all this country is a desert, and Maan (Teman) is the only inhabited place in it: 'I will stretch out my hand against thee, O Mount Seir, and will make thee most desolate. I will stretch out my hand upon Edom, and will make it desolate from Teman.'" In the interior of Idumea, where the ruins of some of its ancient cities are still visible, and in the extensive valley which reaches from the Red to the Dead Sea, the appearance of which must now be totally and sadly changed from what it was, "the whole plain presented to the view an expanse of shifting sands, whose surface was broken by innumerable undulations and low hills. The sand appears to have been brought from the shores of the Red Sea, by the southern winds; and the Arabs told me that the valleys continue to present the same appearance beyond the latitude of Wady Mousa. In some parts of the valley the sand is very deep, and there is not the slightest appearance of a road, or of any work of human art. A few trees grow among the sand hills, but the depth of sand precludes all vegetation of herbage." "If grape gatherers come to thee, would not they leave some gleanings? If thieves by night, they will destroy till they have enough; but I have made Esau bare. Edom shall be a desolate wilderness." "On ascending the western plain," continues Mr. Burckhardt, "on a higher level than that of Arabia, we had before us an immense expanse of dreary country, entirely covered with black flints, with here and there some hilly chain rising from the plain." "I will stretch out upon Idumea the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness." Such is the present desolate aspect of one of the most fertile countries of ancient times! So visibly even now does the withering curse of an offended God rest upon it!

EGG, בִּיצִים, Deut. xxii, 6; Job xxxix, 14; Isaiah x, 14; lix, 5; ὄν, Luke xi, 12. Eggs are considered as a very great delicacy in the east, and are served up with fish and honey at their entertainments. As a desirable article of food, the egg is mentioned, Luke xi, 12: "If a son ask for an egg, will his father offer him a scorpion?" It has been remarked that the body of the scorpion is very like an egg, as its head can scarcely be distinguished, especially if it be of the white kind, which is the first species mentioned by Ælian, Avicenna, and others. Bochart has produced testimonies to prove that the scorpions in Judea were about the bigness of an egg. So the similitude is preserved between the thing asked, and the thing given.

EGLON, a king of Moab, who oppressed the Israelites, and was slain by Ehud, Judges iii, 14, 21. It is thought to have been a common name of the kings of Moab, as Abimelech was of the Philistines.

EGYPT, a country of Africa, called also in the Hebrew Scriptures the land of Mizraim, and the land of Ham; by the Turks and Arabs, Masr and Misr;



and by the native Egyptians, Chemi, or the land of Ham. Mr. Faber derives the name from Ai-Capht, or the land of the Caphtorim; from which, also, the modern Egyptians derive their name of Cophts. Egypt was first peopled after the deluge by Mizraim, or Mizr, the son of Ham, who is supposed to be the same with Menes, recorded in Egyptian history as the first king. Every thing relating to the subsequent history and condition of this country, for many ages, is involved in fable. Nor have we any clear information from Heathen writers, until the time of Cyrus, and his son Cambyses, when the line of Egyptian princes ceased in agreement with prophecies to that effect. Manetho, the Egyptian historian, has given a list of thirty dynasties, which, if successive, make a period of five thousand three hundred years to the time of Alexander, or three thousand two hundred and eighty-two years more than the real time, according to the Mosaic chronology. But this is a manifest forgery, which has, nevertheless, been appealed to by infidel writers, as authority against the veracity of the Mosaic history. The truth is, that this pretended succession of princes, if all of them can be supposed to have existed at all, constituted several distinct dynasties, ruling in different cities at the same time: thus these were the kingdoms of Thebes, Thin, Memphis, and Tanis. See Writing.

2. In the time of Moses we find Egypt renowned for learning; for he was instructed “in all its wisdom;” and it is one of the commendations of Solomon, at a later period, that he excelled in knowledge “all the wisdom of the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt.” Astronomy, which probably, like that of the Chaldeans, comprehended also judicial astrology, physics, agriculture, jurisprudence, medicine, architecture, painting, and sculpture, were the principal sciences and arts; to which were added, and that by their wisest men, the study of divination, magic, and enchantments. They had also their consulters with familiar spirits, and necromancers, those who had, or pretended to have, intercourse with the infernal deities, and the spirits of the dead, and delivered responses to inquirers. Of all this knowledge, good and evil, and of a monstrous system of idolatry, Egypt was the polluted fountain to the surrounding nations; but in that country itself it appears to have degenerated into the most absurd and debased forms. Among nations who are not blessed by divine revelation, the luminaries of heaven are the first objects of worship. Diodorus Siculus, mentioning the Egyptians, informs us, that “the first men, looking up to the world above them, and, struck with admiration at the nature of the universe, supposed the sun and moon to be the principal and eternal gods.” This, which may be called the natural superstition of mankind, we can trace in the annals of the west, as well as of the east; among the inhabitants of the new world, as well as of the old. The sun and moon, under the names of Isis and Osiris, were the chief objects of adoration among the Egyptians. But the earliest times had a purer faith.

The following inscription, engraven in hieroglyphics in the temple of Neith, the Egyptian Minerva, conveys the most sublime idea of the Deity which unenlightened reason could form: "I am that which is, was, and shall be: no mortal hath lifted up my veil: the offspring of my power is the sun." A similar inscription still remains at Capua, on the temple of Isis: "Thou art one, and from thee all things proceed." Plutarch also informs us, that the inhabitants of Thebais worshipped only the immortal and supreme God, whom they called Eneph. According to the Egyptian cosmogony, all things sprung from achor, or night, by which they denoted the darkness of chaos before the creation. Sanchoniathon relates, that, "from the breath of gods and the void were mortals created." This theology differs little from that of Moses, who says, "The earth was without form, and void; darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

3. A superstitious reverence for certain animals, as propitious or hurtful to the human race, was not peculiar to the Egyptians. The cow has been venerated in India from the most remote antiquity. The serpent has been the object of religious respect to one half of the nations of the known world. The Romans had sacred animals, which they kept in their temples, and distinguished with peculiar honours. We need not therefore be surprised that a nation so superstitious as the Egyptians should honour, with peculiar marks of respect, the ichneumon, the ibis, the dog, the falcon, the wolf, and the crocodile. These they entertained at great expense, and with much magnificence. Lands were set apart for their maintenance; persons of the highest rank were employed in feeding and attending them; rich carpets were spread in their apartments; and the pomp at their funerals corresponded to the profusion and luxury which attended them while alive. What chiefly tended to favour the progress of animal worship in Egypt, was the language of hieroglyphics. In the hieroglyphic inscriptions on their temples, and public edifices, animals, and even vegetables, were the symbols of the gods whom they worshipped. In the midst of innumerable superstitions, the theology of Egypt contained the two great principles of religion, the existence of a supreme Being, and the immortality of the soul. The first is proved by the inscription on the temple of Minerva; the second, by the care with which dead bodies were embalmed, and the prayer recited at the hour of death, by an Egyptian, expressing his desire to be received to the presence of the deities.

4. The opulence of Egypt was for ages increased by the large share it had in the commerce with the east; by its own favourable position, making it the connecting link of intercourse between the eastern and western nations; and especially by its own remarkable fertility, particularly in corn, so that it was, in times of scarcity, the granary of the world. Its extraordinary

fertility was owing to the periodical inundation of the Nile; and sufficient proofs of the ancient accounts which we have of its productiveness are afforded to this day. The Rev. Mr. Jowett has given a striking example of the extraordinary fertility of the soil of Egypt, which is alluded to in Genesis xli, 47: "The earth brought forth by handfuls." "I picked up at random," says Mr. Jowett, "a few stalks out of the thick corn fields. We counted the number of stalks which sprouted from single grains of seed; carefully pulling to pieces each root, in order to see that it was but one plant. The first had seven stalks, the next three, the next nine, then eighteen, then fourteen. Each stalk would have been an ear."

5. The architecture of the early Egyptians, at least that of their cities and dwellings, was rude and simple: they could indeed boast of little in either external elegance or internal comfort, since Herodotus informs us that men and beasts lived together. The materials of their structure were bricks of clay, bound together with chopped straw, and baked in the sun. Such were the bricks which the Israelites were employed in making, and of which the cities of Pithom and Rameses were built. Their composition was necessarily perishable, and explains why it is that no remains of the ancient cities of Egypt are to be found. They would indeed last longer in the dry climate of this country than in any other; but even here they must gradually decay and crumble to dust, and the cities so constructed become heaps. Of precisely the same materials are the villages of Egypt built at this day. "Village after village," says Mr. Jowett, speaking of Tentyra, "built of unburnt brick, crumbling into ruins, and giving place to new habitations, have raised the earth, in some parts, nearly to the level of the summit of the temple. In every part of Egypt, we find the towns built in this manner, upon the ruins, or rather the rubbish, of the former habitations. The expression in Jeremiah xxx, 18, literally applies to Egypt, in the meanest sense: 'The city shall be builded upon her own heap.' And the expression in Job xv, 28, might be illustrated by many of these deserted hovels: 'He dwelleth in desolate cities, and in houses which no man inhabiteth, which are ready to become heaps.' Still more touching is the allusion, in Job iv, 19, where the perishing generations of men are fitly compared to habitations of the frailest materials, built upon the heap of similar dwelling-places, now reduced to rubbish: 'How much less in them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust!'"

6. The splendid temples of Egypt were not built, in all probability, till after the time of Solomon; for the recent progress made in the decyphering of hieroglyphics has disappointed the antiquaries as to the antiquity of these stupendous fabrics. It is well observed by Dr. Shuckford, that temples made no great figure in Homer's time. If they had, he would not have lost such an opportunity of exerting his genius on so grand a subject, as Virgil has

done in his description of the temple built by Dido at Carthage. The first Heathen temples were probably nothing more than mean buildings, which served merely as a shelter from the weather: of which kind was, probably, the house of the Philistine god Dagon. But when the fame of Solomon's temple had reached other countries, it excited them to imitate its splendour; and nation vied with nation in the structures erected to their several deities. All were, however, outdone, at least in massiveness and durability, by the Egyptians; the architectural design of whose temples, as well as that of the Grecian edifices, was borrowed from the stems and branches of the grove temples.

7. It appears to be an unfounded notion, that the pyramids were built by the Israelites: they were, probably, Mr. Faber thinks, the work of the "Shepherds," or Cushite invaders, who, at an early period, held possession of Egypt for two hundred and sixty years, and reduced the Egyptians to bondage, so that "a shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians" in Joseph's time. The Israelites laboured in making bricks, not in forming stones such as the pyramids are constructed with; and a passage in Mr. Jowett's "Researches," before referred to, will throw light upon this part of their history. Mr. Jowett saw at one place the people making bricks, with straw cut into small pieces, and mingled with the clay, to bind it. Hence it is, that when villages built of these bricks fall into rubbish, which is often the case, the roads are full of small particles of straws, extremely offensive to the eyes in a high wind. They were, in fact, engaged exactly as the Israelites used to be, making bricks with straw; and for a similar purpose, to build extensive granaries for the bashaw; "treasure-cities for Pharaoh." The same intelligent missionary also observes: "The mollems transact business between the bashaw and the peasants. He punishes them if the peasants prove that they oppress; and yet he requires from them that the work of those who are under them shall be fulfilled. They strikingly illustrate the case of the officers placed by the Egyptian task-masters over the children of Israel; and, like theirs, the mollems often find their case is evil, Exodus v."

8. It is not necessary to go over those parts of the Egyptian history which occur in the Old Testament. The prophecies respecting this haughty and idolatrous kingdom, uttered by Jeremiah and Ezekiel when it was in the height of its splendour and prosperity, were fulfilled in the terrible invasions of Nebuchadnezzar, Cambyses, and the Persian monarchs. It comes, however, again into an interesting connection with the Jewish history under Alexander the Great, who invaded it as a Persian dependence. So great, indeed, was the hatred of the Egyptians toward their oppressors, that they hailed the approach of the Macedonians, and threw open their cities to receive them. Alexander, merciless as he was to those who

opposed his progress or authority, knew how to requite those who were devoted to his interests; and the Egyptians, for many centuries afterward, had reason to recollect with gratitude his protection and foresight. It was he who discerned the local advantages of the spot on which the city bearing his name afterward stood, who projected the plan of the town, superintended its erection, endowed it with many privileges, and peopled it with colonies drawn from other places for the purpose, chiefly Greeks. But, together with these, and the most favoured of all, were the Jews, who enjoyed the free exercise of their religion, and the same civil rights and liberties as the Macedonians themselves. Kindness shown to the people of Israel has never, in the providence of God, brought evil on any country; and there can be no doubt but that the encouragement given to this enterprising and commercial people, assisted very much to promote the interests of the new city, which soon became the capital of the kingdom, the centre of commerce, of science, and the arts, and one of the most flourishing and considerable cities in the world. Egypt, indeed, was about to see 334 better days; and, during the reigns of the Ptolemies, enjoyed again, for nearly three hundred years, something of its former renown for learning and power. It formed, during this period, and before the rapid extension of the Roman empire toward the termination of these years, one of the only two ancient kingdoms which had survived the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and Macedonian empires: the other was the Syrian, where the Seleucidæ, another family of one of the successors of Alexander, reigned; who, having subdued Macedonia and Thrace, annexed them to the kingdom of Syria, and there remained out of the four kingdoms into which the empire of Alexander was divided these two only; distinguished, in the prophetic writings of Daniel, by the titles of the kings or kingdoms of the north and the south.

9. Under the reign of the three first Ptolemies, the state of the Jews was exceedingly prosperous. They were in high favour, and continued to enjoy all the advantages conferred upon them by Alexander. Judea was, in fact, at this time, a privileged province of Egypt; the Jews being governed by their own high priest, on paying a tribute to the kings of Egypt. But in the reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes, the fifth of the race, it was taken by Antiochus, king of Syria; which was the beginning of fresh sufferings and persecutions; for although this Antiochus, who was the one surnamed the Great, was a mild and generous prince, and behaved favourably toward them, their troubles began at his death; his successor, Seleucus, oppressing them with taxes; and the next was the monster, Antiochus Epiphanes, whose impieties and cruelties are recorded in the two books of Maccabees. But still, in Egypt, the Jews continued in the enjoyment of their privileges, so late as the reign of the sixth Ptolemy, called Philometor, who committed the charge of his affairs to two Jews, Onias and Dositheus; the former of

whom obtained permission to build a temple at Heliopolis. The introduction of Christianity into Egypt is mentioned under the article Alexandria.

10. The prophecies respecting Egypt in the Old Testament have had a wonderful fulfilment. The knowledge of all its greatness and glory deterred not the Jewish prophets from declaring, that Egypt would become "a base kingdom, and never exalt itself any more among the nations." And the literal fulfilment of every prophecy affords as clear a demonstration as can possibly be given, that each and all of them are the dictates of inspiration. Egypt was the theme of many prophecies, which were fulfilled in ancient times; and it bears to the present day, as it has borne throughout many ages, every mark with which prophecy had stamped its destiny: "They shall be a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of kingdoms. Neither shall it exalt itself any more among the nations: for I will diminish them, that they shall no more rule over the nations. The pride of her power shall come down; and they shall be desolate in the midst of the countries that are desolate; and her cities shall be in the midst of the cities that are wasted. I will make the land of Egypt desolate, and the country shall be desolate of that whereof it was full. I will sell the land into the hand of the wicked. I will make the land waste and all that is therein, by the hand of strangers. I the Lord have spoken it. And there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt," Ezek. xxx, 5, 7, 12, 13. "The sceptre of Egypt shall depart away," Zech. x, 11.

11. Egypt became entirely subject to the Persians about three hundred and fifty years previous to the Christian æra. It was afterward subdued by the Macedonians, and was governed by the Ptolemies for the space of two hundred and ninety-four years; until, about B. C. 30, it became a province of the Roman empire. It continued long in subjection to the Romans,--tributary first to Rome, and afterward to Constantinople. It was transferred, A. D. 641, to the dominion of the Saracens. In 1250 the Mamelukes deposed their rulers, and usurped the command of Egypt. A mode of government, the most singular and surprising that ever existed on earth, was established and maintained. Each successive ruler was raised to supreme authority, from being a stranger and a slave. No son of the former ruler, no native of Egypt, succeeded to the sovereignty; but a chief was chosen from among a new race of imported slaves. When Egypt became tributary to the Turks in 1517, the Mamelukes retained much of their power; and every pasha was an oppressor and a stranger. During all these ages, every attempt to emancipate the country, or to create a prince of the land of Egypt, has proved abortive, and has often been fatal to the aspirant. Though the facts relative to Egypt form too prominent a feature in the history of the world to admit of contradiction or doubt, yet the description of the fate of that country, and of the form of its government, may be left,

says Keith, to the testimony of those whose authority no infidel will question, and whom no man can accuse of adapting their descriptions to the predictions of the event. Volney and Gibbon are our witnesses of the facts: "Such is the state of Egypt. Deprived, twenty-three centuries ago, of her natural proprietors, she has seen her fertile fields successively a prey to the Persians, the Macedonians, the Romans, the Greeks, the Arabs, the Georgians, and, at length, the race of Tartars distinguished by the name of Ottoman Turks. The Mamelukes, purchased as slaves, and introduced as soldiers, soon usurped the power and elected a leader. If their first establishment was a singular event, their continuance is not less extraordinary. They are replaced by slaves brought from their original country. The system of oppression is methodical. Every thing the traveller sees or hears reminds him he is in the country of slavery and tyranny." "A more unjust and absurd constitution cannot be devised than that which condemns the natives of a country to perpetual servitude, under the arbitrary dominion of strangers and slaves. 335 Yet such has been the state of Egypt above five hundred years. The most illustrious sultans of the Baharite and Borgite dynasties were themselves promoted from the Tartar and Circassian bands; and the four-and-twenty beys, or military chiefs, have ever been succeeded, not by their sons, but by their servants." These are the words of Volney and of Gibbon; and what did the ancient prophets foretel?--"I will lay the land waste, and all that is therein, by the hands of strangers. I the Lord have spoken it. And there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt. The sceptre of Egypt shall depart away." The prophecy adds: "They shall be a base kingdom: it shall be the basest of kingdoms." After the lapse of two thousand and four hundred years from the date of this prophecy, a scoffer at religion, but an eye witness of the facts, thus describes the self-same spot: "In Egypt," says Volney, "there is no middle class, neither nobility, clergy, merchants, landholders. A universal air of misery, manifest in all the traveller meets, points out to him the rapacity of oppression, and the distrust attendant upon slavery. The profound ignorance of the inhabitants equally prevents them from perceiving the causes of their evils, or applying the necessary remedies. Ignorance, diffused through every class, extends its effects to every species of moral and physical knowledge. Nothing is talked of but intestine troubles, the public misery, pecuniary extortions, bastinadoes, and murders. Justice herself puts to death without formality." Other travellers describe the most execrable vices as common, and represent the moral character of the people as corrupted to the core. As a token of the desolation of the country, mud-walled cottages are now the only habitations where the ruins of temples and palaces abound. Egypt is surrounded by the dominions of the Turks and of the Arabs; and the prophecy is literally true which marked it in the midst of desolation: "They shall be desolate in the midst of the countries that are desolate, and her cities shall be in the midst of the cities that are

wasted.” The systematic oppression, extortion, and plunder, which have so long prevailed, and the price paid for his authority and power by every Turkish pasha, have rendered the country “desolate of that whereof it was full,” and still show both how it has been “wasted by the hands of strangers,” and how it has been “sold into the hand of the wicked.”

12. Egypt has, indeed, lately somewhat risen, under its present spirited but despotic pasha, to a degree of importance and commerce. But this pasha is still a stranger, and the dominion is foreign. Nor is there any thing like a general advancement of the people to order, intelligence and happiness. Yet this fact, instead of militating against the truth of prophecy, may, possibly at no distant period, serve to illustrate other predictions. “The Lord shall smite Egypt: he shall smite and heal it; and they shall return to the Lord, and he shall be entreated of them, and shall heal them. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land,” &c, Isaiah xix, 22–25.

ELAM, the eldest son of Shem, who settled in a country to which he gave his name, Gen. x, 22. It is frequently mentioned in Scripture, as lying to the south-east of Shinar. Susiana, in later times, seems to have been a part of this country, Daniel viii, 2; and before the captivity the Jews seem always to have intended Persia by the name of Elam. Stephanus takes it to be a part of Assyria, but Pliny and Josephus, more properly, of Persia, whose inhabitants, this latter tells us, sprung from the Elamites.

ELATH, or ELOTH, a part of Idumea, situate upon the Red Sea, the emporium of Syria in Asia. It was taken by David, 2 Sam. viii, 14, who there established an extensive trade. There Solomon built ships, 2 Chron. viii, 17, 18. The Israelites held possession of Elath one hundred and fifty years, when the Edomites, in the reign of Joram, recovered it, 2 Kings viii, 20. It was again taken from them by Azariah, and by him left to his son, 2 Kings xiv, 22. The king of Syria took it from his grandson, 2 Kings xvi, 6. In process of time it fell to the Ptolemies, and lastly to the Romans. The branch of the Red Sea on which this city stood, obtained among Heathen writers the name of Sinus Elaniticus or Elanitic Gulf, from a town built on its site called Elana, and subsequently Ala; which, as we are informed by Eusebius and Jerom, was used as a port in their time. The modern Arabian town of Akaba stands upon or near the site either of Elath or Ezion-Geber; which of the two it is impossible to determine, as both ports, standing at the head of the gulf, were probably separated from each other by a creek or small bay only.

ELDAD and Medad were appointed by Moses among the seventy elders of Israel who were to assist in the government. Though not present in the



general assembly, they were, notwithstanding, filled with the Spirit of God, equally with those who were in that assembly, and they began to prophesy in the camp. Joshua would have had Moses forbid them, but Moses replied, "Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that God would pour forth his Spirit upon them!" Numbers xi, 24–29.

ELDERS, a name given to certain laymen in the Presbyterian discipline, who are ecclesiastical officers, and in conjunction with the ministers and deacons compose the kirk sessions in Scotland. The number of elders is proportioned to the extent and population of the parish, and is seldom less than two or three, but sometimes exceeds fifty. They are laymen in this respect, that they have no right to teach, or to dispense the sacraments; and on this account they form an office in the Presbyterian church inferior in rank and power to that of pastors. They generally discharge the office which originally belonged to the deacons, of attending to the interests of the poor. But their peculiar business is expressed by the name ruling elders; for in every jurisdiction 336 within the parish they are the spiritual court, of which the minister is officially moderator; and in the presbytery, of which the pastors of all the parishes within its bounds are officially members, lay elders sit as the representatives of the several sessions or consistories.

Elders of Israel. By this name we understand the heads of tribes, or rather of the great families in Israel, who, before the settlement of the Hebrew commonwealth, had a government and authority over their own families, and the people. When Moses was sent into Egypt to deliver Israel, he assembled the elders of Israel, and told them that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had appeared to him, Exod. iii, 15; iv, 29, &c. Moses and Aaron treat the elders of Israel as the representatives of the nation. When God gave the law to Moses, he said, "Take Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, his sons, and the seventy elders of Israel, and worship ye afar off," Exod. xxiv, 1, 9, 10. They advanced only to the foot of the mountain. On all occasions afterward, we find this number of seventy elders. But it is credible, that as there were twelve tribes, there were seventy-two elders, six from each tribe, and that seventy is set down, instead of seventy-two; or rather, that Moses and Aaron should be added to the number seventy, and that, exclusive of them, there were but four elders from the tribe of Levi. After Jethro's arrival in the camp of Israel, Moses made a considerable change in the governors of the people. He established over Israel heads of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, that justice might be readily administered to applicants; only difficult cases were referred to himself, Exod. xviii, 24, 25, &c. But this constitution did not continue long; for on the murmuring of the people at the encampment called the Graves of Lust, Num. xi, 24–

35, Moses appointed seventy elders of Israel, to whom God communicated part of that legislator's spirit; they began to prophesy, and ceased not afterward. This, according to the generality of interpreters, was the beginning of the sanhedrim; but, to support this opinion, many things must be supposed, whereby to infer, that this court of justice was constantly in being during the Scripture history. It seems that the establishment of the seventy elders by Moses continued, not only during his life, but under Joshua likewise, and under the judges. The elders of the people and Joshua swore to the treaty with the Gibeonites, Josh, ix, 15. A little before his death, Joshua renewed the covenant with the Lord, in company with the elders, the princes, the heads, and officers of Israel, Joshua xxiii; xxiv, 1, 28. After the death of Joshua, and the elders who survived him, the people were several times brought into bondage, and were delivered by their judges. We do not see distinctly what authority the elders had during this time, and still less under the kings who succeeded the judges.

ELEAZAR, the third son of Aaron, and his successor in the dignity of high priest, Exod. vi, 23. He entered into the land of Canaan with Joshua, and is supposed to have lived there upward of twenty years. The high priesthood continued in his family till the time of Eli. He was buried in a hill that belonged to the son of Phineas, Joshua xxiv.

2. Eleazar, the son of Aminadab, to whose care the ark was committed when it was sent back by the Philistines, 1 Samuel vii. He is thought to have been a priest, or at least a Levite, though he is not mentioned in the catalogue of the sons of Levi.

ELECTION. Of a divine election, a choosing and separating from others, we have three kinds mentioned in the Scriptures. The first is the election of individuals to perform some particular and special service. Cyrus was "elected" to rebuild the temple; the twelve Apostles were "chosen," elected, to their office by Christ; St. Paul was a "chosen," or elected "vessel," to be the Apostle of the Gentiles. The second kind of election which we find in Scripture, is the election of nations, or bodies of people, to eminent religious privileges, and in order to accomplish, by their superior illumination, the merciful purposes of God, in benefiting other nations or bodies of people. Thus the descendants of Abraham, the Jews, were chosen to receive special revelations of truth; and to be "the people of God," that is, his visible church, publicly to observe and uphold his worship. "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth." "The Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, even you, above all people." It was especially on account of the application of the terms elect, chosen, and peculiar, to the Jewish people, that they were

so familiarly used by the Apostles in their epistles addressed to the believing Jews and Gentiles, then constituting the church of Christ in various places. For Christians were the subjects, also, of this second kind of election; the election of bodies of men to be the visible people and church of God in the world, and to be endowed with peculiar privileges. Thus they became, though in a more special and exalted sense, the chosen people, the elect of God. We say "in a more special sense," because as the entrance into the Jewish church was by natural birth, and the entrance into the Christian church, properly so called, is by faith and a spiritual birth, these terms, although many became Christians by mere profession, and enjoyed various privileges in consequence of their people or nation being chosen to receive the Gospel, have generally respect, in the New Testament, to bodies of true believers, or to the whole body of true believers as such. They are not, therefore, to be interpreted according to the scheme of Dr. Taylor of Norwich, by the constitution of the Jewish, but by the constitution of the Christian, church.

2. To understand the nature of this "election," as applied sometimes to particular bodies of Christians, as when St. Peter says, "The church which is at Babylon, elected together with you," and sometimes to the whole body of believers every where; and also the reason of the frequent use of the term election, and of the occurrence of allusions to the fact; it is to be remembered, that a great religious revolution, so to speak, had occurred in the age of the Apostles; with the full import of which we cannot, without calling in the aid of a little reflection, be adequately impressed. This change was no other than the abrogation of the church state of the Jews, which had continued for so many ages. They had been the only visibly acknowledged people of God in all the nations of the earth; for whatever pious people might have existed in other nations, they were not, in the sight of men, and collectively, acknowledged as "the people of Jehovah." They had no written revelations, no appointed ministry, no forms of authorized initiation into his church and covenant, no appointed holy days, or sanctioned ritual. All these were peculiar to the Jews, who were, therefore, an elected and peculiar people. This distinguished honour they were about to lose. They might have retained it as Christians, had they been willing to admit the believing Gentiles of all nations to share it with them; but the great reason of their peculiarity and election, as a nation, was terminated by the coming of the Messiah, who was to be "a light to lighten the Gentiles," as well as "the glory of his people Israel." Their pride and consequent unbelief resented this, which will explain their enmity to the believing part of the Gentiles, who, when that which St. Paul calls "the fellowship of the mystery" was fully explained, chiefly by the glorious ministry of that Apostle himself, were called into that church relation and visible acknowledgment as the people of God, which the Jews had formerly

enjoyed, and that with even a higher degree of glory, in proportion to the superior spirituality of the new dispensation. It was this doctrine which excited that strong irritation in the minds of the unbelieving Jews, and in some partially Christianized ones, to which so many references are made in the New Testament. They were “provoked,” were made “jealous;” and were often roused to the madness of persecuting opposition by it. There was then a new election of a new people of God, to be composed of Jews, not by virtue of their natural descent, but through their faith in Christ, and of Gentiles of all nations, also believing, and put as believers, on an equal ground with the believing Jews: and there was also a rejection, a reprobation, but not an absolute one; for the election was offered to the Jews first, in every place, by offering them the Gospel. Some embraced it, and submitted to be the elect people of God, on the new ground of faith, instead of the old one of natural descent; and therefore the Apostle, Rom. xi, 7, calls the believing part of the Jews, “the election,” in opposition to those who opposed this “election of grace,” and still clung to their former and now repealed election as Jews and the descendants of Abraham: “But the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.” The offer had been made to the whole nation; all might have joined the one body of believing Jews and believing Gentiles; but the major part of them refused: they would not “come into the supper;” they made “light of it;” light of an election founded on faith, and which placed the relation of “the people of God” upon spiritual attainments, and offered to them only spiritual blessings. They were, therefore, deprived of election and church relationship of every kind: their temple was burned; their political state abolished; their genealogies confounded; their worship annihilated and all visible acknowledgment of them; by God as a church withdrawn, and transferred to a church henceforward to be composed chiefly of Gentiles: and thus, says St. Paul, “were fulfilled the words of Moses, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish,” ignorant and idolatrous, “people I will anger you.” It is easy, therefore, to see what is the import of the “calling” and “election” of the Christian church, as spoken of in the New Testament. It was not the calling and the electing of one nation in particular to succeed the Jews; but it was the calling and the electing of believers in all nations, wherever the Gospel should be preached, to be in reality what the Jews typically, and therefore in an inferior degree, had been,—the visible church of God, “his people,” under Christ “the Head;” with an authenticated revelation; with an appointed ministry, never to be lost; with authorized worship; with holy days and festivals; with instituted forms of initiation; and with special protection and favour.

3. The third kind of election is personal election; or the election of individuals to be the children of God, and the heirs of eternal life. This is not a choosing to particular offices and service, which is the first kind of

election we have mentioned; nor is it that collective election to religious privileges and a visible church state, of which we have spoken. For although “the elect” have an individual interest in such an election as parts of the collective body, thus placed in possession of the ordinances of Christianity; yet many others have the same advantages, who still remain under the guilt and condemnation of sin and practical unbelief. The individuals properly called “the elect,” are they who have been made partakers of the grace and saving efficacy of the Gospel. “Many,” says our Lord, “are called, but few chosen.” What true personal election is, we shall find explained in two clear passages of Scripture. It is explained by our Lord, where he says to his disciples, “I have chosen you out of the world:” and by St. Peter, when he addresses his First Epistle to the “elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus.” To be elected, therefore, is to be separated from “the world,” and to be sanctified by the Spirit, and by the blood of Christ. It follows, then, not only that election is an act of God done in time, but also that it is subsequent to the administration of the means of salvation. The “calling” goes before the “election;” the publication of the doctrine of “the Spirit,” and the atonement, 338 called by Peter “the sprinkling of the blood of Christ,” before that “sanctification” through which they become “the elect” of God. In a word, “the elect” are the body of true believers; and personal election into the family of God is through personal faith. All who truly believe are elected; and all to whom the Gospel is sent have, through the grace that accompanies it, the power to believe placed within their reach; and all such might, therefore, attain to the grace of personal election.

ELEMENTS, *στοιχεῖα*, the elements or first principles of any art, whence the subsequent parts proceed. The elements or first principles of the Christian doctrine, Heb, v, 12. St. Paul calls the ceremonial ordinances of the Mosaic law, “worldly elements,” Gal. iv, 3; Col. ii, 8, 20; “weak and beggarly elements,” Gal. iv, 9. Elements, as containing the rudiments of the knowledge of Christ, to which knowledge the law, as a pedagogue, Gal. iii, 24, was intended, by means of those ordinances, to bring the Jews; worldly, as consisting in outward worldly institutions, Heb. ix, 1; weak and beggarly, when considered in themselves, and set up in opposition to the great realities to which they were designed to lead. But, in Col. ii, 8, the elements or rudiments of the world are so closely connected with philosophy and vain deceit, or an empty and deceitful philosophy, that they must be understood there to include the dogmas of Pagan philosophy; to which, no doubt, many of the Colossians were in their unconverted state attached, and of which the Judaizing teachers, who also were probably themselves infected with them, took advantage to withdraw the Colossian converts from the purity of the Gospel, and from Christ their living head.

And from the general tenor of this chapter, and particularly from verses 18–23, it appears, that these philosophical dogmas, against which the Apostle cautioned his converts, were partly Platonic, and partly Pythagorean; the former teaching the worship of angels, or demons, as mediators between God and man; the latter enjoining such abstinence from particular kinds of meats and drinks, and such severe mortifications of the body, as God had not commanded.

ELI, a high priest of the Hebrews, of the race of Ithamar, who succeeded Abdon, and governed the Hebrews, both as priest and judge, during forty years. How Eli came to the high priesthood, and how this dignity was transferred from Eleazar's family to that of Ithamar, who was Aaron's youngest son, we know not. This much, however, is certain, that it was not done without an express declaration of God's will, 1 Sam. ii, 27, &c. In the reign of Solomon, the predictions in relation to Eli's family were fulfilled; for the high priesthood was taken from Abiathar, a descendant of Eli, and given to Zadok, who was of the race of Eleazar, 1 Kings ii, 26. Eli appears to have been a pious, but indolent man, blinded by paternal affection, who suffered his sons to gain the ascendancy over him; and for want either of personal courage, or zeal for the glory of God sufficient to restrain their licentious conduct, he permitted them to go on to their own and his ruin. Thus he carried his indulgence to cruelty; while a more dignified and austere conduct on his part might have rendered them wise and virtuous, and thereby have preserved himself and family. A striking lesson for parents! God admonished him by Samuel, then a child; and Eli received those awful admonitions with a mind fully resigned to the divine will. "It is the Lord," said he, "let him do what seemeth him good." God deferred the execution of his vengeance many years. At length, however, Hophni and Phineas, the sons of Eli, were slain by the Philistines, the ark of the Lord was taken, and Eli himself, hearing this melancholy news, fell backward from his chair and broke his neck, in the ninety-eighth year of his age, 1 Sam. iv, 12, 18.

ELIEZER, a native of Damascus, and the steward of Abraham's house. It seems that Abraham, before the birth of Isaac, intended to make him his heir:—"One born in my house," a domestic slave, "is mine heir," Gen. xv, 1–3. He was afterward sent into Mesopotamia, to procure a wife for Isaac, Gen. xxiv, 2, 3, &c; which business he accomplished with fidelity and expedition. "It is still the custom in India," says Forbes, "especially among the Mohammedans, that in default of children, and sometimes where there are lineal descendants, the master of a family adopts a slave, frequently a Haffshee Abyssinian, of the darkest hue, for his heir. He educates him agreeably to his wishes, and marries him to one of his daughters. As the reward of superior merit, or to suit the caprice of an arbitrary despot, this

honour is also conferred on a slave recently purchased, or already grown up in the family; and to him he bequeaths his wealth, in preference to his nephews, or any collateral branches. This is a custom of great antiquity in the east, and prevalent among the most refined and civilized nations. In the earliest period of the patriarchal history, we find Abraham complaining for want of children; and declaring that either Eliezer of Damascus, or probably one born from him in his house, was his heir, to the exclusion of Lot, his favourite nephew, and all the other collateral branches of his family.”

ELIHU, one of Job’s friends, a descendant of Nahor, Job xxxii, 2. See Job.

ELIJAH. Elijah or Elias, a prophet, was a native of Tishbe beyond Jordan in Gilead. Some think that he was a priest descended from Aaron, and say that one Sabaca was his father; but this has no authority. He was raised up by God, to be set like a wall of brass, in opposition to idolatry, and particularly to the worship of Baal, which Jezebel and Ahab supported in Israel. The Scripture introduces Elijah saying to Ahab, 1 Kings xvii, 1, 2, A. M. 3092, “As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word.” It is remarkable, that the number of years is not here specified; but in the New Testament we are informed that it was three years and six 339months. By the prohibition of dew as well as rain, the whole vegetable kingdom was deprived of that moisture, without which neither the more hardy, nor more delicate kinds of plants could shoot into herbage, or bring that herbage to maturity. The Lord commanded Elijah to conceal himself beyond Jordan, near the brook Cherith. He obeyed, and God sent ravens to him morning and evening, which brought him flesh and bread. Scheuzer observes, that he cannot think that the orebim of the Hebrew, rendered “ravens,” means, as some have thought, the inhabitants of a town called Oreb, nor a troop of Arabs called orbhim; and contends that the bird called the raven, or one of the same genus is intended. Suppose that Elijah was concealed from Ahab in some rocky or mountainous spot, where travellers never came; and that here a number of voracious birds had built their nests upon the trees which grew around it, or upon a projecting rock, &c. These flying every day to procure food for their young, the prophet availed himself of a part of what they brought; and while they, obeying the dictates of nature, designed only to provide for their offspring, Divine providence directed them to provide at the same time for the wants of Elijah. What, therefore, he collected, whether from their nests, from what they dropped, or under a supernatural influence, brought to him, or occasionally from all these means, was enough for his daily support. “And the orebim furnished him bread or flesh in the morning, and bread or flesh in the evening.” But as there were probably several of them, some might furnish bread and others flesh, as it

happened; so that a little from each formed his solitary but satisfactory meal. To such straits was the exiled prophet driven! perhaps these orebim were not strictly ravens, but rooks. The word rendered raven, includes the whole genus, among which are some less impure than the raven, as the rook. Rooks living in numerous societies are supposed by some to be the kind of birds employed on this occasion rather than ravens, which fly only in pairs. But upon all these explanations we may observe, that when an event is evidently miraculous, it is quite superfluous, and often absurd, to invent hypotheses to make it appear more easy. After a time the brook dried up, and God sent Elijah to Zarephath, a city of the Sidonians. At the city gate he met with a widow woman gathering sticks, from whom he desired a little water, adding, "Bring me, I pray thee, also a morsel of bread." She answered, "As the Lord liveth, I have no bread, but only a handful of meal, and a little oil in a cruse; and I am gathering some sticks, that I may dress it for me and my son, that we may eat it, and die." Elijah said, "Make first a little cake, and bring it me, and afterward make for thee and thy son: for thus saith the Lord, the barrel of meal shall not waste, neither shall the cruse of oil fail, until the day the Lord sendeth rain upon the earth." His prediction was fully accomplished, and he dwelt at the house of this widow. Some time after, the son of this woman fell sick, and died. The mother, overwhelmed with grief, intreated the assistance and interposition of Elijah, who taking the child in his arms laid him on his own bed, and cried to the Lord for the restoration of the child's life. The Lord heard the prophet's petition, and restored the child.

2. After three years of drought the Lord commanded Elijah to show himself to Ahab. The famine being great in Samaria, Ahab sent the people throughout the country, to inquire after places where they might find forage for the cattle. Obadiah, an officer of the king's household, being thus employed, Elijah presented himself, and directed him to tell Ahab, "Behold, Elijah is here!" Ahab came to meet the prophet, and reproached him as the cause of the famine. Elijah retorted the charge upon the king, and his iniquities, and challenged Ahab to gather the people together, and the prophets of Baal, that it might be determined by a sign from heaven, the falling of fire upon the sacrifice, who was the true God. In this the prophet obeyed the impulse of the Spirit of God; and Ahab, either under an influence of which he was not conscious, or blindly confident in the cause of idolatry, followed Elijah's direction, and convened the people of Israel, and four hundred prophets of Baal. The prophets of Baal prepared their altar, sacrificed their bullock, placed it on the altar, and called upon their gods. They leaped upon the altar, and cut themselves after their manner, crying with all their might. Elijah ridiculed them, and said, "Cry aloud, for he is god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked." When midday was past,



Elijah repaired the altar of the Lord; and with twelve stones, in allusion to the twelve tribes of Israel, he built a new altar. He then laid his bullock upon the wood, poured a great quantity of water three times upon the sacrifice and the wood, so that the water filled the trench which was dug round the altar. After this he prayed, and, in answer to his prayer, the Lord sent fire from heaven, and consumed the wood, the burnt sacrifice, the stones, and dust of the place, and even dried up the water in the trench. Upon this, all the people fell on their faces, and exclaimed, "The Lord, he is the God." Elijah then, having excited the people to slay the false prophets of Baal, said to Ahab, "Go home, eat and drink, for I hear the sound of abundance of rain;" which long-expected blessing descended from heaven according to his prediction, and gave additional proof to the truth of his mission from the only living and true God.

3. Jezebel, the wife of Ahab, threatened Elijah for having slain her prophets. He therefore fled to Beersheba, in the south of Judah, and thence into Arabia Petrea. In the evening, being exhausted with fatigue, he laid himself down under a juniper tree, and prayed God to take him out of the world. An angel touched him, and he arose, and saw a cake baked on the coals, and a cruse of water; and he ate and drank, and slept again. The angel again awakened him, and said, "Rise and eat, for the 340 journey is too great for thee;" and he ate and drank, and went in the strength of that meat forty days and forty nights, unto Horeb, the mount of God. Here he had visions of the glory and majesty of God, and conversed with him; and was commanded to return to the wilderness of Damascus, to anoint Hazael king over Syria, and Jehu king over Israel, and to appoint Elisha his successor in the prophetic office. Some years after, Ahab having seized Naboth's vineyard, the Lord commanded Elijah to reprove Ahab for the crime he had committed. Elijah met him going to Naboth's vineyard to take possession of it, and said, "In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall they lick thy blood, even thine. And the dogs shall eat Jezebel by the wall of Jezreel." Both of which predictions were fulfilled in the presence of the people. Ahaziah, king of Israel, being hurt by a fall from the platform of his house, sent to consult Baalzebub, the god of Ekron, whether he should recover. Elijah met the messengers, and said to them, "Is it because there is no God in Israel that ye go to inquire of Baalzebub, the god of Ekron? Now, therefore, saith the Lord, Thou shalt surely die." The messengers of Ahaziah returned, and informed the king, that a stranger had told them he should certainly die; and Ahaziah knew that this was the Prophet Elijah. The king, therefore, sent a captain with his company of fifty men, to apprehend him; and when the officer was come to Elijah, who was sitting upon a hill, he said, "Thou man of God, the king commands thee to come down." Elijah answered, "If I be a man of God, let fire come down from heaven, and consume thee and thy fifty." The prophet's words were

followed with the effect predicted. The king sent another captain, who was also consumed; but a third captain going to Elijah intreated him to save him and his people's lives, and Elijah accompanied him to the king. By these fearful miracles he was accredited to this successor of Ahab as a prophet of the true God, and the destruction of these companies of armed men was a demonstration of God's anger against the people at large. Elijah could not in this case act from any other impulse than that of the Spirit of God.

4. Elijah, understanding by revelation that God would soon translate him out of this world, was desirous of concealing this fact from Elisha, his inseparable companion. He therefore said to Elisha, "Tarry thou here, for the Lord hath sent me to Bethel." But Elisha answered, "I will not leave thee." At Bethel, Elijah said, "Tarry thou here, the Lord hath sent me to Jericho;" but Elisha replied, he would not forsake him. At Jericho Elijah desired him to stay; but Elisha would not leave him. They went therefore together to Jordan, and fifty of the sons of the prophets followed them at a distance. When they were come to the Jordan, Elijah took his mantle, and with it struck the waters, which divided, and they went over on dry ground. Elijah then said to Elisha, "Ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee." "I pray thee," said Elisha, "let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me;" that is, obtain the gift of prophecy from God for me, in the same measure that thou possessest it. Double may signify like; or the gift of prophecy, and of miracles, in a degree double to what thou dost possess, or to what I now possess. Elijah answered, "Thou hast asked me a very hard thing; yet, if thou see me when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so." As they journeyed, a fiery chariot, with horses of fire, suddenly separated them, and Elijah was carried in a whirlwind to heaven; while Elisha exclaimed, "My father, my father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof!"

5. Elijah was one of the most eminent of that illustrious and singular race of men, the Jewish prophets. Every part of his character is marked by a moral grandeur, which is heightened by the obscurity thrown around his connections, and his private history. He often wears the air of a supernatural messenger suddenly issuing from another world, to declare the commands of heaven, and to awe the proudest mortals by the menace of fearful judgments. His boldness in reproof; his lofty zeal for the honour of God; his superiority to softness, ease, and suffering, are the characters of a man filled with the Holy Spirit; and he was admitted to great intimacy with God, and enabled to work miracles of a very extraordinary and unequivocal character. These were called for by the stupid idolatry of the age, and were in some instances equally calculated to demonstrate the being and power of Jehovah, and to punish those who had forsaken him for

idols. The author of Ecclesiasticus has an encomium to his memory, and justly describes him as a prophet “who stood up as fire, and whose word burned as a lamp.” In the sternness and power of his reproofs he was a striking type of John the Baptist, and the latter is therefore prophesied of, under his name. Malachi, iv, 5, 6, has this passage: “Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.” Our Saviour also declares that Elijah had already come in spirit, in the person of John the Baptist. At the transfiguration of our Saviour, Elijah and Moses both appeared and conversed with him respecting his future passion, Matt. xvii, 3, 4; Mark ix, 4; Luke ix, 30. Many of the Jews in our Lord’s time believed him to be Elijah, or that the soul of Elijah had passed into his body, Matt. xvi, 14; Mark vi, 15; Luke ix, 8. In conclusion, we may observe, that to assure the world of the future existence of good men in a state of glory and felicity, and that in bodies changed from mortality to immortality, each of the three grand dispensations of religion had its instance of translation into heaven; the patriarchal in the person of Enoch, the Jewish in the person of Elijah, and the Christian in the person of Christ.

ELISHA, the son of Shaphat, Elijah’s disciple and successor in the prophetic office, was of the city of Abelmeholah, 1 Kings xix, 34, 16, &c. Elijah having received God’s command to anoint Elisha as a prophet, came to Abelmeholah; and finding him ploughing with oxen, he threw his mantle over the shoulders of Elisha, who left the oxen, and accompanied him. Under the article Elijah, it has been observed that Elisha was following his master, when he was taken up to heaven; and that he inherited Elijah’s mantle, with a double portion of his spirit. Elisha smote the waters of Jordan, and divided them; and he rendered wholesome the waters of a rivulet near Jericho. The kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom, having taken the field against the king of Moab, who had revolted from Israel, were in danger of perishing for want of water. Elisha was at that time in the camp; and seeing Jehoram, the king of Israel, he said, “What have I to do with thee? get thee to the prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother. As the Lord liveth, were it not out of respect to Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, who is here present, I would not so much as look on thee. But now send for a minstrel; and while this man played, the Spirit of the Lord fell upon Elisha, and he said, Thus saith the Lord, Make several ditches along this valley; for ye shall see neither wind nor rain, yet this valley shall be filled with water, and you and your cattle shall drink of it.” The widow of one of the prophets having told Elisha, that her husband’s creditor was determined to take her two sons and sell them for slaves, Elisha multiplied the oil in the widow’s house, in such quantity that she was enabled to sell it and to discharge the debt. Elisha went frequently to Shunem, a city of Manasseh, on this side Jordan, and was entertained by a

certain matron at her house. As she had no children, Elisha promised her a son; and his prediction was accomplished. Some years after, the child died. Elisha, who was then at Mount Carmel, was solicited by the mother to come to her house. The prophet went, and restored the child. At Gilgal, during a great famine, one of the sons of the prophets gathered wild gourds, which he put into the pot, and they were served up to Elisha and the other prophets. It was soon found that they were mortal poison; but Elisha ordering meal to be thrown into the pot, corrected the quality of the pottage. Naaman, general of the king of Syria's forces, having a leprosy, was advised to visit Elisha in order to be cured. Elisha appointed him to wash himself seven times in the Jordan; and by this means Naaman was perfectly healed. He returned to Elisha, and offered him large presents, which the man of God resolutely refused. But Gehazi, Elisha's servant, did not imitate the disinterestedness of his master. He ran after Naaman, and in Elisha's name begged a talent of silver, and two changes of garments. Naaman gave him two talents. Elisha, to whom God had discovered Gehazi's action, reproached him with it, and declared, that the leprosy of Naaman should cleave to him and his family for ever. This is a striking instance of the disinterestedness of the Jewish prophets. Elisha, like his master Elijah, had learned to contemn the world. The king of Syria being at war with the king of Israel, could not imagine how all his designs were discovered by the enemy. He was told, that Elisha revealed them to the king of Israel. He therefore sent troops to seize the prophet at Dothan; but Elisha struck them with blindness, and led them in that condition into Samaria. When they were in the city, he prayed to God to open their eyes; and after he had made them eat and drink, he sent them back unhurt to their master. Some time after, Benhadad, king of Syria, having besieged Samaria, the famine became so extreme, that a certain woman ate her own child. Jehoram, king of Israel, imputing to Elisha these calamities, sent a messenger to cut off his head. Elisha, who was informed of this design against his life, ordered the door to be shut. The messenger was scarcely arrived, when the king himself followed, and made great complaints of the condition to which the town was reduced. Elisha answered, "To-morrow about this time shall a measure of fine flour be sold for a shekel, and two measures of barley for a shekel, in the gate of Samaria." Upon this, one of the king's officers said, "Were the Lord to open windows in heaven, might this thing be." This unbelief was punished; for the prophet answered, "Thou shalt see it with thine eyes, but shalt not eat thereof," which happened according to Elisha's prediction, for he was trodden to death by the crowd in the gate. At the end of the seven years' famine, which the prophet had foretold, he went to Damascus, to execute the command which God had given to Elijah many years before, of declaring Hazael king of Syria. Benhadad being at that time indisposed, and hearing that Elisha was come into his territories, sent Hazael, one of his principal officers, to the

prophet to consult him, and inquire of him whether it were possible for him to recover. The prophet told Hazael, that he might recover, but that he was very well assured that he should not; and then looking steadfastly upon him, he broke out into tears upon the prospect, as he told him, of the many barbarous calamities which he would bring upon Israel, when once he was advanced to power, as he would soon be, because he was assured by divine revelation that he was to be king of Syria. Hazael, though offended at the time at being thought capable of such atrocities, did but too clearly verify these predictions; for at his return, having murdered Benhadad, and procured himself to be declared king, he inflicted the greatest miseries upon the Israelites.

2. Elisha sent one of the sons of the prophets to anoint Jehu, the son of Jehoshaphat, and grandson of Nimshi, to be king, in pursuance of an order given to Elijah some years before; and Jehu having received the royal unction, executed every thing that had been foretold by Elijah against Ahab's family, and against Jezebel. Elisha falling sick, Joash, king of Israel, came to visit him, and said, "O my father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof." Elisha desired the king to bring him a bow and arrows. Joash having brought them, Elisha requested him to put his hands on the bow, and at the same time the prophet put his own hand upon the king's, and said, Open the window which looks east, and let fly an arrow. The king having done this, Elisha said, This is the arrow of the Lord's deliverance: thou shalt be successful against Syria at Aphek. Elisha desired him again to shoot, which he did three times, and then stopped. But Elisha with vehemence said, "If thou hadst smitten five or six times, then thou hadst smitten Syria until thou hadst consumed it; whereas now thou shalt smite Syria only thrice." This is the last prediction of Elisha of which we read in Scripture, for soon after he died; but it was not his last miracle: for, some time after his interment, a company of Israelites, as they were going to bury a dead person, perceiving a band of Moabites making toward them, put the corpse for haste into Elisha's tomb, and, as soon as it had touched the prophet's body, it immediately revived; so that the man stood upon his feet: a striking emblem of the life-giving effect of the labours of the servants of God, after they themselves are gathered to their fathers.

ELUL, the sixth month of the Hebrew ecclesiastical year, and the twelfth of the civil year, answering to our August and part of September, containing twenty-nine days.

EMBALMING, the art of preserving dead bodies from putrefaction. It was much practised by the Egyptians of ancient times, and from them seems to have been borrowed by the Hebrews. It consisted in opening the body, taking out the intestines, and filling the place with odoriferous drugs and

spices of a desiccative quality. Joseph gave orders for the embalming of the body of his father Jacob, Gen. 1, 1, 2; and Moses informs us that the process took up forty days. Joseph himself also was embalmed, Gen. 1, 26. Asa, king of Israel, seems to have been embalmed, 2 Chron. xvi, 13, 14. See Burial.

EMERALD, נִפְךָ, Exod. xxviii, 19; Ezek. xxvii, 16; xxviii, 13; σμάραγδος, Rev. xxi, 19; Eccles. xxxii, 6; Tobit xiii, 16; Judith x, 21. This is generally supposed to be the same with the ancient smaragdus. It is one of the most beautiful of all the gems, and is of a bright green colour, without the admixture of any other. Pliny thus speaks of it: "The sight of no colour is more pleasant than green; for we love to view green fields and green leaves; and are still more fond of looking at the emerald, because all other greens are dull in comparison with this. Beside, these stones seem larger at a distance, by tinging the circumambient air. Their lustre is not changed by the sun, by the shade, nor by the light of lamps; but they have always a sensible moderate brilliancy." From the passage in Ezekiel we learn that the Tyrians traded in these jewels in the marts of Syria. They probably had them from India, or the south of Persia. The true oriental emerald is very scarce, and is only found at present in the kingdom of Cambay.

EMERODS. The disease of the Philistines, which is mentioned in 1 Sam. v, 6, 12; vi, 17, is denominated, in the Hebrew, עֲפָלִים. This word occurs, likewise, in Deut. xxviii, 27; and it is worthy of remark, that it is every where explained in the *keri*, or marginal readings, by the Aramæan word, טַחְרִים; an expression which, in the Syriac dialect, where it occurs under the forms, טַהֲרָא and טַהֲרָא, means the fundament, and likewise the effort which is made in an evacuation of the system. The authors, therefore, of the reading in the *keri* appear to have assented to the opinion of Josephus, and to have understood by this word the dysentery. The corresponding Arabic words mean a swelling, answering somewhat in its nature to the hernia in men: a disease, consequently, very different from the hemorrhoids, which some persons understand to be meant by the word עֲפָלִים. Among other objections, it may also be observed, that the mice, which are mentioned, not only in the Hebrew text, 1 Sam. vi, 5, 12; xvi, 18, but also in the Alexandrine and Vulgate versions, 1 Sam. v, 6; vi, 5, 11, 18, are an objection to understanding the hemorrhoids by the word under consideration, since if that were in fact the disease, we see no reason why mice should have been presented as an offering to avert the anger of the God of Israel. Lichtenstein has given this solution: The word, עֲכַפְרִים, which is rendered mice, he supposes to mean venomous solpugas, which belong to the spider class, and yet are so large, and so similar in their form to mice, as to admit of their being denominated by the same word. These venomous animals destroy and live upon scorpions. They also bite men,

whenever they can have an opportunity, particularly in the fundament and the verenda. Their bite causes swellings, which are fatal in their consequences, called, in Hebrew, עפלים. The probable supposition, then, is, that solpugas were at this time multiplied among the Philistines by the special providence of God; and that, being very venomous, they were the means of destroying many individuals.

EMIMS, ancient inhabitants of the land of Canaan, beyond Jordan, who were defeated by Chedorlaomer and his allies, Gen. xiv, 5. Moses tells us that they were beaten at Shaveh-Kirjathaim, which was in the country of Sihon, conquered from the Moabites, Josh. xiii, 19–21. The Emims were a warlike people, of a gigantic stature, great and numerous, tall as the Anakims, and were accounted giants as well as they, Deut. ii, 10, 11.

EMMANUEL, or IMMANUEL, “God with us.” It answers both in the LXX, and Matt. i, 23, to the Hebrew עִמָּנוּאֵל, from עם, with, נו, us, and אֵל, God, Isa. vii, 14; viii, 8.

EMMAUS, a village about eight miles north-west of Jerusalem; on the road to which, two of the disciples were travelling in sorrow and disappointment after the resurrection, when our Lord appeared to them, and held that memorable conversation with them which is recorded by St. Luke, xxiv.

ENDOR, a city in the tribe of Manasseh, where the witch resided whom Saul consulted a little before the battle of Gilboa, Joshua xvii, 34311; 1 Sam. xxviii, 13. Mr. Bryant derives Endor from En-Ador, signifying fons pythonis, “the fountain of light,” or oracle of the god Ador: which oracle was probably founded by the Canaanites, and had never been totally suppressed. The ancient world had many such oracles: the most famous of which were that of Jupiter-Ammon in Lybia, and that of Delphi in Greece: and in all of them, the answers to those who consulted them were given from the mouth of a female; who, from the priestess of Apollo at Delphi, has generally received the name of Pythia. That many such oracles existed in Canaan, is evident from the number which Saul himself is said to have suppressed; and such a one, with its Pythia, was this at Endor. At these shrines, either as mock oracles, contrived by a crafty and avaricious priesthood, to impose on the credulity and superstition of its followers; or, otherwise, as is more generally supposed, as the real instruments of infernal power, mankind, having altogether departed from the true God, were permitted to be deluded. That, in this case, the real Samuel appeared is plain both from the affright of the woman herself, and from the fulfilment of his prophecy. It was an instance of God’s overruling the wickedness of men, to manifest his own supremacy and justice.

ENGEDI. It is also called Hazazon-Tamar, or city of palm trees, 2 Chron. xx, 2, because there was a great quantity of palm trees in the territory belonging to it. It abounded with Cyprus vines, and trees that produced balm. Solomon speaks of the "vineyards of Engedi," Cant. i, 14. This city, according to Josephus, stood near the lake of Sodom, three hundred furlongs from Jerusalem, not far from Jericho, and the mouth of the river Jordan, through which it discharged itself into the Dead Sea. There is frequent mention of Engedi in the Scriptures. It was in the cave of Engedi that David had it in his power to kill Saul, 1 Sam. xxiv. The spot where this transaction took place, was a cavern in the rock, sufficiently large to contain in its recesses the whole of David's men, six hundred in number, unperceived by Saul when he entered. Many similar caves existed in the Holy Land. Such were those at Adullam and Makkedah, and that in which Lot and his daughters dwelt after the destruction of Sodom. Such also is that described by Mr. Maundrell, near Sidon, which contained two hundred smaller caverns. Many of these were natural cavities in the limestone rock, similar to those in Yorkshire and Derbyshire, and in the Mendip hills in Somersetshire; and others, excavations made by the primeval inhabitants, for defence, or for shelter from the sun; and which subsequently served as retreats for robbers, as they are at this day. Josephus has given an interesting account of these caves, and the manner in which the robbers were taken by Herod. And Dr. E. D. Clarke has described similar retreats in the rocks near Bethlehem; others, between Jerusalem and Jericho, are mentioned by Mr. Wilson. Into such caves the Israelites frequently retired for shelter from their enemies, Judg. vi, 2; 1 Sam. xiii, 6; xiv, 11; a circumstance which has afforded some striking and terrific images to the prophets, Isaiah ii, 19; Hosea x, 8; Rev. vi, 15, 16.

ENOCH, the son of Cain, Gen. iv, 17, in honour of whom the first city noticed in Scripture was called Enoch, by his father Cain, who was the builder. It was situated on the east of the province of Eden.

2. Enoch, the son of Jared, and father of Methuselah. He was born A. M. 622, and being contemporary with Adam, he had every opportunity of learning from him the story of the creation, the circumstance of the fall, the terms of the promise, and other important truths. An ancient author affirms, that he was the father of astronomy; and Eusebius hence infers, that he is the same with the Atlas of the Grecian mythology. Enoch's fame rests upon a better basis than his skill in science. The encomium of Enoch is, that he "walked with God." While mankind were living in open rebellion against Heaven, and provoking the divine vengeance daily by their ungodly deeds, he obtained the exalted testimony, "that he pleased God." This he did, not only by the exemplary tenor of his life, and by the attention which he paid



to the outward duties of religion, but by the soundness of his faith, and the purity of his heart and life: see Heb. xi, 5, 6. The intent of the Apostle, in the discourse containing this passage, is, to show that there has been but one way of obtaining the divine favour ever since the fall, and that is, by faith, or a firm persuasion and confidence in the atonement to be made for human transgressions by the obedience, sufferings, death, and resurrection of the promised Messiah. The cloud of witnesses which the Apostle has produced of Old Testament worthies, all bore, in their respective generations, their testimony to this great doctrine, in opposition to the atheism or theism, and gross idolatry, which prevailed around them. All the patriarchs are celebrated for their faith in this great truth, and for preserving this principle of religion in the midst of a corrupt generation. Enoch, therefore, is said, by another evangelical writer, to have spoken of the coming of Christ to judgment unto the antediluvian sinners. See Jude 14, 15. This prophecy is a clear, and it is also an awful, description of the day of judgment, when the Messiah shall sit upon his throne of justice, to determine the final condition of mankind, according to their works; and it indicates that the different offices of Messiah both to save and to judge, or as Prophet, Priest, and King, were known to the holy patriarchs. On what the Apostle founded this prediction has been matter of much speculation and inquiry. Some, indeed, have produced a treatise, called "The Book of Enoch," which, as they pretend, contains the cited passage; but its authority is not proved, and internal evidence sufficiently marks its spurious origin. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the prophecy cited by St. Jude was either traditionally handed down, or had been specially communicated to that Apostle. In the departure of Enoch from this world of sin and sorrow, the Almighty altered the ordinary course of things, and gave him a dismissal as glorious to himself, as it was instructive to mankind. To convince them how acceptable holiness is to him, and to show that he had prepared for those that love him a heavenly inheritance, he caused Enoch to be taken from the earth without passing through death. See Elijah.

ENOS, or ENOSH, the son of Seth, and father of Cainan. He was born A. M. 235. Moses tells us that then "men began to call upon the name of the Lord," Gen iv, 26; that is, such as abhorred the impiety and immorality which prevailed among the progeny of Cain, began to worship God in public, and to assemble together at stated times for that purpose. Good men, to distinguish themselves from the wicked, began to take the name of sons or servants of God; for which reason Moses, Gen. vi, 1, 2, says that "the sons of God," or the descendants of Enos, "seeing the daughters of men," &c. The eastern people make the following additions to his history:-that Seth, his father, declared him sovereign prince and high priest of mankind, next after himself; that Enos was the first who ordained public

alms for the poor, established public tribunals for the administration of justice, and planted, or rather cultivated, the palm tree.

EPHAH, the eldest son of Midian, who gave his name to a city and small extent of land in the country of Midian, situated on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, Genesis xxv, 4. This country abounded with camels and dromedaries, Isaiah lx, 6, &c.

2. Ephah, a measure both for things dry and liquid, in use among the Hebrews. The ephah for the former contained three pecks and three pints. In liquid measure it was of the same capacity as the bath.

EPHESUS, a much celebrated city of Ionia, in Asia Minor, situated upon the river Cayster, and on the side of a hill. It was the metropolis of the Proconsular Asia, and formerly in great renown among Heathen authors on account of its famous temple of Diana. This temple was seven times set on fire: one of the principal conflagrations happened on the very day that Socrates was poisoned, four hundred years before Christ; the other, on the same night in which Alexander the Great was born, when a person of the name of Erostratus set it on fire, according to his own confession, to get himself a name! It was, however, rebuilt and beautified by the Ephesians, toward which the female inhabitants of the city contributed liberally. In the times of the Apostles it retained much of its former grandeur; but, so addicted were the inhabitants of the city to idolatry and the arts of magic, that the prince of darkness would seem to have, at that time, fixed his throne in it. Ephesus is supposed to have first invented those obscure mystical spells and charms by means of which the people pretended to heal diseases and drive away evil spirits; whence originated the Ἐφεσια γράμματα, or Ephesian letters, so often mentioned by the ancients.

2. The Apostle Paul first visited this city, A. D. 54; but being then on his way to Jerusalem, he abode there only a few weeks, Acts xviii, 19–21. During his short stay, he found a synagogue of the Jews, into which he went, and reasoned with them upon the interesting topics of his ministry, with which they were so pleased that they wished him to prolong his visit. He however declined that, for he had determined, God willing, to be at Jerusalem at an approaching festival; but he promised to return, which he did a few months afterward, and continued there three years, Acts xix, 10; xx, 31. While the Apostle abode in Ephesus and its neighbourhood, he gathered a numerous Christian church, to which, at a subsequent period, he wrote that epistle, which forms so important a part of the Apostolic writings. He was then a prisoner at Rome, and the year in which he wrote it must have been 60 or 61 of the Christian æra. It appears to have been transmitted to them by the hands of Tychicus, one of his companions in

travel, Ephesians vi, 21. The critics have remarked that the style of the Epistle to the Ephesians is exceedingly elevated; and that it corresponds to the state of the Apostle's mind at the time of writing. Overjoyed with the account which their messenger brought him of the steadfastness of their faith, and the ardency of their love to all the saints, Eph. i, 15; and, transported with the consideration of the unsearchable wisdom of God displayed in the work of man's redemption, and of his amazing love toward the Gentiles, in introducing them, as fellow-heirs with the Jews, into the kingdom of Christ, he soars into the most exalted contemplation of those sublime topics, and gives utterance to his thoughts in language at once rich and varied. The epistle, says Macknight, is written as it were in a rapture. Grotius remarks that it expresses the sublime matters contained in it in terms more sublime than are to be found in any human language; to which Macknight subjoins this singular but striking observation, that no real Christian can read the doctrinal part of the Epistle to the Ephesians, without being impressed and roused by it, as by the sound of a trumpet.

3. Ephesus was one of the seven churches to which special messages were addressed in the book of Revelation. After a commendation of their first works, to which they were commanded to return, they were accused of having left their first love, and threatened with the removal of their candlestick out of its place, except they should repent, Rev. ii, 5. The contrast which its present state presents to its former glory, is a striking fulfilment of this prophecy. Ephesus was the metropolis of Lydia, a great and opulent city, and, according to Strabo, the greatest emporium of Asia Minor. Its temple of Diana, "whom all Asia worshipped," was adorned with one hundred and twenty-seven columns of Parian marble, each of a single shaft, and sixty feet high, and which formed one of the seven wonders of the world. The remains of its magnificent theatre, in which it is said that twenty thousand people could easily have been seated, are yet to be seen. But a few heaps of stones, and some miserable mud cottages, occasionally tenanted by Turks, without one Christian residing there, are all the remains of ancient Ephesus. It is, as described by different travellers, a solemn and most forlorn spot. The Epistle to the Ephesians is read throughout the world; but there is none in Ephesus to read it now. They left their first love, they returned not to their first works. Their "candlestick has been removed out of its place;" and the great city of Ephesus is no more. Dr. Chandler says, "The inhabitants are a few Greek peasants, living in extreme wretchedness, dependence, and insensibility; the representatives of an illustrious people, and inhabiting the wreck of their greatness; some, in the substructions of the glorious edifices which they raised; some, beneath the vaults of the stadium, once the crowded scene of their diversions; and some, by the abrupt precipice, in the sepulchres which received their ashes. Its streets are obscured and overgrown. A herd of goats

was driven to it for shelter from the sun at noon; and a noisy flight of crows from the quarries seemed to insult its silence. We heard the partridge call in the area of the theatre and the stadium. The glorious pomp of its Heathen worship is no longer remembered; and Christianity, which was here nursed by Apostles, and fostered by general councils, until it increased to fulness of stature, barely lingers on in an existence hardly visible." "I was at Ephesus," says Mr. Arundell, "in January, 1824; the desolation was then complete: a Turk, whose shed we occupied, his Arab servant, and a single Greek, composed the entire population; some Turcomans excepted, whose black tents were pitched among the ruins. The Greek revolution, and the predatory excursions of the Samiotes, in great measure accounted for this total desertion. There is still, however, a village near, probably the same which Chishull and Van Egmont mention, having four hundred Greek houses."

St. John passed the latter part of his life in Asia Minor, and principally at Ephesus, where he died.

EPHOD, עֶפְדֹּד. This article of dress was worn by laymen as well as by the high priest. The sacred ephod, the one made for the high priest, differed from the others, in being fabricated of cotton, which was coloured with crimson, purple, and blue, and in being ornamented with gold. In the time of Josephus, it was a cubit of the larger size in length, and was furnished with sleeves. The high priest's ephod had a very rich button upon each shoulder, made of a large onyx stone set in gold. This stone was so large, that the names of the twelve tribes of Israel were engraven, six on each stone, Exod. xxviii, 9–12. The word shoham, which we render onyx, is translated, by the Septuagint smaragdus, an emerald; but as we have no certain knowledge either of this, or of any of the twelve stones of the breastplate, we may as well be satisfied with our translation as with any other. To the ephod belonged a curious girdle, of the same rich fabric as the ephod itself. This girdle is said to be upon the ephod, Exod. xxviii, 8; that is, woven with the ephod, as Maimonides understands; and, coming out from the ephod on each side, it was brought under the arms like a sash, and tied upon the breast. Samuel, though a Levite only, and a child, wore a linen ephod, 1 Sam. ii, 18. And David, in the ceremony of removing the ark from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem, was girt with a linen ephod, 2 Sam. vi, 14. The Levites were not generally allowed to wear the ephod; but in the time of Agrippa, as we are told by Josephus, a little before the taking of Jerusalem by the Romans, they obtained of that prince permission to wear the linen stole as well as the priests. Spencer and Cunæus are of opinion, that the Jewish kings had a right to wear the ephod, because David, coming to Ziklag, and finding that the Amalekites had plundered the city, and carried away his and the people's wives, ordered

Abiathar, the high priest, to bring him the ephod, which being done, David inquired of the Lord, saying, "Shall I pursue after this troop?" 1 Sam. xxx, 8. Whence they infer, that David consulted God by urim and thummim, and consequently put on the ephod. But it is probable the text only means that he ordered the priest to do what he is himself said to have done. The ephod of Gideon is remarkable for having become the occasion of a new kind of idolatry to the Israelites, Judges viii, 27. What this consisted in, is matter of dispute among the learned. Some authors are of opinion that this ephod, as it is called, was an idol; others, that it was only a trophy in memory of the signal victory obtained by Gideon, and that the Israelites paid a kind of divine worship to it; so that Gideon was the innocent cause of their idolatry, in like manner as Moses had been in making the brazen serpent, which was afterward worshipped.

EPHRAIM was the name of Joseph's second son, by Asenath, Potiphar's daughter. He was born in Egypt, A. M. 2294. Ephraim, with his brother Manasseh, was presented by his father Joseph to Jacob on his death bed, Gen. xlviii, 8, &c. Jacob laid his right hand on Ephraim the younger, and his left on Manasseh the elder. Joseph was desirous to change his hands, but Jacob answered, "I know it, my son; Manasseh shall be multiplied, but Ephraim shall be greater." The sons of Ephraim having made an inroad into Palestine, the inhabitants of Gath killed them. Ephraim their father mourned many days for them, and his brethren came to comfort him, 1 Chron. vii, 20, 21. Afterward, he had a son named Beriah, and a daughter Sherah. He had also other sons, Rephah, Resheph, Tela, &c. His posterity multiplied in Egypt to the number of forty thousand five hundred men capable of bearing arms. In the land of promise, Joshua, who was of this tribe, gave them their portion between the Mediterranean west, and the river Jordan east. The ark and tabernacle remained long in this tribe at Shiloh; 346 and after the separation of the ten tribes, the seat of the kingdom was in Ephraim, and hence Ephraim is frequently used to denote the whole kingdom. The district belonging to this tribe is called Ephrath, Psalm cxxxii, 6. Ephraim was led captive beyond the Euphrates, with all Israel, by Salmaneser, king of Assyria, A. M. 3283.

2. Ephraim was also the name of a city, into which Christ retired with his disciples a little before his passion, John xi, 54. It was situated in the tribe of Ephraim near the river Jordan. There was also the wood or forest of Ephraim, situated on the other side Jordan, in which Absalom's army was routed and himself killed, 2 Sam. xviii, 6.

EPHRATH, Caleb's second wife, who was the mother of Hur, 1 Chron. ii, 19. From her, it is believed that the city of Ephrath, otherwise called

Bethlehem, where our Lord was born, had its name; and this city is more than once known in Scripture by the name of Ephrath, Gen. xxxv, 16.

EPICUREANS, a sect of philosophers in Greece and Rome. Epicurus was their founder, who lived about B. C. 300. The physical doctrine of Epicurus was as follows: Nothing can ever spring from nothing, nor can any thing ever return to nothing. The universe always existed, and will always remain; for there is nothing into which it can be changed. There is nothing in nature, nor can any thing be conceived, beside body and space. Body is that which possesses the properties of bulk, figure, resistance, and gravity; it is this alone which can touch and be touched. Space, or vacuum, destitute of the properties of body, incapable of action or passion, is the region which is or may be occupied by body, and which affords it an opportunity of moving freely. The existence of bodies is attested by the senses. Space must also exist, in order to allow bodies place in which to move and exist; and of their existence and motion we have the certain proof of perception. Beside body and space, no third nature can be conceived. But the existence of qualities is not precluded, because these have no subsistence except in the body to which they belong. The universe, consisting of body and space, is infinite. Bodies are infinite in multitude; space is infinite in magnitude. The universe is immovable, because there is no place beyond it into which it can move. It is also eternal and immutable, since it is liable to neither increase nor decrease, to production nor decay. Nevertheless, the parts of the universe are in motion, and are subject to change. All bodies consist of parts which are either themselves simple principles, or may be resolved into such. These first principles, or simple atoms, are divisible by no force, and therefore must be immutable.

2. The formation of the world he conceived to have happened in the following manner: A finite number of that infinite multitude of atoms, which, with infinite space, constitute the universe, falling fortuitously into the region of the world, were, in consequence of their innate motion, collected into one rude and indigested mass. In this chaos, the heaviest and largest atoms, or collections of atoms, first subsided, while the smaller, and those which from their form would move most freely, were driven upwards. These latter, after several reverberations, rose into the outer region of the world, and formed the heavens. Those atoms which, by their size and figure, were suited to form fiery bodies, collected themselves into stars; those which were not capable of rising so high in the sphere of the world, being disturbed by the fiery particles, formed themselves into air. At length, from those which subsided, was produced the earth. By the action of air, agitated by heat from the heavenly bodies, upon the mixed mass of the earth, its smoother and lighter particles were separated from the rest, and water was produced, which naturally flowed into the lowest

places. In the first combination of atoms, which formed the chaos, various seeds arose, which, being preserved and nourished by moisture and heat, afterward sprung forth in organized bodies of different kinds. The soul is a subtle corporeal substance, composed of the finest atoms, which, by the extreme tenuity of its particles, is able to penetrate the whole body, and to adhere to all its parts. It is composed of four distinct parts: fire, which causes animal heat; an ethereal principle which is moist vapour; air; and a fourth principle, which is the cause of sensation. These four parts are so perfectly combined as to form one subtle substance, which, while it remains in the body, is the cause of all its faculties, motions, and passions, and which cannot be separated from it, without producing the entire dissolution of the animal system.

3. In the universe there are, according to Epicurus, without contradiction, divine natures; because nature itself has impressed the idea of divinity upon the minds of men. The notion is universal; nor is it established by custom, law, or any human institution; but it is the effect of an innate principle, producing universal consent, and therefore it must be true. This universal notion has probably arisen from images of the gods, which have casually made their way into the minds of men in sleep, and have afterward been recollected. But it is inconsistent with our natural notions of the gods, as happy and immortal beings, to suppose that they encumber themselves with the management of the world, or are subject to the cares and passions which must attend so great a charge. Hence it is inferred, that the gods have no intercourse with mankind, nor any concern with the affairs of the world. Nevertheless, on account of their excellent nature, they are objects of reverence and worship. In their external shape the gods resemble men; and though the place of their residence is unknown to mortals; it is without doubt the mansion of perfect purity, tranquillity, and happiness. Thus he attempted to account for all the appearances of nature, even those which respect animated and intelligent beings, upon the simple principles of matter and motion, without introducing the agency of a supreme intelligence, or admitting any other idea of fate, than that of blind necessity inherent in every atom, by which it moves in a certain direction.

4. The ethics of Epicurus are much less exceptionable than his physics; of which we may judge from the following summary: The end of living, or the ultimate good, which is to be sought for its own sake, according to the universal opinion of mankind, is happiness; which men generally fail of attaining, because they form wrong notions of the nature of happiness, or do not use proper means for attaining it. The happiness which belongs to man, is that state in which he enjoys as many of the good things, and suffers as few of the evils incident to human nature as possible, passing his days in a smooth course of permanent tranquillity. Perfect happiness cannot

possibly be possessed without the pleasure that attends freedom from pain, and the enjoyment of the good things of life. Pleasure is in its nature good, and ought to be pursued; and pain is in its nature evil, and should be avoided. Beside, pleasure or pain is the measure of what is good or evil in every object of desire or aversion. However, pleasure ought not in every instance to be pursued, nor pain to be avoided; but reason is to distinguish and compare the nature and degrees of each, that the result may be a wise choice of that which shall appear to be, upon the whole, good. That pleasure is the first good, appears from the inclination which every animal, from its first birth, discovers to pursue pleasure and avoid pain; and is confirmed by the universal experience of mankind, who are incited to action by no other principle, than the desire of avoiding pain, or obtaining pleasure. Of pleasures there are two kinds; one consisting in a state of rest, in which both body and mind are free from pain; the other arising from an agreeable agitation of the senses, producing a correspondent emotion in the soul. Upon the former of these, the enjoyment of life chiefly depends. Happiness may, therefore, be said to consist in bodily ease and mental tranquillity. It is the office of reason to confine the pursuit of pleasure within the limits of nature, so as to attain this happy state; which neither resembles a rapid torrent, nor a standing pool, but is like a gentle stream, that glides smoothly and silently along. This happy state can only be attained by a prudent care of the body, and a steady government of the mind. The diseases of the body are to be prevented by temperance, or cured by medicine, or endured tolerably by patience. Against the diseases of the mind philosophy provides sufficient antidotes; the virtues are its instruments for this purpose; the radical spring of which is prudence, or wisdom, and this instructs men to free their understanding from the clouds of prejudice; to exercise temperance and fortitude in the government of themselves; and to practise justice toward all others. In a happy life, pleasure can never be separated from virtue. The followers of Epicurus, however, degenerated into mere sensualists,--an effect which could only result from a system which denied a supreme God, and excluded from all concern with the affairs of men even those divine natures which it allowed to exist. This sect is mentioned Acts xvii, 18.

EPISCOPACY, Diocesan. The number of Christians in most of the primitive churches was at first small: they could easily, when not prevented by persecution, assemble together; and they thus formed one church or congregation; for, in Scripture, the term church is never used in the more modern acceptation of the word, but is employed to denote either the whole church of Christ, or a number of disciples meeting for the celebration of divine worship. The converts, however, rapidly increased; and when they could no longer meet in one place, other places would be prepared for them. But, connected as they still were with the parent church, they would



choose from its presbyters their own pastors, and view themselves as under the inspection of the president and the presbytery, by whom the affairs of the church had been previously conducted. The pastors would thus remain members of the presbytery, as they had formerly been, and would look up to that one of their number who had been accustomed to preside among them. They were, in fact, for a considerable time, considered as one with the original church: the bishop sent to them the elements of the Lord's Supper as the pledge of unity; and we find it asserted by ancient writers, that there was one altar and one bishop. There were in this way gradually established, first in the towns or cities in which the Apostles had called men to the truth, and then in the contiguous district of country, several congregations: in these pastors officiated, who were authorized by the bishop and presbytery, whose superintendence was extended, so that parochial episcopacy was insensibly but naturally changed into diocesan episcopacy; many of the presbyters sent out by the bishop residing at their churches, but nevertheless composing part of his council, and being summoned to meet with him upon important occasions. This enlargement of the field of inspection rendered the particular superintendence of the bishop more requisite; and was the means both of adding to his influence, and of his being regarded as permanently raised above his brethren.

2. The ministers who were sent to the recently erected churches had probably different powers, according to the numbers to whom they were to officiate, the situation of the churches in respect of the original church, and the tranquillity or persecution which was their lot. In the immediate neighbourhood of the bishop, and where one person was sufficient, he would merely perform the duties that had been assigned to him previous to his mission; but the same reasons that led the Apostles to plant several presbyters in the churches which they founded might render it expedient that more than one, sometimes that a considerable number, should be attached to the newly-formed congregations; more particularly when the number attending was large, and when there was the prospect of their still farther increasing. In such cases, it appears that the bishop gave to one of the presbyters sent, and did so for the same reasons that had at first created inequality among the pastors, more extensive powers than were entrusted to the rest, and made him his representative authorizing him to preside over the others, and to discharge those parts of the ministerial office which, in his own church, he reserved for himself. When this happened, the person so distinguished was termed choro-episcopus: he was more than a presbyter, but he was inferior to the bishop, acted by his directions, and could be controlled by him in the exercise of the privileges which had been granted. Such subordinate bishops continued for a considerable time; but it might, from the beginning, have been foreseen that they would soon aspire to an equality with the original bishops; and they were at length

suppressed, under the pretence that, by multiplying the higher order in places of little consequence, the church would detract from the respectability of that order, and lessen the reverence with which it should be regarded.

3. The different congregations or churches which were established in various cities and the adjoining districts were in so far independent of each other, that the bishops and presbyters of each had the rule of their particular church, and of the churches which had sprung from it, and were entitled, by their own authority, to make such regulations as appeared to them to be requisite; and this species of independence continued for a considerable time, every bishop presiding in his congregation, and afterward in his diocese. There was, however, always a common tie by which they were united. Neighbouring churches, actuated by ardent zeal for the interests of divine truth, consulted together upon the best mode of promoting it. We know that the Apostolic churches were enjoined to communicate to other bodies the epistles which they had received; and while persecution continued, it was natural for all who were exposed to it to consider by what means its fury could be avoided.

4. After the bishops were established as superior to presbyters, when any meeting was held respecting religion, or the administration of the church, it was chiefly composed of this higher order, and the president of the synod or council was elected from their number. These meetings were generally assembled in the metropolis, or principal city of the district; and hence the bishop of this city, being frequently called to preside, came, at length, to be regarded as entitled to do so: thus acquiring a superiority over the other bishops, just as they had acquired superiority over the inferior clergy. He was, in consequence, distinguished by a particular name, being denominated, from the city in which he presided, a metropolitan.

EPISCOPALIANS, those who maintain that bishops, presbyters, or priests, and deacons, are three distinct orders in the church; and that the bishops have a superiority over both the others. The episcopal form of church government professes to find in the days of the Apostles the model upon which it is framed. While our Lord remained upon earth, he acted as the immediate governor of his church. Having himself called the Apostles, he kept them constantly about his person, except at one time, when he sent them forth upon a short progress through the cities of Judea, and gave them particular directions how they should conduct themselves. The seventy disciples, whom he sent forth at another time, are never mentioned again in the New Testament. But the Apostles received from him many intimations that their office was to continue after his departure; and as one great object of his ministry was to qualify them for the execution of this

office, so, in the interval between his resurrection and his ascension, he explained to them the duties of it, and he invested them with the authority which the discharge of those duties implied. “Go,” said he, “make disciples of all nations, baptizing them, teaching them; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost,” Matt. xxviii, 19, 20; John xx, 21, 22. Soon after the ascension of Jesus, his Apostles received those extraordinary gifts of which his promise had given them assurance; and immediately they began to execute their commission, not only as the witnesses of his resurrection, and the teachers of his religion, but as the rulers of that society which was gathered by their preaching. In Acts vi, we find the Apostles ordering the Christians at Jerusalem to “look out seven men of honest report,” who might take charge of the daily ministrations to the poor, and to bring the men so chosen to them, that “we,” said the Apostles, “may appoint them over this business.” The men accordingly were “set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.” Here are the Apostles ordaining deacons. Afterward, we find St. Paul, in his progress through Asia Minor, ordaining in every church elders, πρεσβυτέρους; the name properly expressive of age being transferred, after the practice of the Jews, as a mark of respect, to ecclesiastical rulers, Acts xiv, 23. The men thus ordained by St. Paul appear, from the book of Acts and the Epistles, to have been teachers, pastors, overseers, of the flock of Christ; and to Timothy, who was a minister of the word, the Apostle speaks of “the gift which is in thee by the putting on of my hands,” 2 Tim. i, 6. Over the persons to whom he thus conveyed the office of teaching, he exercised jurisdiction; for he sent to Ephesus, to the elders of the church to meet him at Miletus; and there, in a long discourse, gave them a solemn charge, Acts xx, 17–35; and to Timothy and Titus he writes epistles in the style of a superior.

2. As St. Paul unquestionably conceived that there belonged to him, as an Apostle, an authority over other office-bearers of the church, so his epistles contain two examples of a delegation of that authority. He not only directs Timothy, whom he had besought to abide at Ephesus, how to behave himself in the house of God as a minister, but he sets him over other ministers. He empowers him to ordain men to the work of the ministry: “The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also,” 2 Tim. ii, 2. He gives him directions about the ordination of bishops and deacons; he places both these kinds of office-bearers in Ephesus under his inspection, instructing him in what manner to receive an accusation against an elder who laboured in word and doctrine; and he commands him to charge some that they teach no other doctrine but the form of sound words. In like manner he says to Titus, “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that

thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee,” Titus i, 5. He describes to Titus the qualifications of a bishop or elder, making him the judge how far any person in Crete was possessed of these qualifications; he gives him authority over all orders of Christians there; and he empowers him to reject heretics. Here, then, is that Apostle, with whose actions we are best acquainted, seemingly aware that there would be continual occasion in the Christian church for the exercise of that authority over pastors and teachers, which the Apostles had derived from the Lord Jesus; and by these two examples of a delegation, given during his life time, preparing the world for beholding that authority exercised by the successors of the Apostles in all ages. Accordingly, the earliest Christian writers tell us that the Apostles, to prevent contention, appointed bishops and deacons; giving orders, too, that, upon their death, other approved men should succeed in their ministry. We are told that the other Apostles constituted their first-fruits, that is, their first disciples, after they had proved them by the Spirit, bishops and deacons of those who were to believe; and that the Apostle John, who survived the rest, after returning from Patmos, the place of his banishment, went about the neighbouring nations, ordaining bishops, establishing whole churches, and setting apart particular persons for the ministry, as they were pointed out to him by the Spirit.

3. As bishops are mentioned in the earliest times, so ecclesiastical history records the succession of bishops through many ages; and even during the first three centuries, before Christianity was incorporated with the state, every city, where the multitude of Christians required a number of pastors to perform the stated offices, presents to us, as far as we can gather from contemporary writers, an appearance very much the same with that of the church of Jerusalem in the days of the Apostles. The Apostle James seems to have resided in that city. But there is also mention of the elders of the church, who, according to the Scripture representation of elders, must have discharged the ministerial office, but over whom the Apostle James presided. So, in Carthage, where Cyprian was bishop, and in every other Christian city of which we have particular accounts, there was a college of presbyters; and there was one person who had not only presidency, but jurisdiction and authority, over the rest. They were his council in matters relating to the church, and they were qualified to preach, to baptize, and to administer the Lord’s Supper; but they could do nothing without his permission and authority. It is a principle in Christian antiquity, εἰς ἐπίσκοπος, μία ἐκκλησία, “one bishop, and one church.” The one bishop had the care of all the Christians, who, although they met in separate congregations, constituted one church; and he had the inspection of the pastors, who, having received ordination from the bishop, officiated in the separate congregations, performed the several parts of duty which he

prescribed to them, and were accountable to him for their conduct. In continuation of this primitive institution, we find episcopacy in all corners of the church of Christ. Until the time of the reformation, there were, in every Christian state, persons with the name, the rank, and the authority of bishops; and the existence of such persons was not considered as an innovation, but as an establishment, which, by means of catalogues preserved in ecclesiastical writers, may be traced back to the days of the Apostles.

4. Upon the principles which have now been stated, it is understood, according to the episcopal form of government, that there is in the church a superior order of office-bearers, the successors of the Apostles, who possess in their own persons the right of ordination and jurisdiction, and who are called ἐπισκόποι, as being the overseers not only of the people, but also of the clergy; and an inferior order of ministers, called presbyters, the literal translation of the word πρεσβύτεροι, which is rendered in our English Bibles elders, persons who receive, from the ordination of the bishop, power to preach and to administer the sacraments, who are set over the people, but are themselves under the government of the bishop, and have no right to convey to others the sacred office, which he gives them authority to exercise under him. According to a phrase used by Charles I, who was by no means an unlearned defender of that form of government to which he was a martyr, the presbyters are *episcopi gregis*; [bishops of the flock;] but the bishops are *episcopi gregis et pastorum*, [bishops of the flock and of the pastors.]

5. The liberal writers on that side, however, do not contend that this form of government is made so binding in the church as not to be departed from, and varied according to circumstances. It cannot be proved, says Dr. Paley, that any form of church government was laid down in the Christian, as it had been in the Jewish, Scriptures, with a view of fixing a constitution for succeeding ages. The truth seems to have been, that such offices were at first erected in the Christian church as the good order, the instruction, and the exigencies of the society at that time required; without any intention, at least without any declared design, of regulating the appointment, authority, or the distinction, of Christian ministers under future circumstances. To the same effect, also, Bishop Tomline says, “It is not contended that the bishops, priests, and deacons of England are at present precisely the same that bishops, presbyters, and deacons were in Asia Minor, seventeen hundred years ago. We only maintain that there have always been bishops, priests, and deacons, in the Christian church, since the days of the Apostles, with different powers and functions, it is allowed, in different countries and at different periods; but the general principles and duties which have respectively characterized these clerical orders have

been essentially the same at all times, and in all places; and the variations which they have undergone have only been such as have ever belonged to all persons in public situations, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and which are indeed inseparable from every thing in which mankind are concerned in this transitory and fluctuating world. I have thought it right to take this general view of the ministerial office, and to make these observations upon the clerical orders subsisting in this kingdom, for the purpose of pointing out the foundation and principles of church authority, and of showing that our ecclesiastical establishment is as nearly conformable, as change of circumstances will permit, to the practice of the primitive church. But, though I flatter myself that I have proved episcopacy to be an Apostolical institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every church should be governed by bishops. No church can exist without some government; but though there must be rules and orders for the proper discharge of the offices of public worship, though there must be fixed regulations concerning the appointment of ministers, and though a subordination among them is expedient in the highest degree, yet it does not follow that all these things must be precisely the same in every Christian country; they may vary with the other varying circumstances of human society, with the extent of a country, the manners of its inhabitants, the nature of its civil government, and many other peculiarities which might be specified. As it has not pleased our almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. But he has, in the most explicit terms, enjoined obedience to all governors, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and whatever may be their denomination, as essential to the character of a true Christian. Thus the Gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to men as free agents." Bishop Tomline, however, and the high Episcopalians of the church of England, contend for an original distinction in the office and order of bishops and presbyters; which notion is controverted by the Presbyterians, and is, indeed, contradicted by one who may be truly called the founder of the church of England, Archbishop Cranmer, who says, "The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things; but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion." The more rigid Episcopalians admit of no ordination as valid in the church but by the hands of bishops, and those derived in a right line from the Apostles. See Presbyterians.

6. The churches of Rome and of England are the principal Episcopalian churches in the west of Europe; and those of the Greeks and Arminians in the east; but, beside these, there are Episcopalians in Scotland, and in other countries, where, Presbyterianism being the establishment, they are, of

course, Dissenters. Thus a Presbyterian is a Dissenter in England, and an Episcopalian a Dissenter in Scotland. There is also an Episcopalian church in the United States of America; but there being no established religion, there are, of course, no Dissenters. The Episcopal church in America is organized very differently from that in England. The following particulars are from the best authorities:--The general convention was formed in 1789, by a delegation from the different states, and meets triennially. They have eleven dioceses, two of which are without bishops, and are at liberty to form more in other states. The above convention consists of an upper and lower house; the former consisting of bishops, in which the senior bishop presides: they have no archbishop: and the lower, of the other clergy, and laymen mingled with them. There are also diocesan conventions annually, in which the bishop presides. The bishops have no salaries as such, but are allowed to hold parishes as other ministers; but it has lately been found more convenient in many states to raise a fund for the support of the bishop, that his time may be more at liberty for visiting the clergy. They have neither patronage nor palaces, and some of their incomes are extremely small. The English Common Prayer Book is adopted, with the omission of the Athanasian Creed, and some other slight alterations. Subscription to the articles is not required by candidates for holy orders. The Methodists in America, also, form an episcopal church; but founded upon the primitive principle that bishops and presbyters are of the same order, although the oversight of presbyters may be committed to those who are, by virtue of their office, also called bishops.

[The Methodist Episcopal Church was organized in December, 1784. The fundamental principle on which the episcopacy of this church rests, is here correctly stated. It is proper to add to Mr. Watson's enumeration, that the Roman and Moravian churches in the United States are also episcopal; and that the statement that the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church receive no salaries as bishops, is not at present (1832) without exception. Their incomes, too, though doubtless extremely small compared with those of the bishops of the establishment in England, are not so, compared with those of other ministers generally in the United States.

351 EPISTLES, which occur under the same Hebrew word with books, namely, ספר, are mentioned the more rarely, the farther we go back into antiquity. An epistle is first mentioned, 2 Sam. xi, 14, &c. Afterward, there is more frequent mention of them; and sometimes an epistle is meant, when literally a messenger is spoken of, as in Ezra iv, 15–17. In the east, letters are commonly sent unsealed. In case, however, they are sent to persons of distinction, they are placed in a valuable purse, which is tied, closed over with wax or clay, and then stamped with a signet, Isaiah xxix, 11; Job xxxviii, 14. The most ancient epistles begin and end without either

salutation or farewell; but under the Persian monarchy the salutation was very prolix. It is given in an abridged form in Ezra iv, 7–10; v, 7. The Apostles, in their epistles, used the salutation customary among the Greeks; but they omitted the usual farewell at the close, namely, *χαίρειν*, and adopted a benediction more conformable to the spirit of the Christian religion. St. Paul, when he dictated his letters, wrote the benediction at the close with his own hand, 2 Thess. iii, 17. He was more accustomed to dictate his letters than to write them himself.

The name Epistles is given, by way of eminence, to the letters written by the Apostles, or first preachers of Christianity, to particular churches or persons, on particular occasions or subjects. Of these the Apostle Paul wrote fourteen. St. James wrote one general epistle; St. Peter two; St. John three; and St. Jude one.

An epistle has its Hebrew name from its being rolled or folded together. The modern Arabs roll up their letters, and then flatten them to the breadth of an inch, and paste up the end of them, instead of sealing them. The Persians make up their letters in a roll about six inches long, and a bit of paper is fastened round it with gum, and sealed with an impression of ink, which resembles our printers' ink, but is not so thick. Letters, as stated above, were generally sent to persons of distinction in a bag or purse; but to inferiors, or those who were held in contempt, they were sent open, that is, unenclosed. Lady M. W. Montagu says, the bassa of Belgrade's answer to the English ambassador going to Constantinople was brought to him in a purse of scarlet satin. But, in the case of Nehemiah, an insult was designed to be offered to him by Sanballat, in refusing him the mark of respect usually paid to persons of his station, and treating him contemptuously, by sending the letter open, that is, without the customary appendages when presented to persons of respectability. "Futty Sihng," says Mr. Forbes, "sent a chopdar to me at Dhuboy, with a letter of invitation to the wedding, then celebrating at Brodera at a great expense, and of long continuance. The letter, as usual, from oriental princes, was written on silver paper, flowered with gold, with an additional sprinkling of saffron, enclosed under a cover of gold brocade. The letter was accompanied with a bag of crimson and gold keem-caub, filled with sweet-scented seeds, as a mark of favour and good omen."

EPOCH, a term in chronology signifying a fixed point of time, from which the succeeding years are numbered. Scaliger says it means "a stop," because "in epochs stop and terminate the measures of times." It now usually denotes a remarkable date; as, the epoch of the destruction of Troy, B. C. 1183, &c. The first epoch is the creation of the world, which, according to the Vulgate Bible, Archbishop Usher fixes in the year 710 of



the Julian period, and 4004 years before Jesus Christ. The second is the deluge, which, according to the Hebrew text, happened in the year of the world 1656. Six other epochs are commonly reckoned in sacred history: the building of the tower of Babel, which was, according to Dr. Hales, B. C. 2554; the calling of Abraham, B. C. 2153; the departure of the Israelites out of Egypt, B. C. 1648; the dedication of the temple, B. C. 1027; the end of the Babylonish captivity, B. C. 536; and the birth of Jesus Christ, A. D. 1. In profane history are reckoned five epochs: the founding of the Assyrian empire, B. C. 1267; the era of Nabonassar, or death of Sardanapalus, B. C. 747; the reign of Cyrus at Babylon, B. C. 556; the reign of Alexander the Great over the Persians, B. C. 330; and the beginning of the reign of Augustus, in which our Saviour was born, B. C. 44.

ERA. The term era (not *æra*, as incorrectly written) is Spanish, signifying time, as in the phrase, *de era en era*, “from time to time.” It was first used in the Era Hispanica, instituted B. C. 38, in honour of Augustus, when Spain was allotted to him in the distribution of the provinces among the second triumvirate, Augustus, Anthony, and Lepidus. It now usually denotes an indefinite series of years, beginning from some known epoch; and so differs from a period which is a definite series: as the era of the foundation of Rome, the era of the Olympiads, the era of Nabonassar, &c. See Epoch.

ESAR-HADDON, son of Sennacherib, and his successor in the kingdom of Assyria: called Sargon, or Saragon, Isa. xx, 1. He reigned twenty-nine years. He made war with the Philistines, and took Azoth, by Tartan, his general: he attacked Egypt, Cush, and Edom, Isa. xx, xxxiv; designing, probably, to avenge the affront Sennacherib his father had received from Tirhakah, king of Cush, and the king of Egypt, who had been Hezekiah’s confederates. He sent priests to the Cuthæans, whom Salmaneser, king of Assyria, had planted in Samaria, instead of the Israelites: he took Jerusalem, and carried King Manasseh to Babylon, of which he had become master, perhaps, because there was no heir to Belesis, king of Bayblon. He is said to have reigned twenty-nine or thirty years at Nineveh, and thirteen years at Babylon; in all forty-two years. He died A. M. 3336.

ESAU, son of Isaac and Rebekah, born A. M. 2168, B. C. 1836. When the time of Rebekah’s delivery came, she had twins, Gen. xxv, 24–26: the first-born was hairy, therefore called Esau; that is, a man full grown or of perfect age; but some derive Esau from the Arabic *gescha* or *gencheva*, which signifies a hair cloth. Esau delighted in hunting, and his father Isaac had a particular affection for him. On one occasion, Esau, returning from the fields greatly fatigued, desired Jacob to give him some red pottage, which he was then preparing. Jacob consented, provided Esau would sell

him his birthright. Esau complied, and by oath resigned it to him, Gen. xxv, 29–34. Esau, when aged forty, married two Canaanitish women, Judith, daughter of Beeri, the Hittite; and Bashemath, daughter of Elon, Gen. xxvi, 34. These marriages were very displeasing to Isaac and Rebekah, because they intermingled the blood of Abraham with that of Canaanite aliens. Isaac being old, and his sight decayed, directed Esau to procure him delicate venison by hunting, that he might give him his chief blessing, Gen. xxvii. The artifice of his mother, however, counteracted his purpose; and she contrived to impose upon Isaac, and to obtain the father's principal blessing for her son Jacob. Esau was indignant on account of this treachery and determined to kill Jacob as soon as their father should die. Rebekah again interposed, and sent Jacob away to her brother Laban, with whom he might be secure. During the period of separation, which lasted several years, Esau married a wife of the family of Ishmael; and, removing to Mount Seir, acquired great power and wealth. When Jacob returned, after long absence, to his father's country, with a numerous family, and large flocks and herds, he dreaded his brother's displeasure; but they had an amicable and affectionate interview. After their father's death, they lived in peace and amity; but, as their possessions enlarged, and there was not sufficient room for them in the land in which they were strangers, Esau returned to Mount Seir, where his posterity multiplied under the denomination of Edomites. (See Edom.) The time of his death is not mentioned; but Bishop Cumberland thinks it probable that he died about the same time with his brother Jacob, at the age of about one hundred and forty-seven years, Gen. xxv-xxxvi.

2. On the most important part of this history, the selling of the birthright, we may observe, (1.) That although it was always the design of God that the blessing connected with primogeniture in the family of Abraham should be enjoyed by Jacob, and to exercise his sovereignty in changing the succession in which the promises of the Abrahamic covenant might descend; yet the conduct of Rebekah and Jacob was reprehensible in endeavouring to bring about the divine design by the unworthy means of contrivance and deceit; and they were punished for their presumption by their sufferings. (2.) That the conduct of Esau in selling his birthright was both wanton and profane. It was wanton, because he, though faint, could be in no danger of not obtaining a supply of food in his father's house; and was therefore wholly influenced by his appetite, excited by the delicacy of Jacob's pottage. It was profane, because the blessings of the birthright were spiritual as well as civil. The church of God was to be established in the line of the first-born; and in that line the Messiah was to appear. These high privileges were despised by Esau, who is therefore made by St. Paul a type of all apostates from Christ, who, like him, profanely despise their birthright as the sons of God. See Birthright.

ESDRAELON, Plain of, in the tribe of Issachar, extends east and west from Scythopolis to Mount Carmel; called, likewise, the Great Plain, the Valley of Jezreel, the Plain of Esdrela. Dr. E. D. Clarke observes, it is by far the largest plain in the Holy Land; extending quite across the country from Mount Carmel and the Mediterranean Sea to the southern extremity of the Sea of Galilee; about thirty miles in length, and twenty in breadth. It is also a very fertile district, abounding in pasture; on which account it has been selected for the purposes of encampment by almost every army that has traversed the Holy Land. Here Barak, descending with his ten thousand men from Mount Tabor, which rises like a cone in the centre of the plain, defeated Sisera, with his “nine hundred chariots of iron, and all the people that were with him, gathered from Harosheth of the Gentiles unto the river of Kishon; and pursued after the chariots and after the host unto Harosheth of the Gentiles; and all the host of Sisera fell upon the edge of the sword; and there was not a man left,” Judges iv. Here Josiah, king of Judah, fell, fighting against Necho, king of Egypt, 2 Kings xxiii, 29. And here the Midianites and the Amalekites, who were “like grasshoppers for multitude, and their camels without number as the sand of the sea,” encamped, when they were defeated by Gideon, Judges vi. This plain has likewise been used for the same purpose by the armies of every conqueror or invader, from Nabuchodonosor, king of Assyria, to his imitator, Napoleon Buonaparte, who, in the spring of 1799, with a small body of French, defeated an army of several thousand Turks and Mamelukes. Jews, Gentiles, Saracens, Christians, crusaders, and antichristian Frenchmen, Egyptians, Persians, Druses, Turks, and Arabs, warriors out of every nation which is under heaven, have pitched their tents in the Plain of Esdraelon; and have beheld the various banners of their nations wet with the dews of Tabor and of Hermon. And it is to this day generally found to be the place of encampment of large parties of Arabs.

ESDRAS, the name of two apocryphal books which were always excluded the Jewish canon, and are too absurd to be admitted as canonical by the Papists themselves. They are supposed to have been originally written in Greek by some Hellenistical Jews; though some imagine that they were first written in Chaldee, and afterward translated into Greek. It is uncertain when they were composed, though it is generally agreed that the author wrote before Josephus.

ESHBAAL, or ISHBOSHETH, the fourth son of Saul. The Hebrews, to avoid pronouncing the word baal, “lord,” used bosheth, “confusion.” Instead of Mephi-baal, they said Mephi-bosheth; and, instead of Esh-baal, they said Ish-bosheth, 2 Sam. ii, 8.

ESHCOL, one of Abraham's allies, who dwelt with him in the valley of Mamre, and accompanied him in the pursuit of Chedorlaomer, and the other confederated kings, who pillaged Sodom and Gomorrah, and carried away Lot, Abraham's nephew, Gen. xiv, 24. Also the valley or brook of Eshcol was that in which the Hebrew messengers, who went to spy the land of Canaan, cut a bunch of grapes so large that it was as much as two men could carry. It was situated in the south part of Judah, Num. xiii, 24; xxxii, 9.

ESSENES, or ESSENIANS, one of the three ancient sects of the Jews. They appear to have been an enthusiastic sect, never numerous, and but little known; directly opposite to the Pharisees with respect to their reliance upon tradition, and their scrupulous regard to the ceremonial law, but pretending, like them, to superior sanctity of manners. They existed in the time of our Saviour; and though they are not mentioned in the New Testament, they are supposed to be alluded to by St. Paul in his Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, and in his first Epistle to Timothy. From the account given of the doctrines and institutions of this sect by Philo and Josephus, we learn that they believed in the immortality of the soul; that they were absolute predestinarians; that they observed the seventh day with peculiar strictness; that they held the Scriptures in the highest reverence, but considered them as mystic writings, and expounded them allegorically; that they sent gifts to the temple, but offered no sacrifices; that they admitted no one into their society till after a probation of three years; that they lived in a state of perfect equality, except that they paid respect to the aged, and to their priests; that they considered all secular employment as unlawful, except that of agriculture; that they had all things in common, and were industrious, quiet, and free from every species of vice; that they held celibacy and solitude in high esteem; that they allowed no change of raiment till necessity required it; that they abstained from wine; that they were not permitted to eat but with their own sect; and that a certain portion of food was allotted to each person, of which they partook together, after solemn ablutions. The austere and retired life of the Essenes is supposed to have given rise to monkish superstition.

The Therapeutæ were a distinct branch of the Essenes. Jahn has thus described the difference between them: The principal ground of difference between the Essenes or Essaëi, and Therapeutæ consisted in this; the former were Jews, who spoke the Aramean; the latter were Greek Jews, as the names themselves intimate, namely, Ἰουδαῖοι and Θεραπευταί. The Essenes lived chiefly in Palestine; the Therapeutæ, in Egypt. The Therapeutæ were more rigid than the Essenes, since the latter, although they made it a practice to keep at a distance from large cities, lived, nevertheless, in towns and villages, and practised agriculture and the arts, with the exception of

those arts which were made more directly subservient to the purposes of war. The Therapeutæ, on the contrary, fled from all inhabited places, dwelt in fields and deserts and gardens, and gave themselves up to contemplation. Both the Essenes and the Therapeutæ held their property in common, and those things which they stood in need of for the support and the comforts of life, were distributed to them from the common stock. The candidates for admission among the Essenes gave their property to the society; but those who were destined for a membership with the Therapeutæ, left theirs to their friends; and both, after a number of years of probation, made a profession which bound them to the exercise of the strictest uprightness. The Romanists pretend, as Dr. Prideaux observes, without any foundation, that the Essenes were Christian monks, formed into a society by St. Mark, who founded the first church at Alexandria. But it is evident, from the accounts of Josephus and Philo, that the Essenes were not Christians, but Jews.

Dr. Neander's account of the Essenes is as follows:--A company of pious men, much experienced in the trials of the outward and of the inward life, had withdrawn themselves out of the strife of theological and political parties, at first apparently (according to Pliny the elder) to the western side of the Dead Sea; where they lived together in intimate connection, partly in the same sort of society as the monks of later days, and partly as mystical orders in all periods have done. From this society, other smaller ones afterward proceeded, and spread themselves over all Palestine. They were called Essenes, Ἐσσηνοὶ or Ἐσσαιοὶ. They employed themselves in the arts of peace, agriculture, pasture, handicraft works, and especially in the art of healing, while they took great delight in investigating the healing powers of nature. It is probable, also, that they imagined themselves under the guidance of a supernatural illumination in their search into nature, and their use of her powers. Their natural knowledge, and their art of healing, appear also to have had a religious, theosophic character, as they professed also to have peculiar prophetic gifts. The Essenes were, no doubt, distinguished from the mass of ordinary Jews by this, that they knew and loved something higher than the outward ceremonial and a dead faith, that they did really strive after holiness of heart, and inward communion with God. Their quiet, pious habits also rendered them remarkable, and by means of these they remained quiet amidst all the political changes, respected by all parties, even by the Heathens; and by their laborious habits and kindness, their obedience toward the higher powers, as ordained of God, their fidelity and love of truth, they were enabled to extend themselves in all directions. In their society every yea and nay had the force of an oath; for every oath, said they, pre-supposes a mutual distrust, which 354ought not to be the case among a society of honest men. Only in one case was an oath suffered among them, namely, as a pledge for those who after a three years'

noviciate were to be received into the number of the initiated. According to the portraiture of them, given by Philo, the Alexandrian, in his separate treatise concerning the "True Freedom of the Virtuous," we should take the Essenes for men of an entirely practical religious turn, far removed from all theosophy and all idle speculation; and we should ascribe to them an inward religious habit of mind, free from all mixture of superstition and reliance on outward things. But the account of Philo does not at all accord with that of Josephus; and the more historical Josephus deserves in general more credit than Philo, who was too apt to indulge in philosophizing and idealism. Beside, Josephus had more opportunity of knowing this sect thoroughly, than Philo; for Philo lived in Egypt, and the Essenes did not extend beyond Palestine. Josephus had here passed the greater part of his life, and had certainly taken all necessary pains to inform himself accurately of the nature of the different sects, among which he was determined, as a youth of sixteen years of age, to make choice, although he can hardly have completely passed through a noviciate in the sect of the Essenes, because he made the round of all the three Jewish sects, in a period of from three to four years. Josephus, also, shows himself completely unprejudiced in this description; while Philo, on the contrary, wished to represent the Essenes to the more cultivated Greeks as models of practical wisdom, and, therefore, he allowed himself to represent much, not as it really was, but as it suited his purpose. We must conclude that the Essenes did also busy themselves with theosophy, and pretended to impart to those of their order disclosures relating to the supernatural world of spirits, because those who were about to be initiated, were obliged to swear that they would never make known to any one the names of the angels then to be communicated to them. The manner in which they kept secret the ancient books of their sect is also a proof of this. And, indeed, Philo himself makes it probable, when he says, that they employed themselves with a φιλοσοφία διὰ συμβολῶν, a philosophy which was supported by an allegorical interpretation of Scripture, for this kind of allegorizing interpretation was usually the accompaniment of a certain speculative system. According to Philo, they rejected the sacrifice of victims, because they considered, that to consecrate and offer up themselves wholly to God, was the only true sacrifice, the only sacrifice worthy of God. But according to Josephus they certainly considered sacrifice as something peculiarly holy, but they thought that from its peculiar holiness it must have been desecrated by the profane Jews in the temple of Jerusalem, and that it could be worthily celebrated only in their holy community, just as mystic sects of this nature are constantly accustomed to make the objective acts of religion dependent on the subjective condition of those who perform or take part in them. In the troublesome and superstitious observance of the rest of the Sabbath, according to the letter, and not according to the spirit, they went even farther than the other Jews, only with this difference, that

they were in good earnest in the matter, while the Pharisees by their casuistry relaxed their rules, or drew them tighter, just as it suited their purpose. The Essenes, not only strenuously abhorred, like the other Jews, contact with the uncircumcised, but, having divided themselves into four classes, the Essenes of a higher grade were averse from contact with those of a lower, as if they were rendered unclean by it, and when any thing of this kind did happen, they purified themselves after it. Like many other Jews, they attributed great value, in general, to lustration by bathing in cold water. To their ascetic notions, the constant and healthy practice in the east of anointing with oil seemed unholy, and if it befel any one of them, he was obliged to purify himself. It was also a great abomination to them to eat any food except such as had been prepared by persons of their own sect. They would die rather than eat of any other. This is a sufficient proof that although the Essenes might possess a certain inward religious life, and a certain practical piety, yet that these qualities with them, as well as with many other mystical sects, as for example, those of the middle ages, were connected with a theosophy, which desired to know things hidden from human reason, ἐμβρατευειν εις ἃ τις μη ἑωρακεν, and therefore lost itself in idle imaginations and dreams, and were also mixed up with an outward asceticism, a proud spirit of separation from the rest of mankind, and superstitious observances and demeanours totally at variance with the true spirit of inward religion.

ESTHER. The book of Esther is so called, because it contains the history of Esther a Jewish captive, who by her remarkable accomplishments gained the affection of King Ahasuerus, and by marriage with him was raised to the throne of Persia; and it relates the origin and ceremonies of the feast of Purim, instituted in commemoration of the great deliverance, which she, by her interest, procured for the Jews, whose general destruction had been concerted by the offended pride of Haman. There is great diversity of opinion concerning the author of this book; it has been ascribed to Ezra, to Mordecai, to Joachim, and to the joint labours of the great synagogue; and it is impossible to decide which of these opinions is the most probable. We are told, that the facts here recorded happened in the reign of Ahasuerus king of Persia, “who reigned from India even unto Ethiopia, over a hundred and twenty-seven provinces,” Esther i, 1; and this extent of dominion plainly proves that he was one of the successors of Cyrus. That point is indeed allowed by all; but learned men differ concerning the person meant by Ahasuerus, whose name does not occur in profane history; and consequently they are not agreed concerning the precise period to which we are to assign this history. Archbishop Usher supposed, that by Ahasuerus was meant Darius Hystaspes, and Joseph Scaliger contended that Xerxes was meant; but Dean Prideaux has very satisfactorily shown, that by Ahasuerus we are to understand Artaxerxes

Longimanus. Josephus also considered Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes as the same person; and we may observe, that Ahasuerus is always translated Artaxerxes in the Septuagint version; and he is called by that name in the apocryphal part of the book of Esther. See Ecbatana, and Ahasuerus.

ETERNITY is an attribute of God. (See God.) The self-existent being, says the learned Dr. Clarke, must of necessity be eternal. The ideas of eternity and self-existence are so closely connected, that because something must of necessity be eternal, independently and without any outward cause of its being, therefore it must necessarily be self-existent; and because it is impossible but something must be self-existent, therefore it is necessary that it must likewise be eternal. To be self-existent, is to exist by an absolute necessity in the nature of the thing itself. Now this necessity being absolute, and not depending upon any thing external, must be always unalterably the same; nothing being alterable but what is capable of being affected by somewhat without itself. That being therefore which has no other cause of its existence but the absolute necessity of its own nature, must of necessity have existed from everlasting, without beginning; and must of necessity exist to everlasting, without end.

On the eternal duration of the divine Being, many have held a metaphysical refinement. "The eternal existence of God," it is said, "is not to be considered as successive; the ideas we gain from time are not to be allowed in our conceptions of his duration. As he fills all space with his immensity, he fills all duration with his eternity; and with him eternity is nunc stans, a permanent now, incapable of the relations of past, present, and future." Such, certainly, is not the view given us of this mysterious subject in the Scriptures; and if it should be said that they speak popularly, and are accommodated to the infirmity of the reason of the body of mankind, we may reply, that philosophy has not, with all its boasting of superior light, carried our views on this attribute of the divine nature at all beyond revelation; and, in attempting it, has only obscured the conceptions of its admirers. "Filling duration with his eternity," is a phrase without any meaning: for how can any man conceive a permanent instant, which coexists with a perpetually flowing duration? One might as well apprehend a mathematical point coextended with a line, a surface, and all dimensions. As this notion has, however, been made the basis of some theological opinions, it may be proper to examine it.

2. Whether we get our idea of time from the motion of bodies without us, or from the consciousness of the succession of our own ideas, or both, is not important to this inquiry. Time, in our conceptions, is divisible. The artificial divisions are years, months, days, minutes, seconds, &c. We can conceive of yet smaller portions of duration; and, whether we have given



to them artificial names or not, we can conceive no otherwise of duration, than continuance of being, estimated as to degree, by this artificial admeasurement, and therefore as substantially answering to it. It is not denied but that duration is something distinct from these its artificial measures; yet of this every man's consciousness will assure him, that we can form no idea of duration except in this successive manner. But we are told that the eternity of God is a fixed eternal now, from which all ideas of succession, of past and future, are to be excluded; and we are called upon to conceive of eternal duration without reference to past or future, and to the exclusion of the idea of that flow under which we conceive of time. The proper abstract idea of duration is, however, simple continuance of being, without any reference to the exact degree or extent of it, because in no other way can it be equally applicable to all the substances of which it is the attribute. It may be finite or infinite, momentary or eternal; but that depends upon the substance of which it is the quality, and not upon its own nature. Our own observation and experience teach us how to apply it to ourselves. As to us, duration is dependent and finite; as to God, it is infinite; but in both cases the originality or dependence, the finiteness or infinity of it, arises, not out of the nature of duration itself, but out of other qualities of the subjects respectively.

3. Duration, then, as applied to God, is no more than an extension of the idea as applied to ourselves; and to exhort us to conceive of it as something essentially different, is to require us to conceive what is inconceivable. It is to demand of us to think without ideas. Duration is continuance of existence; continuance of existence is capable of being longer or shorter; and hence necessarily arises the idea of the succession of the minutest points of duration into which we can conceive it divided. Beyond this the mind cannot go, it forms the idea of duration no other way: and if what we call duration be any thing different from this in God, it is not duration, properly so called, according to human ideas; it is something else, for which there is no name among men, because there is no idea, and therefore it is impossible to reason about it. As long as meta-physicians use the term, they must take the idea: if they spurn the idea, they have no right to the term, and ought at once to confess that they can go no farther. Dr. Cudworth defines infinity of duration to be nothing else but perfection, as including in it necessary existence and immutability. This, it is true, is as much a definition of the moon, as of infinity of duration; but it is valuable, as it shows that, in the view of this great man, though an advocate of the nunc stans, "the standing now," of eternity, we must abandon the term duration, if we give up the only idea under which it can be conceived.

4. It follows from this, therefore, that either <sup>356</sup>we must apply the term duration to the divine Being in the same sense in which we apply it to

creatures, with the extension of the idea to a duration which has no bounds and limits; or blot it out of our creeds, as a word to which our minds, with all the aid they may derive from the labours of metaphysicians, can attach no meaning. The only objection to successive duration as applied to God, which has any plausibility, is, that it seems to imply change; but this wholly arises from confounding two very distinct things; succession in the duration, and change in the substance. Dr. Cudworth appears to have fallen into this error. He speaks of the duration of an imperfect nature, as sliding from the present to the future, expecting something of itself which is not yet in being; and of a perfect nature being essentially immutable, having a permanent and unchanging duration, never losing any thing of itself once present, nor yet running forward to meet something of itself which is not yet in being. Now, though this is a good description of a perfect and immutable nature, it is no description at all of an eternally-enduring nature. Duration implies no loss in the substance of any being, nor addition to it. A perfect nature never loses any thing of itself, nor expects more of itself than is possessed; but this does not arise from the attribute of its duration, however that attribute may be conceived of, but from its perfection and consequent immutability. These attributes do not flow from the duration, but the continuance of the duration from them. The argument is clearly good for nothing, unless it could be proved that successive duration necessarily implies a change in the nature; but that is contradicted by the experience of finite beings,--their natures are not at all determined by their duration, but their duration by their natures; and they exist for a moment, or for ages, according to the nature which their Maker has impressed upon them. If it be said that, at least, successive duration imports that a being loses past duration, and expects the arrival of future existence, we reply, that this is no imperfection at all. Even finite creatures do not feel it to be an imperfection to have existed, and to look for continued and interminable being. It is true, with the past we lose knowledge and pleasure; and expecting in all future periods increase of knowledge and happiness, we are reminded by that of our present imperfection; but this imperfection does not arise from our successive and flowing duration, and we never refer it to that. It is not the past which takes away our knowledge and pleasure; nor future duration, simply considered, which will confer the increase of both. Our imperfections arise out of the essential nature of our being, not out of the manner in which our being is continued. It is not the flow of our duration, but the flow of our nature, which produces these effects. On the contrary, we think that the idea of our successive duration, that is of continuance, is an advantage, and not a defect. Let all ideas of continuance be banished from the mind, let there be to us a *nunc semper stans*, during the whole of our being, and we appear to gain nothing,--our pleasures surely are not diminished by the idea of successive duration being added to present enjoyment: that they have been, and still remain, and will

continue, on the contrary, greatly heightens them. Without the idea of a flowing duration, we could have no such measure of the continuance of our pleasures; and this we should consider an abatement of our happiness. What is so obvious an excellency in the spirit of man, and in angelic natures, can never be thought an imperfection in God, when joined with a nature essentially perfect and immutable.

5. But it may be said, that “eternal duration, considered as successive, is only an artificial manner of measuring and conceiving of duration; and is no more eternal duration itself than minutes and moments, the artificial measures of time, are time itself.” Were this granted, the question would still be, whether there is any thing in duration considered generally, or in time considered specially, which corresponds to these artificial methods of measuring and conceiving of them. The ocean is measured by leagues; and the extension of the ocean, and the measure of it, are distinct; they, nevertheless, answer to each other. Leagues are the nominal divisions of an extended surface; but there is a real extension, which answers to the artificial conception and admeasurement of it. In like manner, days, and hours, and moments, are the measures of time: but there is either something in time which answers to these measures; or not only the measure, but the thing itself, is artificial--an imaginary creation. If any man will contend, that the period of duration which we call time is nothing, no farther dispute can be held with him; and he may be left to deny also the existence of matter, and to enjoy his philosophic revel in an ideal world. We apply the same argument to duration generally, whether finite or infinite. Minutes and moments, or smaller portions, for which we have no name, may be artificial things, adopted to aid our conceptions; but conceptions of what? Not of any thing standing still, but of something going on. Of duration we have no other conception; and if there be nothing in nature which answers to this conception, then is duration itself imaginary, and we discourse about nothing. If the duration of the divine Being admits not of past, present, and future, one of these two consequences must follow,--that no such attribute as that of eternity belongs to him,--or that there is no power in the human mind to conceive of it. In either case, the Scriptures are greatly impugned; for “He who was, and is, and is to come,” is a revelation of the eternity of God, which is then in no sense true. It is not true, if used literally: and it is as little so, if the language be figurative; for the figure rests on no basis, it illustrates nothing, it misleads. It is, however, to be remembered, that the eternal, supreme cause, must of necessity have such a perfect, independent, unchangeable comprehension of all things, that there can be no one point or instant of his eternal duration, 357wherein all things that are past, present, and to come, will not be as entirely known and represented to him in one single thought or view, and all things present and future be equally

entirely in his power and direction; as if there was really no succession at all, but all things were actually present at once.

6. The Hebrew word for eternity is **שֶׁלֶם**. This is its proper sense; but, as Gesenius observes, as with us in common life, it is often used in an inaccurate or loose manner to express a very long space of time. So it is applied to the Jewish priesthood; to the Mosaic ordinances; to the possession of the land of Canaan; to the hills and mountains; to the earth, &c. These must, however, be considered as exceptions to predominant and certain usage.

**ETHAN**, the Ezrahite, one of the wisest men of his time; nevertheless, Solomon was wiser than he, 1 Kings iv, 31. The eighty-ninth psalm bears the name of Ethan the Ezrahite. This Ethan, and Ethan son of Kishi, of the tribe of Levi, and of the family of Merari, are the same person, 1 Chron. vi, 44. He was called likewise Idithun, and appears under this name in the titles to several psalms. He was a principal master of the temple music, 1 Chron. xv, 17, &c.

**ETHANIM**, one of the Hebrew months, 1 Kings viii, 2. In this month the temple of Solomon was dedicated. After the Jews returned from the captivity, the month Ethanim was called Tisri, which answers to our September.

**ETHIOPIA**. See Cush.

**EUCCHARIST**, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The word, in its original Greek, **εὐχαρίστησις**, properly signifies giving thanks; from the hymns and thanksgivings which accompanied that holy service in the primitive church. See Lord's Supper.

**EUNICE**, the mother of Timothy, who was a Jewess by birth, but married to a Greek, Timothy's father, 2 Tim. i, 5. Eunice had been converted to Christianity by some other preacher, Acts xvi, 1, 2, and not by St. Paul; for when that Apostle came to Lystra, he found there Eunice and Timothy, already far advanced in grace and virtue.

**EUNUCH**. The word signifies, one who guards the bed. In the courts of eastern kings, the care of the beds and apartments belonging to princes and princesses, was generally committed to eunuchs; but they had the charge chiefly of the princesses, who lived secluded. The Hebrew **סָרִיס** signifies a real eunuch, whether naturally born such, or rendered such. But in Scripture this word often denotes an officer belonging to a prince, attending his court, and employed in the interior of his palace, as a name of office

and dignity. In the Persian and Turkish courts, the principal employments are at this day possessed by real eunuchs. Our Saviour speaks of men who “made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven,” Matt. xix, 12; that is, who, from a religious motive, renounced marriage or carnal pleasures.

EUPHRATES, a river of Asiatic Turkey, which rises from the mountains of Armenia, as some have said, in two streams, a few miles to the north-east of Erzeron, the streams uniting to the south-west near that city; and chiefly pursuing a south-west direction to Semisat, where it would fall into the Mediterranean, if not prevented by a high range of mountains. In this part of its course the Euphrates is joined by the Morad, a stream almost doubling in length that of the Euphrates, so that the latter river might more justly be said to spring from Mount Ararat, about one hundred and sixty British miles to the east of the imputed source. At Semisat, the ancient Samosata, this noble river assumes a southerly direction, then runs an extensive course to the south-east, and after receiving the Tigris, falls by two or three mouths into the gulf of Persia, about fifty miles south-east of Bassora; north latitude  $29^{\circ} 50'$ ; east longitude  $66^{\circ} 55'$ . The comparative course of the Euphrates may be estimated at about one thousand four hundred British miles. This river is navigable for a considerable distance from the sea. In its course it separates Aladulia from Armenia, Syria from Diarbekir, and Diarbekir from Arabia, and passing through the Arabian Irak, joins the Tigris. The Euphrates and Tigris, the most considerable as well as the most renowned rivers of western Asia, are remarkable for their rising within a few miles of each other, running the same course, never being more than one hundred and fifty miles asunder, and sometimes, before their final junction, approaching within fifteen miles of each other, as in the latitude of Bagdad. The space included between the two is the ancient country of Mesopotamia. But the Euphrates is by far the more noble river of the two. Sir R. K. Porter, describing this river in its course through the ruins of Babylon, observes, “The whole view was particularly solemn. The majestic stream of the Euphrates wandering in solitude, like a pilgrim monarch through the silent ruins of his devastated kingdom, still appeared a noble river, even under all the disadvantages of its desert-tracked course. Its banks were hoary with reeds; and the grey osier willows were yet there, on which the captives of Israel hung up their harps, and, while Jerusalem was not, refused to be comforted.” The Scripture calls it “the great river,” and assigns it for the eastern boundary of that land which God promised to the Israelites, Deut. i, 7; Joshua i, 4.

EUROCLYDON, the Greek name for the north-east wind, very dangerous at sea, of the nature of a whirlwind, which falls of a sudden upon ships, Acts xxvii, 14. The same wind is now called a Levanter.

EUTYCHIANS, a denomination which arose in the fifth century, and were so called from Eutyches, abbot of a certain convent of monks at Constantinople. The Nestorians having explained the two natures in Christ in such a manner as, in the opinion of many, to make them equivalent to two persons, which was an evident absurdity, Eutyches, to avoid this error, fell into the opposite extreme, and maintained that there was only one nature in Jesus Christ, the divine nature, which, according to him, had so entirely swallowed up the human, that the latter could not be distinguished. Hence it was inferred that according to this system our Lord had nothing of humanity but the appearance.

EVANGELISTS, the inspired authors of the Gospels. The word is derived from the Greek, εὐαγγελιον, formed of εὖ, bene, "well," and ἄγγελος, angel, messenger. The name of evangelists is said by some to have been given in the ancient church to such as preached the Gospel without being attached to any particular church, being either commissioned by the Apostles to instruct the nations, or, of their own accord, abandoning every worldly attachment, consecrated themselves to the sacred office of preaching the Gospel. In which sense these interpreters think it is that St. Philip, who was one of the seven deacons, is called "the evangelist" in Acts xxi, 8; and that St. Paul, writing to Timothy, bids him do the work of an evangelist, 2 Tim. iv, 5. It is, however, to be remarked, that the office in which the evangelists chiefly present themselves to our notice in the New Testament, is that of assistants to the Apostles; or, as they might be termed vice apostles, who acted under their authority and direction. As they were directed to ordain pastors or bishops in the churches, but had no authority given them to ordain successors to themselves in their particular office as evangelists, whatever it might be, they must be considered as but temporary officers in the church, like the Apostles and prophets. The term evangelist is, at present, confined to the writers of the four Gospels.

EVE, the first woman. She was called חַוָּה, Gen. iii, 20, a word that signifies life, because she was to be the mother of all that live. Our translators, therefore, might have called her Life, as the Septuagint, who render the Hebrew word by Ζωή. Soon after the expulsion of the first pair from paradise, Eve conceived and bare a son; and imagining, as is probable, that she had given birth to the promised seed, she called his name Cain, which signifies possession, saying, "I have gotten a man from the Lord." She afterward had Abel, and some daughters, and then Seth. The Scriptures name only these three sons of Adam and Eve, but sufficiently inform us, Gen. v, 4, that they had many more, saying, that "Adam lived, after he had begotten Seth, eight hundred years, and begat sons and daughters." See Adam.

EVIL is distinguished into natural and moral. Natural evil is whatever destroys or any way disturbs the perfection of natural beings, such as blindness, diseases, death, &c. Moral evil is the disagreement between the actions of a moral agent, and the rule of those actions, whatever it be. Applied to choice, or acting contrary to the moral or revealed laws of the Deity, it is termed wickedness, or sin. Applied to an act contrary to a mere rule of fitness, it is called a fault. The question concerning the origin of evil has very much perplexed philosophers and divines, both ancient and modern. Plato, for the solution of this question, maintained, that matter, from its nature, possesses a blind and refractory force, from which arises in it a propensity to disorder and deformity; and that this is the cause of all the imperfection which appears in the works of God, and the origin of evil. Matter, he conceives, resists the will of the supreme Artificer, so that he cannot possibly execute his designs; and this is the cause of the mixture of good and evil, which is found in the material world. "It cannot be," says he, "that evil should be destroyed, for there must always be something contrary to good;" and again, "God wills, as far as it is possible, every thing good, and nothing evil." What that property of matter is which opposes the wise and benevolent intentions of the first Intelligence, Plato has not clearly explained; but he speaks of it as *ξύμφοτος ἐπιθυμία*, an innate propensity to disorder, and says, that before nature was adorned with its present beautiful forms, it was inclined to confusion and deformity, and that from this habitude arises all the evil which happens in the world. Plutarch supposes the Platonic notion to be, that there is in matter an unconscious, irrational soul; and this supposition has been adopted by several modern writers. But the writings of Plato afford no evidence that he conceived the imperfection of matter to arise from any cause distinct from its nature. Such a notion is incongruous with Plato's general system, and is contrary to the doctrine of the Pythagorean school, to which he was probably indebted for his notions on this subject; for the philosophers of that sect held that motion is the effect of a power essential to matter. Some of the Stoics adopted the notion of the Platonists concerning the origin of evil, and ascribed it to the defective nature of matter, which it is not in the power of the great Artificer to change; asserting, that imperfections appear in the world, not through any defect of skill in its author, but because matter will not admit of the accomplishment of his designs. But it was perceived by others, that this hypothesis was inconsistent with the fundamental doctrine of the Stoics concerning nature. For since, according to their system, matter itself receives all its qualities from God, if its defects be the cause of evil, these defects must be ultimately ascribed to him. No other way of relieving this difficulty remained, than to have recourse to fate, and say, that evil was the necessary consequence of that eternal necessity to which the great whole, comprehending both God and matter, is subject. Thus, when Chrysippus was asked whether diseases were to be ascribed to

Divine providence, he replied that it was not the intention of nature that these things should happen; nor were they conformable to the will of the Author of nature and Parent of all good things; but that, in framing the world, some inconveniences had adhered by necessary consequence, to his wise and useful plan. To others the question concerning the origin of evil appeared so intricate and difficult, that, finding themselves unequal to the solution of it, they denied either that there is any God at all, or, at least, any author or governor of the world. The Epicureans belonged to this class; nor does Lucretius allege any other reason for denying the system of the world to be the production of a Deity beside its being so very faulty. Others again judged it to be more rational to assign a double cause of visible effects, than to assign no cause at all; as nothing, indeed, can be more absurd than to admit actions and effects without any agent and cause. These persons perceiving a mixture of good and evil, and being persuaded that so many inconsistencies and disorders could not proceed from a good being, supposed the existence of a malevolent principle, or god, directly contrary to the good one; hence they derived corruption and death, diseases, griefs, mischiefs, frauds, and villanies, while from the good being they deduced nothing but good. This opinion was held by many of the ancients; by the Persian magi, Manicheans, Paulicians, &c.

2. Dr. Samuel Clarke, in his “Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God,” deduces from the possibility and real existence of human liberty an answer to the question, What is the cause and original of evil? For liberty, he says, implying a natural power of doing evil, as well as good; and the imperfect nature of finite beings making it possible for them to abuse this their liberty to an actual commission of evil; and it being necessary to the order and beauty of the whole, and for displaying the infinite wisdom of the Creator, that there should be different and various degrees of creatures, whereof, consequently, some must be less perfect than others; hence there necessarily arises a possibility of evil, notwithstanding that the Creator is infinitely good. In short thus: all that we call evil is either an evil of imperfection, as the want of certain faculties and excellencies which other creatures have; or natural evil, as pain, death, and the like; or moral evil, as all kinds of vice. The first of these is not properly an evil: for every power, faculty, or perfection, which any creature enjoys, being the free gift of God, which he was no more obliged to bestow, than he was to confer being or existence itself, it is plain the want of any certain faculty or perfection in any kind of creatures which never belonged to their nature, is no more an evil to them than their never having been created, or brought into being at all, could properly have been called an evil. The second kind of evil, which we call natural evil, is either a necessary consequence of the former; as death, to a creature on whose nature immortality was never conferred; and then it is no more properly an evil than the former; or else



it is counterpoised, in the whole, with as great or greater good, as the afflictions and sufferings of good men, and then also it is not properly an evil; or else, lastly, it is a punishment; and then it is a necessary consequent of the third and last sort of evil, namely, moral evil. And this arises wholly from the abuse of liberty, which God gave to his creatures for other purposes, and which it was reasonable and fit to give them for the perfection and order of the whole creation; only they, contrary to God's intention and command, have abused what was necessary for the perfection of the whole, to the corruption and depravation of themselves. And thus all sorts of evils have entered into the world, without any diminution to the infinite goodness of its Creator and Governor.

3. This is obviously all the answer which the question respecting the origin of evil is capable of receiving. It brings us to the point to which the Scriptures themselves lead us. And though many questions may yet be asked, respecting a subject so mysterious as the permission of evil by the Supreme Being, this is a part of his counsels of which we can have no cognizance, unless he is pleased to reveal them; and as revelation is silent upon this subject, except generally, that all his acts, his permissive ones as well as others, are "wise, and just, and good," we may rest assured, that beyond what is revealed, human wisdom in the present state can never penetrate.

EXCOMMUNICATION, is the judicial exclusion of offenders from the religious rites and other privileges of the particular community to which they belong. Founded in the natural right which every society possesses to guard its laws and privileges from violation and abuse by the infliction of salutary discipline, proportioned to the nature of the offences committed against them, it has found a place, in one form or another, under every system of religion, whether human or divine. That it has been made an engine for the gratification of private malice and revenge, and been perverted to purposes the most unjustifiable and even diabolical, the history of the world but too lamentably proves; yet this, though unquestionably a consideration which ought to inculcate the necessity of prudence, as well as impartiality and temperance in the use of it, affords no valid argument against its legitimate exercise. From St. Paul's writings we learn that the early excommunication was effected by the offender not being allowed to "eat" with the church, that is, to partake of the Lord's Supper, the sign of communion. In the early ages of the primitive church also, this branch of discipline was exercised with moderation, which, however, gradually gave place to an undue severity. From Tertullian's "Apology" we learn, that the crimes which in his time subjected to exclusion from Christian privileges, were murder, idolatry, theft, fraud, lying, blasphemy, adultery, fornication, and the like: and in Origen's

treatise against Celsus, we are informed that such persons were expelled from the communion of the church, and lamented as lost and dead unto God; [ut perditos Deoque mortuos;] but that on making confession and giving evidence of penitence, they were received back as restored to life. It was at the same time specially ordained, that no such delinquent, however suitably qualified in other respects, could be afterward admitted 360to any ecclesiastical office. But it does not appear that the infliction of this discipline was accompanied with any of those forms of excommunication, of delivering over to Satan, or of solemn execration, which were usual among the Jews, and subsequently introduced into them by the Romish church. The authors and followers of heretical opinions which had been condemned, were also subject to this penalty; and it was sometimes inflicted on whole congregations when they were judged to have departed from the faith. In this latter case, however, the sentence seldom went farther than the interdiction of correspondence with these churches, or of spiritual communication between their respective pastors. To the same exclusion from religious privileges, those unhappy persons were doomed, who, whether from choice or from compulsion, had polluted themselves, after their baptism, by any act of idolatrous worship; and the penance enjoined on such persons, before they could be restored to communion, was often peculiarly severe. The consequences of excommunication, even then, were of a temporal as well as a spiritual nature. The person against whom it was pronounced, was denied all share in the oblations of his brethren; the ties both of religious and of private friendship were dissolved; he found himself an object of abhorrence to those whom he most esteemed, and by whom he had been most tenderly beloved; and, as far as expulsion from a society held in universal veneration could imprint on his character a mark of disgrace, he was shunned or suspected by the generality of mankind.

2. It was not, however, till churchmen began to unite temporal with spiritual power, that any penal effects of a civil kind became consequent on their sentences of excommunication; and that this ghostly artillery was not less frequently employed for the purposes of lawless ambition and ecclesiastical domination, than for the just punishment of impenitent delinquents, and the general edification of the faithful. But as soon as this union took place, and in exact proportion to the degree in which the papal system rose to its predominance over the civil rights as well as the consciences of men, the list of offences which subjected their perpetrators to excommunication, was multiplied; and the severity of its inflictions, with their penal effects, increased in the same ratio. The slightest injury, or even insult, sustained by an ecclesiastic, was deemed a sufficient cause for the promulgation of an anathema. Whole families, and even provinces, were prohibited from engaging in any religious exercise, and cursed with

the most tremendous denunciations of divine vengeance. Nor were kings and emperors secure against these thunders of the church; their subjects were, on many occasions, declared, by a papal bull, to be absolved from allegiance to them; and all who should dare to support them, menaced with a similar judgment. These terrors have passed away; the true Scriptural excommunication ought to be maintained in every church; which is the prohibition of immoral and apostate persons from the use of those religious rites which indicate “the communion of saints,” but without any temporal penalty.

EXODUS, from ἐξ, out, and ὁδός, a way, the name of the second book of Moses, and is so called in the Greek version because it relates to the departure of the Israelites out of Egypt. It comprehends the history of about a hundred and forty-five years; and the principal events contained in it are, the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt, and their miraculous deliverance by the hand of Moses; their entrance into the wilderness of Sinai; the promulgation of the law, and the building of the tabernacle. See Pentateuch.

EXPIATION, a religious act, by which satisfaction or atonement is made for the commission of some crime, the guilt done away, and the obligation to punishment cancelled. The chief methods of expiation among the Jews were by sacrifices; and it is important always to recollect that the Levitical sacrifices were of an expiatory character; because as among the Jews sacrifices were unquestionably of divine original, and as the terms taken from them are found applied so frequently to Christ and to his sufferings in the New Testament, they serve to explain that peculiarity under which the Apostles regarded the death of Christ, and afford additional proof that it was considered by them as a sacrifice of expiation, as the grand universal sin-offering for the whole world. For our Lord is announced by John as “the Lamb of God;” and that not with reference to meekness or any other moral virtue; but with an accompanying phrase, which would communicate to a Jew the full sacrificial sense of the term employed, “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” He is called “our Passover, sacrificed for us.” He is said to have given “himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savour.” As a priest, it was necessary “he should have somewhat to offer;” and he offered “himself;” “his own blood,” to which is ascribed the washing away of sin, and our eternal redemption. He is declared to have “put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;” to have “by himself purged our sins;” to have “sanctified the people by his own blood;” to have “offered to God one sacrifice for sins.” Add to these, and to innumerable other similar expressions and allusions, the argument of the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which, by proving at length, that the sacrifice of Christ was superior in efficacy to the sacrifices of the law, he most unequivocally

assumes, that the death of Christ was a sacrifice and sin-offering; for without that it would no more have been capable of comparison with the sacrifices of the law, than the death of John the Baptist, St. Stephen, or St. James, all martyrs and sufferers for the truth, who had recently sealed their testimony with their blood. This very comparison, we may affirm, is utterly unaccountable and absurd on any hypothesis which denies the sacrifice of Christ; for what relation could his death have to the Levitical immolations and offerings, if it had no sacrificial character? Nothing could, in fact, be more misleading, and even absurd, than to apply those terms which, both among Jews and Gentiles, were in use to express the various processes and means of atonement and propitiatory, if the Apostles and Christ himself did not intend to represent his death strictly as an expiation for sin:--misleading, because such would be the natural and necessary inference from the terms themselves, which had acquired this as their established meaning:--and absurd, because if, as Socinians say, they used them metaphorically, there was not even an ideal resemblance between the figure and that which it was intended to illustrate. So totally irrelevant, indeed, will those terms appear to any notion entertained of the death of Christ which excludes its expiatory character, that to assume that our Lord and his Apostles used them as metaphors, is profanely to assume them to be such writers as would not in any other case be tolerated; writers wholly unacquainted with the commonest rules of language, and therefore wholly unfit to be teachers of others, and that not only in religion but in things of inferior importance.

2. The use of such terms, we have said, would not only be wholly absurd, but criminally misleading to the Gentiles, as well as to the Jews, who were first converted to Christianity. To them the notion of propitiatory offerings, offerings to avert the displeasure of the gods, and which expiated the crimes of offenders, was most familiar, and terms corresponding to it were in constant use. The bold denial of this by Dr. Priestley might well bring upon him the reproof of Archbishop Magee, who, after establishing this point from the Greek and Latin writers, observes, "So clearly does their language announce the notion of a propitiatory atonement, that if we would avoid an imputation on Dr. Priestley's fairness, we are driven, of necessity, to question the extent of his acquaintance with those writers." The reader may consult the instances given by this writer, in No. 5 of his "Illustrations," appended to his "Discourses on the Atonement;" and also the tenth chapter of Grotius "De Satisfactione," whose learning has most amply illustrated and firmly settled this view of the Heathen sacrifices. The use to be made of this in the argument is, that as the Apostles found the very terms they used with reference to the nature and efficacy of the death of Christ, fixed in an expiatory signification among the Greeks, they could not, in honesty, use them in a distant figurative sense, much less in a

contrary one, without giving their readers due notice of their having invested them with a new import. From ἄγος, a pollution, an impurity, which was to be expiated by sacrifice, are derived ἀγνίζω and ἀγιάζω, which denote the act of expiation; καθαίρω, too, to purify, cleanse, is applied to the effect of expiation; and ἱλάσκομαι denotes the method of propitiating the gods by sacrifice. These, and other words of similar import, are used by the authors of the Septuagint, and by the Evangelists and Apostles; but they give no premonition of using them in any strange and altered sense; and when they apply them to the death of Christ, they must, therefore, be understood to use them in their received meaning. In like manner the Jews had their expiatory sacrifices, and the terms and phrases used in them are, in like manner, employed by the Apostles to characterize the death of their Lord; and they would have been as guilty of misleading their Jewish as their Gentile readers, had they employed them in a new sense, and without warning, which, unquestionably, they never gave.

3. As to the expiatory nature of the sacrifices of the law, it is not required by the argument to show that all the Levitical offerings were of this character. There were also offerings for persons and for things prescribed for purification, which were incidental; but even they grew out of the leading notion of expiatory sacrifice, and that legal purification which resulted from the forgiveness of sins. It is enough to prove, that the grand and eminent sacrifices of the Jews were strictly expiatory, and that by them the offerers were released from punishment and death, for which ends they were appointed by the Lawgiver. When we speak, too, of vicarious sacrifice, we do not mean either, on the one hand, such a substitution as that the victim should bear the same quantum of pain and suffering as the offender himself; or, on the other, that it was put in the place of the offender as a mere symbolical act, by which he confessed his desert of punishment; but a substitution made by divine appointment, by which the victim was exposed to sufferings and death instead of the offender, in virtue of which the offender himself was released. With this view, one can scarcely conceive why so able a writer as Archbishop Magee should prefer to use the term, “vicarious import,” rather than the simple and established term, “vicarious;” since the Antinomian notion of substitution may be otherwise sufficiently guarded against, and the phrase “vicarious import” is certainly capable of being resolved into that figurative notion of mere symbolical action, which, however plausible, does in fact deprive the ancient sacrifices of their typical, and the oblation of Christ of its real, efficacy. Vicarious acting, is acting for another; vicarious suffering, is suffering for another; but the nature and circumstances of that suffering in the case of Christ are to be determined by the doctrine of Scripture at large, and not wholly by the term itself, which is, however, useful for this purpose, (and therefore to be preserved,) that it indicates the sense in which those who use it

understand the declaration of Scripture, "Christ died for us," so as that he died not merely for our benefit, but in our stead; in other words, that, but for his having died, those who believe in him would personally have suffered that death which is the penalty of every violation of the law of God.

4. That sacrifices under the law were expiatory and vicarious, admits of abundant proof.

The chief objections made to this doctrine are, (1.) That under the law in all capital cases, the offender, upon legal proof or conviction, was doomed to die, and that no sacrifice could exempt him from the penalty. (2.) That in all lower cases to which the law had not attached capital punishment, but pecuniary mulcts, or personal labour or servitude upon their nonpayment, this penalty was to be strictly executed, and none could plead any privilege or exemption on account of sacrifice; and that when sacrifices were ordained with a pecuniary mulct, they are to be regarded in the light of fine, one part of which was paid to the state, the other to the church. This was the mode of argument adopted by the author of "the Moral Philosopher;" and nothing of weight has been added to these objections since his day. Now, much of this may be granted, without any prejudice to the argument; and, indeed, is no more than the most orthodox writers on this subject have often remarked. The law, under which the Jews were placed, was at once, as to them, both a moral and a political law; and the Lawgiver excepted certain offences from the benefit of pardon, because that would have been exemption from temporal death, which was the state penalty. He therefore would accept no atonement for such transgressions. Blasphemy, idolatry, murder, and adultery, were the "presumptuous sins" which were thus exempted; and the reason will be seen in the political relation of the people to God; for in refusing to exempt them from punishment in this world, respect was had to the order and benefit of society. Running parallel, however, with this political application of the law to the Jews as subjects of the theocracy, we see the authority of the moral law kept over them as men and creatures; and if these "presumptuous sins," of blasphemy and idolatry, of murder and adultery, and a few others, were the only capital crimes considered politically, they were not the only capital crimes considered morally; that is, there were other crimes which would have subjected the offender to death, but for this provision of expiatory oblations. The true question then is, whether such sacrifices were appointed by God, and accepted instead of the personal punishment or life of the offender, which otherwise would have been forfeited, as in the other cases; and if so, if the life of animal sacrifices was accepted instead of the life of man, then the notion that "they were mere mulcts and pecuniary penalties" falls to the ground, and the vicarious nature of most of the

Levitical oblations is established. That other offences, beside those above mentioned, were capital, that is, exposed the offender to death, is clear from this, that all offences against the law had this capital character. As death was the sanction of the commandment given to Adam, so every one who transgressed any part of the law of Moses became guilty of death; every man was “accursed,” that is, devoted to die, who “continued not in all things written in the book of the law.” “The man only that doeth these things shall live by them,” was the rule; and it was, therefore, to redeem the offenders from this penalty that sacrifices were appointed. So with reference to the great day of expiation, we read, “For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that you may be clean from all your sins; and this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel, for all their sins, once a year,” Lev. xvi, 30–34.

5. To prove that this was the intention and effect of the annual sacrifices of the Jews, we need do little more than refer to Lev. xvii, 10, 11: “I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.” Here the blood which is said to make an atonement for the soul, is the blood of the victims; and to make an atonement for the soul is the same as to be a ransom for the soul, as will appear by referring to Exodus xxx, 12–16; and to be a ransom for the soul is to avert death. “They shall give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, that there be no plague among them,” by which their lives might be suddenly taken away. The “soul” is also here used obviously for the life; the blood, or the life of the victims in all sacrifices, was substituted for the life of man, to preserve him from death, and the victims were therefore vicarious.

6. The Hebrew word כפר, rendered atonement, signifying primarily to cover, to overspread, has been the subject of some evasive criticisms. It comes, however, in the secondary sense to signify atonement or propitiation, because the effect of that is to cover, or, in Scripture meaning, to remit offences. The Septuagint also renders it by ἐξιλάσκομαι, to appease, to make propitious. It is used, indeed, where the means of atonement are not of the sacrificial kind, but these instances equally serve to evince the Scripture sense of the term, in cases of transgression, to be that of reconciling the offended Deity, by averting his displeasure; so that when the atonement for sin is said to be made by sacrifice, no doubt can remain that the sacrifice was strictly a sacrifice of propitiation. Agreeably to this conclusion we find it expressly declared, in the several cases of

particular oblations for transgression of the divine commands, that the sin for which atonement was made by those oblations should be forgiven.

7. As the notion that the sacrifices of the law were not vicarious, but mere mulcts and fines, is overturned by the general appointment of the blood to be an atonement for the souls, the forfeited lives, of men, so also is it contradicted by particular instances. Let us refer to Leviticus v, 15,16: "If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance in the holy things of the Lord, he shall make amends for the harm that he hath done in the holy thing, and shall add a fifth part thereto, and shall give it to the priest." Here, indeed, is the proper fine for the trespass; but it is added, "He shall bring for his trespass unto the Lord a ram without blemish, and the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering, and it shall be forgiven him." Thus, then, so far from the sacrifice being the fine, the fine is distinguished from it, and with the ram only was the atonement made to the Lord for his trespass. Nor can the ceremonies with which the trespass and sin offerings were accompanied agree with any notion but that of their vicarious character. The worshipper, conscious of his trespass, brought an animal, his own property, to the door of the tabernacle. This was not a eucharistical act; not a memorial of mercies received, but of sins committed. He laid his hands upon the head of the animal, the symbolical act of transferring punishment; then slew it with his own hand, and delivered it to the priest, who burned the fat and part of the animal upon the altar; and, having sprinkled part of the blood upon the altar, and, in some cases, upon the offerer himself, poured the rest at the bottom of the altar. And thus, we are told, "The priest shall make an atonement for him, as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him." So clearly is it made manifest by these actions, and by the description of their nature and end, that the animal bore the punishment of the offender, and that by this appointment he was reconciled to God, and obtained the forgiveness of his offences.

8. An equally strong proof that the life of the animal sacrifice was accepted in place of the life of man, is afforded by the fact, that atonement was required by the law to be made, by sin offerings and burnt offerings, for even bodily distempers and disorders. It is not necessary to the argument to explain the distinctions between these various oblations; nor yet to inquire into the reason for requiring propitiation to be made for corporal infirmities which, in many cases, could not be avoided. They were, however, thus connected with sin as the cause of all these disorders; and God, who had placed his residence among the Israelites, insisted upon a perfect ceremonial purity, to impress upon them a sense of his moral purity, and the necessity of purification of mind. Whether these were the reasons, or some others not at all discoverable by us, all such unclean persons were



liable to death, and were exempted from it only by animal sacrifices. This appears from the conclusion to all the Levitical directions concerning the ceremonial to be observed in all such cases: "Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness; that they die not in," or by, "their uncleanness, when they defile my tabernacle which is among them," Lev. xv, 31. So that, by virtue of the sin offerings, the children of Israel were saved from a death which otherwise they would have suffered from their uncleanness, and that by substituting the life of the animal for the life of the offerer. Nor can it be urged that death is, in these instances, threatened only as the punishment of not observing these laws of purification; for the reason given in the passage just quoted shows that the threatening of death was not hypothetical upon their not bringing the prescribed purification, but is grounded upon the fact of "defiling the tabernacle of the Lord which was among them," which is supposed to be done by all uncleanness, as such, in the first instance.

9. As a farther proof of the vicarious character of the principal sacrifices of the Mosaic economy, we may instance those statedly offered for the whole congregation. Every day were offered two lambs, one in the morning, and the other in the evening, "for a continual burnt offering." To these daily victims were to be added, weekly, two other lambs for the burnt offering of every Sabbath. None of these could be considered in the light of fines for offences, since they were offered for no particular persons, and must be considered, therefore, unless resolved into an unmeaning ceremony, piacular and vicarious. To pass over, however, the monthly sacrifices, and those offered at the great feasts, it is sufficient to fix upon those, so often alluded to in the Epistle to the Hebrews, offered on the solemn anniversary of expiation. On that day, to other prescribed sacrifices were to be added another ram for a burnt offering, and another goat, the most eminent of the sacrifices for a sin offering, whose blood was to be carried by the high priest into the inner sanctuary, which was not done by the blood of any other victim, except the bullock, which was offered the same day as a sin offering for the family of Aaron. The circumstances of this ceremony, whereby atonement was to be made "for all the sins" of the whole Jewish people, are so strikingly significant, that they deserve a particular detail. On the day appointed for this general expiation, the priest is commanded to offer a bullock and a goat, as sin offerings, the one for himself, and the other for the people; and, having sprinkled the blood of these in due form before the mercy seat, to lead forth a second goat, denominated "the scape-goat;" and, after laying both his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, and confessing over him all the iniquities of the people, to put them upon the head of the goat, and to send the animal, thus bearing the sins of the people, away into the wilderness; in this manner expressing, by an action which cannot be misunderstood, that the atonement, which, it is affirmed, was to

be effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering, consisted in removing from the people their iniquities by this translation of them to the animal. For it is to be remarked, that the ceremony of the scape-goat is not a distinct one: it is a continuation of the process, and is evidently the concluding part and symbolical consummation of the sin offering: so that the transfer of the iniquities of the people upon the head of the scape-goat, and the bearing them away into the wilderness, manifestly imply, that the atonement effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering consisted in the transfer and consequent removal of those iniquities.

10. How, then, is this impressive and singular 364ceremonial to be explained? Shall we resort to the notion of mulcts and fines? If so, then this and other stated sacrifices must be considered in the light of penal enactments. But this cannot agree with the appointment of such sacrifices annually in succeeding generations: "This shall be a statute for ever unto you." The law appoints a certain day in the year for expiating the sins both of the high priest himself and of the whole congregation, and that for all high priests and all generations of the congregation. Now, could a law be enacted, inflicting a certain penalty, at a certain time, upon a whole people, as well as upon their high priest, thus presuming upon their actual transgression of it? The sacrifice was also for sins in general; and yet the penalty, if it were one, is not greater than individual persons were often obliged to undergo for single trespasses. Nothing, certainly, can be more absurd than this hypothesis. Shall we account for it by saying that sacrifices were offered for the benefit of the worshipper, but exclude the notion of expiation? But here we are obliged to confine the benefit to reconciliation and the taking away of sins, and that by the appointed means of the shedding of blood, and the presentation of blood in the holy place, accompanied by the expressive ceremony of imposition of hands upon the head of the victim; the import of which act is fixed, beyond all controversy, by the priest's confessing over that victim the sins of all the people, and at the same time imprecating upon its head the vengeance due to them, Lev. xvi, 21. Shall we content ourselves with merely saying that this was a symbol? But the question remains, Of what was it the symbol? To determine this, let the several parts of the symbolic action be enumerated. Here is confession of sin; confession before God at the door of the tabernacle; the substitution of a victim; the figurative transfer of sins to that victim; the shedding of blood, which God appointed to make atonement for the soul; the carrying the blood into the holiest place, the very permission of which clearly marked the divine acceptance; the bearing away of iniquity; and the actual reconciliation of the people to God. If, then, this is symbolical, it has nothing correspondent with it, it never had or can have any thing correspondent to it but the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, and the communication of the benefits of his passion in the

forgiveness of sins to those that believe in him, and in their reconciliation with God. Shall we, finally, say that those sacrifices had respect, not to God to obtain pardon by expiation, but to the offerer, teaching him moral lessons, and calling forth moral dispositions? We answer, that this hypothesis leaves many of the essential circumstances of the ceremonial wholly unaccounted for. The tabernacle and temple were erected for the residence of God, by his own command. There it was his will to be approached, and to these sacred places the victims were required to be brought. Any where else they might as well have been offered, if they had had respect only to the offerer; but they were required to be brought to God, to be offered according to a prescribed ritual, and by an order of men appointed for that purpose. Now truly there is no reason why they should be offered in the sanctuary rather than in any other place, except that they were offered to the Inhabitant of the sanctuary; nor could they be offered in his presence without having respect to him. There were some victims whose blood, on the day of atonement, was to be carried into the inner sanctuary; but for what purpose can we suppose the blood to have been carried into the most secret place of the divine residence, except to obtain the favour of Him in whose presence it was sprinkled? To this we may add, that the reason given for these sacred services is not in any case a mere moral effect to be produced upon the minds of the worshippers: they were “to make atonement,” that is, to avert God’s displeasure, that the people might not “die.”

11. We may find, also, another more explicit illustration in the sacrifice of the passover. The sacrificial character of this offering is strongly marked; for it was an offering brought to the tabernacle; it was slain in the sanctuary; and the blood was sprinkled upon the altar by the priests. It derives its name from the passing over and sparing of the houses of the Israelites, on the door posts of which the blood of the immolated lamb was sprinkled, when the first-born in the houses of the Egyptians were slain; and thus we have another instance of life being spared by the instituted means of animal sacrifice. Nor need we confine ourselves to particular instances. “Almost all things,” says an Apostle, who surely knew his subject, “are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission.” Thus, by their very law, and by constant usage, were the Jews familiarized to the notion of expiatory sacrifice, as well as by the history contained in their sacred books, especially in Genesis, which speaks of the vicarious sacrifices offered by the patriarchs; and in the book of Job, in which that patriarch is said to have offered sacrifices for the supposed sins of his sons; and where Eliphaz is commanded, by a divine oracle, to offer a burnt offering for himself and his friends, “lest God should deal with them after their folly.”

12. On the sentiments of the uninspired Jewish writers on this point, the substitution of the life of the animal for that of the offerer, and, consequently, the expiatory nature of their sacrifices, Outram has given many quotations from their writings, which the reader may consult in his work on Sacrifices. Two or three only may be adduced by way of specimen. R. Levi Ben Gerson says, "The imposition of the hands of the offerers was designed to indicate that their sins were removed from themselves, and transferred to the animal." Isaac Ben Arama: "He transfers his sins from himself, and lays them upon the head of the victim." R. Moses Ben Nachman says, with respect to a sinner offering a victim, "It was just that his blood should be shed, and that his body should be burned; but the Creator, of his mercy, accepted the victim from him, as his substitute 365and ransom; that the blood of the animal might be shed instead of his blood; that is, that the blood of the animal might be given for his life."

13. Full of these ideas of vicarious expiation, then, the Apostles wrote and spoke, and the Jews of their time heard and read, the books of the New Testament. The Socinian pretence is, that the inspired penmen used the sacrificial terms which occur in their writings figuratively; but we not only reply, as before, that they could not do this honestly, unless they had given notice of this new application of the established terms of the Jewish theology; but, if this be assumed, it leaves us wholly at a loss to discover what that really was which they intended to teach by these sacrificial terms and allusions. They are themselves utterly silent as to this point; and the varying theories of those who reject the doctrine of atonement, in fact, confess that their writings afford no solution of the difficulty. If, therefore, it is blasphemous to suppose, on the one hand, that inspired men should write on purpose to mislead; so, on the other, it is utterly inconceivable that, had they only been ordinary writers, they should construct a figurative language out of terms which had a definite and established sense, without giving any intimation at all that they employed them otherwise than in their received meaning, or telling us why they adopted them at all, and more especially when they knew that they must be interpreted, both by Jews and Greeks, in a sense which, if the Socinians are right, was in direct opposition to that which they intended to convey. See Type, Sacrifice, Propitiation.

Expiation, or Atonement, Great Day of, was the tenth of Tizri, which nearly answers to our September, O. S. The Hebrews call it KIPPUR, or CHIPPUR, "pardon," or "expiation," because the faults of the year were then expiated. The principal ceremonies of this day have been noticed in the preceding article; but a more particular detail may be useful. The high priest, after he had washed, not only his hands and his feet, as usual at common sacrifices, but his whole body, dressed himself in plain linen, like the other priests, wearing neither his purple robe, nor the ephod, nor the

pectoral, because he was to expiate his own sins, together with those of the people. He first offered a bullock and a ram for his own sins, and those of the priests: putting his hands on the heads of these victims, he confessed his own sins and the sins of his house. Afterward, he received from the princes of the people two goats for a sin offering, and a ram for a burnt offering, to be offered in the name of the whole nation. The lot determined which of the two goats should be sacrificed, and which set at liberty. After this, the high priest put some of the sacred fire of the altar of burnt offerings into a censer, threw incense upon it, and entered with it, thus smoking, into the sanctuary. After he had perfumed the sanctuary with this incense, he came out, took some of the blood of the young bullock he had sacrificed, carried that also into the sanctuary, and, dipping his fingers in it, sprinkled it seven times between the ark and the vail, which separated the holy from the sanctuary, or most holy. Then he came out a second time, and, beside the altar of burnt offerings, killed the goat which the lot had determined to be the sacrifice. The blood of this goat he carried into the most holy sanctuary, and sprinkled it seven times between the ark and the vail, which separated the holy from the sanctuary: from thence he returned into the court of the tabernacle, and sprinkled both sides of it with the blood of the goat. During all this, none of the priests or people were admitted into the tabernacle, or into the court. After this, the high priest came to the altar of burnt offerings, wetted the four horns of it with the blood of the goat and young bullock, and sprinkled it seven times with the same blood. The sanctuary, the court, and the altar, being thus purified, the high priest directed the goat which was set at liberty by the lot to be brought to him. He put his hand on the goat's head, confessed his own sins and the sins of the people, and then delivered the goat to a person appointed, who was to carry it to some desert place, and let it loose, or, as others say, throw it down some precipice. This being done, the high priest washed himself all over in the tabernacle; and, putting on other clothes, his pontifical dress, that is, his robe of purple, the ephod, and the pectoral, he sacrificed two rams for burnt offering, one for himself, the other for the people. The great day of expiation was a principal solemnity of the Hebrews, a day of rest and strict fasting.

2. There have been various disputes among the learned respecting the meaning of the word *azazel*, the name of the scape-goat on which the lot fell; but the most prevailing opinion is, that it is derived from *gnez*, "a goat," and *azel*, "to go away." So Buxtorf and many others explain it; and so it was understood by our translators, who have therefore rendered it "a scape-goat." Both goats were typical of Christ: that which was sacrificed is understood to have denoted his death, by means of which sin was expiated; the other, which was to have the sins of the people confessed over him, and, as it were, put upon him, and then to be sent alive into some

desert place, where they could see him no more, was intended to signify the effect of the expiation, namely, the removing of guilt, indicating that it should never more be charged on the pardoned sinner.

3. The rites attending the public service of the day of expiation were chiefly performed by the high priest, whose duties were on this day more arduous than on any other day in the year, or perhaps on all the rest united. He was to kill and offer the sacrifices, and sprinkle their blood with his own hands, Lev. xvi, 11–15; and he was to enter with it into the holy of holies, which he was not permitted to do at any other time, Lev. xvi, 2, &c; Heb. ix, 7. It was thus his peculiar privilege to draw nearer to God, or to the tokens of his special presence, to the ark of the covenant, to the mercy seat, and to the Shekinah, than was allowed to 366any other mortal. The services which he performed in the inmost sanctuary were, the burning of incense, and sprinkling the blood of the sacrifices before the mercy seat, which he was to do with his finger seven times, Lev. xvi, 14.

4. The spiritual meaning of all these rites has been particularly explained by the Apostle Paul in Hebrews ix. As the high priest was a type of Christ, his laying aside those vestments which were made “for glory and beauty,” Exodus xxviii, 2, and appearing in his common garments, which he did on that day, probably signified our Lord’s humiliation, when he emptied himself of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and “was made in fashion as a man,” Phil. ii, 6, 7. The expiatory sacrifices, offered by the high priest, were typical of the true expiation which Christ made for the sins of his people, when he gave himself for them, that he might redeem them from all iniquity, Titus ii, 14; Heb. i, 3; and the priest’s confessing the sins of the people over them, and putting them upon the head of the scape-goat, Lev. xvi, 21, was a lively emblem of the imputation of sin to Christ, who “was made sin for us,” 2 Cor. v, 21; for “the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,” Isaiah liii, 6. Farther, the goat’s “bearing upon him all the iniquities of the Jews into a land not inhabited,” Lev. xvi, 22, represents the effect of Christ’s sacrifice in delivering his people from guilt and punishment; and the priest’s entering into the holy of holies with the blood of the sacrifice is explained by the Apostle to be typical of Christ’s ascension into heaven itself, and his making intercession for his people in virtue of the sacrifice of his death.

EYE, the organ of sight. The Hebrews by a curious and bold metaphor call fountains eyes; and they also give the same name to colours: “And the eye,” or colour, “of the manna was as the eye,” or colour, “of bdellium,” Num. xi, 7. By an “evil eye” is meant, envy, jealousy, grudging, ill-judged parsimony; to turn the eyes on any one, is to regard him and his interests; to find grace in any one’s eyes, Ruth ii, 10, is to win his friendship and

good will. "The eyes of servants look unto the hands of their masters," Psalm cxxiii, 2, to observe the least motion, and obey the least signal. "Their eyes were opened," Gen. iii, 7, they began to comprehend in a new manner. "The wise man's eyes are in his head," Eccles. ii, 14, he does not act by chance. The eye of the soul, in a moral sense, is the intention, the desire. God threatens to set his eyes on the Israelites for evil, and not for good, Amos ix, 4. Nebuchadnezzar recommends to Nebuzaradan that he would "set his eyes" on Jeremiah, and permit him to go where he pleased, Jer. xxxix, 12; xl, 4. Sometimes expressions of this kind are taken in a quite opposite sense: "Behold, the eyes of the Lord are on the sinful kingdom; and I will destroy it," Amos ix, 8. To be eyes to the blind, or to serve them instead of eyes, is sufficiently intelligible, Job xxix, 15. The Persians called those officers of the crown who had the care of the king's interests and the management of his finances, the king's eyes. Eye service is peculiar to slaves, who are governed by fear only; and is to be carefully guarded against by Christians, who ought to serve from a principle of duty and affection, Eph. vi, 6; Col. iii, 22. The lust of the eyes, or the desire of the eyes, comprehends every thing that curiosity, vanity, &c, seek after; every thing that the eyes can present to men given up to their passions, 1 John ii, 16. "Cast ye away every man the abomination of his eyes," Ezek. xx, 7, 8; let not the idols of the Egyptians seduce you. The height or elevation of the eyes is taken for pride, Eccles. xxiii, 5. St. Paul says that the Galatians would willingly have "plucked out their eyes" for him, Gal. iv, 15; expressing the intensity of their zeal, affection, and devotion to him. The Hebrews call the apple of the eye the black daughter of the eye. To keep any thing as the apple of the eye, is to preserve it with particular care, Deut. xxxii, 10: "He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of mine eye," Zech. ii, 8; attempts to injure me in the tenderest part, which men instinctively defend. The eye and its actions are occasionally transferred to God: "The eyes of the Lord run to and fro through the whole earth," Zech. iv, 10; 2 Chron. xvi, 9; Psalm xi, 4. "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good," Proverbs xv, 3. "The Lord looked down from heaven," &c. We read, Matthew vi, 22, "The light," or lamp, "of the body is the eye; if therefore thine eye be single," simple, clear, ἀπλοῦς, "thy whole body shall be full of light; but if thine eye be evil," distempered, diseased, "thy whole body shall be darkened." The direct allusion may hold to a lantern, or lamp, λύχνος; if the glass of it be clear, the light will shine through it strongly; but if the glass be soiled, dirty, foul, but little light will pass through it: for if they had not glass lanterns, such as we use, they had others in the east made of thin linen, &c: these were very liable to receive spots, stains, and foulnesses, which impeded the passage of the rays of light from the luminary within. So, in the natural eye, if the cornea be single, and the humours clear, the light will act correctly; but if there be a film over the cornea, or a cataract, or a skin between any of the humours, the

rays of light will never make any impression on the internal seat of sight, the retina. By analogy, therefore, if the mental eye, the judgment, be honest, virtuous, sincere, well-meaning, pious, it may be considered as enlightening and directing the whole of a person's actions; but if it be perverse, malign, biassed by undue prejudices, or drawn aside by improper views, it darkens the understanding, perverts the conduct, and suffers a man to be misled by his unwise and unruly passions.

2. The orientals, in some cases, deprive the criminal of the light of day, by sealing up his eyes. A son of the great Mogul was actually suffering this punishment when Sir Thomas Roe visited the court of Delhi. The hapless youth was cast into prison, and deprived of the light by some adhesive plaster put upon his eyes, for the space of three years; after which the seal was taken away, that he might with freedom enjoy the light; but he was still detained in prison. Other princes have been treated in a different manner, to prevent them from conspiring against the reigning monarch, or meddling with affairs of state: they have been compelled to swallow opium and other stupifying drugs, to weaken or benumb their faculties, and render them unfit for business. Influenced by such absurd and cruel policy, Shah Abbas, the celebrated Persian monarch, who died in 1629, ordered a certain quantity of opium to be given every day to his grandson, who was to be his successor, to stupify him, and prevent him from disturbing his government. Such are probably the circumstances alluded to by the prophet: "They have not known nor understood; for he hath shut their eyes that they cannot see; and their hearts that they cannot understand," Isaiah xlv, 18. The verb *טָהַ*, rendered in our version, to shut, signifies "to overlay," "to cover over the surface;" thus, the king of Israel prepared three thousand talents of gold, and seven thousand talents of refined silver, to overlay the walls of the temple, 1 Chron. xxix, 4. But it generally signifies to overspread, or daub over, as with mortar or plaster, of which Parkhurst quotes a number of examples; a sense which entirely corresponds with the manner in which the eyes of a criminal are sealed up in some parts of the east. The practice of sealing up the eyes, and stupifying a criminal with drugs, seems to have been contemplated by the same prophet in another passage of his book: "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert and be healed."

3. Deprivation of sight was a very common punishment in the east. It was at first the practice to sear the eyes with a hot iron; but a discovery that this was not effectual, led to the cruel method of taking them out altogether with a sharp-pointed instrument. The objects of this barbarity were usually persons who aspired to the throne, or who were considered likely to make such an attempt. It was also inflicted on chieftains, whom it was desirable



to deprive of power without putting them to death. For this reason the hapless Zedekiah was punished with the loss of sight, because he had rebelled against the king of Babylon, and endeavoured to recover the independence of his throne: "Then he put out the eyes of Zedekiah; and the king of Babylon bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon, and put him in prison till the day of his death," Jer. lii, 11.

4. Females used to paint their eyes. The substance used for this purpose is called in Chaldee כהל, *cohol*; by the LXX, ζίβη. Thus we read of Jezebel, 2 Kings ix, 30, that, understanding that Jehu was to enter Samaria, she decked herself for his reception, and (as in the original Hebrew) "put her eyes in paint." This was in conformity to a custom which prevailed in the earliest ages. As large black eyes were thought the finest, the women, to increase their lustre, and to make them appear larger, tinged the corner of their eyelids with the impalpable powder of antimony or of black lead. This was supposed also to give the eyes a brilliancy and humidity, which rendered them either sparkling or languishing, as suited the various passions. The method of performing this among the women in the eastern countries at the present day, as described by Russel, is by a cylindrical piece of silver or ivory, about two inches long, made very smooth, and about the size of a common probe; this is wet with water, and then dipped into a powder finely levigated, made from what appears to be a rich lead ore, and applied to the eye; the lids are closed upon it while it is drawn through between them. This blacks the inside, and leaves a narrow black rim all round the edge. That this was the method practised by the Hebrew women, we infer from Isaiah iii, 22, where the prophet, in his enumeration of the articles which composed the toilets of the delicate and luxurious daughters of Zion, mentions "the wimples and the crisping pins," or bodkins for painting the eyes. The satirist Juvenal describes the same practice:--

*Ille supercilium madida fuligine tinctum  
Obliqua producit acu, pingitque trementes  
Attollens oculos.*

Sat. ii.

"These with a tiring pin their eyebrows dye  
Till the full arch give lustre to the eye."

Gifford.

This custom is referred to by Jeremiah, iv, 30:--

"Though thou clothest thyself in scarlet,  
Though thou adornest thyself with ornaments of gold,  
Though thou distendest thine eyes with paint,  
In vain shalt thou set forth thy beauty;

Thy paramours have rejected thee.”

And Ezekiel, describing the irregularities of the Jewish nation, under the idea of a debauched woman, says, כַּחֲלֵת עֵינַיִךְ, “Thou didst dress thine eyes with cohob;” which the Septuagint render, Ἐστρίψθ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς σου, “Thou didst dress thine eyes with stibium,” Ezek. xxiii, 40.

5. The passage, Psalm cxxiii, 2, derives a striking illustration from the customs of the east. The servants or slaves in eastern countries attend their masters or mistresses with the profoundest respect. Maundrell observes, that the servants in Turkey stand round their master and his guests in deep silence and perfect order, watching every motion. Pococke says, that at a visit in Egypt every thing is done with the greatest decency and the most profound silence, the slaves or servants standing at the bottom of the room, with their hands joined before them, watching with the utmost attention every motion of their master, who commands them by signs. De la Motraye says, that the eastern ladies are waited on even at the least wink of the eye, or motion of the fingers, and that in a manner not perceptible to strangers.

EZEKIEL, like his contemporary Jeremiah, was of the sacerdotal race. He was carried away captive to Babylon with Jehoiachim, king of Judah, B. C. 598, and was placed with 368 many others of his countrymen upon the river Chebar, in Mesopotamia, where he was favoured with the divine revelations contained in his book. He began to prophesy in the fifth year of his captivity, and is supposed to have prophesied about twenty-one years. The boldness with which he censured the idolatry and wickedness of his countrymen is said to have cost him his life; but his memory was greatly revered, not only by the Jews, but also by the Medes and Persians. The book which bears his name may be considered under the five following divisions: the first three chapters contain the glorious appearance of God to the prophet, and his solemn appointment to his office, with instructions and encouragements for the discharge of it. From the fourth to the twenty-fourth chapter inclusive, he describes, under a variety of visions and similitudes, the calamities impending over Judea, and the total destruction of the temple and city of Jerusalem, by Nebuchadnezzar, occasionally predicting another period of yet greater desolation, and more general dispersion. From the beginning of the twenty-fifth to the end of the thirty-second chapter, the prophet foretels the conquest and ruin of many nations and cities, which had insulted the Jews in their affliction; of the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Edomites, and Philistines; of Tyre, of Sidon, and Egypt; all of which were to be punished by the same mighty instrument of God’s wrath against the wickedness of man; and in these prophecies he not only predicts events which were soon to take place, but he also describes the condition of these several countries in the remote periods of the world. From the thirty-second to the fortieth chapter, he inveighs

against the accumulated sins of the Jews collectively, and the murmuring spirit of his captive brethren; exhorts them earnestly to repent of their hypocrisy and wickedness, upon the assurance that God will accept sincere repentance; and comforts them with promises of approaching deliverance under Cyrus; subjoining intimations of some far more glorious, but distant, redemption under the Messiah, though the manner in which it is to be effected is deeply involved in mystery. The last nine chapters contain a remarkable vision of the structure of a new temple and a new polity, applicable in the first instance to the return from the Babylonian captivity, but in its ultimate sense referring to the glory and prosperity of the universal church of Christ. Jerom observes that the visions of Ezekiel are among the things in Scripture hard to be understood. This obscurity arises, in part at least, from the nature and design of the prophecies themselves; they were delivered amidst the gloom of captivity; and though calculated to cheer the drooping spirits of the Jews, and to keep alive a watchful and submissive confidence in the mercy of God, yet they were intended to communicate only such a degree of encouragement as was consistent with a state of punishment, and to excite an indistinct expectation of future blessings, upon condition of repentance and amendment. It ought also to be observed, that the last twelve chapters of this book bear a very strong resemblance to the concluding chapters of the Revelation. The style of this prophet is characterized by Bishop Lowth as bold, vehement, and tragical; as often worked up to a kind of tremendous dignity. He is highly parabolical, and abounds in figures and metaphorical expressions. He may be compared to the Grecian Æschylus; he displays a rough but majestic dignity; an unpolished though noble simplicity; inferior perhaps in originality and elegance to others of the prophets, but unequalled in that force and grandeur for which he is particularly celebrated. He sometimes emphatically and indignantly repeats his sentiments, fully dilates his pictures, and describes the idolatrous manners of his countrymen under the strongest and most exaggerated representations that the license of eastern style would admit. The middle part of the book is in some measure poetical, and contains even some perfect elegies, though his thoughts are in general too irregular and uncontrolled to be chained down to rule, or fettered by language.

EZION-GEGER. See Elath.

EZRA, the author of the book which bears his name, was of the sacerdotal family, being a direct descendant from Aaron, and succeeded Zerubbabel in the government of Judea. This book begins with the repetition of the last two verses of the second book of Chronicles, and carries the Jewish history through a period of seventy-nine years, commencing from the edict of Cyrus. The first six chapters contain an account of the return of the Jews

under Zerubbabel, after the captivity of seventy years; of their reestablishment in Judea; and of the building and dedication of the temple at Jerusalem. In the last four chapters, Ezra relates his own appointment to the government of Judea by Artaxerxes Longimanus, his journey thither from Babylon, the disobedience of the Jews, and the reform which he immediately effected among them. It is to be observed, that between the dedication of the temple and the departure of Ezra, that is, between the sixth and seventh chapters of this book, there was an interval of about fifty-eight years, during which nothing is here related concerning the Jews, except that, contrary to God's command, they intermarried with Gentiles. This book is written in Chaldee from the eighth verse of the fourth chapter to the twenty-seventh verse of the seventh chapter. It is probable that the sacred historian used the Chaldean language in this part of his work, because it contains chiefly letters and decrees written in that language, the original words of which he might think it right to record; and indeed the people, who were recently returned from the Babylonian captivity, were at least as familiar with the Chaldee as they were with the Hebrew tongue.

Till the arrival of Nehemiah, Ezra had the principal authority in Jerusalem. In the second year of Nehemiah's government, the people being assembled in the temple, at the feast of tabernacles, Ezra was desired to read the law. He read it from morning till noon, <sup>369</sup>and was accompanied by Levites who stood beside him, and kept silence. The next day they desired to know of Ezra how they were to celebrate the feast of tabernacles. This he explained, and continued eight days reading the law in the temple. All this was followed by a solemn renewal of the covenant with the Lord. Josephus says that Ezra was buried at Jerusalem; but the Jews believe that he died in Persia, in a second journey to Artaxerxes. His tomb is shown there in the city of Zamuza. He is said to have lived nearly one hundred and twenty years.

Ezra was the restorer and publisher of the Holy Scriptures, after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity. 1. He corrected the errors which had crept into the existing copies of the sacred writings by the negligence or mistake of transcribers. 2. He collected all the books of which the Holy Scriptures then consisted, disposed them in their proper order, and settled the canon of Scripture for his time. 3. He added throughout the books of his edition what appeared necessary for illustrating, connecting, or completing them; and of this we have an instance in the account of the death and burial of Moses, in the last chapter of Deuteronomy. In this work he was assisted by the same Spirit by which they were at first written. 4. He changed the ancient names of several places become obsolete, and substituted for them new names, by which they were at that time called. 5. He wrote out the whole in the Chaldee character; that language having

grown into use after the Babylonish captivity. The Jews have an extraordinary esteem for Ezra, and say that if the law had not been given by Moses, Ezra deserved to have been the legislator of the Hebrews.

FABLE, a fiction destitute of truth. St. Paul exhorts Timothy and Titus to shun profane and Jewish fables, 1 Tim. iv, 7; Titus i, 14; as having a tendency to seduce men from the truth. By these fables some understand the reveries of the Gnostics; but the fathers generally, and after them most of the modern commentators, interpret them of the vain traditions of the Jews; especially concerning meats, and other things, to be abstained from as unclean, which our Lord also styles "the doctrines of men," Matt. xv, 9. This sense of the passages is confirmed by their contexts. In another sense, the word is taken to signify an apologue, or instructive tale, intended to convey truth under the concealment of fiction; as Jotham's fable of the trees, Judges ix, 7–15, no doubt by far the oldest fable extant.

FACE. Moses begs of God to show him his face, or to manifest his glory; he replies, "I will make all my goodness pass before thee," and I will proclaim my name; "but my face thou canst not see; for there shall no man see it and live!" The persuasion was very prevalent in the world, that no man could support the sight of Deity, Genesis xvi, 13; xxxii, 30; Exod. xx, 19; xxiv, 11; Judges vi, 22, 23. We read that God spake mouth to mouth with Moses, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, Numbers xii, 8; "The Canaanites have heard that thou art among thy people, and seen face to face," Numbers xiv, 14. God talked with the Hebrews "face to face out of the midst of the fire," Deut. v, 4. All these places are to be understood simply, that God so manifested himself to the Israelites, that he made them hear his voice as distinctly as if he had appeared to them face to face; but not that they actually saw more than the cloud of glory which marked his presence. The face of God denotes sometimes his anger: "The face of the Lord is against them that do evil." "As wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked perish before the face of God," Psalm lxviii, 2. To turn the face upon any one, especially when connected with the light or shining of the countenance, are beautiful representations of the divine kindness and condescension. To regard the face of any one, is to have respect of persons, Proverbs xxviii, 21. The Apostle, speaking of the difference between our knowledge of God here and in heaven, says, "Now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face," 1 Cor. xiii, 12; by which he shows the vast difference between our seeing or knowing God and divine things by an imperfect revelation to faith, and by direct vision. This observation of the Apostle is rendered the more striking, when it is recollected that the Roman glass was not fully transparent as ours, but dull and clouded. Of this, specimens may be seen in the glass vessels taken out of Pompeii.

FAITH, in Scripture, is presented to us under two leading views: the first is that of assent or persuasion; the second, that of confidence or reliance. The former may be separate from the latter, but the latter cannot exist without the former. Faith, in the sense of an intellectual assent to truth, is, by St. James, allowed to devils. A dead, inoperative faith is also supposed, or declared, to be possessed by wicked men, professing Christianity; for our Lord represents persons coming to him at the last day, saying, "Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name" &c, to whom he will say, "Depart from me, I never knew you." And yet the charge in this place does not lie against the sincerity of their belief, but against their conduct as "workers of iniquity." As this distinction is taught in Scripture, so it is also observed in experience: assent to the truths of revealed religion may result from examination and conviction, while yet the spirit and conduct may remain unrenewed and sinful.

2. The faith which is required of us as a condition of salvation always includes confidence or reliance, as well as assent or persuasion. That faith by which "the elders obtained a good report," was of this character; it united assent to the truth of God's revelations with a noble confidence in his promise. "Our fathers trusted in thee, and were not confounded." We have a farther illustration in our Lord's address to his disciples upon the withering away of the fig tree: "Have faith in God." He did not question whether they believed the existence of God, but exhorted them to confidence in his promises, when called by him to contend with mountainous difficulties: "Have faith in God; for verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe (trust) that these things which he saith shall come to pass, he shall have whatsoever he saith." It was in reference to his simple confidence in Christ's power that our Lord so highly commended the centurion, and said, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel," Matt. viii, 10. And all the instances of faith in the persons miraculously healed by Christ, were also of this kind: their faith was belief in his claims, and also confidence in his goodness and power.

3. That faith in Christ which in the New Testament is connected with salvation, is clearly of this nature; that is, it combines assent with reliance, belief with trust. "Whatsoever ye ask the Father in my name," that is, in dependence upon my interest and merits, "he shall give it you." Christ was preached both to Jews and Gentiles as the object of their trust, because he was preached as the only true sacrifice for sin; and they were required to renounce their dependence upon their own accustomed sacrifices, and to transfer that dependence to his death and mediation,--and "in his name shall the Gentiles trust." He is said to be set forth as a propitiation, "through

faith in his blood;” which faith can neither merely mean assent to the historical fact that his blood was shed by a violent death; nor mere assent to the general doctrine that his blood had an atoning quality; but as all expiatory offerings were trusted in as the means of propitiation both among Jews and Gentiles, faith or trust was now to be exclusively rendered to the blood of Christ, as the divinely appointed sacrifice for sin, and the only refuge of the true penitent.

4. To the most unlettered Christian this then will be very obvious, that true and saving faith in Christ consists both of assent and trust; but this is not a blind and superstitious trust in the sacrifice of Christ, like that of the Heathens in their sacrifices; nor the presumptuous trust of wicked and impenitent men, who depend on Christ to save them in their sins; but such a trust as is exercised according to the authority and direction of the word of God; so that to know the Gospel in its leading principles, and to have a cordial belief in it, is necessary to that more specific act of faith which is called reliance, or in systematic language, fiducial assent. The Gospel, as the scheme of man’s salvation, declares that he is under the law; that this law of God has been violated by all; and that every man is under sentence of death. Serious consideration of our ways, confession of the fact, and sorrowful conviction of the evil and danger of sin, will, under the influence of divine grace, follow the cordial belief of the testimony of God; and we shall then turn to God with contrite hearts, and earnest prayers, and supplications for his mercy. This is called “repentance toward God;” and repentance being the first subject of evangelical preaching, and then the injunction to believe the Gospel, it is plain, that Christ is only immediately held out, in this divine plan of our redemption, as the object of trust in order to forgiveness to persons in this state of penitence and under this sense of danger. The degree of sorrow for sin, and alarm upon this discovery of our danger as sinners, is no where fixed to a precise standard in Scripture; only it is supposed every where, that it is such as to lead men to inquire earnestly, “What shall I do to be saved?” and with earnest seriousness to use all the appointed means of grace, as those who feel that their salvation is at issue, that they are in a lost condition, and must be pardoned or perish. To all such persons, Christ, as the only atonement for sin, is exhibited as the object of their trust, with the promise of God, “that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.” Nothing is required of such but this actual trust in, and personal apprehension or taking hold of, the merits of Christ’s death as a sacrifice for sin; and upon their thus believing they are justified, their “faith is counted for righteousness,” or, in other words, they are forgiven.

5. This appears to be the plain Scriptural representation of this doctrine; and we may infer from it, (1.) That the faith by which we are justified is

not a mere assent to the doctrines of the Gospel, which leaves the heart unmoved and unaffected by a sense of the evil and danger of sin and the desire of salvation, although it supposes this assent; nor, (2.) Is it that more lively and cordial assent to, and belief in, the doctrine of the Gospel, touching our sinful and lost condition, which is wrought in the heart by the Spirit of God, and from which springeth repentance, although this must precede it; nor, (3.) Is it only the assent of the mind to the method by which God justifies the ungodly by faith in the sacrifice of his Son, although this is an element of it; but it is a hearty concurrence of the will and affections with this plan of salvation, which implies a renunciation of every other refuge, and an actual trust in the Saviour, and personal apprehension of his merits: such a belief of the Gospel by the power of the Spirit of God as leads us to come to Christ, to receive Christ, to trust in Christ, and to commit the keeping of our souls into his hands, in humble confidence of his ability and his willingness to save us.

6. This is that qualifying condition to which the promise of God annexes justification; that without which justification would not take place; and in this sense it is that we are justified by faith; not by the merit of faith, but by faith instrumentally as this condition: for its connection with the benefit arises from the merits of Christ and the promise of God. If Christ had not merited, God had not promised; if God had not promised, justification had never followed upon this faith; so that the indissoluble connection of faith and justification is from God's institution, whereby he hath bound himself to give the benefit upon performance of the condition. Yet there is an aptitude in this faith to be made a condition; for no other act can receive Christ as a Priest propitiating and pleading the propitiation and the promise of God for his sake to give the benefit. As receiving Christ and the gracious promise in this manner, it acknowledgeth man's guilt, and so man renounceth all righteousness in himself, and honoureth God the Father, and Christ the Son, the only Redeemer. It glorifies God's mercy and free grace in the highest degree. It acknowledges on earth, as it will be perpetually acknowledged in heaven, that the whole salvation of sinful man, from the beginning to the last degree thereof, whereof there shall be no end, is from God's freest love, Christ's merit and intercession, his own gracious promise, and the power of his own Holy Spirit.

7. Faith, in Scripture, sometimes is taken for the truth and faithfulness of God, Rom. iii, 3; and it is also taken for the persuasion of the mind as to the lawfulness of things indifferent, Rom. xiv, 22, 23; and it is likewise put for the doctrine of the Gospel, which is the object of faith, Acts xxiv, 24; Phil. i, 27; Jude 3; for the belief and profession of the Gospel, Rom. i, 8; and for fidelity in the performance of promises.



FALL OF MAN. In addition to what is stated on this subject under the article Adam, it may be necessary to establish the literal sense of the account given of man's fall in the book of Genesis. This account is, that a garden having been planted by the Creator, for the use of man, he was placed in it, "to dress it, and to keep it;"--that in this garden two trees were specially distinguished, one as "the tree of life," the other as "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil;"--that from eating of the latter Adam was restrained by positive interdict, and by the penalty, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;"--that the serpent, who was more subtle than any beast of the field, tempted the woman to eat, by denying that death would be the consequence, and by assuring her, that her eyes and her husband's eyes "would be opened," and that they would "be as gods, knowing good and evil;"--that the woman took of the fruit, gave of it to her husband, who also ate;--that for this act of disobedience they were expelled from the garden, made subject to death, and laid under other maledictions.

2. That this history should be the subject of much criticism, not only by infidels, but by those who hold false and perverted views of the Christian system, was to be expected. Taken in its natural and obvious sense, along with the comments of the subsequent Scriptures, it teaches the doctrines of the existence of an evil, tempting, invisible spirit, going about seeking whom he may deceive and devour; of the introduction of moral corruptness into human nature, which has been transmitted to all men; and is connected also with the doctrine of a vicarious atonement for sin; and wherever the fundamental truths of the Christian system are denied, attempts will be made so to interpret this part of the Mosaic history as to obscure the testimony which it gives to them, either explicitly, or by just induction. Interpreters have adopted various and often strange theories; but those whose opinions it seems necessary to notice may be divided into such as deny the literal sense of the relation entirely; such as take the account to be in part literal and in part allegorical; and those who, while they contend earnestly for the literal interpretation of every part of the history, consider some of the terms used, and some of the persons introduced, as conveying a meaning more extensive than the letter, and as constituting several symbols of spiritual things and of spiritual beings.

3. Those who have denied the literal sense entirely, and regarded the whole relation as an instructive mythos, or fable, have, as might be expected, when all restraint of authority was thus thrown off from the imagination, themselves adopted very different theories. Thus we have been taught, that this account was intended to teach the evil of yielding to the violence of appetite and to its control over reason; or the introduction of vice in conjunction with knowledge and the artificial refinements of society; or the necessity of keeping the great mass of mankind from acquiring too great a

degree of knowledge, as being hurtful to society; or to consider it as another version of the story of the golden age, and its being succeeded by times more vicious and miserable; or as designed, enigmatically, to account for the origin of evil, or of mankind. This catalogue of opinions might be much enlarged: some of them have been held by mere visionaries; others by men of learning, especially by several of the semi-infidel theologians and Biblical critics of Germany; nor has our own country been exempt from this class of bold expositors. How to fix upon the moral of “the fable” is, however, the difficulty; and the great variety of opinion is a sufficient refutation of the general notion assumed by the whole class, since scarcely can two of them be found who adopt the same views, after they have discarded the literal acceptation.

4. But that the account of Moses is to be taken as a matter of real history, and according to its literal import, is established by two considerations, against which, as being facts, nothing can successfully be urged. The first is, that the account of the fall of the first pair is a part of a continuous history. The creation of the world, of man, of woman; the planting of the garden of Eden, and the placing of man there; the duties and prohibitions laid upon him; his disobedience; his expulsion from the garden; the subsequent birth of his children, their lives, and actions, and those of their posterity, down to the flood; and, from that event, to the life of Abraham, are given in the same plain and unadorned narrative; brief, but yet simple; and with no intimation at all, either from the elevation of the style or otherwise, that a fable or allegory is in any part introduced. As this, then, is the case, and the evidence of it lies upon the very face of the history, it is clear, that if the account of the fall be excerpted from the whole narrative as allegorical, any subsequent part, from Abel to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, may be excerpted for the same reason, which reason is merely this, that it does not agree with the theological opinions of the interpreter; and thus the whole of the Pentateuch may be rejected history, and converted into fable. Either then the account of the fall must be taken as history, or the historical character of the whole five books of Moses must be unsettled; and if none but infidels will go to the latter consequence, then no one who admits the Pentateuch to be a true history generally, can consistently refuse to admit the story of the fall of the first pair to be a narrative of real events, because it is written in the same style, and presents the same character of a continuous record of events. So conclusive has this argument been felt, that the anti-literal interpreters have endeavoured to evade it, by asserting that the part of the history of Moses in question bears marks of being a separate fragment, more ancient than the Pentateuch itself, and transcribed into it by Moses, the author and compiler of the whole. This point is examined and satisfactorily refuted in Holden’s learned and excellent work, entitled,

“Dissertation on the Fall of Man;” but it is easy to show, that it would amount to nothing, if granted, in the mind of any who is satisfied on the previous question of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. For let it be admitted that Moses, in writing the pentateuchal history, availed himself of the traditions of the patriarchal ages, a supposition not in the least inconsistent with his inspiration or with the absolute truth of his history, since the traditions so introduced have been authenticated by the Holy Spirit; or let it be supposed, which is wholly gratuitous, that he made use of previously existing documents; and that some differences of style in his books may be traced which serve to point out his quotations, which is a position that some of the best Hebraists have denied; yet two things are to be noted: first, that the inspired character of the books of Moses is authenticated by our Lord and his Apostles, so that they must necessarily be wholly true, and free from real contradictions; and, secondly, that to make it any thing to their purpose who contend that the account of the fall is an older document, introduced by Moses, it ought to be shown that it is not written as truly in the narrative style, even if it could be proved to be, in some respects, a different style, as that which precedes and follows it. Now the very literal character of our translation will enable even the unlearned reader to discover this. Whether it be an embodied tradition, or the insertion of a more ancient document, (though there is no foundation at all for the latter supposition,) it is obviously a narrative, and a narrative as simple as any which precedes or follows it.

5. The other indisputable fact to which I just now adverted, as establishing the literal sense of the history, is that, as such, it is referred to and reasoned upon in various parts of Scripture: “Knowest thou not this of old, since man (Adam) was placed upon earth, that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment?” Job xx, 4, 5. There is no reason to doubt but that this passage refers to the fall and the first sin of man. The date agrees; for the knowledge here taught is said to arise from facts as old as the first placing of man upon earth, and the sudden punishment of the iniquity corresponds to the Mosaic account: “The triumphing of the wicked is short, his joy but for a moment.” “If I covered my transgressions as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom,” Job xxxi, 33. Magee renders the verse,

“Did I cover, like Adam, my transgression,  
By hiding in a lurking place mine iniquity?”  
and adds, “I agree with Peters, that this contains a reference to the history of the first man, and his endeavours to hide himself after his transgression.” Our margin reads, “after the manner of men;” and also the old versions; but the Chaldee paraphrase agrees with our translation, which is also satisfactorily defended by numerous critics. “What is man, that he should

be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" Job xv, 14. Why not clean? Did God make woman or man unclean at the beginning? If he did, the expostulation would have been more apposite, and much stronger, had the true cause been assigned, and Job had said, "How canst thou expect cleanness in man, whom thou createdst unclean?" But, as the case now stands, the expostulation has a plain reference to the introduction of vanity and corruption by the sin of the woman, and is an evidence that this ancient writer was sensible of the evil consequences of the fall upon the whole race of man. "Eden" and "the garden of the Lord" are also frequently referred to in the prophets. We have the "tree of life" mentioned several times in the Proverbs and in the Revelation. "God," says Solomon, "made man upright." The enemies of Christ and his church are spoken of, both in the Old and New Testaments, under the names of "the serpent," and "the dragon;" and the habit of the serpent to lick the dust is also referred to by Isaiah.

6. If the history of the fall, as recorded by Moses, were an allegory, or any thing but a literal history, several of the above allusions would have no meaning; but the matter is put beyond all possible doubt in the New Testament, unless the same culpable liberties be taken with the interpretation of the words of our Lord and of St. Paul as with those of the Jewish lawgiver. Our Lord says, "Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female; and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh?" Matt. xix, 4, 5. This is an argument on the subject of divorces, and its foundation rests upon two of the facts recorded by Moses: (1.) That God made at first but two human beings, from whom all the rest have sprung. (2.) That the intimacy and indissolubility of the marriage relation rests upon the formation of the woman from the man; for our Lord quotes the words in Genesis, where the obligation of man to cleave to his wife is immediately connected with that circumstance: "And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh." This is sufficiently in proof that both our Lord and the Pharisees considered this early part of the history of Moses as a narrative; for, otherwise, it would neither have been a reason, on his part, for the doctrine which he was inculcating, nor have had any force of conviction as to them. "In Adam," says the Apostle Paul, "all die;" "by one man sin entered into the world." "But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." In the last passage, the instrument of the temptation is said to be a serpent, ὄφις, which is a sufficient answer to those who would make it any other animal; and Eve is represented as being first

seduced, according to the account in Genesis. This St. Paul repeats in 1 Tim. ii, 13, 14: "Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived," first or immediately, "but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." And he offers this as the reason of an injunction, "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection." When, therefore, it is considered, that these passages are introduced, not for rhetorical illustration, or in the way of classical quotation, but are made the basis of grave and important reasonings, which embody some of the most important doctrines of the Christian revelation, and of important social duties and points of Christian order and decorum; it would be to charge the writers of the New Testament with the grossest absurdity, nay, with even culpable and unworthy trifling, to suppose them to argue from the history of the fall as a narrative, when they knew it to be an allegory. And if we are, therefore, compelled to allow that it was understood as a real history by our Lord and his inspired Apostles, those speculations of modern critics, which convert it into a parable, stand branded with their true character of infidel and semi-infidel temerity.

7. The effect of the sin or lapse of Adam was to bring him under the wrath of God; to render him liable to pain, disease, and death; to deprive him of primeval holiness; to separate him from communion with God and that spiritual life which was before imparted by God, and on which his holiness alone depended, from the loss of which a total moral disorder and depravation of his soul resulted; and finally to render him liable to everlasting misery. See Original Sin. For the effect of the fall of Adam upon his posterity, see Justification.

FASTING has been practised in all ages, and among all nations, in times of mourning, sorrow, and affliction. We see no example of fasting, properly so called, before Moses. Since the time of Moses, examples of fasting have been very common among the Jews. Joshua and the elders of Israel remained prostrate before the ark from morning till evening, without eating, after Israel was defeated at Ai, Joshua vii, 6. The eleven tribes which fought against that of Benjamin, fell down on their faces before the ark, and so continued till evening without eating, Judges xx, 26. David fasted while the first child he had by Bathsheba was sick, 2 Sam. xii, 16. The Heathens sometimes fasted: the king of Nineveh, terrified by Jonah's preaching, ordered that not only men, but also beasts, should continue without eating or drinking; should be covered with sackcloth, and each after their manner should cry to the Lord, Jonah iii, 5, 6. The Jews, in times of public calamity, appointed extraordinary fasts, and made even the children at the breast fast, Joel ii, 16. Moses fasted forty days upon Mount Horeb, Exod. xxiv, 18. Elijah passed as many days without eating, 1 Kings xix, 8. Our Saviour fasted forty days and forty nights in the wilderness,

Matt. iv, 2. These fasts were miraculous, and out of the common rules of nature.

2. Beside the solemn fast of expiation instituted by divine authority, the Jews appointed certain days of humiliation, called the fasts of the congregation. The calamities for which these were enjoined, were a siege, pestilence, diseases, famine, &c. They were observed on the second and fifth days of the week: they began at sunset, and continued till midnight of the following day. On these days they wore sackcloth next the skin, and rent their clothes; they sprinkled ashes on their heads, and neither washed their hands, nor anointed their heads with oil. The synagogues were filled with suppliants, whose prayers were long and mournful, and their countenances dejected with all the marks of sorrow and repentance.

3. As to the fasts observed by Christians, it does not appear by his own practice, or by his commands to his disciples, that our Lord instituted any particular fast. But when the Pharisees reproached him, that his disciples did not fast so often as theirs, or as John the Baptist's, he replied, "Can ye make the children of the bride-chamber fast while the bride-groom is with them? But the days will come when the bride-groom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days," Luke v, 34, 35. Fasting is also recommended by our Saviour in his sermon on the mount; not as a stated, but as an occasional, duty of Christians, for the purpose of humbling their minds under the afflicting hand of God; and he requires that this duty be performed in sincerity, and not for the sake of ostentation, Matt. vi, 16.

4. Although Christians, says Dr. Neander, did not by any means retire from the business of life, yet they were accustomed to devote many separate days entirely to examining their own hearts, and pouring them out before God, while they dedicated their life anew to him with uninterrupted prayers, in order that they might again return to their ordinary occupations with a renovated spirit of zeal and seriousness, 374and with renewed powers of sanctification. These days of holy devotion, days of prayer and penitence, which individual Christians appointed for themselves, according to their individual necessities, were often a kind of fast-days. In order that their sensual feelings might less distract and impede the occupation of their heart with its holy contemplations, they were accustomed on these days to limit their corporeal wants more than usual, or to fast entirely. In the consideration of this, we must not overlook the peculiar nature of that hot climate in which Christianity was first promulgated. That which was spared by their abstinence on these days was applied to the support of the poorer brethren.

FAT. God forbade the Hebrews to eat the fat of beasts: "All the fat is the Lord's. It shall be a perpetual statute for your generations, throughout all your dwellings, that ye eat neither fat nor blood," Lev. iii, 17. Some interpreters understand these words literally, and suppose fat as well as blood to be forbidden. Josephus says Moses forbids only the fat of oxen, goats, sheep, and their species. This agrees with Lev. vii, 23: "Ye shall eat no manner of fat, of ox, or of sheep, or of goat." This is observed by the modern Jews, who think that the fat of other sorts of clean creatures is allowed them, even that of beasts which have died of themselves, conformably to Lev. vii, 24: "And the fat of the beast that dieth of itself, and the fat of that which is torn with beasts, may be used in any other use; but ye shall in nowise eat of it." Others maintain that the law which forbids the use of fat, should be restrained to fat separated from the flesh, such as that which covers the kidneys and the intestines; and this only in the case of its being offered in sacrifice. This is confirmed by Lev. vii, 25: "Whosoever eateth of the fat of the beast of which men offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, even the soul that eateth it shall be cut off from his people." In the Hebrew style, fat signifies not only that of beasts, but also the richer or prime part of other things: "He should have fed them with the finest" (in Hebrew the fat) "of the wheat." Fat denotes abundance of good things: "I will satiate the souls of the priests with fatness," Jer. xxxi, 14. "My soul shall be satisfied with marrow and fatness," Psalm lxiii, 5. The fat of the earth implies its fruitfulness: "God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine," Gen. xxvii, 28.

FATHER. This word, beside its common acceptation, is taken in Scripture for grandfather, great-grandfather, or the founder of a family, how remote soever. So the Jews in our Saviour's time called Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, their fathers. Jesus Christ is called the Son of David, though David was many generations distant from him. By father is likewise understood the institutor of a certain profession. Jabal "was father of such as dwell in tents, and such as have cattle." Jubal "was father of all such as handle the harp and organ," or flute, &c, Gen. iv, 20, 21. Hiram is called father of the king of Tyre, 2 Chron. ii, 13; and, 2 Chron. iv, 16, even of Solomon, because he was the principal workman, and chief director of their undertakings. The principal prophets were considered as fathers of the younger, who were their disciples, and are called sons of the prophets, 2 Kings ii, 12. Father is a term of respect given by inferiors to superiors. "My father," said Naaman's attendants to him, "if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing," 2 Kings v, 13; and so the king of Israel addresses the prophet Elisha, 2 Kings vi, 21. Rechab, the founder of the Rechabites, is called their father, Jer. xxxv, 6. A man is said to be a father to the poor and orphans, when he supplies their necessities, and sympathizes with their miseries, as a father

would do toward them: "I was a father to the poor," says Job, xxix, 16. God declares himself to be the "Father of the fatherless, and Judge of the widow," Psalm lxviii, 5. God is frequently called our heavenly Father, and simply our Father; eminently the Father, Preserver, and Protector of all, especially of those who invoke him, and serve him: "Is he not thy Father that bought thee?" says Moses, Deut. xxxii, 6. Since the coming of Jesus Christ, we have a new right to call God our Father, by reason of the adoption which our Saviour has merited for us, by clothing himself in our humanity, and purchasing us by his death: "Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God," Romans viii, 15. Job entitles God "the Father of rain," Job xxxviii, 28; he produces it, and causes it to fall. The devil is called the father of the wicked and the father of lies, John viii, 44. He deceived Eve and Adam; he introduced sin and falsehood; he inspires his followers with his spirit and sentiments. The father of Sichem, the father of Tekoah, the father of Bethlehem, &c, signify the chief persons who inhabited these cities; he who built or rebuilt them. Adam is the first father, the father of the living; Abraham is the father of the faithful, the father of the circumcision; called also the "father of many nations," because many people sprung from him; as the Jews, Ishmaelites, Arabs, &c. God is called "the Father of spirits," Heb. xii, 9. He not only creates them, but he justifies, sanctifies, and glorifies them, and thus confers upon them eternal happiness.

FATHERS, a term of honour applied to the first and most eminent writers of the Christian church. Those of the first century are called Apostolical fathers; those of the first three centuries, and till the council of Nice, Ante-Nicene; and those later than that council, Post-Nicene. Learned men are not unanimous concerning the degree of esteem which is due to these ancient fathers. Some represent them as the most excellent guides, while others place them in the very lowest rank of moral writers, and treat their precepts and decisions as perfectly insipid, and, in many respects, pernicious. It appears, however, 375incontestable, that, in the writings of the primitive fathers are many sublime sentiments, judicious thoughts, and several things well adapted to form a religious temper, and to excite pious and virtuous affections. At the same time, it must be confessed, that, after the earliest age, they abound still more with precepts of an excessive and unreasonable austerity, with stoical and academical dictates, with vague and indeterminate notions, and, what is still worse, with decisions absolutely false, and in evident opposition to the commands of Christ. Though the judgment of antiquity in some disputable points may certainly be useful, yet we ought never to consider the writings of the fathers as of equal authority with the Scriptures. In many cases they may be deemed competent witnesses, but we must not confide in their verdict as judges. As



Biblical critics they are often fanciful and injudicious, and their principal value consists in this, that the succession of their writings enables us to prove the existence and authenticity of the sacred books, up to the age of the Apostles.

The following is a list of the entire fathers: Contemporaries of the Apostles, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp. Papias, A. D. 116; Justin Martyr, 140; Dionysius of Corinth, 170; Tatian, 172; Hegesippus, 173; Melito, 177; Irenæus, 178; Athenagoras, 178; Miltiades, 180; Theophilus, 181; Clement of Alexandria, 194; Tertullian, 200; Minutius Felix, 210; Ammonius, 220; Origen, 230; Firmilian, 233; Dionysius of Alexandria, 247; Cyprian, 248; Novatus, or Novatian, 251; Arnobius, 306; Lactantius, 306; Alexander of Alexandria, 313; Eusebius, 315; Athanasius, 326; Cyril of Jerusalem, 348; Hilary, 354; Epiphanius, 368; Basil, 370; Gregory of Nazianzum, 370; Gregory of Nyssa, 370; Optatus, 370; Ambrose, 374; Philaster, 380; Jerome, 392; Theodore of Mopsuestia, 394; Ruffin, 397; Augustine, 398; Chrysostom, 398; Sulpitius Severus, 401; Cyril of Alexandria, 412; Theodoret, 423; and Gennadius, 494.

Archbishop Wake, in his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England has very satisfactorily shown, that the deference paid by Protestants to the Christian fathers of the first three ages, is neither of such an idolatrous description as is generally represented, nor is their authority ever extolled to an equality with that of the Holy Scriptures. "Though we have appealed," he says, "to the churches of the first ages for new proofs of the truth of our doctrine, it is not that we think that the doctors of those times had more right to judge of our faith than those had that followed them; but it is because after a serious examination we have found, that, as for what concerns the common belief that is among us, they have believed and practised the same things without adding other opinions or superstitions that destroy them,--wherein they have acted conformably to their and our rule, the Word of God: notwithstanding, it cannot be denied, but that they effectually fell into some wrong opinions, as that of the Millenaries and infant communion," &c. The usefulness and necessity of studying the ancient fathers have been defended by many persons eminent for their learning and piety. Archbishop Usher was one who beyond all men then living knew the vast importance of these studies, and had derived the greatest benefits from them. The following brief advice, in the language of Dr. Parr, his erudite biographer, will convey his sentiments on this very interesting subject: "Indeed he had so great an esteem of the ANCIENT AUTHORS, for the acquiring any solid learning, whether sacred or profane, that his advice to young students, either in divinity or antiquity, was, not to spend too much time in epitomes, but to set themselves to read

the ancient authors themselves; as, to begin with the FATHERS, and to read them according to the ages in which they lived, (which was the method he had taken himself,) and, together with them, carefully to peruse the CHURCH HISTORIANS that treated of that age in which those fathers lived: by which means the student would be better able to perceive the reason and meaning of divers passages in their writings, (which otherwise would be obscure,) when he knew the original and growth of those heresies and heterodox opinions against which they wrote, and may also better judge what doctrines, ceremonies, and opinions prevailed in the church in every age, and by what means introduced.”

FEAR, a painful apprehension of danger. It is sometimes used for the object of fear; as, “the fear of Isaac,” that is, the God whom Isaac feared, Gen. xxxi, 42. God says that he will send his fear before his people, to terrify and destroy the inhabitants of Canaan. Job speaks of the terrors of God, as set in array against him, Job vi, 4; the Psalmist, that he had suffered the terrors of the Lord with a troubled mind, Psalm lxxxviii, 15. Fear is used, also, for reverence: “God is greatly to be feared” in the assembly of his saints. This kind of fear, being compatible with confidence and love, is sometimes called filial fear; while “the fear which hath torment,” being the result of conscious guilt, and the anticipation of punishment, is removed by that “love” to God which results from a consciousness of our reconciliation to him.

The filial fear of God is a holy affection, or gracious habit, wrought in the soul by God, Jer. xxxii, 40, whereby it is inclined and enabled to obey all God’s commandments, even the most difficult, Gen. xxii, 12; Eccl. xii, 13; and to hate and avoid evil, Nehemiah v, 15; Prov. viii, 13; xv, 6. Slavish fear is the consequence of guilt; it is a judicial impression from the sad thoughts of the provoked majesty of the heaven; it is an alarm within that disturbs the rest of a sinner. Fear is put for the whole worship of God: “I will teach you the fear of the Lord,” Psalm xxxiv, 11; I will teach you the true way of worshipping and serving God. It is likewise put for the law and word of God: “The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring for ever,” Psalm xix, 9. The law is so called, because it is the object, the cause, and the rule of the grace of holy fear.

FEASTS. God appointed several festivals among the Jews. 1. To perpetuate the memory of great events; so, the Sabbath commemorated the creation of the world; the passover, the departure out of Egypt; the pentecost, the law given at Sinai, &c. 2. To keep them under the influence of religion, and by the majesty of that service which he instituted among them, and which abounded in mystical symbols or types of evangelical things, to convey spiritual instruction, and to keep alive the expectation of

the Messiah, and his more perfect dispensation. 3. To secure to them certain times of rest and rejoicings. 4. To render them familiar with the law; for, in their religious assemblies, the law of God was read and explained. 5. To renew the acquaintance, correspondence, and friendship of their tribes and families, coming from the several towns in the country, and meeting three times a year in the holy city.

The first and most ancient festival, the Sabbath, or seventh day, commemorated the creation. "The Lord blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it," says Moses, "because that in it he had rested from all his work," Gen. ii, 3. See Sabbath.

The passover was instituted in memory of the Israelites' departure out of Egypt, and of the favour which God showed his people in sparing their first-born, when he destroyed the first-born of the Egyptians, Exod. xii, 14, &c. See Passover.

The feast of pentecost was celebrated on the fiftieth day after the passover, in memory of the law being given to Moses on Mount Sinai, fifty days after the departure out of Egypt. They reckoned seven weeks from the passover to pentecost, beginning at the day after the passover. The Hebrews call it the feast of weeks, and the Christians, pentecost, which signifies the fiftieth day.

The feast of trumpets was celebrated on the first day of the civil year; on which the trumpets sounded, proclaiming the beginning of the year, which was in the month Tisri, answering to our September, O. S. We know no religious cause of its establishment. Moses commands it to be observed as a day of rest, and that particular sacrifices should be offered at that time.

The new moons, or first days of every month, were, in some sort, a consequence of the feasts of trumpets. The law did not oblige people to rest upon this day, but ordained only some particular sacrifices. It appears that, on these days, also, the trumpet was sounded, and entertainments were made, 1 Sam. xx, 5–18.

The feast of expiation or atonement was celebrated on the tenth day of Tisri, which was the first day of the civil year. It was instituted for a general expiation of sins, irreverences, and pollutions of all the Israelites, from the high priest to the lowest of the people, committed by them throughout the year, Lev. xxiii, 27, 28; Num. xxix, 7. See Expiation, Day of.

The feast of tents, or tabernacles, on which all Israel were obliged to attend the temple, and to dwell eight days under tents of branches, in memory of

their fathers dwelling forty years in tents, as travellers in the wilderness. It was kept on the fifteenth of the month Tisri, the first of the civil year. The first and seventh day of this feast were very solemn. But during the other days of the octave they might work, Lev. xxiii, 34, 35; Num. xxix, 12, 13. At the beginning of the feast, two vessels of silver were carried in a ceremonious manner to the temple, one full of water, the other of wine, which were poured at the foot of the altar of burnt offerings, always on the seventh day of this festival.

Of the three great feasts of the year, the passover, pentecost, and that of the tabernacles, the octave, or seventh day after these feasts, was a day of rest as much as the festival itself; and all the males of the nation were obliged to visit the temple at these three feasts. But the law did not require them to continue there during the whole octave, except in the feast of tabernacles, when they seem obliged to be present for the whole seven days.

Beside these feasts, we find the feast of lots, or purim, instituted on occasion of the deliverance of the Jews from Haman's plot, in the reign of Ahasuerus. See Purim.

The feast of the dedication of the temple, or rather of the restoration of the temple, which had been profaned by Antiochus Epiphanes, 1 Mac. iv, 52, &c, was celebrated in winter, and is supposed to be the feast of dedication mentioned in John x, 22. Josephus says, that it was called the feast of lights, probably because this happiness befel them when least expected, and they considered it as a new light risen on them.

In the Christian church, no festival appears to have been expressly instituted by Jesus Christ, or his Apostles. Yet, as we commemorate the passion of Christ as often as we celebrate his Supper, he seems by this to have instituted a perpetual feast. Christians have always celebrated the memory of his resurrection, and observe this feast on every Sunday, which was commonly called the Lord's day, Rev. i, 10. By inference we may conclude this festival to have been instituted by Apostolic authority.

The birth-day of Christ, commonly called Christmas-day, has been generally observed by his disciples with gratitude and joy. His birth was the greatest blessing ever bestowed on mankind. The angels from heaven celebrated it with a joyful hymn; and every man, who has any feeling of his own lost state without a Redeemer, must rejoice and be glad in it. "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," Isaiah ix, 6. For this festival, however, there is no authority in Scripture, nor do we know that it was observed in the age of the Apostles.

On Easter Sunday we celebrate our Saviour's victory over death and hell, when, having on the cross made an atonement for the sin of the 377world, he rose again from the grave, brought life and immortality to light, and opened to all his faithful servants the way to heaven. On this great event rest all our hopes. "If Christ be not risen," says St. Paul, "then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept," 1 Cor. xv, 14, 20.

Forty days after his resurrection, our Lord ascended into heaven, in the sight of his disciples. This is celebrated on what is called Ascension-day, or Holy Thursday. Ten days after his ascension, our Lord sent the Holy Spirit to be the comforter and guide of his disciples. This blessing is commemorated on Whit-Sunday, which is a very great festival, and may be profitably observed; for the assistance of the Holy Spirit can alone support us through all temptations, and guide us into all truth.

The pretended success of some in discovering the remains of certain holy men, called "relics," multiplied in the fourth century of the Christian church the festivals and commemorations of the martyrs in a most extravagant manner. These days, instead of being set apart for pious exercises, were spent in indolence, voluptuousness, and criminal pursuits; and were less consecrated to the service of God, than employed in the indulgence of sinful passions. Many of these festivals were instituted on a Pagan model, and perverted to similar purposes.

FELIX, CLAUDIUS. See Claudius.

FERRET, אַנְקָה, from אַנְק, or cry out, Lev. xi, 30. The ferret is a species of the weasel; but Bochart will have the anakah to be the spotted lizard, called by Pliny stellio. Dr. James takes it for the frog, in allusion to the name, which literally signifies the crier, befitting the croaking of that animal; but we shall find the frog mentioned under another name. Dr. Geddes renders it the newt, or rather the lizard of the Nile; and it evidently must be of the lizard species. Pliny mentions "the galleotes, covered with red spots, whose cries are sharp," which may be the gekko, which is probably the animal here intended. As its name, in the Indies tockai, and in Egypt gekko, is formed from its voice, so the Hebrew name anakah, or perhaps anakkah, seems to be formed in like manner; the double k being equally observable in all these appellations. If these remarks are admissible, this lizard is sufficiently identified.

FESTUS. Portius Festus succeeded Felix in the government of Judea, A. D. 60. Felix his predecessor, to oblige the Jews, when he resigned his

government, left St. Paul in bonds at Cæsarea, in Palestine, Acts xxiv, 27. Festus, at his first coming to Jerusalem, was entreated by the principal Jews to condemn St. Paul, or to order him up to Jerusalem, they having conspired to assassinate him in the way. Festus answered, that it was not customary with the Romans to condemn any man without hearing him; but said that he would hear their accusations against St. Paul at Cæsarea. From these accusations St. Paul appealed to Cæsar, and by this means secured himself from the prosecution of the Jews, and the wicked intentions of Festus, whom they had corrupted.

FIG TREE, תאגה, Gen. iii, 7; Num. xiii, 23; σκῆ, Matthew vii, 16; xxi, 19; xxiv, 32; Mark xi, 13, 20, 21; xiii, 28; Luke vi, 44; xiii, 6, 7; xxi, 29; John i, 48; James iii, 12; Rev. vi, 13. This tree was very common in Palestine. It becomes large, dividing into many branches, which are furnished with leaves shaped like those of the mulberry, and affords a friendly shade. Accordingly, we read, in the Old Testament, of Juda and Israel dwelling, or sitting securely, every man under his fig tree, 1 Kings iv, 25; Micah iv, 4; Zech. iii, 10; 1 Mac. xiv, 12. And, in the New Testament, we find Nathanael under a fig tree, probably for the purposes of devotional retirement, John i, 49–51. Hasselquist, in his journey from Nazareth to Tiberias, says, “We refreshed ourselves under the shade of a fig tree, where a shepherd and his herd had their rendezvous; but without either house or hut.” The fruit which it bears is produced from the trunk and large branches, and not from the smaller shoots, as in most other trees. It is soft, sweet, and very nourishing. Milton is of opinion that the banian tree was that with the leaves of which our first parents made themselves aprons. But his account, as to the matter of fact, wants even probability to countenance it; for the leaves of this are so far from being, as he has described them, of the bigness of an Amazonian target, that they seldom or never exceed five inches in length, and three in breadth. Therefore, we must look for another of the fig kind, that better answers the purpose referred to by Moses, Gen. iii, 7; and as the fruit of the banana tree, is often, by the most ancient authors, called a fig, may we not suppose this to have been the fig tree of paradise? Pliny, describing this tree, says that its leaves were the greatest and most shady of all others; and as the leaves of these are often six feet long, and about two broad, are thin, smooth, and very flexible, they may be deemed more proper than any other for the covering spoken of, especially since they may be easily joined together with the numerous threadlike filaments, which may, without labour, be peeled from the body of the tree. The first ripe fig is still called boccôre in the Levant, which is nearly its Hebrew name, בכורה, Jer. xxiv, 2. Thus Dr. Shaw, in giving an account of the fruits in Barbary, mentions “the black and white boccôre, or ‘early fig,’ which is produced in June, though the kermes, or kermouse, the ‘fig,’ probably so called, which they preserve and make up into cakes, is

rarely ripe before August.” And on Nahum iii, 12, he observes, that “the boccôres drop as soon as they are ripe, and, according to the beautiful allusion of the prophet, fall into the mouth of the eater upon being shaken.” Farther, “It frequently falls out in Barbary,” says he; “and we need not doubt of the like in this hotter climate of Judea, that, according to the quality of the preceding season, some of the more forward and vigorous trees will now and then yield a few ripe figs six weeks or more before the full 378season. Something like this may be alluded to by the Prophet Hosea, when he says, ‘I saw your fathers as בכורה, the first ripe, in the fig tree, at her first time,’ Hosea ix, 10. Such figs were reckoned a great dainty.” See Isaiah xxviii, 4. The Prophet Isaiah gave orders to apply a lump of figs to Hezekiah’s boil; and immediately after it was cured. God, in effecting this miraculous cure, was pleased to order the use of means not improper for that end.

2. The account of our Saviour’s denunciation against the barren fig tree, Matt. xxi, 19; Mark xi, 13, has occasioned some of the boldest cavils of infidelity; and the vindication of it has exercised the ingenuity of several of the most learned critics and commentators. The whole difficulty arises from the circumstance of his disappointment in not finding fruit on the tree, when it is expressly said, that “the time of figs was not yet.” While it was supposed that this expression signified, that the time for such trees to bring forth fruit was not yet come, it looked very unaccountable that Christ should reckon a tree barren, though it had leaves, and curse it as such, when he knew that the time of bearing figs was not come; and that he should come to seek figs on this tree, when he knew that figs were not used to be ripe so soon in the year. But the expression does not signify the time of the coming forth of figs, but the time of the gathering in of ripe figs, as is plain from the parallel expressions. Thus, “the time of the fruit,” Matt. xxi, 34, most plainly signifies the time of gathering in ripe fruits, since the servants were sent to receive those fruits for their master’s use. St. Mark and St. Luke express the same by the word time, or season: “At the season he sent a servant,” &c; that is, at the season or time of gathering in ripe fruit, Mark xii, 2; Luke xx, 10. In like manner, if any one should say in our language, the season of fruit, the season of apples, the season of figs, every one would understand him to speak of the season or time of gathering in these fruits. When, therefore, St. Mark says, that “the time or season of figs was not yet,” he evidently means that the time of gathering ripe figs was not yet past; and, if so, it was natural to expect figs upon all those trees that were not barren; whereas, after the time of gathering figs, no one would expect to find them on a fig tree, and its having none then would be no sign of barrenness. St. Mark, by saying, “For the time of figs was not yet,” does not design to give a reason for “his finding nothing but leaves;” but he gives a reason for what he said in the clause before: “He came, if haply he

might find any thereon;" and it was a good reason for our Saviour's coming and seeking figs on the tree, because the time for their being gathered was not come. We have other like instances in the Gospels, and, indeed, in the writings of all mankind, of another clause coming in between the assertion and the proof. Thus, in this very evangelist: "They said among themselves, Who shall roll away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? and when they looked, they saw the stone was rolled away; for it was very great," Mark xvi, 3, 4; where its being very great is not assigned as a reason of its being rolled away, but of the women's wishing for some one to roll it away for them. St. Matthew informs us that the tree was "in the way," that is, in the common road, and therefore, probably, no particular person's property; but if it was, being barren, the timber might be as serviceable to the owner as before. So that here was no real injury; but Jesus was pleased to make use of this innocent miracle to prefigure the speedy ruin of the Jewish nation on account of its unfruitfulness under greater advantages than any other people enjoyed at that day; and, like all the rest of his miracles, it was done with a gracious intention, namely, to alarm his countrymen, and induce them to repent. In the blasting of this barren fig tree, the distant appearance of which was so fair and promising, he delivered one more awful lesson to a degenerate nation, of whose hypocritical exterior and flattering but delusive pretensions it was a just and striking emblem.

**FINGER.** The finger of God signifies his power, his operation. Pharaoh's magicians discovered the finger of God in the miracle which Moses wrought, Exodus viii, 19. This legislator gave the law written by the finger of God to the Hebrews, Exodus xxxi, 18. Our Saviour says he cast out devils by the finger and Spirit of God, which he intimates was a sign that the kingdom of God was come; that God's spiritual government of his church was begun to be exercised among the Jews, by the Messiah, Luke xi, 20. To put forth one's finger, is a bantering, insulting gesture. "If thou take away from the midst of thee the yoke, and the putting out of the finger," Isaiah lviii, 9; if thou take away from the midst of thee the chain, or yoke, wherewith thou loadest thy debtors; and forbear pointing at them, and using jeering or menacing gestures.

**FIRE.** God hath often appeared in fire, and encompassed with fire, as when he showed himself in the burning bush; and descended on Mount Sinai, in the midst of flames, thunderings, and lightning, Exodus iii, 2; xix, 18. Hence fire is a symbol of the Deity: "The Lord thy God is a consuming fire," Deut. iv, 24. The Holy Ghost is compared to fire: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," Matt. iii, 11. To verify this prediction, he sent the Holy Ghost, which descended upon his disciples, in the form of tongues, or like flames of fire, Acts ii, 3. It is the work of the Holy Spirit to enlighten, purify, and sanctify the soul; and to inflame it with



love to God, and zeal for his glory. Fire from heaven fell frequently on the victims sacrificed to the Lord, as a mark of his presence and approbation. It is thought, that God in this manner expressed his acceptance of Abel's sacrifices, Gen. iv, 4. When the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, a fire like that of a furnace passed through the divided pieces of the sacrifices, and consumed them, Gen. xv, 17. Fire fell upon the sacrifices which Moses offered at the dedication of the tabernacle, Lev. ix, 24; 379 and upon those of Manoah, Samson's father, Judges xiii, 19, 20; upon Solomon's, at the dedication of the temple, 2 Chron. vii, 1; and on Elijah's, at Mount Carmel, 1 Kings xviii, 38. The fire which came down from heaven, first upon the altar in the tabernacle, and afterward descended anew upon the altar in the temple of Solomon, at its consecration, was there constantly fed and maintained by the priests, day and night, in the same manner as it had been in the tabernacle. The Jews have a tradition, that Jeremiah, foreseeing the destruction of the temple, took this fire and hid it in a pit; but that at the rebuilding of the temple, being brought again from thence, it revived upon the altar. But this is a fiction: and the generality of them allow, that, at the destruction of the temple, it was extinguished: and in the time of the second temple, nothing was made use of for all their burnt offerings but common fire only. The ancient Chaldeans adored the fire, as well as the old Persians, and some other people of the east. The torments of hell are described by fire, both in the Old and New Testament. Our Saviour makes use of this similitude, to represent the punishment of the damned, Mark ix, 44. He likewise speaks frequently of the eternal fire prepared for the devil, his angels, and reprobates, Matt. xxv, 41. The sting and remorse of conscience is the worm that will never die; and the wrath of God upon their souls and bodies, the fire that shall never go out. There are writers who maintain, that by the worm is to be understood a living and sensible, not an allegorical and figurative, worm; and by fire, a real elementary and material fire. Among the abettors of this opinion are Austin, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Jerom, &c. The word of God is compared to fire: "Is not my word like a fire?" Jer. xxiii, 20. It is full of life and efficacy; like a fire it warms, melts, and heats; and is powerful to consume the dross, and burn up the chaff and stubble. Fire is likewise taken for persecution, dissension, and division: "I am come to send fire on earth," Luke xii, 49; as if it was said, upon my coming and publishing the Gospel, there will follow, through the devil's malice and corruption of men, much persecution to the professors thereof, and manifold divisions in the world, whereby men will be tried, whether they will be faithful or not.

**FIRMAMENT.** It is said, Gen. i, 7, that God made the firmament in the midst of the waters, to separate the inferior from the superior. The word used on this occasion properly signifies expansion, or something expanded.

This expansion is properly the atmosphere, which encompasses the globe on all sides, and separates the water in the clouds from that on the earth.

**FIRST-BORN.** The first-born, who was the object of special affection to his parents, was denominated by way of eminence, פטר, the opening of the womb. In case a man married with a widow, who by a previous marriage had become the mother of children, the first-born as respected the second husband was the eldest child by the second marriage. Before the time of Moses, the father might, if he chose, transfer the right of primogeniture to a younger child, but the practice occasioned much contention, Gen. xxv, 31, 32; and a law was enacted, overruling it, Deut. xxi, 15–17. The first-born inherited peculiar rights and privileges. (1.) He received a double portion of the estate. Jacob, in the case of Reuben, his first-born, bestowed his additional portion upon Joseph, by adopting his two sons, Gen. xlviii, 5–8; Deut. xxi, 17. This was done as a reprimand, and a punishment of his incestuous conduct, Genesis xxxv, 22; but Reuben, notwithstanding, was enrolled as the first-born in the genealogical registers, 1 Chron. v, 1. (2.) The first-born was the priest of the whole family. The honour of exercising the priesthood was transferred, by the command of God communicated through Moses, from the tribe of Reuben, to whom it belonged by right of primogeniture, to that of Levi, Num. iii, 12–18; viii, 18. In consequence of God having taken the Levites from among the children of Israel instead of all the first-born to serve him as priests, the first-born of the other tribes were to be redeemed, at a valuation made by the priest not exceeding five shekels, from serving God in that capacity, Numbers xviii, 15, 16; Luke ii, 22, &c. (3.) The first-born enjoyed an authority over those who were younger, similar to that possessed by a father, Gen. xxv, 23, &c; 2 Chron. xxi, 3; Gen. xxvii, 29; Exod. xii, 29: which was transferred in the case of Reuben by Jacob their father to Judah, Gen. xlix, 8–10. The tribe of Judah, accordingly, even before it gave kings to the Hebrews, was every where distinguished from the other tribes. In consequence of the authority which was thus attached to the first-born, he was also made the successor in the kingdom. There was an exception to this rule in the case of Solomon, who, though a younger brother, was made his successor by David at the special appointment of God. It is very easy to see in view of these facts, how the word “first-born” came to express sometimes a great, and sometimes the highest, dignity.

2. First-born is not always to be understood literally; it is sometimes taken for the prime, most excellent, most distinguished of any thing. “The first-born of the poor,” Isaiah xiv, 30, signifies the most miserable of the poor; and “the first-born of death,” Job xviii, 13, the most terrible of deaths.

3. God ordained that all the Jewish first-born both of men and beasts, for service, should be consecrated to him. The male children only were subject to this law. If a woman's first child were a girl, the father was not obliged to offer any thing for her, or for the children after her, though they were males. If a man had many wives, he was obliged to offer the first-born of each of them to the Lord. The first-born were offered in the temple, and were redeemed for the sum of five shekels. The firstling of a clean beast was offered at the temple, not to be redeemed, but to be killed. An unclean beast, a horse, an ass, or a camel, was either redeemed or exchanged. An ass was redeemed by a lamb, or five shekels; if not redeemed, it was killed.

FIRST-FRUITS, among the Hebrews, were presents made to God of part of the fruits of the harvest, to express the submission, dependence, and thankfulness of the offerers. They were offered at the temple, before the crop was touched; and when the harvest was over, before any private persons used their corn. The first of these first-fruits, offered in the name of the nation, was a sheaf of barley, gathered on the fifteenth of Nisan in the evening, and threshed in a court of the temple. After it was well cleaned, about three pints of it were roasted and pounded in a mortar. Over this was thrown a portion of oil, and a handful of incense. Then the priest took this offering, waved it before the Lord toward the four parts of the world, threw a handful of it into the fire upon the altar, and kept the rest. After this, every one was at liberty to get in his harvest. Beside these first-fruits, every private person was obliged to bring his first-fruits to the temple. The Scripture prescribes neither the time nor the quantity. The rabbins say, that they were obliged to bring at least the sixtieth part of their fruits and harvest. These first-fruits consisted of wheat, barley, grapes, figs, apricots, olives, and dates. They met in companies of four-and-twenty persons to carry their first-fruits in a ceremonious manner. The company was preceded by an ox appointed for the sacrifice, with a crown of olives on his head, and his horns gilded. There was also another sort of first-fruits paid to God, Num. xv, 19, 20, when the bread in every family was kneaded, a portion of it was set apart, and given to the priest or Levite of the place. If there was no priest or Levite, it was cast into the oven, and consumed by the fire. This is one of the three precepts peculiar to the women; because they generally made the bread. The first-fruits and tenths were the most substantial revenue of the priests and Levites. St. Paul says, Christians have the first-fruits of the Spirit, Rom. viii, 23, that is, a greater abundance of God's Spirit, more perfect and more excellent gifts than the Jews. Christ is called the first-fruits of them that slept; for as the first-fruits were earnest to the Jews of the succeeding harvest, so Christ is the first-fruits or the earnest of the general resurrection.

FIR TREE, ברֹשׁ, occurs 2 Sam. vi, 5; 1 Kings v, 8, 10; vi, 15, 34; ix, 11; 2 Kings xix, 23; 2 Chron. ii, 8; iii, 5; Psalm civ, 17; Isaiah xiv, 8; xxxvii, 24; xli, 19; lv, 13; lx, 13; Ezek. xxvii, 5; xxxi, 8; Hosea xiv, 8; Nahum ii, 3; Zech. xi, 2. The LXX render it so variously as to show that they knew not what particular tree is meant; the Vulgate, generally by abietes, the “fir tree.” Celsius asserts that it is the cedar; but Millar maintains that it is the fir. The fir tree is an evergreen, of beautiful appearance, whose lofty height, and dense foliage, afford a spacious shelter and shade. The trunk of the tree is very straight. The wood was anciently used for spears, musical instruments, furniture for houses, rafters in building, and for ships. In 2 Sam. vi, 5, it is mentioned that David played on instruments of fir wood; and Dr. Burney, in his “History of Music,” observes, “This species of wood, so soft in its nature, and sonorous in its effects, seems to have been preferred by the ancients, as well as moderns, to every other kind for the construction of musical instruments, particularly the bellies of them, on which the tone of them chiefly depends. Those of the harp, lute, guitar, harpsichord, and violin, in present use, are always made of this wood.”

FISH, דג, ἰχθῦς, Matt. vii, 10; xvii, 27; Luke v, 6; John xxi, 6, 8, 11, occurs very frequently. This appears to be the general name in Scripture of aquatic animals. Boothroyd, in the note upon Num. xi, 4, says, “I am inclined to think that the word בֶּשָׂר, here rendered flesh, denotes only the flesh of fish, as it certainly does in Lev. xi, 11; and indeed the next verse seems to support this explication: ‘We remember how freely we ate fish.’ It was then, particularly, the flesh of fish, for which they longed, which was more relishing than either the beef or mutton of those regions, which, unless when young, is dry and unpalatable. Of the great abundance and deliciousness of the fish of Egypt, all authors, ancient and modern, are agreed.” We have few Hebrew names, if any, for particular fishes. Moses says in general, Lev. xi, 9–12, that all sorts of river, lake, and sea fish, might be eaten, if they had scales and fins; others were unclean. St. Barnabas, in his epistle, cites, as from ancient authority, “You shall not eat of the lamprey, the many-feet, [polypes,] nor the cuttle fish.” Though fish was the common food of the Egyptians, yet we learn from Herodotus and Chæremon, as quoted by Porphyry, that their priests abstained from fish of all sorts. Hence we may see how distressing to the Egyptians was the infliction which turned the waters of the river into blood, and occasioned the death of the fish, Exod. vii, 18–21. Their sacred stream became so polluted as to be unfit for drink, for bathing, and for other uses of water to which they were superstitiously devoted, and themselves obliged to nauseate what was the usual food of the common people, and held sacred by the priests, Exod. ii, 5; vii, 15; viii, 20.

In Ezekiel xxix, 4, the king of Egypt is compared to the crocodile: "I am against thee, the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers in Egypt. I will put hooks in thy jaws, and I will cause the fish in thy rivers to stick to thy scales, and I will bring thee out of the midst of thy rivers, and all the fish of thy rivers shall stick to thy scales." If the remora is as troublesome to the crocodile as it is to some other tenants of the water, it may here be referred to. Forskal mentions the *echeneis neucrates* [remora] at Gidda, there called *kaml el kersh*, "the louse of the shark," because it often adheres very strongly to this fish; and Hasselquist says that it is found at Alexandria.

The term, ἰχθὺς, a fish, was, at an early 381 period of the Christian era, adopted as a symbolical word. It was formed from the initial letters of the Greek words, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ, "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour." From the use of symbolical terms, the transition was easy to the adoption of symbolical representations, and it therefore soon became common for the Christians to have the letters of the word ἰχθὺς, or the figures of fishes, sculptured on their monuments for the dead, struck on their medals, engraved on their rings and seals, and even formed on the articles of domestic use.

FITCHES, or VETCHES, a kind of tare. There are two words in Hebrew which our translators have rendered fitches, פצק and ממת: the first occurs only in Isaiah xxviii, 25, 27, and must be the name of some kind of seed; but the interpreters differ much in explaining it. Jerom, Maimonides, R. David Kimchi, and the rabbins understand it of the gith; and rabbi Obdias de Bartenora expressly says that its barbarous or vulgar name is גילי. The gith was called by the Greeks μελάνθιον, and by the Latins nigella; and is thus described by Ballester: "It is a plant commonly met with in gardens, and grows to a cubit in height, and sometimes more, according to the richness of the soil. The leaves are small like those of fennel, the flower blue, which disappearing, the ovary shows itself on the top, like that of a poppy, furnished with little horns, oblong, divided by membranes into several partitions, or cells, in which are enclosed seeds of a very black colour, not unlike those of the leek, but of a very fragrant smell." And Ausonius observes, that its pungency is equal to that of pepper:--

*Est inter fruges morsu piper æquiparens git.*

Pliny says it is of use in bakehouses, *pistrinis*, and that it affords a grateful seasoning to the bread. The Jewish rabbins also mention the seeds among condiments, and mixed with bread. For this purpose it was probably used in the time of Isaiah; since the inhabitants of those countries, to this day, have a variety of rusks and biscuits, most of which are strewed on the top with the seeds of *sesamum*, coriander, and wild garden saffron.

The other word rendered fitches in our translation of Ezek. iv, 9, is כסמת; but in Exod. ix, 32, and Isaiah xxviii, 25, “rye.” In the latter place the Septuagint has ζέα, and in the two former ὀλύρα; and the Vulgate in Exodus, far, and in Isaiah and Ezekiel, vicia. Saadiah, likewise, took it to be something of the leguminous kind, גלגאן, cicircula, (misprinted circula in the Polyglott version,) or, “a chickling.” Aquila has ζέα, and Theodotion, ὀλύρα. Onkelos and Targum have כונהיא and Syriac, כונהא, which are supposed to be the millet, or a species of it called panicum; Persian, כورכדם, the spelt; and this seems to be the most probable meaning of the Hebrew word; at least it has the greatest number of interpreters from Jerom to Celsius. There are not, however, wanting, who think it was rye; among whom R. D. Kimchi, followed by Luther, and our English translators: Dr. Geddes, too, has retained it, though he says that he is inclined to think that the spelt is preferable.

Dr. Shaw thinks that this word may signify rice. Hasselquist, on the contrary, affirms that rice was brought into cultivation in Egypt under the Caliphs. This, however, may be doubted. One would think from the intercourse of ancient Egypt with Babylon and with India, that this country could not be ignorant of a grain so well suited to its climate.

FLAG, אחו, occurs Gen. xli, 2, 18; Job viii, 11; and סרף, weeds, Exod. ii, 3, 5; Isa. xix, 6; John ii, 5. The word achu in the first two instances is translated “meadows,” and in the latter, “flag.” It probably denotes the sedge, or long grass, which grows in the meadows of the Nile, very grateful to the cattle. It is retained in the Septuagint in Genesis, ἐν τῷ ἄχει; and is used by the son of Sirach, Ecclesiasticus xl, 16, ἄχι and ἄχει; for the copies vary.

“We have no radix,” says the learned Chapelow, “for אחו, unless we derive it, as Schultens does, from the Arabic achi, ‘to bind or join together.’” Thus, Parkhurst defines it “a species of plant, sedge, or reed, so called from its fitness for making ropes, or the like, to connect or join things together; as the Latin juncus, a ‘bulrush,’ a jungendo, from ‘joining,’ for the same reason;” and he supposes that it is the plant, or reed, growing near the Nile, which Hasselquist describes as having numerous narrow leaves, and growing about eleven feet high, of the leaves of which the Egyptians make ropes.

The word סרף is called by Eben Ezra, “a reed growing on the borders of the river.” Bochart, Fuller, Rivetus, Ludolphus, and Junius and Tremellius, render it by juncus, carex, or alga; and Celsius thinks it the fucus or alga, “sea weed.” Dr. Geddes says there is little doubt of its being the sedge

called sari, which, as we learn from Theophrastus and Pliny, grows on the marshy banks of the Nile, and rises to the height of almost two cubits. This, indeed, agrees very well with Exod. ii, 3, 5, and the thickets of arundinaceous plants, at some small distances from the Red Sea, observed by Dr. Shaw; but the place in Jonah seems to require some submarine plant.

FLAX, פשתה, Exod. ix, 31; Lev. xiii, 47, 48, 52, 59; Deut. xxii, 11; Joshua ii, 6; Judg. xv, 14; Prov. xxxi, 13; Isaiah xix, 9; xlii, 3; xliii, 17; Jer. xiii, 1; Ezek. xl, 3; xliv, 17, 18; Hosea ii, 5, 9; λῖνον Matt. xii, 20; Rev. xv, 6; a plant very common, and too well known to need a description. It is a vegetable upon which the industry of mankind has been exercised with the greatest success and utility. On passing a field of it, one is struck with astonishment when he considers that this apparently insignificant plant may, by the labour and ingenuity of man, be made to assume an entirely new form and appearance, and to contribute to pleasure and health, by furnishing us with agreeable and ornamental apparel. This word Mr. Parkhurst thinks is derived from the verb פָּשַׁח, to strip, because the substance which we term flax is properly the bark or fibrous part of the vegetable, pilled or stripped off the stalks. From time immemorial Egypt was celebrated for the production or manufacture of flax. Wrought into garments, it constituted the principal dress of the inhabitants, and the priests never put on any other kind of clothing. The fine linen of Egypt is celebrated in all ancient authors, and its superior excellence mentioned in the sacred Scriptures. The manufacture of flax is still carried on in that country, and many writers take notice of it. Rabbi Benjamin Tudela mentions the manufactory at Damiata; and Egmont and Heyman describe the article as being of a beautiful colour, and so finely spun that the threads are hardly discernible.

FLEA, פָּרַעַשׁ, Sam. xxiv, 14; xxvi, 20. The LXX, and another Greek version in the Hexapla, render it ψύλλων, and the Vulgate pulex. It seems, says Mr. Parkhurst, an evident derivative from פָּרַע free, and רָעַשׁ to leap, bound, or skip, on account of its agility in leaping or skipping. The flea is a little wingless insect, equally contemptible and troublesome. It is thus described by an Arabian author: "A black, nimble, extenuated, hunch-backed animal, which being sensible when any one looks on it, jumps incessantly, now on one side, now on the other, till it gets out of sight." David likens himself to this insect; importing that while it would cost Saul much pains to catch him, he would obtain but very little advantage from it.

FLESH, a term of very ambiguous import in the Scriptures. An eminent critic has enumerated no less than six different meanings which it bears in the sacred writings, and for which, he affirms, there will not be found a single authority in any profane writer: 1. It sometimes denotes the whole

body considered as animated, as in Matt. xxvi, 41, "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." 2. It sometimes means a human being, as in Luke iii, 6, "All flesh shall see the salvation of God." 3. Sometimes a person's kindred collectively considered, as in Rom. xi, 14, "If by any means I may provoke them which are my flesh." 4. Sometimes any thing of an external or ceremonial nature, as opposed to that which is internal and moral, as in Gal. iii, 3, "Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect in the flesh?" 5. The sensitive part of our nature, or that which is the seat of appetite, as in 2 Cor. vii, 1, "Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit;" where there can be no doubt that the pollutions of the flesh must be those of the appetites, being opposed to the pollutions of the spirit, or those of the passions. 6. It is employed to denote any principle of vice and moral pravity of whatever kind. Thus among the works of the flesh, Gal. v, 19–21, are numbered not only adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, drunkenness, and revellings, which all relate to criminal indulgence of appetite, but idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, and murders, which are manifestly vices of a different kind, and partake more of the diabolical nature than of the beastly.

FLIES. The kinds of flies are exceedingly numerous; some with two, and some with four, wings. They abound in warm and moist regions, as in Egypt, Chaldea, Palestine, and in the middle regions of Africa; and during the rainy seasons are very troublesome. In the Hebrew Scriptures, or in the ancient versions, are seven kinds of insects, which Bochart classes among muscæ, or flies. These are, 1. ערב, Exod. viii, 20; Psa. lxxviii, 45; cv, 31, which those interpreters who, by residing on the spot, have had the best means of identifying, have rendered the dog-fly, *κυσόμυτα*, and it is supposed to be the same which in Abyssinia is called the zimb. 2. זבוב, Kings i, 2, 3, 6, 16; Eccles. x, 1; Isa. vii, 18. Whether this denotes absolutely a distinct species of fly, or swarms of all sorts, may be difficult to determine. 3. ידבריה Judges xiv, 18; Psa. cxviii, 12, rendered bee. 4. צרעה, σφήξ, Exodus xxiii, 28; Joshua xxiv, 12; Deut. vii, 20, hornet. 5. סרבים, οἰζρος, Ezek. ii, 6; Hosea iv, 16. 6. כק, κόωνωψ, Matt. xxiii, 24, the gnat. 7. כנים, ασκνίφες, Exod. viii, 16; Psa. cv, 31, lice.

2. M. Sonnini, speaking of Egypt, says, "Of insects there the most troublesome are the flies. Both man and beast are cruelly tormented with them. No idea can be formed of their obstinate rapacity when they wish to fix upon some part of the body. It is in vain to drive them away; they return again in the self-same moment; and their perseverance wearies out the most patient spirit. They like to fasten themselves in preference on the corners of the eye, and on the edge of the eyelid; tender parts, toward which a gentle moisture attracts them." The Egyptians paid a superstitious worship to



several sorts of flies and insects. If, then, such was the superstitious homage of this people, nothing could be more determinate than the judgment brought upon them by Moses. They were punished by the very things they revered; and though they boasted of spells and charms, yet they could not ward off the evil.

3. "The word zimb," says Bruce, "is Arabic, and signifies the fly in general." The Chaldee paraphrase is content with calling it simply zebub, which has the same general signification. The Ethiopic version calls it tsaltsalya, which is the true name of this particular fly in Geez. It is in size very little larger than a bee, of a thicker proportion; and its wings, which are broader, are placed separate like those of a fly. Its head is large; the upper jaw or lip is sharp, and has at the end of it a strong pointed hair, of about a quarter of an inch in length; the lower jaw has two of these hairs: and this pencil of hairs, joined together, makes a resistance to the finger, nearly equal to a strong bristle of a hog. Its legs are serrated on the inside, and the whole covered with brown hair, or down. It has no sting, though it appears to be of the bee kind. As soon as this winged assassin appears, and its buzzing is heard, the cattle forsake their food, and run wildly about the plain till they die, worn out with affright, fatigue, and pain. The inhabitants of Melinda down to Cape Gardefan, to Saba, and the south coast of the Red Sea, are obliged to put themselves in motion, and remove 383 to the next sand in the beginning of the rainy season. This is not a partial emigration; the inhabitants of all the countries, from the mountains of Abyssinia northward, to the confluence of the Nile and Astaboras, are, once in a year, obliged to change their abode, and seek protection in the sands of Beja, till the danger of the insect is over. The elephant and the rhinoceros, which by reason of their enormous bulk, and the vast quantity of food and water they daily need, cannot shift to desert and dry places, are obliged, in order to resist the zimb, to roll themselves in mud and mire, which, when dry, coats them over like armour. It was no trifling judgment, then, with which the prophet threatened the refractory Israelites: "The Lord shall hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost parts of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria," Isaiah vii, 18. If the prediction be understood in the literal sense, it represents the *œstra* or *cincinellæ*, as the armies of Jehovah, summoned by him to battle against his offending people; or, if it be taken metaphorically, which is perhaps the proper way of expounding it, the prophet compares the numerous and destructive armies of Babylon to the countless swarms of these flies, whose distant hum is said to strike the quadrupeds with consternation, and whose bite inflicts, on man and beast, a torment almost insupportable. How intolerable a plague of flies can prove, is evident from the fact, that whole districts have been laid waste by them. Such was the fate of Myuns in Ionia, and of Alarnæ. The inhabitants were forced to quit these cities, not being able to stand against the flies and

gnats with which they were pestered. Trajan was obliged to raise the siege of a city in Arabia, before which he had sat down, being driven away by the swarms of these insects. Hence different people had deities whose office it was to defend them against flies. Among these may be reckoned Baalzebub, the fly-god of Ekron: Hercules muscarum abactor, "Hercules, the expeller of flies;" and hence Jupiter had the titles of ἀπόμνιος, μυῖαγρος, μυϊόχορος, because he was supposed to expel flies, and especially to clear his temples of these insects.

4. Solomon observes, "Dead flies cause the apothecary's ointment to stink," Eccles. x, 1. "A fact well known," says Scheuchzer; "wherefore apothecaries take care to prevent flies from coming to their syrups and other fermentable preparations. For in all insects there is an acrid volatile salt, which, mixed with sweet or even alkaline substances, excites them to a brisk intestine motion, disposes them to fermentation, and to putrescence itself; by which the more volatile principles fly off, leaving the grosser behind: at the same time, the taste and odour are changed, the agreeable to fetid, the sweet to insipid." This verse is an illustration, by a very appropriate similitude, of the concluding assertion in the preceding chapter, that "one sinner destroyeth much good," as one dead fly spoils a whole vessel of precious ointment, which, in eastern countries, was considered as very valuable, 2 Kings xx, 13. The application of this proverbial expression to a person's good name, which is elsewhere compared to sweet ointment, Eccles. vii, 1; Cant. i, 3, is remarkably significant. As a fly, though a diminutive creature, can taint and corrupt much precious perfume; so a small mixture of folly and indiscretion will tarnish the reputation of one who, in other respects, is very wise and honourable; and so much the more, because of the malignity and ingratitude of mankind, who are disposed rather to censure one error, than to commend many excellencies, and from whose minds one small miscarriage is sufficient to blot out the memory of all other deserts. It concerns us, therefore, to conduct ourselves unblamably, that we may not by the least oversight or folly blemish our profession, or cause it to be offensive to others.

FLOCK. See Shepherd.

FLOOR, for threshing corn, or threshing floor, is frequently mentioned in Scripture. This was a place in the open air, in which corn was threshed, by means of a cart or sledge, or some other instrument drawn by oxen. The threshing floors among the Jews were only, as they are to this day in the east, round level plats of ground in the open air, where the corn was trodden out by oxen. Thus Gideon's floor appears to have been in the open air, Judges vi, 37; and also that of Araunah the Jebusite, 2 Sam. xxiv, otherwise

it would not have been a proper place for erecting an altar, and offering sacrifices. In Hosea xiii, 3, we read of the chaff which is driven by the whirlwind from the floor. This circumstance of the threshing floor's being exposed to the agitation of the wind seems to be the principal reason of its Hebrew name. It appears, therefore, that a threshing floor, which is rendered in our textual translation, "a void place," might well be near the entrance of the gate of Samaria, and a proper situation in which the kings of Israel and Judah might hear the prophets, 1 Kings xxii, 10; 2 Chron. xviii, 9. An instrument sometimes used in Palestine and the east, to force the corn out of the ear, and bruise the straw, was a heavy kind of sledge made of thick boards, and furnished beneath with teeth of stone or iron, Isa. xli, 15. The sheaves being laid in order, the sledge was drawn over the straw by oxen, and at the same time threshed out the corn, and cut or broke the straw into a kind of chaff. An instrument in the east is still used for the same purpose. This sledge is alluded to in 2 Sam. xii, 31; Isa. xxviii, 27; xli, 15; Amos i, 3. Dr. Lowth, in his notes on Isaiah xxviii, 27, 28, observes, that four methods of threshing are mentioned in this passage, by different instruments, the flail, the drag, the wain, and the treading of the cattle. The staff, or flail, was used for the infirmiora semina, the grain that was too tender to be treated in the other methods. The drag consisted of a sort of frame of strong planks, made rough at the bottom with hard stones or iron; it was drawn by horses or oxen over the corn sheaves on the floor, the driver sitting upon it. The wain was nearly similar to this instrument, but had wheels with iron teeth, or 384edges like a saw. The last method is well known from the law of Moses, which forbids the ox to be muzzled when he treadeth out the corn. Niebuhr, in his Travels, gives the following description of a machine which the people of Egypt use at this day for threshing out their corn: "This machine," says he, "is called nauridsj. It has three rollers which turn on their axles; and each of them is furnished with some irons round and flat. At the beginning of June, Mr. Forskall and I several times saw, in the environs of Dsjise, how corn was threshed in Egypt. Every peasant chose for himself, in the open field, a smooth plat of ground from eighty to a hundred paces in circumference. Hither was brought on camels or asses the corn in sheaves, of which was formed a ring of six or eight feet wide, and two high. Two oxen were made to draw over it again and again the sledge, traineau, above mentioned; and this was done with the greatest convenience to the driver; for he was seated in a chair fixed on the sledge. Two such parcels or layers of corn are threshed out in a day, and they move each of them as many as eight times, with a wooden fork of five prongs, which they call meddre. Afterward they throw the straw into the middle of the ring, where it forms a heap, which grows bigger and bigger. When the first layer is threshed they replace the straw in the ring, and thresh it as before. Thus the straw becomes every time smaller, till at last it resembles chopped straw. After this, with the fork just

described, they cast the whole some yards from thence, and against the wind; which driving back the straw, the corn and the ears not threshed out fall apart from it, and make another heap. A man collects the clods of dirt, and other impurities to which any corn adheres, and throws them into a sieve. They afterward place in a ring the heaps, in which a good many entire ears are still found, and drive over them for four or five hours together ten couple of oxen joined two and two, till by absolute trampling they have separated the grains, which they throw into the air with a shovel to cleanse them.”

FO, or FUH, as the Chinese now call him, was an Indian prince, who was made a god at thirty years of age, and died at seventy-five. His worshippers form one of the three great sects of China, and it is said to be far the most numerous. The worship of this idol, they pretend, was observed a thousand years before the Christian era, and was introduced from India into China within the first century after. Many temples are reared to this deity, some of which are magnificent; and a number of bonzes, or priests, are consecrated to his service. He is represented shining in light, with his hands hid under his robes, to show that he does all things invisibly. The doctors of this sect, like those of Egypt, Greece, and India, teach a double doctrine; the one public, the other private. According to the former, they say, all the good are recompensed, and the wicked punished, in places destined for each. They enjoin all works of charity; and forbid cheating, impurity, murder, and even the taking of life from any creature whatever. For they believe that the souls of their ancestors transmigrate into irrational creatures; either into such as they liked best, or resembled most in their behaviour; for which reason they never kill any such animals; but, while they live, feed them well, and when they die bury them with respect. As they build temples for Fuh, which are filled with images, so also monasteries for his priests, providing for their maintenance, as the most effectual means to partake of their prayers. These priests pretend to know into what bodies the dead are transmigrated; and seldom fail of representing their case to the surviving friends as miserable, or uncomfortable; that they may extort money from them to procure for the deceased a passage into a better state, or pray them out of purgatory, which forms a part of their system.

The interior doctrine of this sect, which is kept secret from the common people, teaches a philosophical atheism, which admits neither rewards nor punishments after death; and believes not in a providence, or the immortality of the soul; acknowledges no other God than the void, or nothing; and which makes the supreme happiness of mankind to consist in a total inaction, an entire insensibility, and a perfect quietude. Fuh, though the idol of the common people, is considered as a foreign deity in China,

imported by the Boudhists from India: great effects are, however, attached to the perpetual reiteration of his name, and even to meditation upon it. It is supposed to render fate favourable, and life secure; to prevent migration into the bodies of inferior animals; and, in fine, to secure a place in the paradise of Fuh, whose land is yellow gold, whose towers are composed of gems, the bridges of pearls, &c.

FOOL, FOLLY, or FOOLISHNESS. The term fool is to be understood sometimes according to its plain, literal meaning, as denoting a person void of understanding; but it is often used figuratively, Psalm xxxviii, 5; lxix, 5. "The fool," that is, the impious sinner, "hath said in his heart, There is no God," Psalm xiv, 1. "I have sinned: do away the iniquity of thy servant; for I have done very foolishly," 1 Chron. xxi, 8. "Fools make a mock at sin," Prov. xiv, 9. See also the language of Tamar to her brother Amnon: "Do not this folly; for whither shall I cause my shame to go? And as for thee, thou shalt be as one of the fools in Israel," 2 Sam. xiii, 13; that is, Thou wilt be accounted a very wicked person. Our Lord seems to have used the term in a sense somewhat peculiar in Matthew v, 22: "Whosoever shall say to his brother, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." But the whole verse shows the meaning to be, that when any one of his professed disciples indulges a temper and disposition of mind contrary to charity, or that peculiar love which the brethren of Christ are bound by his law to have toward each other, John xiii, 34, not only showing anger against another without a cause, but also treating him with contemptuous language, and that with malicious intent, he shall be in danger of eternal destruction.

FOOT. Anciently it was customary to wash the feet of strangers coming off a journey, because generally they travelled barefoot, or wore sandals only, which did not secure them from dust or dirt. Jesus Christ washed the feet of his Apostles, and thereby taught them to perform the humblest services for one another. Feet, in the sacred writers, often mean inclinations, affections, propensities, actions, motions: "Guide my feet in thy paths." "Keep thy feet at a distance from evil." "The feet of the debauched woman go down to death." "Let not the foot of pride come against me." To be at any one's feet, signifies obeying him, listening to his instructions and commands. Moses says that "the Lord loved his people; all his saints are in thy hand: and they sat down at his feet," Deut. xxxiii, 3. St. Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel. Mary sat at our Saviour's feet, and heard his word, Luke x, 39.

It is said that the land of Canaan is not like Egypt, "where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot," Deut. xi, 10. Palestine is a country which has rains, plentiful dews, springs, rivulets, brooks, &c, that supply the earth with the moisture necessary to its fruitfulness. On the contrary,

Egypt has no river except the Nile: there it seldom rains, and the lands which are not within reach of the inundation continue parched and barren. To supply this want, ditches are dug from the river, and water is distributed throughout the several villages and cantons: there are great struggles who shall first obtain it; and, in this dispute, they frequently come to blows. Notwithstanding these precautions, many places have no water; and, in the course of the year, those places which are nearest the Nile require to be watered again by means of art and labour. This was formerly done by the help of machines, one of which is thus described by Philo: It is a wheel which a man turns by the motion of his feet, by ascending successively the several steps that are within it. This is what Moses means in this place by saying, that, in Egypt, they water the earth with their feet. The water is thus conveyed to cisterns; and when the gardens want refreshment, water is conducted by trenches to the beds in little rills, which are stopped by the foot, and turned at pleasure into different directions.

2. To be under any one's feet, to be a footstool to him, signifies the subjection of a subject to his sovereign, of a slave to his master. To lick the dust of one's feet, is an abject manner of doing homage. In Mr. Hugh Boyd's account of his embassy to the king of Candy, in Ceylon, there is a paragraph which singularly illustrates this, and shows the adulation and obsequious reverence with which an eastern monarch is approached. Describing his introduction to the king, he says, "The removal of the curtain was the signal of our obeisances. Mine, by stipulation, was to be only kneeling. My companions immediately began the performance of theirs, which were in the most perfect degree of eastern humiliation. They almost literally licked the dust; prostrating themselves with their faces almost close to the stone floor, and throwing out their arms and legs; then, rising on their knees, they repeated, in a very loud voice, a certain form of words of the most extravagant meaning that can be conceived, that the head of the king of kings might reach beyond the sun; that he might live a thousand years," &c. Nakedness of feet was a sign of mourning. God says to Ezekiel, "Make no mourning for the dead, and put on thy shoes upon thy feet," &c. It was also a mark of respect: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground," Exodus iii, 5. The rabbins say that the priests went barefoot in the temple. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day," Isaiah lviii, 13; if thou forbear walking and travelling on the Sabbath day, and do not then thine own will. We know that journeys were forbidden on the Sabbath day, Matt. xxiv, 20; Acts i, 12. Kissing the feet was often practised as a mark of affection and reverence.

FORNICATION, whoredom, or the act of incontinency between single persons; for if either of the parties be married, the sin is adultery.

FOREHEAD, Mark on the, Ezekiel ix, 4. Mr. Maurice, speaking of the religious rites of the Hindoos, says, Before they can enter the great pagoda, an indispensable ceremony takes place, which can only be performed by the hand of a brahmin; and that is, the impression of their foreheads with the tiluk, or mark of different colours, as they may belong either to the sect of Veeshnu, or Seeva. If the temple be that of Veeshnu, their foreheads are marked with a longitudinal line, and the colour used is vermilion. If it be the temple of Seeva, they are marked with a parallel line, and the colour used is turmeric, or saffron. But these two grand sects being again subdivided into numerous classes, both the size and the shape of the tiluk are varied, in proportion to their superior or inferior rank. In regard to the tiluk, I must observe, that it was a custom of very ancient date in Asia to mark their servants in the forehead. It is alluded to in these words of Ezekiel, where the Almighty commands his angels to “go through the midst of the city, and set a mark on the foreheads of the men who sigh for the abominations committed in the midst thereof.” The same idea occurs also in Rev. vii, 3. The divers sects of the Hindoos have a distinguishing mark of the sect, by which they are known, on the forehead, of powdered sandal wood, or of the slime of the Ganges. The mark of the Wischnites consists of two nearly oval lines down the nose, which runs from two straight lines on the forehead. The mark of the Schivites consists of two curved lines, like a half moon with a point on the nose. It is made either with the slime of the Ganges, with sandal wood, or the ashes of cow dung.

FOUNTAIN is properly the source or springhead of waters. There were several celebrated fountains in Judea, such as that of Rogel, of Gihon, of Siloam, of Nazareth, &c; and allusions to them are often to be met with in both the Old and New Testament. Dr. Chandler, in his travels in Asia Minor, says, “The reader, as we proceed, will find frequent mention of fountains. Their number is owing to the nature of the country and the climate. The soil, parched and thirsty, demands moisture to aid vegetation; and a cloudless sun, which inflames the air, requires for the people the verdure, with shade and air, its agreeable attendants. Hence fountains are met with, not only in the towns and villages, but in the fields and gardens, and by the sides of the roads, and of the beaten tracks on the mountains. Many of them are the useful donations of humane persons while living, or have been bequeathed as legacies on their decease.” As fountains of water were so extremely valuable to the inhabitants of the eastern countries, it is easy to understand why the inspired writers so frequently allude to them, and thence deduce some of their most beautiful and striking similitudes, when they would set forth the choicest spiritual blessings. Thus Jeremiah calls the blessed God, “the fountain of living waters,” Jer. ii, 13. As those springs or fountains of water are the most valuable and highly prized which never

intermit or cease to flow, but are always sending forth their streams; such is Jehovah to his people: he is a perennial source of felicity. Zechariah, pointing in his days to the atonement which was to be made in the fulness of time, by the shedding of the blood of Christ, describes it as a fountain that was to be opened in which the inhabitants of Jerusalem might wash away all their impurities: "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness," Zech. xiii, 1. Joel predicted the salvation which was to come out of Zion, under the beautiful figure of "a fountain which should come forth out of the house of the Lord, and water the plain of Shittim," Joel iii, 18. The Psalmist, expatiating on the excellency of the loving-kindness of God, not only as affording a ground of hope to the children of men, but also as the source of consolation and happiness, adds, "Thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures; for with thee is the fountain of life," Psalm xxxvi, 7-9. In short, the blessedness of the heavenly state is shadowed forth under this beautiful figure; for as "in the divine presence there is fulness of joy, and at God's right hand, pleasures for evermore," Psalm xvi, 11; so it is said of those who came out of great tribulation, that "the Lamb that was in the midst of the throne shall lead them unto living fountains of water, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes," Rev. vii, 17.

FOX, שׁוּעַל, Judges xv, 4; Nehemiah iv, 3; xi, 27; Psalm lxiii, 10; Cant. ii, 15; Lam. v, 11; Ezek. xiii, 4; Matt. viii, 20; Luke ix, 58; xiii, 32. Parkhurst observes that this is the name of an animal, probably so called from its burrowing, or making holes in the earth to hide himself or dwell in. The LXX render it by *άλώνηξ*, the Vulgate, *vulpes*, and our English version, *fox*. It is recorded, in Judges xv, 4, 5, that "Samson went and caught three hundred foxes, and took firebrands, and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between two tails; and when he had set the brands on fire, he let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines, and burnt up both the shocks, and also the standing corn, with the vineyards and olives." Dr. Shaw thinks jackals to be the animals here intended; observing, that "as these are creatures by far the most common and familiar, as well as the most numerous of any in the eastern countries, we may well perceive the great possibility there was for Samson to take, or cause to be taken, three hundred of them. The fox, properly so called," he adds, "is rarely to be met with, neither is it gregarious." So Hasselquist remarks: "Jackals are found in great numbers about Gaza; and, from their gregarious nature, it is much more probable that Samson should have caught three hundred of them, than of the solitary quadruped, the fox."

2. At the feast of Ceres, the goddess of corn, celebrated annually at Rome about the middle of April, there was the observance of this custom, to fix



burning torches to the tails of a number of foxes, and to let them run through the circus till they were burnt to death. This was done in revenge upon that species of animals, for having once burnt up the fields of corn. The reason, indeed, assigned by Ovid, is too frivolous an origin for so solemn a rite; and the time of its celebration, the seventeenth of April, it seems, was not harvest time, when the fields were covered with corn, *vestitos messibus agros*; for the middle of April was seed time in Italy, as appears from Virgil's *Georgics*. Hence we must infer that this rite must have taken its rise from some other event than that by which Ovid accounted for it; and Samson's foxes are a probable origin of it. The time agrees exactly, as may be collected from several passages of Scripture. For instance: from the book of Exodus we learn, that before the passover, that is, before the fourteenth day of the month Abib, or March, barley in Egypt was in the ear, *Exod. xii, 18; xiii, 4*. And in chapter ix, 31, 32, it is said, that the wheat at that time was not grown up. Barley harvest, then, in Egypt, and so in the country of the Philistines, which bordered upon it, must have fallen about the middle of March. Wheat harvest, according to Pliny, was a month later: "*In Egypto hordeum sexto a satu mense, frumenta septimo metuntur.*" [In Egypt barley is reaped in the sixth month from the time of its being sown, wheat in the seventh.] Therefore wheat harvest happened about the middle of April; the very time in which the burning of foxes was observed at Rome. It is certain that the Romans borrowed many of their rites and ceremonies, both serious and ludicrous, from foreign nations; and Egypt and Phenicia furnished them with more perhaps than any other country. From one of these the Romans might either receive 387this rite immediately, or through the hands of their neighbours, the Carthaginians, who were a colony of Phenicians; and so its true origin may be referred back to the story which we have been considering.

Bochart has made it probable that the דָּוָן spoken of in Isaiah xiii, 22; xxxiv, 14; and Jer. 1, 39, rendered by our translators "the beasts of the islands," an appellation very vague and indeterminate, are jackals; and that the θωές of the Greeks, and the *beni ani* of the Arabians are the same animal; and though he takes that to have been their specific name, yet he thinks, that, from their great resemblance to a fox, they might be comprehended under the Hebrew name of a fox, *shual*; which is indeed almost the same with *sciagal sciugal*, the Persian names of the jackal. Scaliger and Olearius, quoted by Bochart, expressly call the jackal a fox; and Mr. Sandys speaks of it in the same manner: "The jackals, in my opinion, are no other than foxes, whereof an infinite number," &c. Hasselquist calls it the little eastern fox; and Kæmpfer says that it might not be improperly called the wolf-fox. It is therefore very conceivable that the ancients might comprehend this animal under the general name of fox.

3. To give an idea of his own extreme poverty, the Lord Jesus says, Luke ix, 58, "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." And he calls Herod, the tetrarch of Galilee, a fox, Luke xiii, 32; thereby signifying his craft, and the refinements of his policy. In illustration of the pertinency of this allusion, we may quote a remark of Busbequius: "I heard a mighty noise, as if it had been of men who jeered and mocked us. I asked what was the matter; and was answered, 'Only the howlings of certain beasts which the Turks call, ciagals, or jackals.' They are a sort of wolves, somewhat bigger than foxes, but less than common wolves, yet as greedy and devouring. They go in flocks, and seldom hurt man or beast; but get their food more by craft and stealth than by open force. Thence it is that the Turks call subtle and crafty persons by the metaphorical name of ciagals."

FRANKINCENSE, לבונה, Exod. xxx, 34, &c. λίβανος, Matt. ii, 11; Rev. xviii, 13, a dry, resinous substance, of a yellowish white colour, a strong fragrant smell, and bitter, acrid taste. The tree which produces it is not known. Dioscorides mentions it as procured from India. What is here called the pure frankincense is, no doubt, the same with the mascula thura of Virgil, and signifies what is first obtained from the tree.

FRIEND is taken for one whom we love and esteem above others, to whom we impart our minds more familiarly than to others, and that from a confidence of his integrity and good will toward us: thus Jonathan and David were mutually friends. Solomon, in his book of Proverbs, gives the qualities of a true friend. "A friend loveth at all times:" not only in prosperity, but also in adversity; and, "there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother." He is more hearty in the performance of all friendly offices; he reproveth and rebuketh when he sees any thing amiss. "Faithful are the wounds of a friend." His sharpest reproofs proceed from an upright, and truly loving and faithful soul. He is known by his good and faithful counsel, as well as by his seasonable rebukes. "Ointment and perfume rejoice the heart, so does the sweetness of a man's friend by hearty counsel:" by such counsel as comes from his very heart and soul, and is the language of his inward and most serious thoughts. The company and conversation of a friend is refreshing and reviving to a person, who, when alone, is sad, dull, and inactive. "Iron sharpeneth iron, so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend." The title, "the friend of God," is principally given to Abraham: "Art not thou our God, who gavest this land to the seed of Abraham, thy friend, for ever?" And in Isaiah xli, 8, "But thou Israel art the seed of Abraham, my friend." "And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God," James ii, 23. This title was given him, not only because God frequently appeared to him, conversed familiarly

with him, and revealed his secrets to him, "Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?" Gen. xviii, 17; but also because he entered into a covenant of perpetual friendship both with him and his seed. Our Saviour calls his Apostles "friends:" "But I have called you friends;" and he adds the reason of it, "for all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you," John xv, 15. As men use to communicate their counsels and their whole mind to their friends, especially in things which are of any concern, or may be of any advantage for them to know and understand, so I have revealed to you whatever is necessary for your instruction, office, comfort, and salvation. And this title is not peculiar to the Apostles only, but is common with them to all true believers. The friend of the bridegroom is the brideman; he who does the honours of the wedding, and leads his friend's spouse to the nuptial chamber. John the Baptist, with respect to Christ and his church, was the friend of the bridegroom; by his preaching he prepared the people of the Jews for Christ, John iii, 29. Friend is a word of ordinary salutation, whether to a friend or foe: he is called friend who had not on a wedding garment, Matt. xxii, 12. And our Saviour calls Judas the traitor friend. Some are of opinion that this title is given to the guest by an irony, or antiphrasis; meaning the contrary to what the word importeth; or that he is called so, because he appeared to others to be Christ's friend; or was so in his own esteem and account, though falsely, being a hypocrite. However, this being spoken in the person of him who made the feast, it is generally taken for a usual compellation, and that Christ, following the like courteous custom of appellation and friendly greeting, did so salute Judas, which yet left a sting behind it in his conscience, 388 who knew himself to be the reverse of what he was called. The name of friend is likewise given to a neighbour. "Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go to him at midnight, and say, Friend, lend me three loaves?" Luke xi, 3.

FRIENDS, or QUAKERS, a religious society which began to be distinguished about the middle of the seventeenth century. Their doctrines were first promulgated in England, by George Fox, about the year 1647; for which he was imprisoned at Nottingham, in the year 1649, and the year following at Derby. Fox evidently considered himself as acting under a divine commission, and went, not only to fairs and markets, but into courts of justice and "steeple houses," as he called the churches, warning all to obey the Holy Spirit, speaking by him. It is said, that the appellation of Quakers was given them in reproach by one of the magistrates, who, in 1650, committed Fox to prison, on account of his bidding him, and those about him, to quake at the word of the Lord. But they adopted among themselves, and still retain, the kind appellation of Friends.

From their first appearance, they suffered much persecution. In New-England they were treated with peculiar severity, imprisoned, scourged,

(women as well as men,) and at Boston four of them were even hanged, among whom was one woman; and this was the more extraordinary and inexcusable, as the settlers themselves had but lately fled from persecution in the parent country! During these sufferings, they applied to King Charles II, for relief; who, in 1661, granted a mandamus, to put a stop to them. Neither were the good offices of this prince in their favour confined to the colonies; for in 1672, he released, under the great seal, four hundred of these suffering people who were imprisoned in Great Britain. To what has been alleged against them, on account of James Naylor and his associates, they answer that their extravagancies and blasphemies were disapproved at the time, and the parties disowned; nor was Naylor restored till he had given signs of a sincere repentance, and publicly condemned his errors.

In 1681, Charles II, granted to W. Penn the province of Pennsylvania. Penn's treaty with the Indians, and the liberty of conscience which he granted to all denominations, even those which had persecuted his own, do honour to his memory. In the reign of James II, the Friends, in common with other English Dissenters, were relieved by the suspension of the penal laws. But it was not till the reign of William and Mary that they obtained any thing like a proper legal protection. An act was passed in the year 1696, which, with a few exceptions, allowed to their affirmation the legal force of an oath, and provided a less oppressive mode for recovering tithes under a certain amount; which provisions, under the reign of George I, were made perpetual. For refusing to pay tithes, &c, however, they are still liable to suffer in the exchequer and ecclesiastical court, both in Great Britain and Ireland.

The true Friends are orthodox, as to the leading doctrines of Christianity, but express themselves in peculiar phrases. They hold special revelations of the Holy Spirit, yet not to the disparagement of the written word, which they regard as the infallible rule of faith and practice. They reject a salaried ministry, and interpret the sacraments mystically. They are advocates of the interior spiritual life of religion, to which, indeed, they have borne constant testimony; and they are distinguished by probity, philanthropy, and a public spirit. [In the United States, the Friends are divided into the Orthodox, (so called,) and Hicksites, or followers of the late Elias Hicks. The latter are considered as having departed from the original doctrines of the Friends, and very far from the leading doctrines of Christianity, as held by Protestant Christians in general.]

FROG, צפרדע; Arabic, akurrak; Greek, βάτραχος; Exod. viii, 2–14; Psalm lxxviii, 45; cv, 30; Rev. xvi, 13. When God plagued Pharaoh and his people, the river Nile, which was the object of great admiration to the Egyptians, was made to contribute to their punishment. “The river brought forth frogs

abundantly;" but the circumstance of their coming up into the bed chambers, and into the ovens and kneading troughs, needs explanation to us, whose domestic apartments and economy are so different from those of the ancient nations. Their lodgings were not in upper stories, but in recesses on the ground floor; and their ovens were not like ours, built on the side of a chimney, and adjacent to a fireplace, where the glowing heat would frighten away the frogs, but they dug a hole in the ground, in which they placed an earthen pot, which having sufficiently heated, they stuck their cakes to the inside to be baked. To find such places full of frogs when they came to heat them in order to bake their bread, and to see frogs in the beds where they sought repose, must have been both disgusting and distressing in the extreme. Frogs were reckoned unclean by the Hebrews.

FRONTLETS. Leo of Modena thus describes them: The Jews take four pieces of parchment, and write, with an ink made on purpose, and in square letters, these four passages, one on each piece: 1. "Sanctify unto me all the first-born," &c, Exodus xiii, 1–10. 2. "And when the Lord shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites," &c, verses 11–16. 3. "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord," &c, Deut. vi, 4–9. 4. "If you shall hearken diligently unto my commandments," &c, Deut. xi, 13–21. This they do in obedience to these words of Moses: "These commandments shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes." These four little pieces of parchment are fastened together, and a square formed of them, on which the letter  $\psi$  is written; then a little square of hard calf's skin is put upon the top, out of which come two leathern strings an inch wide, and a cubit and a half, or thereabouts, in length. This square is put on the middle of the forehead, and the strings being girt about the head, make a knot in the form of the letter  $\gamma$ : they then are brought before, and fall on the breast. It is called *teffila-schel-rosch*, or the *tephila* of the head. The most devout Jews put it on both at morning and noon-day prayer; but the generality of the Jews wear it only at morning prayer. Only the chanter of the synagogue is obliged to put it on at noon as well as morning.

It is a question, whether the use of frontlets, and other phylacteries, was literally ordained by Moses. They who believe their use to be binding, observe, that the text of Moses speaks as positively of this as of other precepts; he requires the commandments of God to be written on the doors of houses, as a sign on their hands, and as an ornament on their foreheads, Exod. xiii, 16. If there be any obligation to write these commandments on their doors, as the text intimates, there is the same for writing them on their hands and foreheads. On the contrary, others maintain that these precepts should be taken figuratively and allegorically, as denoting that the Jews should very carefully preserve the remembrance of God's law, and observe his commands; that they should always have them before them, and never

forget them. Prior to the Babylonish captivity, no traces of them appear in the history of the Jews. The prophets never inveigh against the omission or neglect of them, nor was there any question concerning them in the reformation of manners at any time among the Hebrews. The almost general custom in the east of wearing phylacteries and frontlets, determines nothing for the antiquity or usefulness of this practice. The Caraites Jews, who adhere to the letter of the law, and despise traditions, call the rabbinical Jews bridled asses, because they wear these tephilim and frontlets. See Phylactery.

FRUIT, the product of the earth, as trees, plants, &c. "Blessed shall be the fruit of thy ground and cattle." The fruit of the body signifies children: "Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body." By fruit is sometimes meant reward: "They shall eat of the fruit of their own ways," Prov. i, 31; they shall receive the reward of their bad conduct, and punishment answerable to their sins. The fruit of the lips is the sacrifice of praise or thanksgiving, Heb. xiii, 15. The fruit of the righteous, that is, the counsel, example, instruction, and reproof of the righteous, is a tree of life, is a means of much good, both temporal and eternal; and that not only to himself, but to others also, Prov. xi, 30. Solomon says, in Prov. xii, 14, "A man shall be satisfied with good by the fruit of his mouth;" that is, he shall receive abundant blessings from God as the reward of that good he has done, by his pious and profitable discourses. "Fruits meet for repentance," Matt. iii, 8, is such a conduct as befits the profession of penitence.

2. The fruits of the Spirit are those gracious habits which the Holy Spirit of God produces in those in whom he dwelleth and worketh, with those acts which flow from them, as naturally as the tree produces its fruit. The Apostle enumerates these fruits in Galatians v, 22, 23. The same Apostle, in Eph. v, 9, comprehends the fruits of the sanctifying Spirit in these three things; namely, goodness, righteousness, and truth. The fruits of righteousness are such good works and holy actions as spring from a gracious frame of heart: "Being filled with the fruits of righteousness," Phil. i, 11. Fruit is taken for a charitable contribution, which is the fruit or effect of faith and love: "When I have sealed unto them this fruit," Rom. xv, 28; when I have safely delivered this contribution. When fruit is spoken of good men, then it is to be understood of the fruits or works of holiness and righteousness; but when of evil men, then are meant the fruits of sin, immorality, and wickedness. This is our Saviour's doctrine, Matt. vii, 16–18.

3. Uncircumcised fruit, or impure, of which there is mention in Lev. xix, 23, is the fruit for the first three years of a tree newly planted; it was reputed unclean, and no one was permitted to eat of it in all that time. In the fourth

year it was offered to the Lord; after which it was common, and generally eaten. Various reasons are assigned for this precept. As (1.) Because the first-fruits were to be offered to God, who required the best: but in this time the fruit was not come to perfection. (2.) It was serviceable to the trees themselves, which grew the better and faster; being early stripped of those fruits which otherwise would have derived to themselves, and drawn away, much of the strength from the root and tree. (3.) It tended to the advantage of men, both because the fruit was then waterish, undigestible, and unwholesome; and because hereby men were taught to bridle their appetites, a lesson of great use and absolute necessity in a godly life.

FUEL. In preparing their victuals, the orientals are, from the extreme scarcity of wood in many countries, reduced to use cow dung for fuel. At Aleppo, the inhabitants use wood and charcoal in their rooms, but heat their baths with cow dung, the parings of fruit, and other things of a similar kind, which they employ people to gather for that purpose. In Egypt, according to Pitts, the scarcity of wood is so great, that at Cairo they commonly heat their ovens with horse or cow dung, or dirt of the streets; what wood they have, being brought from the shores of the Black Sea, and sold by weight. Chardin attests the same fact: "The eastern people always used cow dung for baking, boiling a pot, and dressing all kinds of victuals that are easily cooked, especially in countries that have but little wood;" and Dr. Russel remarks, in a note, that "the Arabs carefully collect the dung of the sheep and camel, as well as that of the cow; and that the dung, offals, and other matters, used in the bagnios, after having been new gathered in the streets, are carried out of the city, and laid in great heaps to dry, where they become very offensive. They are intolerably disagreeable, while drying, in the town, adjoining to the bagnios; and are so at all times when it rains, though they be stacked, pressed hard together, and thatched at top." These statements exhibit, in a very strong light, the extreme misery of the Jews, who escaped from the devouring sword of Nebuchadnezzar: "They that did feed delicately are desolate in the streets; they that were brought up in scarlet embrace dunghills," Lam. iv, 5. To embrace dunghills, is a species of wretchedness, perhaps unknown to us in the history of modern warfare; but it presents a dreadful and appalling image, when the circumstances to which it alludes are recollected. What can be imagined more distressing to those who lived delicately, than to wander without food in the streets? What more disgusting and terrible to those who had been clothed in rich and splendid garments, than to be forced, by the destruction of their palaces, to seek shelter among stacks of dung, the filth and stench of which it is almost impossible to endure? The dunghill, it appears from Holy Writ, is one of the common retreats of the mendicant. This imparts great force and beauty to a passage in the song of Hannah: "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth the beggar from the dunghill, to set

them among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory," 1 Sam. ii, 8. The change in the circumstances of that excellent woman, she reckoned as great, (and it was to her as unexpected,) as the elevation of a poor despised beggar from a nauseous and polluting dunghill, rendered tenfold more fetid by the intense heat of an oriental sun, to one of the highest and most splendid stations on earth.

2. Dung is used as fuel in the east only when wood cannot be had; for the latter, and even any other combustible substance, is preferred when it can be obtained. The inhabitants of Aleppo, according to Russel, use thorns and fuel of a similar kind for those culinary purposes which require haste, particularly for boiling, which seems to be the reason that Solomon mentions the "crackling of thorns under a pot," rather than in any other way. The same allusion to the use of thorns for boiling occurs in other parts of the sacred volume: thus, the Psalmist speaks of the wicked, "Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living, and in his wrath." The Jews are sometimes compared in the prophets to "a brand plucked out of the burning," Amos iv, 11; Zech. iii, 2; a figure which Chardin considers as referring to vine twigs, and other brushwood which the orientals frequently use for fuel, and which, in a few minutes, must be consumed if they are not snatched out of the fire; and not to those battens, or large branches, which will lie a long time in the fire before they are reduced to ashes. If this idea be correct, it displays in a stronger and more lively manner the seasonable interposition of God's mercy, than is furnished by any other view of the phrase. The same remark applies to the figure by which the Prophet Isaiah describes the sudden and complete destruction of Rezin, and the son of Remaliah; only in this passage, the firebrands are supposed to be smoking; that is, in the opinion of Harmer, having the steam issuing with force from one end, in consequence of the fire burning violently at the other. The words of the prophet are: "Take heed and be quiet; fear not, neither be faint-hearted, for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah," Isaiah vii, 4. It is not easy to conceive an image more striking than this; the remains of two small twigs burning with violence at one end, as appears by the steaming of the other, are soon reduced to ashes; so shall the kingdoms of Syria and Israel sink into ruin and disappear.

3. The scarcity of fuel in the east obliges the inhabitants to use, by turns, every kind of combustible matter. The withered stalks of herbs and flowers, the tendrils of the vine, the small branches of myrtle, rosemary, and other plants, are all used in heating their ovens and bagnios. We can easily recognise this practice in these words of our Lord: "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, that Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these.



Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" Matt. vi, 28–30. The grass of the field, in this passage, evidently includes the lilies of which our Lord had just been speaking, and, by consequence, herbs in general; and in this extensive sense the word *χόρτος* is not unfrequently taken. These beautiful productions of nature, so richly arrayed, and so exquisitely perfumed, that the splendour even of Solomon is not to be compared with theirs, shall soon wither and decay, and be used as fuel to heat the oven and the bagnio. Has God so adorned these flowers and plants of the field, which retain their beauty and vigour but for a few days, and are then applied to some of the meanest purposes of life; and will he not much more clothe you who are the disciples of his own Son, who are capable of immortality, and destined to the enjoyment of eternal happiness?

FULNESS. "The fulness of time" is the time when the Messiah appeared, which was appointed by God, promised to the fathers, foretold by the prophets, expected by the Jews themselves, and earnestly longed for by all the faithful: "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son," Gal. iv, 4. The fulness of Christ is the superabundance of grace with which he was filled: "Of his fulness have all we received," John i, 16. And whereas men are said to be filled with the Holy Ghost, as John the Baptist, Luke i, 15; and Stephen, Acts vi, 5; this differs from the fulness of Christ in these three respects: (1.) Grace in others is by participation, as the moon hath her light from the sun, rivers their waters from the fountain: but in Christ all that perfection and influence which we include in that term is originally, naturally, and of himself. (2.) The Spirit is in Christ infinitely and above measure, John iii, 34; but in the saints by measure according to the gift of God, Eph. iv, 16. The saints cannot communicate their graces to others, whereas the gifts of the Spirit are in Christ as a head and fountain, to impart them to his members. "We have received of his fulness," John i, 16. It is said, that "the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily," Col. ii, 2; that is, the whole nature and attributes of God are in Christ, and that really, essentially, or substantially; and also personally, by nearest union; as the soul dwells in the body, so that the same person who is man is God also. The church is called the fulness of Christ, Eph. i, 23. It is the church which makes him a complete and perfect head; for though he has a natural and personal fulness as God, yet, as Mediator, he is not full and complete, without his mystical body, (as a king is not complete without his subjects,) but receives an outward, relative, and mystical fulness from his members.

FUNERAL RITES. See Burial.

FURNACE, a fireplace for melting gold and other metals. "The fining pot is for silver, the furnace for gold," Prov. xvii, 3. It signifies also a place of cruel bondage and oppression, such as Egypt was to the Israelites, who there met with much hardship, rigour, and severity, to try and purge them, Deut. iv, 20; Jer. xi, 4; the sharp and grievous afflictions and judgments, wherewith God tries his people, Ezek. xxii, 18; xx, 22; also a place of torment, as Nebuchadnezzar's fiery furnace, Dan. iii, 6, 11. On the last we may remark, that this mode of putting to death is not unusual in the east in modern times. After speaking of the common modes of punishing with death in Persia, Chardin says, "But there is still a particular way of putting to death such as have transgressed in civil affairs, either by causing a dearth, or by selling above the tax by a false weight, or who have committed themselves in any other manner: they are put upon a spit and roasted over a slow fire, Jer. xxix, 22. Bakers, when they offend, are thrown into a hot oven. During the dearth in 1668, I saw such ovens heated in the royal square in Ispahan, to terrify the bakers, and deter them from deriving advantage from the general distress."

GABBATHA, a place in Pilate's palace, from whence he pronounced sentence of death upon Jesus Christ, John xix, 13. This was probably an eminence, or terrace, paved with marble, for the Hebrew means elevated.

GABRIEL, one of the principal angels of heaven. He was sent to the Prophet Daniel, to explain to him the visions of the ram and goat, and the mystery of the seventy weeks, which had been revealed to him, Dan. viii, 15; ix, 21; xi, 1, &c. The same angel was sent to Zechariah, to declare to him the future birth of John the Baptist, Luke i, 11, &c. Six months after this he appeared to a virgin, whose name was Mary, of the city of Nazareth, as related Luke i, 26, &c.

GAD was the name of the son of Jacob and Zilpah, Leah's servant, Gen. xxx, 9–11. Leah, Jacob's wife, gave him also Zilpah, that by her she might have children. Zilpah brought a son, whom Leah called Gad, saying, "A troop cometh." Gad had seven sons, Ziphion, Haggi, Shuni, Ezbon, Eri, Arodi, and Areli, Genesis xlvi, 16. Jacob, blessing Gad, said, "A troop shall overcome him, but he shall overcome at the last," Gen. xlix, 19; and Moses, in his last song, mentions Gad as "a lion which teareth the arm with the crown of the head," &c, Deut. xxxiii, 20, 21. The tribe of Gad came out of Egypt in number forty-five thousand six hundred and fifty. After the defeat of the kings Og and Sihon, Gad and Reuben desired to have their lot in the conquered country, and alleged their great number of cattle. Moses granted their request, on condition that they would accompany their brethren, and assist in the conquest of the land beyond Jordan. Gad had his inheritance

between Reuben south, and Manasseh north, with the mountains of Gilead east, and Jordan west.

2. Gad, a prophet, David's friend, who followed him when persecuted by Saul. The Scripture calls him a prophet and David's seer, 2 Sam. xxiv, 11. The first time we find him with this prince is when he fled into the land of Moab, 1 Sam. xxii, 5, to secure his father and mother in the first year of Saul's persecution. The Prophet Gad warned him to return into the land of Judah. After David had determined to number his people, the Lord sent to him the Prophet Gad, to offer him his choice of three scourges: seven years' famine, or three months' flight before his enemies, or three days' pestilence. Gad also directed David to erect an altar to the Lord, in the threshing floor of Ornan or Araunah, the Jebusite, 2 Sam. xxiv, 13–19; and he wrote a history of David's life, cited in 1 Chron. xxix, 29.

GADARA, a city which gave name to the country of the Gadarenes; situated on a steep rocky hill on the river Hieromax, or Yermuck, about five miles from its junction with the Jordan. It was a place of considerable note in the time of Josephus, and the metropolis of Peræa, or the country beyond Jordan. It was also celebrated for its hot baths. The vicinity was likewise called the country of the Gergesenes, from Gerasa, or Gergesa, another considerable city in the same neighbourhood. Thus the miracle of our Lord performed here is represented by St. Mark to have been done in the country of the Gadarenes, Mark v, 1; and by St. Matthew, in that of the Gergesenes, Matt. viii, 28.

GALATIA, a province of the Lesser Asia, bounded on the west by Phrygia, on the east by the river Haylys, on the north by Paphlagonia, and on the south by Lycaonia. The Galatians are said to have been descended from those Gauls, who, finding their own country too strait for them, left it, after the death of Alexander the Great, in quest of new settlements. Quitting their own country, they migrated eastward along the Danube till they came where the Saave joins that river; then dividing themselves into three bodies, under the conduct of different leaders, one of these bodies entered Pannonia; another marched into Thrace; a third into Illyricum and Macedonia. The party which proceeded into Thrace, crossed the Bosphorus into the Lesser Asia, and hiring themselves to Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, assisted him to subdue his brother Zipetes, with whom he was then at war; and as a reward of their services they received from him a country in the middle of Asia Minor, which from them was afterward called Gallo-Græcia, and, by contraction, Galatia. As their inland situation in a great measure cut them off from all intercourse with more civilized nations, the Galatians long remained a rude and illiterate people. And as a proof of this, it is mentioned by Jerom, that when the Apostle Paul preached the

Gospel among them, and for many ages afterward, they continued to speak the language of the country from whence they came out.

2. Paul and Barnabas carried the light of the Gospel into the regions of Galatia at a very early period; and it appears from the epistle which the former subsequently wrote to the churches in that country, that they had at first received it with great joy, Gal. iv, 15. But some Judaizing teachers getting access among them soon after the Apostle's departure, their minds became corrupted from the simplicity that was in Christ Jesus; and, though mostly Gentiles, they were beginning to mingle circumcision, and other Jewish observances, with their faith in Christ, in order to render it more available to their salvation. This occasioned Paul's writing his epistle to those churches; and his object throughout nearly the whole of it is to counteract the pernicious influence of the doctrine of those false teachers particularly as it respected the article of justification, or a sinner's acceptance with God. And in no part of the Apostle's writings is that important doctrine handled in a more full and explicit manner; nor does he any where display, such a firm, determined, and inflexible opposition to all who would corrupt the truth from its simplicity. He begins by expressing his astonishment that they were so soon turned aside "unto another gospel," but instantly checking himself, he recals the word and declares, "it is not another gospel," but a perversion of the Gospel of Christ. "And though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." There are in his epistle several other things equally pointed and severe, particularly his expostulation on the folly and absurdity of their conduct in subjecting themselves to the Jewish yoke of bondage, Gal. iii, 1. "The erroneous doctrines of the Judaizing teachers," says Dr. Macknight, "and the calumnies they spread for the purpose of discrediting St. Paul's apostleship, no doubt occasioned great uneasiness of mind to him and to the faithful in that age, and did much hurt, at least for a while, among the Galatians. But in the issue these evils have proved of no small service to the church in general; for by obliging the Apostle to produce the evidences of his apostleship, and to relate the history of his life, especially after his conversion, we have obtained the fullest assurance of his being a real Apostle, called to the office by Jesus Christ himself; consequently we are assured that our faith in the doctrines of the Gospel, as taught by him, (and it is he who hath taught the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel most fully,) is not built on the credit of a man, but on the authority of the Spirit of God, by whom St. Paul was inspired in the whole of the doctrine which he has delivered to the world."

GALBANUM, חלבונה, Exod. xxx, 34. Michaëlis makes the word a compound of חלב, milk or gum, (for the Syriac uses the noun in both

senses,) and לבן], white, as being the white milk or gum of a plant. It is the thickened sap of an umbelliferous plant, called metopion, which grows on Mount Amanus, in Syria, and is frequently found in Persia, and in some parts of Africa. It was an ingredient in the holy incense of the Jews.

**GALILEANS.** In the twelfth year of Christ, about the time that Archelaus was sent away from his government, a secession was made from the sect of the Pharisees, and a new sect arose, called the Galileans. Not long after this time, Judea, which was a Roman province, was added, for civil purposes, to Syria, over which Quirinus was governor. It happened, when the tax was levied by Quirinus, that one Judas, of Galilee, otherwise called Gaulonites, in company with Zaduk, a Sadducee, publicly taught, that such taxation was repugnant to the law of Moses, according to which the Jews, they maintained, had no king but God. The tumults which this man excited were suppressed, Acts v, 37; but his disciples, who were called Galileans, continued to propagate this doctrine, and, farthermore, required of all proselytes that they should be circumcised. It was in reference to this sect that the captious question was proposed in Matt. xxii, 17, &c; namely, whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cæsar. The Galileans, whom Pilate slew in the temple, Luke xiii, 1, 2, appear to have been of this sect. By degrees, the Galileans swallowed up almost all the other sects; and it is highly probable that the zealots, particularly mentioned at the siege of Jerusalem, were of this faction.

**GALILEE** was one of the most extensive provinces into which the Holy Land was divided. It exceeded Judea in extent, but probably varied in its limits at different times. This province is divided by the rabbins into, 1. The Upper; 2. The Nether; and, 3. The Valley. Josephus divides it into only Upper and Lower; and he says that the limits of Galilee were, on the south, Samaria and Scythopolis, unto the flood of Jordan. Galilee contained four tribes, Issachar, Zebulun, Naphtali, and Asher; a part, also, of Dan, and part of Peræa, that is, beyond the river. Upper Galilee abounded in mountains. Lower Galilee, which contained the tribes of Zebulun and Asher, was sometimes called the Great Field, “the champaign,” Deut. xi, 30. The Valley was adjacent to the sea of Tiberias. Josephus describes Galilee as very populous, and containing two hundred and four cities and towns. It was also very rich, and paid two hundred talents in tribute. The natives were brave and good soldiers; but they were seditious, and prone to insolence and rebellion. In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the inhabitants of Galilee and Peræa are scarcely mentioned, whether they were Jews returned from Babylon, or a mixture of different nations. The language of these regions differed considerably from that of Judea; as did various customs, in which each followed its own mode. Our Lord so frequently visited Galilee, that he was called a Galilean, Matt. xxvi, 69.

The population of Galilee being very great, he had many opportunities of doing good in this country; and, being there out of the power of the priests at Jerusalem, he seems to have preferred it as his abode. Nazareth and Capernaum were in this division. From such a mixture of people, many provincialisms might be expected. Hence, we find Peter detected by his language, probably by his phraseology, as well as his pronunciation, Mark xiv, 70. Upper Galilee had Mount Lebanon and the countries of Tyre and Sidon on the north; the Mediterranean Sea on the west; Abilene, Ituræa, and the country of the Decapolis, on the east; and Lower Galilee on the south. Its principal city was Cæsarea Philippi. This part of Galilee, being less inhabited by Jews, was thence called Galilee of the Nations, or of the Gentiles. Lower Galilee had the upper division of the same country to the north; the Mediterranean on the west; the sea of Galilee, or lake of Gennesareth, on the east; and Samaria on the south. Its principal cities were Tiberias, Chorazin, Bethsaida, Nazareth, Cana, Capernaum, Nain, Cæsarea of Palestine, and Ptolemais. This district was of all others most honoured with the presence of our Saviour. Here he was conceived; here he was brought back by his mother and reputed father, after their return from Egypt; here he lived with them till he was thirty years of age; and, although after his entrance on his public ministry he frequently visited the other provinces, it was here that he chiefly resided. Here, also, he made his first appearance after his resurrection to his Apostles, who were themselves natives of the same country, and were thence called men of Galilee.

Galilee, Sea of. This inland sea, or more properly lake, which derives its several names, the lake of Tiberias, the sea of Galilee, and the lake of Gennesareth, from the territory which forms its western and south-western border, is computed to be between seventeen and eighteen miles in length, and from five to six in breadth. The mountains on the east come close to its shore, and the country on that side has not a very agreeable aspect: on the west, it has the plain of Tiberias, the high ground of the plain of Hutin, or Hottein, the plain of Gennesareth, and the foot of those hills by which you ascend to the high mountain of Saphet. To the north and south it has a plain country, or valley. There is a current throughout the whole breadth of the lake, even to the shore; and the passage of the Jordan through it is discernible by the smoothness of the surface in that part. Various travellers have given different accounts of its general aspect. According to Captain Mangles, the land about it has no striking features, and the scenery is altogether devoid of character. "It appeared," he says, "to particular disadvantage to us, after those beautiful lakes we had seen in Switzerland; but it becomes a very interesting object when you consider the frequent allusions to it in the Gospel narrative." Dr. Clarke, on the contrary, speaks of the uncommon grandeur of this memorable scenery. "The lake of Gennesareth," he says, "is surrounded by objects well calculated to

heighten the solemn impressions made by such recollections, and affords one of the most striking prospects in the Holy Land. Speaking of it comparatively, it may be described as longer and finer than any of our Cumberland and Westmoreland lakes, although perhaps inferior to Loch Lomond. It does not possess the vastness of the lake of Geneva, although it much resembles it in certain points of view. In picturesque beauty, it comes nearest to the lake of Locarno, in Italy, although it is destitute of any thing similar to the islands by which that majestic piece of water is adorned. It is inferior in magnitude, and in the height of its surrounding mountains, to the Lake Asphaltites." Mr. Buckingham may perhaps be considered as having given the most accurate account, and one which reconciles, in some degree, the differing statements above cited, when, speaking of the lake as seen from Tel Hoom, he says, that its appearance is grand, but that the barren aspect of the mountains on each side, and the total absence of wood, give a cast of dulness to the picture: this is increased to melancholy by the dead calm of its waters, and the silence which reigns throughout its whole extent, where not a boat or vessel of any kind is to be found. The situation of the lake, lying, as it were, in a deep basin between the hills which enclose it on all sides, excepting only the narrow entrance and outlets of the Jordan at either end, protects its waters from long-continued tempests: its surface is in general as smooth as that of the Dead Sea. But the same local features render it occasionally subject to whirlwinds, squalls, and sudden gusts from the mountains, of short duration; especially when the strong current formed by the Jordan is opposed by a wind of this description from the south-east, sweeping from the mountains with the force of a hurricane, it may easily be conceived that a boisterous sea must be instantly raised, which the small vessels of the country would be unable to resist. A storm of this description is plainly denoted by the language of the evangelist, in recounting one of our Lord's miracles: "There came down a storm of wind on the lake, and they were filled with water, and were in jeopardy. Then he arose, and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water; and they ceased, and there was a calm," Luke viii, 23, 24. There were fleets of some force on this lake during the wars of the Jews with the Romans, and very bloody battles were fought between them. Josephus gives a particular account of a naval engagement between the Romans under Vespasian, and the Jews who had revolted during the administration of Agrippa. Titus and Trajan were both present, and Vespasian himself was on board the Roman fleet. The rebel force consisted of an immense multitude, who, as fugitives after the capture of Tarichæa by Titus, had sought refuge on the water. The vessels in which the Romans defeated them were built for the occasion, and yet were larger than the Jewish ships. The victory was followed by so terrible a slaughter of the Jews, that nothing was to be seen, either on the lake or its shores, but the blood and mangled corpses of the slain; and the air was infected by the number of dead bodies. Six thousand five hundred

persons are stated to have perished in this naval engagement, and in the battle of Tarichæa, beside twelve hundred who were afterward massacred in cold blood, by order of Vespasian, in the amphitheatre at Tiberias, and a vast number who were given to Agrippa as slaves.

GALL, שֶׁרָר, something excessively bitter, and supposed to be poisonous, Deut. xxix, 18; xxxii, 32; Psalm lxix, 21; Jer. viii, 14; ix, 15; xxiii, 15; Lam. iii, 19; Hosea x, 4; Amos vi, 12. It is evident, from the first-mentioned place, that some herb or plant is meant of a malignant or nauseous kind. It is joined with wormwood, and, in the margin of our Bibles, explained to be “a very poisonous herb.” In Psalm lxix, 21, which is justly considered as a prophecy of our Saviour’s sufferings, it is said, “They gave me שֶׁרָר to eat”; which the LXX have rendered χολήν, gall. And, accordingly, it is recorded in the history, “They gave him vinegar to drink, mingled with gall,” ὄξος μετὰ χολῆς, Matt. xxvii, 34. But, in the parallel passage, it is said to be, ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον, “wine mingled with myrrh,” Mark xv, 23, a very bitter ingredient. From whence it is probable that χολή, and perhaps שֶׁרָר, may be used as a general name for whatever is exceedingly bitter; and, consequently, where the sense requires it, may be put specially for any bitter herb or plant, the infusion of which may be called שֶׁרָר־מִי.

GALLIO was the name of the brother of Seneca, the philosopher. He was at first named Marcus Annæus Novatus; but, being adopted by Lucius Junius Gallio, he took the name of his adoptive father. The Emperor Claudius made him proconsul of Achaia. He was of a mild and agreeable temper. To him his brother Seneca dedicated his books, “Of Anger.” He shared in the fortunes of his brothers, as well when out of favour as in their prosperity at court. At length, Nero put him, as well as them, to death. The Jews were enraged at St. Paul for converting many Gentiles, and dragged him to the tribunal of Gallio, who, as proconsul, generally resided at Corinth, Acts xviii, 12, 13. They accused him of teaching “men to worship God contrary to the law.” St. Paul being about to speak, Gallio told the Jews, that if the matter in question were a breach of justice, or an action of a criminal nature, he should think himself obliged to hear them; but, as the dispute was only concerning their law, he would not determine such differences, nor judge them. Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, was beaten by the Greeks before Gallio’s seat of justice; but this governor did not concern himself about it. His abstaining from interfering in a religious controversy did credit to his prudence; nevertheless, his name has oddly passed into a reproachful proverb; and a man regardless of all piety is called “a Gallio,” and is said “Gallio-like to care for none of these things.” Little did this Roman anticipate that his name would be so immortalized.



GAMALIEL, a celebrated rabbi, and doctor of the Jewish law, under whose tuition the great Apostle of the Gentiles was brought up, Acts xxii, 3. Barnabas and Stephen are also supposed to have been among the number of his pupils. Soon after the day of pentecost, when the Jewish sanhedrim began to be alarmed at the progress the Gospel was making in Jerusalem, and consequently wished to put to death the Apostles, in the hope of checking its farther progress, they were apprehended and brought before the national council, of which Gamaliel seems to have been a leading member. It is very probable that many zealots among them would have despatched the affair in a very summary manner, but their impetuosity was checked by the cool and prudent advice of Gamaliel; for, having requested the Apostles to withdraw for a while, he represented to the sanhedrim that, if the Apostles were no better than impostors, their fallacy would quickly be discovered; but on the other hand, if what they were engaged in was from God, it was vain for them to attempt to frustrate it, since it was the height of folly to contend with the Almighty. The assembly saw the wisdom of his counsel, and very prudently changed the sentence, upon which they were originally bent against the Apostles' lives, into that of corporal punishment.

2. It may here also be remarked, that the sanhedrim could not themselves believe that tale which they had diligently circulated among the people, that the disciples had stolen away the body of Jesus, and then pretended that he had arisen from the dead. If the Jewish council had thought this, it would have been very absurd in Gamaliel to exhort them to wait to see whether "the counsel and work" was of God, that is, whether the Apostles related a fact when they preached the resurrection, and grounded the divine authority of their religion upon that fact. Gamaliel's advice was wholly based upon the admission, that an extraordinary, and to them an inexplicable, event had happened.

GAMES. Games and combats were instituted by the ancients in honour of their gods; and were celebrated with that view by the most polished and enlightened nations of antiquity. The most renowned heroes, legislators, and statesmen, did not think it unbecoming their character and dignity, to mingle with the combatants, or contend in the race; they even reckoned it glorious to share in the exercises, and meritorious to carry away the prize. The victors were crowned with a wreath of laurel in presence of their country; they were celebrated in the rapturous effusions of their poets; they were admired, and almost adored, by the innumerable multitudes which flocked to the games, from every part of Greece, and many of the adjacent countries. They returned to their own homes in a triumphal chariot, and made their entrance into their native city, not through the gates which admitted the vulgar throng, but through a breach in the walls, which

were broken down to give them admission; and at the same time to express the persuasion of their fellow citizens, that walls are of small use to a city defended by men of such tried courage and ability. Hence the surprising ardour which animated all the states of Greece to imitate the ancient heroes, and encircle their brows with wreaths, which rendered them still more the objects of admiration or envy to succeeding times, than the victories they had gained, or the laws they had enacted.

2. But the institutors of those games and combats had higher and nobler objects in view than veneration for the mighty dead, or the gratification of ambition or vanity; it was their design to prepare the youth for the profession of arms; to confirm their health; to improve their strength, their vigour, and activity; to inure them to fatigue; and to render them intrepid in close fight, where, in the infancy of the art of war, muscular force commonly decided the victory. This statement accounts for the striking allusions which the Apostle Paul makes in his epistles to these celebrated exercises. Such references were calculated to touch the heart of a Greek, and of every one familiarly acquainted with them, in the liveliest manner, as well as to place before the eye of his mind the most glowing and correct images of spiritual and divine things. No passages in the nervous and eloquent epistles from the pen of St. Paul, have been more admired by the critics and expositors of all times, than those into which some allusion to these agonistic exercises is introduced; and, perhaps, none are calculated to leave a deeper impression on the Christian's mind, or excite a stronger and more salutary influence on his actions. Certain persons were appointed to take care that all things were done according to custom, to decide controversies that happened among the antagonists, and to adjudge the prize to the victor. Some eminent writers are of opinion that Christ is called the "Author and Finisher of faith," in allusion to these judges. Those who were designed for the profession of *athletæ*, or combatants, frequented from their earliest years the academies maintained for that purpose at the public expense. In these places they were exercised under the direction of different masters, who employed the most effectual methods to inure their bodies for the fatigues of the public games, and to form them for the combats. The regimen to which they submitted was very hard and severe. At first, they had no other nourishment than dried figs, nuts, soft cheese, and a gross heavy sort of bread called *μάζα*; they were absolutely forbidden the use of wine, and enjoined continence. When they proposed to contend in the Olympian games, they were obliged to repair to the public gymnasium at Elis, ten months before the solemnity, where they prepared themselves by continual exercises. No man that had omitted to present himself at the appointed time, was allowed to be a candidate for the prizes; nor were the accustomed rewards of victory given to such persons, if by any means they insinuated themselves, and overcame their antagonists; nor

would any apology, though seemingly ever so reasonable, serve to excuse their absence. No person that was himself a notorious criminal, or nearly related to one, was permitted to contend. Farther, to prevent underhand dealings, if any person was convicted of bribing his adversary, a severe fine was laid upon him; nor was this alone thought a sufficient guard against unfair contracts, and unjust practices, but the contenders were obliged to swear they had spent ten whole months in preparatory exercises; and, beside all this, they, their fathers, and their brethren, took a solemn oath, that they would not, by any sinister or unlawful means, endeavour to stop the fair and just proceedings of the games.

3. The spiritual contest, in which all true Christians aim at obtaining a heavenly crown, has its rules also, devised and enacted by infinite wisdom and goodness, which require implicit and exact submission, which yield neither to times nor circumstances, but maintain their supreme authority, from age to age, uninterrupted and unimpaired. The combatant who violates these rules forfeits the prize, and is driven from the field with indelible disgrace, and consigned to everlasting wo. Hence the great Apostle of the Gentiles exhorts his son Timothy strictly to observe the precepts of the Gospel, without which, he can no more hope to obtain the approbation of God, and the possession of the heavenly crown, than a combatant in the public games of Greece, who disregarded the established rules, could hope to receive from the hands of his judge the promised reward: “And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully,” 2 Tim. ii, 5, or according to the established laws of the games. Like the Grecian combatants, the Christian must “abstain from fleshly lusts,” and “walk in all the statutes and commandments of the Lord, blameless.” Such was St. Paul; and in this manner he endeavoured to act: “But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away,” 1 Cor. ix, 27. The latter part of this verse Doddridge renders, “lest after having served as a herald I should be disapproved;” and says in a note, “I thought it of importance to retain the primitive sense of these gymnastic expressions.” It is well known to those who are at all acquainted with the original, that the word used means to discharge the office of a herald, whose business it was to proclaim the conditions of the games, and display the prizes, to awaken the emulation and resolution of those who were to contend in them. But the Apostle intimates, that there was this peculiar circumstance attending the Christian contest, that the person who proclaimed its laws and rewards to others, was also to engage in it himself; and that there would be a peculiar infamy and misery in his miscarrying. Ἀδόκιμος, which we render cast-away, signifies one who is disapproved by the judge of the games, as not having fairly deserved the prize: he therefore loses it; even the prize of eternal life. The rule which the Apostle

applies to himself he extends in another passage to all the members of the Christian church: "Those who strive for the mastery are temperate in all things; now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible." Tertullian uses the same thought to encourage the martyrs. He urges constancy upon them, from what the hopes of victory made the *athletæ* endure; and repeats the severe and painful exercises they were obliged to undergo, the continual anguish and constraint in which they passed the best years of their lives, and the voluntary privation which they imposed on themselves, of all that was most grateful to their appetites and passions.

4. The *athletæ* took care to disencumber their bodies of every article of clothing which could in any manner hinder or incommode them. In the race, they were anxious to carry as little weight as possible, and uniformly stripped themselves of all such clothes as, by their weight, length, or otherwise, might entangle or retard them in the course. The Christian also must "lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset" him, Heb. xii, 1. In the exercise of faith and self-denial, he must "cast off the works of darkness," lay aside all malice and guile, hypocrisies, and envyings, and evil speakings, inordinate affections, and worldly cares, and whatever else might obstruct his holy profession, damp his spirits, and hinder his progress in the paths of righteousness.

5. The foot race seems to have been placed in the first rank of public games, and cultivated with a care and industry proportioned to the estimation in which it was held. The Olympic games generally opened with races, and were celebrated at first with no other exercise. The lists or course where the *athletæ* exercised themselves in running, was at first but one stadium in length, or about six hundred feet; and from this measure it took its name, and was called the stadium, whatever might be its extent. This, in the language of St. Paul, speaking of the Christian's course, was "the race which was set before them," determined by public authority, and carefully measured. On each side of the stadium and its extremity, ran an ascent or kind of terrace, covered with seats and benches, upon which the spectators were seated, an innumerable multitude collected from all parts of Greece, to which the Apostle thus alludes in his figurative description of the Christian life: "Seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight," Heb. xii, 1.

The most remarkable parts of the stadium were its entrance, middle, and extremity. The entrance was marked at first only by a line drawn on the sand, from side to side of the stadium. To prevent any unfair advantage being taken by the more vigilant or alert candidates, a cord was at length stretched in front of the horses or men that were to run; and sometimes the

space was railed in with wood. The opening of this barrier, was the signal for the racers to start. The middle of the stadium was remarkable, only by the circumstance of having the prizes allotted to the victors set up there. From this custom, Crysostom draws a fine comparison: "As the judges in the races and other games, expose in the midst of the stadium, to the view of the champions, the crowns which they were to receive; in like manner, the Lord, by the mouth of his prophets, has placed the prizes in the midst of the course, which he designs for those who have the courage to contend for them." At the extremity of the stadium was a goal, where the foot races ended; but in those of chariots and horses, they were to run several times round it without stopping, and afterward conclude the race by regaining the other extremity of the lists from whence they started. It is therefore to the foot race the Apostle alludes, when he speaks of the race set before the Christian, which was a straight course, to be run only once, and not, as in the other, several times without stopping.

6. According to some writers, it was at the goal, and not in the middle of the course, that the prizes were exhibited; and they were placed in a very conspicuous situation, that the competitors might be animated by having them always in their sight. This accords with the view which the Apostle gives of the Christian life: "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things, which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," Phil. iii, 13, 14. L'Enfant thinks, the Apostle here alludes to those who stood at the elevated place at the end of the course, calling the racers by their names, and encouraging them by holding out the crown, to exert themselves with vigour. Within the measured and determinate limits of the stadium, the *athletæ* were bound to contend for the prize, which they forfeited without hope of recovery, if they deviated ever so little from the appointed course.

7. The honours and rewards granted to the victors were of several kinds. They were animated in their course by the rapturous applauses of the countless multitudes that lined the stadium, and waited the issue of the contest with eager anxiety; and their success was instantly followed by reiterated and long continued plaudits; but these were only a prelude to the appointed rewards, which, though of little value in themselves, were accounted the highest honour to which a mortal could aspire. These consisted of different wreaths of wild olive, pine, parsley, or laurel, according to the different places where the games were celebrated. 397 After the judges had passed sentence, a public herald proclaimed the name of the victor; one of the judges put the crown upon his head, and a branch of palm into his right hand, which he carried as a token of victorious

courage and perseverance. As he might be victor more than once in the same games, and sometimes on the same day, he might also receive several crowns and palms. When the victor had received his reward, a herald, preceded by a trumpet, conducted him through the stadium, and proclaimed aloud his name and country; while the delighted multitudes, at the sight of him, redoubled their acclamations and applauses.

8. The crown in the Olympic games was of wild olive; in the Pythian, of laurel; in the Isthmian or Corinthian, of pine tree; and in the Nemæan, of smallage or parsley. Now, most of these were evergreens; yet they would soon grow dry, and crumble into dust. Elsner produces many passages in which the contenders in these exercises are rallied by the Grecian wits, on account of the extraordinary pains they took for such trifling rewards; and Plato has a celebrated passage, which greatly resembles that of the Apostle, but by no means equals it in force and beauty: "Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible." The Christian is thus called to fight the good fight of faith, and to lay hold of eternal life; and to this he is more powerfully stimulated by considering that the ancient *athletæ* took all their care and pains only for the sake of obtaining a garland of flowers, or a wreath of laurel, which quickly fades and perishes, possessed little intrinsic value, and only served to nourish their pride and vanity, without imparting any solid advantage to themselves or others; but that which is placed in the view of the spiritual combatants, to animate their exertions, and reward their labours, is no less than a crown of glory which never decays; "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for them," 1 Pet. i, 4; v, 4. But the victory sometimes remained doubtful, in consequence of which a number of competitors appeared before the judges, and claimed the prize. The candidates who were rejected on such occasions by the judge of the games, as not having fairly merited the prize, were called by the Greeks *ἀδοκμοί*, or disapproved, which we render cast away, in a passage already quoted from St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians: "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be, *ἀδόκιμος*, cast away," rejected by the Judge of all the earth, and disappointed of my expected crown. What has been observed concerning the spirit and ardour with which the competitors engaged in the race, and concerning the prize they had in view to reward their arduous contention, will illustrate the following sublime passage of the same sacred writer in his Epistle to the Philippians: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark, for the prize of the high

calling of God in Christ Jesus,” Phil. iii, 12–14. The affecting passage, also, of the same Apostle, in the Second Epistle of Timothy, written a little before his martyrdom, is beautifully allusive to the above-mentioned race, to the crown that awaited the victory, and to the Hellanodics or judges who bestowed it: “I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but to all them also that love his appearing,” 2 Tim. iv, 8.

GARDENS. In the language of the Hebrews, every place where plants and trees were cultivated with greater care than in the open field, was called a garden. The idea of such an enclosure was certainly borrowed from the garden of Eden, which the bountiful Creator planted for the reception of our first parents. Beside, the gardens of primitive nations were commonly, if not in every instance, devoted to religious purposes. In these shady retreats were celebrated, for a long succession of ages, the rites of Pagan superstition. Thus Jehovah calls the apostate Jews, “a people that provoketh me continually to anger to my face, that sacrificeth in gardens,” Isa. lxv, 3. And in a preceding chapter, the prophet threatens them in the name of the Lord: “They shall be ashamed of the oaks which ye have desired, and ye shall be confounded for the gardens which ye have chosen.” The oriental gardens were either open plantations, or enclosures defended by walls or hedges. Some fences in the Holy Land, in later times, are not less beautiful than our living fences of white thorn; and perfectly answer the description of ancient Jewish prophets, who inform us that the hedges in their times consisted of thorns, and that the spikes of these thorny plants were exceedingly sharp. Doubdan found a very fruitful vineyard, full of olives, fig trees, and vines, about eight miles south-west from Bethlehem, enclosed with a hedge; and that part of it adjoining to the road, strongly formed of thorns and rose bushes, intermingled with pomegranate trees of surpassing beauty and fragrance. A hedge composed of rose bushes and wild pomegranate shrubs, then in full flower, mingled with other thorny plants, adorned in the varied livery of spring, must have made at once a strong and beautiful fence. The wild pomegranate tree, the species probably used in fencing, is much more prickly than the other variety; and when mingled with other thorny bushes, of which they have several kinds in Palestine, some of whose prickles are very long and sharp, must form a hedge very difficult to penetrate. These facts illustrate the beauty and force of several passages in the sacred volume: thus, in the Proverbs of Solomon, “The way of the slothful man is as a hedge of 398thorns,” Prov. xv, 19; it is obstructed with difficulties, which the sloth and indolence of his temper represent as galling or insuperable; but which a moderate share of resolution and perseverance would easily remove or surmount. In the prophecies of Hosea, God threatens his treacherous and idolatrous people

with many painful embarrassments and perplexities, which would as effectually retard or obstruct their progress in the paths of wickedness, as a hedge of thorny plants stretching across the traveller's way, the prosecution of his journey: "Therefore, behold, I will hedge up thy way with thorns, and make a wall, that she shall not find her paths," Hosea ii, 6. In the days of Micah, the magistrates of Judah had become exceedingly corrupt: "The best of them is a brier; the most upright is sharper than a thorn hedge;" to appear before their tribunal, or to have any dealings with them, was to involve one's self in endless perplexities, and to be exposed to galling disappointments, if not to certain destruction. They resembled those thorny plants which are twisted together, whose spines point in every direction, and are so sharp and strong that they cannot be touched without danger, and so entangling that when the traveller has with much pain and exertion freed himself from one, he is instantly seized by another. "But the sons of Belial," said the king of Israel, "shall be all of them as thorns thrust away, because they cannot be taken with hands: but the man that shall touch them must be fenced with iron, and the staff of a spear; and they shall be utterly burned with fire in the same place," 2 Sam. xxiii, 6, 7. Other enclosures had fences of loose stones, or mud walls, some of them very low, which often furnished a retreat to venomous reptiles. To this circumstance the royal preacher alludes, in his observations of wisdom and folly: "He that diggeth a pit, shall fall into it: and whoso breaketh a hedge, a serpent shall bite him," Eccles. x, 8. The term which our translators render hedge in this passage, they might with more propriety have rendered wall, as they had done in another part of the writings of Solomon: "I went by the field of the slothful, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding; and lo, it was all grown over with thorns, and nettles had covered the face thereof, and the stone wall thereof was broken down," Proverbs xxiv, 30.

2. The land of promise has been, from the earliest ages, an unenclosed country, with a few spots defended by a hedge of thorny plants, or a stone wall built without any cement. At Aleppo, most of the vineyards are fenced with stone walls; for in many parts of Syria a hedge would not grow for want of moisture. But, as their various esculent vegetables are now not unfrequently planted in the open fields, both in Syria and Palestine, so Chardin seems to suppose they were often unfenced in ancient times; and, on this account, those lodges and booths, to which Isaiah refers, in the first chapter of his prophecy, were built. In Hindostan they follow the same custom. At the commencement of the rainy season, the peasants plant abundance of melons, cucumbers, and gourds, which are then the principal food of the inhabitants. They are planted in the open fields and extensive plains, and are therefore liable to the depredations of men and beasts. In the centre of the field is an artificial mount, with a hut on the top, sufficiently large to shelter a single person from the inclemency of the



weather. There, amid heavy rains and tempestuous winds, a poor solitary being is stationed day and night to protect the crop. From thence he gives an alarm to the nearest village. Few situations can be more unpleasant than a hovel of this kind, exposed for three or four months to wind, lightning, and rain. To such a cheerless station the prophet no doubt alludes, in that passage where he declares the desolations of Judah: "The daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers," Isa. i, 8. If such watch houses were necessary in those gardens which were defended by walls or hedges, some of which, indeed, it was not difficult to get over, they must have been still more necessary in those which were perfectly open.

3. The oriental garden displays little method, or design; the whole being commonly no more than a confused medley of fruit trees, with beds of esculent plants, and even plots of wheat and barley sometimes interspersed. The garden belonging to the governor of Eleus, a Turkish town on the western border of the Hellespont, which Dr. Chandler visited, consisted only of a very small spot of ground, walled in, and containing only two vines, a fig and a pomegranate tree, and a well of excellent water. And, it would seem, the garden of an ancient Israelite could not boast of greater variety; for the grape, the fig, and the pomegranate, are almost the only fruits which it produced. This fact may perhaps give us some insight into the reason of the sudden and irresistible conviction which flashed on the mind of Nathanael, when our Saviour said to him, "When thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee." The good man seems to have been engaged in devotional exercises in a small retired garden, walled in, and concealed from the scrutinizing eyes of men. The place was so small, that he was perfectly certain no man but himself was there; and so completely defended, that none could break through, or look over, the fence; and, by consequence, that no eye was upon him, but the all-seeing eye of God; and, therefore, since Christ saw him there, Nathanael knew he could be no other than the Son of God, and the promised Messiah.

GARLICK, שום. As this word occurs only in Numbers xi, 5, some doubts have arisen respecting the plant intended. From its being coupled with leeks and onions, there can be but little doubt that the garlick is meant. The Talmudists frequently mention the use of this plant among the Jews, and their fondness for it. That garlicks grew plenteously in Egypt, is asserted by Dioscorides: there they were much esteemed, and were both eaten and worshipped:--

399"Then gods were recommended by their taste.  
Such savoury deities must needs be good,  
Which served at once for worship and for food."

GARMENT. See Habits.

GATE is often used in Scripture to denote a place of public assembly, where justice was administered, Deut. xvii, 5, 8; xxi, 19; xxii, 15; xxv, 6, 7, &c. One instance of these judgments appears in that given at the gate of Bethlehem, between Boaz and a relation of Naomi, on the subject of Ruth, chap. iv, 2; another in Abraham's purchase of a field to bury Sarah, Gen. xxiii, 10, 18. The gate of judgment is a term still common to the Arabians to express a court of justice, and even introduced by the Saracens into Spain. "I had several times," says Jacob, "visited the Alhambra, the ancient palace and fortress of the Moorish kings: it is situated on the top of a hill, overlooking the city, and is surrounded by a wall of great height and thickness. The entrance is through an archway, over which is carved a key, the symbol of the Mohammedan monarchs. This gate, called the gate of judgment, according to eastern forms, was the place where the kings administered justice." In Morocco, the gate is still the place where judgment is held. "All complaints," says Host, "are brought, in the first instance, to the *cadi*, or governor, who, for that purpose, passes certain hours of the day in the gate of the city, partly for the sake of the fresh air, and partly to see all those who go out; and, lastly, to observe a custom which has long prevailed, of holding judgment there. The gate is contrived accordingly, being built like a square chamber, with two doors, which are not directly opposite to each other, but on two adjoining sides, with seats on the other sides. In this manner David sat between two gates," 2 Sam. xviii, 24. Gate sometimes signifies power, dominion, almost in the same sense as the Turkish emperor's palace is called the *Porte*. God promises Abraham that his posterity shall possess the gates of their enemies, their towns, their fortresses, Genesis xxii, 17. Jesus Christ says to Peter, "Thou art Peter; and on this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. xvi, 18. This may mean either the powers of hell, or invisible spirits; or simply death,--the church shall be replenished by living members from generation to generation, so that death shall never annihilate it.

Solomon says, "He that exalteth his gate seeketh destruction." The Arabs are accustomed to ride into the houses of those they design to harass. To prevent this, Thevenot tells us that the door of the house in which the French merchants live at Rama was not three feet high, and that all the doors of that town are equally low. Agreeably to this account, the Abbé Mariti, speaking of his admission into a monastery near Jerusalem, says, "The passage is so low, that it will scarcely admit a horse; and it is shut by a gate of iron, strongly secured in the inside. As soon as we entered, it was again made fast with various bolts and bars of iron: a precaution extremely necessary in a desert place, exposed to the incursions, and insolent attacks

of the Arabs." Mr. Drummond says, that in the country about Roudge, in Syria, "the poor miserable Arabs are under the necessity of hewing their houses out of the rock, and cutting very small doors or openings to them, that they may not be made stables for the Turkish horse, as they pass and repass." And thus, long before him, Sandys, at Gaza, in Palestine: "We lodged under an arch in a little court, together with our asses; the door exceeding low, as are all that belong unto Christians, to withstand the sudden entrance of the insolent Turks." "To exalt the gate," would consequently be to court destruction. Morier says, "A poor man's door is scarcely three feet in height; and this is a precautionary measure to hinder the servants of the great from entering it on horseback; which, when any act of oppression is intended, they would make no scruple to do. But the habitation of a man in power is known by his gate, which is generally elevated in proportion to the vanity of its owner. A lofty gate is one of the insignia of royalty: such is the Allan Capi, at Ispahan, and Bob Homayan, or the Sublime Porte, at Constantinople. It must have been the same in ancient days; the gates of Jerusalem, Zion, &c, are often mentioned in the Scripture, with the same notion of grandeur annexed to them."

**GATH**, the fifth of the Philistine cities. It was a place of strength in the time of the prophets Amos and Micah, and is placed by Jerom on the road between Eleutheropolis and Gaza. It appears to have been the extreme boundary of the Philistine territory in one direction, as Ekron was on the other. Hence the expression, "from Ekron even unto Gath," 1 Sam. vii, 14.

**GAULAN**, or **GOLAN**, a city beyond Jordan, from which the small province called Gaulonitis took its name. It was given to the half tribe of Manasseh, on the other side Jordan, Deut. iv, 43; and became a city of refuge, Joshua xxi, 27.

**GAZA**, a city of the Philistines, made by Joshua part of the tribe of Judah. It was one of the five principalities of the Philistines, situated toward the southern extremity of the promised land, 1 Sam. vi, 17, between Raphia and Askelon. The advantageous situation of Gaza was the cause of the numerous revolutions which it underwent. It first of all belonged to the Philistines, and then to the Hebrews. It recovered its liberty in the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz, and was reconquered by Hezekiah, 2 Kings xviii, 8. It was subject to the Chaldeans, who conquered Syria and Phenicia. Afterward, it fell into the hands of the Persians. It must have been a place of considerable strength. For two months it baffled all the efforts of Alexander the Great, who was repeatedly repulsed, and wounded in the siege; which he afterward revenged in a most infamous manner on the person of the gallant defender Betis, whom, while yet alive, having ordered his ankles to be bored, he dragged round the walls, tied to his chariot

wheels, in the barbarous parade of imitating the less 400savage treatment of the corpse of Hector by Achilles.

Dr. Wittman gives the following description of his visit to Gaza: "In pursuing our route toward this place, the view became still more interesting and agreeable: the groves of olive trees extending from the place where we had halted to the town, in front of which a fine avenue of these trees was planted. Gaza is situated on an eminence, and is rendered picturesque by the number of fine minarets which rise majestically above the buildings, and by the beautiful date trees which are interspersed. The suburbs of Gaza are composed of wretched mud huts; but within side the town the buildings make a much better appearance than those we had generally met with in Syria. The streets are of a moderate breadth. Many fragments of statues, columns, &c, of marble were seen in the walls and buildings in different parts of the town. The suburbs and environs of Gaza are rendered infinitely agreeable by a number of large gardens, cultivated with the nicest care, which lie in a direction north and south of the town; while others of the same description run to a considerable distance westward. These gardens are filled with a great variety of choice fruit trees, such as the fig, the mulberry, the pomegranate, the apricot, the peach, and the almond; together with a few lemon and orange trees. The numerous plantations of olive and date trees which are interspersed contribute greatly to the picturesque effect of the scene exhibited by the surrounding plains. These, on our arrival, were overspread with flowers, the variegated colours of which displayed every tint and every hue. Among these were the chrysanthemum, scarlet ranunculus, lupin, pheasant-eye, tulip, china-aster, dwarf-iris, lintel, daisy, &c, all of them growing wild and abundantly, with the exception of the lupin, which was cultivated in patches, regularly ploughed and sowed, with a view to collect the seeds, which the inhabitants employ at their meals, more especially to thicken their ragouts. The few corn fields, which lay at a distance, displayed the promise of a rich golden harvest; and the view of the sea, distant about a league, tended to diversify still more the animated features of this luxuriant scene." This and similar descriptions of modern travellers, which are occasionally introduced into this work, are given both as interesting in themselves, and to show that relics of the ancient beauty and fertility of the Holy Land are still to be found in many parts of it.

GEMARA. This word signifies complement, perfection. The rabbins call the Pentateuch the law, without any addition. Next to this they have the Talmud, which is divided into two parts: the first is only an application of the law to particular cases, with the decision of the ancient rabbins, and is called mishnah, or "second law;" the other part, which is a more extensive application of the same law, is a collection of determinations by rabbins, later than the mishnah. This last is termed gemara, "perfection,"

“finishing,” because they consider it as a conclusive explanation of the law, to which no farther additions can be made. There are two gemaras, or two Talmuds, that of Jerusalem, and that of Babylon. The former was compiled, according to the Jews, about the end of the second or third century, by a celebrated rabbin, called Jochanan; but father Morinus maintains that the gemara was not finished till about the seventh century. Dr. Prideaux says that it was completed about A. D. 300. The Jews have little value for this Jerusalem Talmud, on account of its obscurity. The Babylonish gemara is, as the rabbins say, more modern. It was begun by a Jewish doctor, named Asa, and continued by Marmar and Mar, his sons or disciples. The Jews believe that the gemara contains nothing but the word of God, preserved in the tradition of the elders, and transmitted, without alteration, from Moses to rabbi Judah, the holy, and the other compilers of the Talmud; who did not reduce it to writing till they were afraid it would be corrupted by the several transmigrations and persecutions to which their nation was subjected.

GENEALOGY, γενεαλογία, signifies a list of a person’s ancestors. The common Hebrew expression for it is Sepher-Toledoth, “the Book of Generations.” No nation was ever more careful to preserve their genealogies than the Jews. The sacred writings contain genealogies extended three thousand five hundred years backward. The genealogy of our Saviour is deduced by the evangelists from Adam to Joseph and Mary, through a space of four thousand years and upward. The Jewish priests were obliged to produce an exact genealogy of their families, before they were admitted to exercise their function. Wherever placed, the Jews were particularly careful not to marry below themselves; and to prevent this, they kept tables of genealogy in their several families, the originals of which were lodged at Jerusalem, to be occasionally consulted. These authentic monuments, during all their wars and persecutions, were taken great care of, and from time to time renewed. But, since the last destruction of their city, and the dispersion of the people, their ancient genealogies are lost. But to this the Jews reply, that either Elias, or some other inspired priest or prophet, shall come, and restore their genealogical tables before the Messiah’s appearance; a tradition, which they ground on a passage in Nehemiah vii, 64, 65, to this effect: the genealogical register of the families of certain priests being lost, they were not able to make out their lineal descent from Aaron; and therefore, “as polluted, were put from the priesthood;” the “Tirshatha said unto them, that they should not eat of the most holy things, till there stood up a priest with Urim and Thummim.” From hence the Jews conclude, that such a priest will stand up, and restore and complete the genealogies of their families: though others suppose these words to import, that they should never exercise their priesthood any more; and that, “till there shall stand up a priest with Urim and 401Thummim,”

amounts to the same as the Roman proverb, *ad Græcas calendas*, [never,] since the Urim and Thummim were now absolutely and for ever lost.

**GENERATION.** Beside the common acceptance of this word, as signifying descent, it is used for the history and genealogy of any individual, as “The book of the generations of Adam,” Genesis v, 1, the history of Adam’s creation, and of his posterity. “The generations of the heavens and of the earth,” Genesis ii, 4, is a recital of the creation of heaven and earth. “The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David,” Matthew i, 1, is the genealogy of Jesus Christ, and the history of his life. The ancients sometimes computed by generations: “In the fourth generation thy descendants shall come hither again,” Genesis xv, 16. “Joseph saw Ephraim’s children of the third generation,” Genesis 1, 23. “A bastard shall not be admitted into the congregation, till the tenth generation,” Deut. xxiii, 2. Among the ancients, when the duration of generations was not exactly described by the age of four men succeeding one another from father to son, it was fixed by some at a hundred years, by others at a hundred and ten, by others at thirty-three, thirty, twenty-five, and even at twenty years; being neither uniform nor settled: only, it is remarked, that a generation is longer as it is more ancient.

**GENESIS**, a canonical book of the Old Testament, so called from the Greek γενεσις, *genesis*, or generation, because it contains an account of the origin of all visible things, and of the genealogy of the first patriarchs. In the Hebrew it is called בראשית, which signifies, in the beginning, because it begins with that word. See Pentateuch.

**GENNESARETH**, Land of, or **GENNESAR**, a small district of Galilee, supposed to have been so called from its pleasantness, and extending about four miles along the north-western shore of the sea of Galilee, or Gennesareth, so called from this same region. It is more probable, however, that Gennesareth is nothing more than a word moulded from Cinnereth, the ancient name of a city and adjoining tract in this very situation, as well as of the lake itself. This part of Galilee is described by Josephus as possessing a singular fertility, with a delightful temperature of the air, and abounding in the fruits of different climates.

**GENTILE.** The Hebrews called the Gentiles גויים, ἔθνη, the nations, that is, those who have not received the faith or law of God. All who are not Jews, and circumcised, are *goiim*. Those who were converted, and embraced Judaism, they called proselytes. Since the Gospel, the true religion is not confined to any one nation or country, as heretofore, God, who had promised by his prophets to call the Gentiles to the faith, with a superabundance of grace, has fulfilled his promise; so that the Christian

church is now composed principally of Gentile converts; and the Jews, too proud of their particular privileges, and abandoned to their reprobate sense of things, have disowned Jesus Christ, their Messiah and Redeemer, for whom, during so many ages, they had looked so impatiently. In the writings of St. Paul, the Gentiles are generally denoted as Greeks, Rom. i, 14, 16; ii, 9, 10; iii, x, 12; 1 Cor. i, 22–24; Gal. iii, 28. St. Luke, in the Acts, expresses himself in the same manner, Acts vi, 1; xi, 20; xviii, &c.

2. St. Paul is commonly called the Apostle of the Gentiles, 1 Tim. ii, 7, or Greeks; because he, principally, preached Jesus Christ to them; whereas Peter, and the other Apostles, preached generally to the Jews, and are called Apostles of the circumcision, Gal. ii, 8. The prophets declared very particularly the calling of the Gentiles. Jacob foretold that the Messiah, he who was to be sent, the Shiloh, should gather the Gentiles to himself. Solomon, at the dedication of his temple, prays for “the stranger” who should there entreat God. The Psalmist says, that the Lord would give the Gentiles to the Messiah for his inheritance; that Egypt and Babylon shall know him; that Ethiopia shall hasten to bring him presents; that the kings of Tarshish, and of the isles, the kings of Arabia and Sheba, shall be tributary to him, Psalm ii, 8; lxvii, 4; lxxii, 9, 10. Isaiah abounds with prophecies of the like nature, on which account he has justly been distinguished by the name of “the prophet of the Gentiles.”

Gentiles, Court of the. Josephus says there was, in the court of the temple, a wall, or balustrade, breast-high, with pillars at particular distances, and inscriptions on them in Greek and Latin, importing that strangers were forbidden from entering farther; here their offerings were received, and sacrifices were offered for them, they standing at the barrier; but they were not allowed to approach to the altar. Pompey, nevertheless, went even into the sanctuary, but behaved with strict decorum; and the next day he commanded the temple to be purified, and the customary sacrifices to be offered. A little before the last rebellion of the Jews, some mutineers would have persuaded the priests to accept no victim not presented by a Jew; and obliged them to reject those which were offered by command of the emperor, for the Roman people. The wisest in vain remonstrated with them on the danger this would bring on their country; urged that their ancestors had never rejected the presents of Gentiles; and that the temple was mostly adorned with the offerings of such people; at the same time, the most learned priests, who had spent their whole lives in the study of the law, testified that their forefathers had always received the sacrifices of strangers.

From the above particulars, we learn the meaning of what the Apostle Paul calls “the middle wall of partition,” between Jews and Gentiles broken down by the Gospel.

GERAR, a royal city of the Philistines, situate not far from the angle where the south and west sides of Palestine meet.

GERIZIM, a mount near Shechem, in Ephraim, a province of Samaria. Shechem lay at the foot of two mountains, Ebal and Gerizim. Gerizim was fruitful, Ebal was barren. God commanded that the Hebrews, after passing the Jordan, should be so divided, that six tribes might be stationed on Mount Gerizim, and six on Mount Ebal. The former was to pronounce blessings on those who observed the law of the Lord; the others, curses against those who should violate it, Deut. xi, 29; xxvii, 12. As to the original of the temple upon Gerizim, we must take Josephus’s relation of it. Manasseh, the grandson of Eliashib, the high priest, and brother to Jaddus, high priest of the Jews, having been driven from Jerusalem in the year of the world 3671, and not enduring patiently to see himself deprived of the honour and advantages of the priesthood, Sanballat, his father-in-law, addressed himself to Alexander the Great, who was then carrying on the siege of Tyre; and having paid him homage for the province of Samaria, whereof he was governor, he farther offered him eight thousand of his best troops, which disposed Alexander to grant what he desired for his son-in-law, and for many other priests, who being married, as well as he, contrary to the law, chose rather to forsake their country than their wives, and had joined Manasseh in Samaria. When Antiochus Epiphanes began to persecute the Jews, A. M. 3836; B. C. 186, the Samaritans entreated him that their temple upon Gerizim, which hitherto had been dedicated to an unknown and nameless god, might be consecrated to Jupiter the Grecian, which was easily consented to by Antiochus. The temple of Gerizim subsisted some time after the worship of Jupiter was introduced into it; but it was destroyed by John Hircanus Maccabæus, and was not rebuilt till Gabinius was governor of Syria; who repaired Samaria, and called it by his own name. It is certain, that, in our Saviour’s time, this temple was in being; and that the true God was worshipped there, since the woman of Samaria, pointing to Gerizim, said to him, “Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship,” John iv, 20. We are assured, that Herod the Great, having rebuilt Samaria, and called it Sebaste, in honour of Augustus, would have obliged the Samaritans to worship in the temple which he had erected there, but they constantly refused.

GETHSEMANE. See Olives, Mount of.



GIANT, גפיל, Greek, γίγας, a monster, a terrible man, a chief who beats and bears down other men. Scripture speaks of giants before the flood: "Nephilim, mighty men who were of old, men of renown," Gen. vi, 4. Aquila translates nephilim, ἐπιπίπτοντες, men who attack, who fall with impetuosity on their enemies, which renders very well the force of the term. Symmachus translates it βιαίιοι, violent men, cruel, whose only rule of action is violence. Scripture sometimes calls giants Rephaim: Chedorlaomer beat the Rephaim at Ashteroth-Karnaim. The Emim, ancient inhabitants of Moab, were of a gigantic stature, that is, Rephaim. The Rephaim and the Perizzites are connected as old inhabitants of Canaan. The Rephaim in some parts of Scripture signify spirits in the invisible world, in a state of misery. Job says that the ancient Rephaim groan under the waters; and Solomon, that the ways of a loose woman lead to the Rephaim; that he who deviates from the ways of wisdom, shall dwell in the assembly of Rephaim, that is, in hell, Prov. ii, 18; iv, 18; xxi, 16, &c; Gen. xiv, 5; Deut. ii, 11, 20; iii, 11, 13; Joshua xii, 4; xiii, 12; Job xxvi, 5. The Anakim, or the sons of Anak, were the most famous giants of Palestine. They dwelt at Hebron and thereabouts. The Israelites sent to view the promised land reported, that, in comparison, they themselves were but grasshoppers, Num. xiii, 33.

2. As to the existence of giants, several writers, both ancient and modern, have thought that the giants of Scripture were men famous for violence and crime, rather than for strength or stature. But it cannot be denied, that there have been races of men of a stature much above that common at present; although their size has often been absurdly magnified. The ancients considered persons whose stature exceeded seven feet as gigantic. Living giants have certainly been seen who were somewhat taller; but the existence of those who greatly surpassed it, or were double the height, has been inferred only from remains discovered in the earth, but not from the ocular testimony of credible witnesses. Were we to admit what has been reported on the subject, there would be no bounds to the dimensions of giants; the earth would seem unsuitable for them to tread upon. History, however, acquaints us that, in the reign of Claudius, a giant named Galbara, ten feet high was brought to Rome from the coast of Africa. An instance is cited by Goropius, an author with whom we are otherwise unacquainted, of a female of equal stature. A certain Greek sophist, Proæresius, is said to have been nine feet in height. Julius Capitolinus affirms that Maximinian, the Roman emperor was eight feet and a half; there was a Swede, one of the life guards of Frederick the Great, of that size. M. Le Cat speaks of a giant exhibited at Rouen, measuring eight feet and some inches; and we believe some have been seen in this country, within the last thirty years, whose stature was not inferior. In Plott's "History of Staffordshire," there is an instance of a man of seven feet and a half high, and another, in

Thoresby's account of Leeds, of seven feet five inches high. Examples may be found elsewhere of several individuals seven feet in height, below which, after the opinion of the ancients, we may cease to consider men gigantic. Entire families sometimes, though rarely, occur of six feet four, or six feet six inches high. From all this we may conclude, that there may have possibly been seen some solitary instances of men who were ten feet in height; that those of eight feet are extremely uncommon, and that even six feet and a half far exceeds the height of men in Europe. We may reasonably understand that the gigantic nations of Canaan were above the average size of other people, with 403 instances among them of several families of gigantic stature. This is all that is necessary to suppose, in order to explain the account of Moses; but the notion that men have gradually degenerated in size has no foundation. There is no evidence whatever, that the modern tribes of mankind have thus degenerated. The catacombs of ancient Egypt and Palestine; the cenotaph, if it be truly such, in the great pyramid; the tomb of Alexander the Great, are all calculated for bodies of ordinary dimensions. The truth is still more satisfactorily established from the mummies which are yet withdrawn from their receptacles in Egypt, and the caverns of the Canary Islands. In the most ancient sepulchres of Britain, those apparently anterior to the introduction of Christianity, no remains are discovered which indicate the larger stature of the inhabitants than our own. In every part of the world domestic implements and personal ornaments, many centuries old, are obtained from tombs, from bogs and mosses, or those cities overwhelmed by volcanic eruptions, which would be ill adapted to a gigantic race of ancestors.

GIBEON, the capital city of the Gibeonites, who took advantage of the oaths of Joshua, and of the elders of Israel, procured by an artful representation of their belonging to a very remote country, Joshua ix. Joshua and the elders had not the precaution to consult God on this affair, but inconsiderately made a league with these people. They soon discovered their mistake, and, without revoking their promise of saving their lives, they condemned them to labour in carrying wood and water for the tabernacle; and to other works, as slaves and captives; in which state of servitude they remained, till the entire dispersion of the Jewish nation, A. M. 2553; B. C. 1451. Three days after the Gibeonites had surrendered to the Hebrews, the kings of Canaan being informed of it, five of them came and besieged the city of Gibeon. The Gibeonites sent to Joshua, and desired speedy help. Joshua attacked the five kings early in the morning, put them to flight, and pursued them to Bethoron, Josh. x, 3, &c. The Gibeonites were descended from the Hivites, the old inhabitants of the country, and possessed four cities: Cephirah, Beeroth, Kirjath-jearim, and Gibeon, their capital; all afterward given to Benjamin, except Kirjath-jearim, which fell to Judah. The Gibeonites continued subject to those burdens which Joshua

imposed on them, and were very faithful to the Israelites. Nevertheless, Saul destroyed a great number of them, 2 Sam. xxi, 1; but God, in the reign of David, sent a great famine, which lasted three years, A. M. 2983; B. C. 1021; and the prophets told David that this calamity would continue while Saul's cruelty remained unavenged. David asked the Gibeonites what satisfaction they desired. They answered, "Seven of Saul's sons we will put to death, to avenge the blood of our brethren." The Gibeonites crucified them. From this time there is no mention of the Gibeonites as a distinct people. But they were probably included among the Nethinim, appointed for the service of the temple, 1 Chron. ix, 2. Afterward, those of the Canaanites who were subdued, and had their lives spared, were added to the Gibeonites. We see in Ezra viii, 20; ii, 58; 1 Kings ix, 20, 21, that David, Solomon, and the princes of Judah, gave many such to the Lord; these Nethinim being carried into captivity with Judah and the Levites, many of them returned with Ezra, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah, and continued, as before, in the service of the temple, under the priests and Levites. We neither know when, nor by whom, nor on what occasion, the tabernacle and altar of burnt sacrifices, made by Moses in the wilderness, were removed to Gibeon; but this we certainly know, that, toward the end of David's reign, and in the beginning of Solomon's, they were there, 1 Chron. xxi, 29, 30. David, seeing an angel of the Lord at Araunah's threshing floor, was so terrified, that he had not time or strength to go so far as Gibeon to offer sacrifice; but Solomon, being seated on the throne, went to sacrifice at Gibeon, 1 Kings iii, 4.

GIDEON, the son of Joash, of the tribe of Manasseh; the same with Jerubbaal, the seventh judge of Israel. He dwelt in the city of Ophra, and was chosen by God in a very extraordinary manner to deliver the Israelites from the oppression of the Midianites, under which they had laboured for the space of seven years. See Judges vi, 14–27; viii, 1–24, &c.

GIER EAGLE, גֵּרְעָל, Lev. xi, 18; Deut. xiv, 17. As the root of this word signifies tenderness and affection, it is supposed to refer to some bird remarkable for its attachment to its young; hence some have thought that the pelican is to be understood; and Bochart endeavours to prove that the golden vulture is meant; but there can be no doubt that it is the percnopterus of the ancients, the ach-bobba of the Arabians, particularly described by Bruce under the name of rachamah. He says, "We know from Horus Apollo, that the rachma, or she vulture, was sacred to Isis, and adorned the statue of the goddess; that it was the emblem of parental affection; and that it was the hieroglyphic for an affectionate mother." He farther says, that "this female vulture, having hatched her young ones, continues with them one hundred and twenty days, providing them with all necessaries; and,

when the stock of food fails them, she tears off the fleshy part of her thigh, and feeds them with that and the blood which flows from the wound.”

Hasselquist thus describes the Egyptian vulture: “The appearance of the bird is as horrid as can well be imagined. The face is naked and wrinkled, the eyes are large and black, the beak black and crooked, the talons large, and extended ready for prey, and the whole body polluted with filth. These are qualities enough to make the beholder shudder with horror. Notwithstanding this, the inhabitants of Egypt cannot be enough thankful to Providence for this bird. All the places round Cairo are filled with the dead bodies of asses and camels; and thousands of these birds fly about and devour the carcasses, before they 404putrify and fill the air with noxious exhalations.” No wonder that such an animal should be deemed unclean.

GIFT OF TONGUES, an ability given to the Apostles and others of readily and intelligibly speaking a variety of languages which they had never learned. This was a glorious and decisive attestation to the Gospel, as well as a suitable, and, indeed, in their circumstances, a necessary qualification for the mission for which the Apostles and their coadjutors were designed. Nor is there any reason, with Dr. Middleton, to understand it as merely an occasional gift, so that a person might speak a language most fluently one hour, and be entirely ignorant of it the next; which neither agrees with what is said of the abuse of it, nor would it have been sufficient to answer the end proposed, Acts ii. Some appear to have been gifted with one tongue, others with more. To St. Paul this endowment was vouchsafed in a more liberal degree, than to many others; for, as to the Corinthians, who had received the gift of tongues, he says, “that he spake with tongues more than they all.”

GIFTS. The practice of making presents is very common in oriental countries. The custom probably had its origin among those men who first sustained the office of kings or rulers, and who, from the novelty and perhaps the weakness attached to their situation, chose, rather than make the hazardous attempt of exacting taxes, to content themselves with receiving those presents which might be freely offered, 1 Sam. x, 27. Hence it passed into a custom, that whoever approached the king should come with a gift. This was the practice and the expectation. The custom of presenting gifts was subsequently extended to other great men; to men who were inferior to the king, but who were, nevertheless, men of influence and rank; it was also extended to those who were equals, when they were visited, Proverbs xviii, 16. Kings themselves were in the habit of making presents, probably in reference to the custom in question and the feelings connected with it, to those individuals, their inferiors in point of rank,

whom they wished to honour, and also to those who, like themselves, were clothed with the royal authority. These presents, namely, such as were presented by the king as a token of the royal esteem and honour, are almost invariably denominated in the Hebrew, שֶׁחַד and 1 כְּרִכָּה, Kings xv, 19; 2 Kings xvi, 8; xviii, 14; Isaiah xxxvi, 16. The more ancient prophets did not deem it discreditable to them to receive presents, nor unbecoming their sacred calling, except when, as was sometimes the case, they refused by way of expressing their dissatisfaction or indignation, 2 Kings v, 15; viii, 9. In later times, when false prophets, in order to obtain money, prophesied without truth and without authority, the true prophets, for the purpose of keeping the line of distinction as broad as possible, rejected every thing that looked like reward. Gifts of this kind, that have now been described, are not to be confounded with those which are called שֶׁחַד, and which were presented to judges, not as a mark of esteem and honour, but for purposes of bribery and corruption. The former was considered an honour to the giver, but a gift of the latter kind has been justly reprobated in every age, Exod. xxii, 8; Deut. x, 17; xvi, 19; xxvii, 25; Psalm xv, 5; xxvi, 10; Isaiah i, 23; v, 23; xxxiii, 15. The giver was not restricted as to the kind of present which he should make. He might present not only silver and gold, but clothes and arms, also different kinds of food, in a word any thing which could be of benefit to the recipient, Gen. xliii, 11; 1 Sam. ix, 7; xvi, 20; Job xiii, 11. It was the custom anciently, as it is at the present time in the east, for an individual when visiting a person of high rank, to make some presents of small value to the servants or domestics of the person visited, 1 Sam. xxv, 27. It was the usual practice among kings and princes to present to their favourite officers in the government, to ambassadors from foreign courts, to foreigners of distinction, and to men eminent for their learning, garments of greater or less value, Genesis xiv, 22, 23; Esther viii, 15. The royal wardrobe, in which a large number of such garments was kept, is denominated in Hebrew 2 בְּגָדִים Chronicles xxxiv, 22. It was considered an honour of the highest kind, if a king or any person in high authority thought it proper, as a manifestation of his favour, to give away to another the garment which he had previously worn himself, 1 Sam. xviii, 4. In the east, at the present day, it is expected, that every one who has received a garment from the king will immediately clothe himself in it, and promptly present himself and render his homage to the giver; otherwise he runs the hazard of exciting the king's displeasure, Matt. xxii, 11, 12. It was sometimes the case, that the king, when he made a feast, presented vestments to all the guests who were invited, with which they clothed themselves before they sat down to it, 2 Kings x, 22; Gen. xlv, 22; Rev. iii, 5. In oriental countries, the presents which are made to kings and princes are to this day carried on beasts of burden, are attended with a body of men, and are escorted with much pomp. It matters not how light or how small the present may be, it

must either be carried on the back of a beast of burden, or by a man, who must support it with both his hands, Judges iii, 18; 2 Kings viii, 9.

GIHON, the name of one of the four rivers the source of which was in paradise, Genesis ii, 13. (See Eden.) Reland, Calmet, &c, think that Gihon is the Araxes, which has its source, as well as the Tigris and Euphrates, in the mountains of Armenia, and, running with almost incredible rapidity, falls into the Caspian Sea. Gihon was also the name of a fountain to the west of Jerusalem, at which Solomon was anointed king by the high priest Zadok, and the Prophet Nathan, 1 Kings i, 33.

GILBOA, Mount, a ridge of mountains on the north of Bethshan, or Scythopolis, forming in that part the boundary of the plain of Jordan to the west. It is memorable from the defeat of Saul by the Philistines; when his 405three sons were slain, and he himself died by his own hand, his armourbearer refusing to kill him, 1 Sam. xxxi.

GILEAD, the name given to the monument erected by Laban and Jacob, in testimony of a mutual covenant and agreement, Gen. xxxi, 47, 48. Hence the hill upon which it was erected, was called Mount Gilead, Cant. iv, 1; vi, 5; Jer. 1, 19. The mountains of Gilead were part of that ridge of mountains which extend from Mount Lebanon southward, on the east of the Holy land; they gave their name to the whole country which lies on the east of the sea of Galilee, and included the mountainous region called in the New Testament Trachonitis. The Scripture speaks of the balm of Gilead, Jer. viii, 22; xlvi, 11; li, 8. The merchants who bought Joseph came from Gilead, and were carrying balm into Egypt, Gen. xxxvii, 25. See Balm.

GILGAL, a celebrated place situated on the west of Jordan, where the Israelites encamped some time after their passage over that river, and where Joshua pitched twelve stones taken out of Jordan as a memorial. A considerable city was afterward built there, which became renowned for many events recorded in the history of the Jews. Gilgal was about a league from Jordan, and at an equal distance from Jericho. It received its name from the circumstance of the Hebrews being there circumcised; for when by divine command that rite had been performed upon them, the Lord said, "This day have I rolled away from off you the reproach of Egypt," Joshua v, 2-4, &c.--The word Gilgal signifies rolling. Here the ark was long stationed, and consequently the place was much resorted to by the Israelites. It seems to have been the place in which Jeroboam or some of the kings of Israel instituted idolatrous worship; and hence the allusions to it by the prophets, Hosea iv, 15; Amos iv, 4. It is probable that there were idols at Gilgal as early as the days of Ehud, who was one of the judges; for

it is said that, having delivered his presents to the king, "Ehud went away, but returned again from the quarries that were by Gilgal," Judges iii, 19. The margin of our Bibles reads, "the graven images," or idols set up by the Moabites, the viewing of which, it is thought, stirred up Ehud to revenge the affront thereby offered to the God of Israel. At this same place, the people met to confirm the kingdom to Saul, 1 Sam. xi, 14, 15. It was at Gilgal, too, that Saul incurred the divine displeasure, in offering sacrifice before Samuel arrived, 1 Sam. xiii; and there also it was that he received the sentence of his rejection for disobeying the divine command, and sparing the king of Amalek with the spoils which he had reserved, 1 Sam. xv.

It has been supposed that the setting up of stones, as at Gilgal and other places, gave rise to the rude stone circular temples of the Druids, and other Heathens. The idea, however, appears fanciful, and there is an essential difference between stones erected for memorials, and those used to mark sacred, or supposed sacred, places for worship.

**GIRDLE.** The girdle is an indispensable article in the dress of an oriental: it has various uses; but the principal one is to tuck up their long flowing vestments, that they may not incommode them in their work, or on a journey. The Jews, according to some writers, wore a double girdle, one of greater breadth, with which they girded their tunic when they prepared for active exertions: the other they wore under their shirt, around their loins. This under girdle they reckon necessary to distinguish between the heart and the less honourable parts of the human frame. The upper girdle was sometimes made of leather, the material of which the girdle of John the Baptist was made; but it was more commonly fabricated of worsted, often very artfully woven into a variety of figures, and made to fold several times about the body; one end of which being doubled back, and sewn along the edges, serves them for a purse, agreeably to the acceptation of ζώνη, in the Scriptures, which is translated purse, in several places of the New Testament, Matt. x, 9; Mark vi, 8. The ancient Romans, in this, as in many other things, imitated the orientals; for their soldiers, and probably all classes of the citizens, used to carry their money in their girdles. Whence, in Horace, *qui zonam perdidit*, means one who had lost his purse; and Aulus Gellius, C. Gracchus is introduced, saying, "Those girdles which I carried out full of money when I went from Rome, I have, at my return from the province, brought again empty." The Turks make a farther use of these girdles, by fixing their knives and poinards in them; while the writers and secretaries suspend in them their ink-horns; a custom as old as the Prophet Ezekiel, who mentions "a person clothed in white linen, with an ink-horn upon his loins," Ezek. ix, 2. That part of the ink-holder which passes between the girdle and the tunic, and receives their pens, is long and

flat; but the vessel for the ink, which rests upon the girdle, is square, with a lid to clasp over it.

2. To loose the girdle and give it to another was, among the orientals, a token of great confidence and affection. Thus, to ratify the covenant which Jonathan made with David, and to express his cordial regard for his friend, among other things, he gave him his girdle. A girdle curiously and richly wrought was among the ancient Hebrews a mark of honour, and sometimes bestowed as a reward of merit; for this was the recompense which Joab declared he meant to bestow on the man who put Absalom to death: "Why didst thou not smite him there to the ground? and I would have given thee ten shekels of silver, and a girdle," 2 Samuel xviii, 11. The reward was certainly meant to correspond with the importance of the service which he expected him to perform, and the dignity of his own station as commander in chief: we may, therefore, suppose that the girdle promised was not a common one of leather, or plain worsted, but of costly materials and richly adorned; for people of rank and fashion in the east wear very broad girdles, all of silk, and superbly adorned with gold and silver, and precious stones, of which they are extremely proud, regarding them as the tokens of their superior station and the proof of their riches. "To gird up the loins" is to bring the flowing robe within the girdle, and so to prepare for a journey, or for some vigorous exercise.

GLASS, ὕαλος. This word occurs Rev. xxi, 18, 21; and the adjective ὑάλινος, Rev. iv, 6; xv, 2. Parkhurst says that in the later Greek writers, and in the New Testament, ὕαλος denotes the artificial substance, glass; and that we may either with Mintert derive it from ἔλη, splendour, or immediately from the Hebrew לה, to shine. There seems to be no reference to glass in the Old Testament. The art of making it was not known. Our translators have rendered the Hebrew word מראה, in Exodus xxxviii, 8, and Job xxxvii, 18, "looking-glass." But the making mirrors of glass coated with quicksilver, is an invention quite modern. The word looking-glass occurs in our version of Ecclesiasticus xii, 11, "Never trust thine enemy; for like as iron rusteth, so is his wickedness. Though he humble himself, and go crouching, yet take good heed and beware of him, and thou shalt be unto him as if thou hadst washed a looking-glass, and thou shalt know that his rust hath not been altogether wiped away." This passage proves, by its mention of rust, that mirrors were then made of polished metal. The word ἔσποπρον, or mirror, occurs in 1 Cor. xiii, 12, and James i, 23. Dr. Pearce thinks that in the former place it signifies any of those transparent substances which the ancients used in their windows, and through which they saw external objects obscurely. But others are of opinion that the word denotes a mirror of polished metal; as this, however, was liable to many imperfections, so that the object before it was not seen clearly or fully, the



meaning of the Apostle is, that we see things as it were by images reflected from a mirror, which shows them very obscurely and indistinctly. In the latter place, a mirror undoubtedly is meant; "For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: for he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway he forgetteth what manner of man he was:" but in the former, 1 Cor. xiii, 12, semi-transparent glass such as that which we see in the ancient glass vases of the Romans is obviously intended. Specimens of Roman glass may be seen in collections of antiquities, and some have been dug up at Pompeii; but in all it is cloudy and dull, and objects can only be seen through it with indistinctness. From this we may fully perceive the force of the Apostle's words, "now we see through a glass darkly."

**GLEAN.** To glean is properly to gather ears of corn, or grapes, left by the reapers, &c. The Jews were not allowed to glean their fields, but were to leave this to the poor, Lev. xix, 10; xxiii, 22; Deut. xxiv, 21; Ruth ii, 3.

**GLORIFY,** to make glorious or honourable, or to cause to appear so, John xii, 28; xiii, 31, 32; xv, 8; xvii, 4, 5; xxi, 19; Acts iii, 13. In this view it particularly refers to the resurrection of Christ, and his ascension to the right hand of God, John vii, 39; xii, 16. It also expresses that change which shall pass upon believers at the general resurrection, and their admission into heaven.

**GLORY,** splendour, magnificence. The glory of God in the writings of Moses, denotes, generally, the divine presence; as when he appeared on Mount Sinai; or, the bright cloud which declared his presence, and descended on the tabernacle of the congregation, Exod. xxiv, 9, 10, 16, 17. Moses, with Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy elders of Israel, went up to Mount Sinai, and "saw the glory of the Lord." Now "the glory of the Lord was, as it were, a burning fire on the mountain; and under his feet was, as it were, the brightness of the sapphire stone, resembling heaven itself in clearness." The glory of the Lord appeared to Israel in the cloud also, when he gave them manna and quails, Exod. xvi, 7, 10. Moses having earnestly begged of God to show his glory to him, God said, "Thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me and live. And the Lord said, There is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock: and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in the cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by: and I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back parts:" (the train, the fainter rays of the glory:) "but my face shall not be seen," Exod. xxxiii, 18. The ark of God is called the glory of Israel; and the glory of God, 1 Samuel iv, 21, 22; Psalm xxvi, 8. The priestly ornaments are called "garments of glory," Exod. xxviii, 2, 40; and the sacred vessels, "vessels of glory," 1 Macc. ii, 9, 12.

Solomon “in all his glory,” in all his lustre, in his richest ornaments, was not so beautifully arrayed as a lily, Matt. vi, 29; Luke xii, 27. When the prophets describe the conversion of the Gentiles, they speak of the “glory of the Lord” as filling the earth; that is, his knowledge shall universally prevail, and he shall be every where worshipped and glorified. The term “glory” is used also of the Gospel dispensation by St. Paul; and to express the future felicity of the saints in heaven. When the Hebrews required an oath of any man, they said, “Give glory to God:” confess the truth, give him glory, confess that God knows the most secret thoughts, the very bottom of your hearts, Joshua vii, 19; John ix, 24.

GNAT, κώνωψ, Matt. xxiii, 24, a small-winged insect, comprehending a genus of the order of diptera. In those hot countries, as Servius remarks, speaking of the east, gnats and flies are very apt to fall into wine, if it be not carefully covered; and passing the liquor through a strainer, that no gnat or part of one might remain, became a proverb for exactness about little matters. This may help us to understand that passage, Matt. xxiii, 24, where the proverbial expression of carefully straining out a little fly from the liquor to be drunk, and yet swallowing a camel, intimates, that the scribes and Pharisees affected to scruple little things, and yet disregarded those of the greatest moment.

GNOSTICS, from γνώσις, “knowledge,” men of science and wisdom, illuminati; men who, from blending the philosophy of the east, or of Greece, with the doctrines of the Gospel, boasted of deeper knowledge in the Scriptures and theology than others. It was, therefore, not so properly a distinct sect as a generic term, comprehending all who, forsaking the simplicity of the Gospel, pretended to be “wise above what is written,” to explain the New Testament by the dogmas of the philosophers, and to derive from the sacred writings mysteries which never were contained in them. The origin of the Gnostic heresy, as it is called, has been variously stated. The principles of this heresy were, however, much older than Christianity; and many of the errors alluded to in the apostolic epistles are doubtless of a character very similar to some branches of the Gnostic system. (See Cabbala.) Cerinthus, against whom St. John wrote his Gospel; the Nicolaitans, mentioned in the Revelation, and the Ebionites, (described under that article,) were all early Gnostics, although the system was not then so completely formed as afterward. Dr. Burton, in his Bampton Lectures, has thus sketched the Gnostic system:--In attempting to give an account of these doctrines, I must begin with observing what we shall see more plainly when we trace the causes of Gnosticism, that it was not by any means a new and distinct philosophy, but made up of selections from almost every system. Thus we find in it the Platonic doctrine of ideas, and the notion that every thing in this lower world has a celestial and

immaterial archetype. We find in it evident traces of that mystical and cabalistic jargon which, after their return from captivity, deformed the religion of the Jews; and many Gnostics adopted the oriental notion of two independent coëternal principles, the one the author of good, the other of evil. Lastly, we find the Gnostic theology full of ideas and terms which must have been taken from the Gospel; and Jesus Christ, under some form or other, of æon, emanation, or incorporeal phantom, enters into all their systems, and is the means of communicating to them that knowledge which raised them above all other mortals, and entitled them to their peculiar name. The genius and very soul of Gnosticism was mystery: its end and object was to purify its followers from the corruptions of matter, and to raise them to a higher scale of being, suited only to those who were become perfect by knowledge.

2. We have a key to many parts of their system, when we know that they held matter to be intrinsically evil, of which, consequently, God could not be the author. Hence arose their fundamental tenet, that the creator of the world, or Demiurgus, was not the same with the supreme God, the Author of good, and the Father of Christ. Their system allowed some of them to call the creator God; but the title most usually given to him was Demiurgus. Those who embraced the doctrine of two principles supposed the world to have been produced by the evil principle; and, in most systems, the creator, though not the father of Christ, was looked upon as the God of the Jews, and the author of the Mosaic law. Some, again, believed that angels were employed in creating the world; but all were agreed in maintaining that matter itself was not created, that it was eternal, and remained inactive, till

Dispositam, quisquis fuit ille Deorum,  
Congeriem secuit, sectamque in membra redegit.  
Ovid.

[Some God, whoever he was, separated and arranged the mass, and reduced it, when separated, into elements.]

The supreme God had dwelt from all eternity in a pleroma of inaccessible light; and beside the name of first Father, or first Principle, they called him also Bythus, as if to denote the unfathomable nature of his perfections. This being, by an operation purely mental, or by acting upon himself, produced two other beings of different sexes, from whom, by a series of descents, more or less numerous according to different schemes, several pairs of beings were formed, who were called æons, from the periods of their existence before time was, or emanations, from the mode of their production. These successive æons or emanations appear to have been inferior each to the preceding; and their existence was indispensable to the Gnostic scheme, that they might account for the creation of the world

without making God the author of evil. These æons lived through countless ages with their first father; but the system of emanations seems to have resembled that of concentric circles; and they gradually deteriorated, as they approached nearer and nearer to the extremity of the pleroma. Beyond this pleroma was matter, inert and powerless, though coëternal with the supreme God, and like him without beginning. At length, one of the æons passed the limits of the pleroma, and, meeting with matter, created the world, after the form and model of an ideal world which existed in the pleroma or in the mind of the supreme God. Here it is that inconsistency is added to absurdity in the Gnostic scheme. For, let the intermediate æons be as many as the wildest imagination could devise, still God was the remote, if not the proximate, cause of creation. Added to which, we are to suppose that the Demiurgus formed the world without the knowledge of God; and that, having formed it, he rebelled against him. Here, again, we find a strong resemblance to the oriental doctrine of two principles, good and evil, or light and darkness. The two principles were always at enmity with each other. God must have been conceived to be more powerful than matter, or an emanation from God could not have shaped and moulded it into form: yet God was not able to reduce matter into its primeval chaos, nor to destroy the evil which the Demiurgus had produced. What God could not prevent, he was always endeavouring to cure: and here 408 it is that the Gnostics borrowed so largely from the Christian scheme. The names, indeed, of several of their æons were evidently taken from terms which they found in the Gospel. Thus we meet with Logos, Monogenes, Zoe, Ecclesia, all of them successive emanations from the supreme God, and all dwelling in the pleroma. At length, we meet with Christ and the Holy Ghost, as two of the last æons which were put forth. Christ was sent into the world to remedy the evil which the creative æon or Demiurgus had caused. He was to emancipate men from the tyranny of matter, or of the evil principle; and, by revealing to them the true God, who was hitherto unknown, to fit them, by a perfection and sublimity of knowledge, to enter the divine pleroma. To give this knowledge, was the end and object of Christ's coming upon earth; and hence the inventors and believers of the doctrine assumed to themselves the name of Gnostics. In all their notions concerning Christ, we still find them struggling with the same difficulty of reconciling the author of good with the existence of evil. Christ, as being an emanation from God, could have no real connection with matter: yet, the Christ of the Gnostics was held out to be the same with him who was revealed in the Gospel; and it was notorious that he was revealed as the Son of Mary, who appeared in a human form. The methods which they took to extricate themselves from the difficulty, were principally two: they either denied that Christ had a real body at all, and held that he was an unsubstantial phantom; or, granting that there was a man called Jesus, the

son of human parents, they believed that one of the æons, called Christ, quitted the pleroma, and descended upon Jesus at his baptism.

3. We have seen that the God who was the father or progenitor of Christ, was not considered to be the creator of the world. Neither was he the God of the Old Testament, and the giver of the Mosaic law. This notion was supported by the same argument which infidels have often urged, that the God of the Jews is represented as a God of vengeance and of cruelty; but it was also a natural consequence of their fundamental principle, that the author of good cannot in any manner be the author of evil. In accordance with this notion, we find all the Gnostics agreed in rejecting the Jewish Scriptures, or, at least, in treating them with contempt. Since they held that the supreme God was revealed for the first time to mankind by Christ, he could not have been the God who inspired the prophets; and yet, with that strange inconsistency which we have already observed in them, they appealed to these very Scriptures in support of their own doctrines. They believed the prophets to have been inspired by the same creative æon, or the same principle of evil, which acted originally upon matter; and if their writings had come down to us, we should perhaps find them arguing, that, though the prophets were not inspired by the supreme God, they still could not help giving utterance to truth.

4. Their same abhorrence of matter, and their same notion concerning that purity of knowledge which Christ came upon earth to impart, led them to reject the Christian doctrines of a future resurrection and a general judgment. They seem to have understood the Apostles as preaching literally a resurrection of the body; and it is certain that the fathers insisted upon this very strongly as an article of belief. But to imagine that the body, a mass of created and corruptible matter, could ever enter into heaven, into that pleroma which was the dwelling of the supreme God, was a notion which violated the fundamental principle of the Gnostics. According to their scheme, no resurrection was necessary, much less a final judgment. The Gnostic, the man who had attained to perfect knowledge, was gradually emancipated from the grossness of matter; and, by an imperceptible transition, which none but a Gnostic could comprehend, he was raised to be an inhabitant of the divine pleroma. If we would know the effect which the doctrines of the Gnostics had upon their moral conduct, we shall find that the same principle led to two very opposite results. Though the fathers may have exaggerated the errors of their opponents, it seems undeniable, that many Gnostics led profligate lives, and maintained upon principle that such conduct was not unlawful. Others, again, are represented as practising great austerities, and endeavouring, by every means, to mortify the body and its sensual appetites. Both parties were actuated by the same common notion, that matter is inherently evil. The

one thought that the body, which is compounded of matter, ought to be kept in subjection; and hence they inculcated self-denial, and the practice of moral virtue: while others, who had persuaded themselves that knowledge was every thing, despised the distinctions of the moral law, which was given, as they said, not by the supreme God, but by an inferior æon, or a principle of evil, who had allied himself with matter.

5. With respect to the origin of this system the same author observes: There is no system of philosophy which has been traced to a greater number of sources than that which we are now discussing; and the variety of opinions seems to have arisen from persons either not observing the very different aspects which Gnosticism assumed, or from wishing to derive it from one exclusive quarter. Thus, some have deduced it from the eastern notion of a good and evil principle, some from the Jewish Cabbala, and others from the doctrines of the later Platonists. Each of these systems is able to support itself by alleging very strong resemblances; and those persons have taken the most natural and probably the truest course, who have concluded that all these opinions contributed to build up the monstrous system, which was known by the name of Gnosticism.

GOAT, עו. There are other names or appellations given to the goat, as, 1. 1. השופ, Kings xx, 27, which means the ram-goat, or leader of the flock. 2. עתודים, a word which never occurs but in the plural, and means, the best prepared, or choicest of the flock; and metaphorically princes, as, Zech. x, 3, "I will visit the goats, saith the Lord," that is, I will begin my vengeance with the princes of the people. "Hell from beneath is moved for thee, to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the great goats of the earth," Isaiah xiv, 9; all the kings, all the great men. And Jeremiah, speaking of the princes of the Jews, says, "Remove out of the midst of Babylon, and be as the he-goats before the flocks," Jer. 1, 8. 3. צפיר, a name for the goat, of Chaldee origin, and found only in Ezra vi, 17; viii, 35; Daniel viii, 5, 21. 4. עואול, from עו, a goat, and אול, to wander about, Leviticus xvi, 8, "the scape-goat." 5. שער, hairy, or shaggy, whence שעירים, "the shaggy ones." In Lev. xvii, 7, it is said, "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils," (seirim, "hairy ones,") "after whom they have gone a whoring." The word here means idolatrous images of goats, worshipped by the Egyptians. It is the same word that is translated satyrs, in Isaiah xiii, 21; where the LXX render it δαίμόνια, demons. But here they have ματασις, to vain things or idols, which comes to the same sense. What gives light to so obscure a passage is what we read in Maimonides, that the Zabian idolaters worshipped demons under the figure of goats, imagining them to appear in that form, whence they called them by the names of seirim; and that this custom, being spread among other nations, gave occasion to this precept. In like manner we learn from Herodotus, that the

Egyptians of Mendes held goats to be sacred animals, and represented the god Pan with the legs and head of that animal. From those ancient idolaters the same notion seems to have been derived by the Greeks and Romans, who represented their Pan, their fauns, satyrs, and other idols, in the form of goats: from all which it is highly probable, that the Israelites had learned in Egypt to worship certain demons, or sylvan deities, under the symbolical figure of goats. Though the phrase, “after whom they have gone a whoring,” is equivalent in Scripture to that of committing idolatry, yet we are not to suppose that it is not to be taken in a literal sense in many places, even where it is used in connection with idolatrous acts of worship. It is well known that Baal-peor and Ashtaroth were worshipped with unclean rites, and that public prostitution formed a grand part of the worship of many deities among the Egyptians, Moabites, Canaanites, &c.

The goat was one of the clean beasts which the Israelites might both eat and offer in sacrifice. The kid, קרי, is often mentioned as a food, in a way that implies that it was considered as a delicacy. The אקו, or wild goat, mentioned Deut. xiv, 5, and no where else in the Hebrew Bible, is supposed to be the tragelaphus, or “goat-deer.” Schultens conjectures that this animal might have its name, ob fugacitatem, from its shyness, or running away. The word יעל, occurs 1 Sam. xxiv, 3; Job xxxix, 1; Psalm civ, 18; Prov. v, 19: and various have been the sentiments of interpreters on the animal intended by it. Bochart insists that it is the ibex, or “rock-goat.” The root whence the name is derived, signifies to ascend, to mount; and the ibex is famous for clambering, climbing, and leaping, on the most craggy precipices. The Arab writers attribute to the jaal very long horns, bending backward; consequently it cannot be the chamois. The horns of the jaal are reckoned among the valuable articles of traffic, Ezek. xxvii, 15. The ibex is finely shaped, graceful in its motions, and gentle in its manners. The female is particularly celebrated by natural historians for tender affection to her young, and the incessant vigilance with which she watches over their safety; and also for ardent attachment and fidelity to her mate.

GOD, an immaterial, intelligent, and free Being; of perfect goodness, wisdom, and power; who made the universe, and continues to support it, as well as to govern and direct it, by his providence. Philologists have hitherto considered the word God as being of the same signification with good; and this is not denied by M. Hallenberg. But he thinks that both words originally denoted unity; and that the root is אהד, unus; whence the Syriac Chad and Gada; the Arabic Ahd and Gahd; the Persic Choda and Chuda; the Greek ἀγαθός and γάθος; the Teutonic Gud; the German Gott; and our Saxon God. The other names of God, this author thinks, are referable to a similar origin.

2. By his immateriality, intelligence, and freedom, God is distinguished from Fate, Nature, Destiny, Necessity, Chance, Anima Mundi, and from all the other fictitious beings acknowledged by the Stoics, Pantheists, Spinozists, and other sorts of Atheists. The knowledge of God, his nature, attributes, word, and works, with the relations between him and his creatures, makes the subject of the extensive science called theology. In Scripture God is defined by, "I am that I am; Alpha and Omega; the Beginning and End of all things." Among philosophers, he is defined a Being of infinite perfection; or in whom there is no defect of any thing which we conceive may raise, improve, or exalt his nature. He is the First Cause, the First Being, who has existed from the beginning, has created the world, or who subsists necessarily, or of himself.

3. The plain argument, says Maclaurin, in his "Account of Sir I. Newton's Philosophical Discoveries," for the existence of the Deity, obvious to all, and carrying irresistible conviction with it, is from the evident contrivance and fitness of things for one another, which we meet with throughout all parts of the universe. There is no need of nice or subtle reasonings in this matter; a manifest contrivance immediately suggests a contriver. It strikes us like a sensation; and artful reasonings against it may puzzle us, but it is without shaking our belief. No person, for example, that knows the principles of optics, and the structure of the eye, can believe that it was formed without skill in that science; or that the ear was formed without the knowledge of sounds; or that the male and female in animals were not formed for each other, and for continuing the species. All our accounts of nature are full of instances of this kind. The admirable and beautiful structure of things for final causes, exalts our idea of the Contriver; the unity of design shows him to be one. The great motions in the system performed with the same facility as the least, suggest his almighty power, which gave motion to the earth and the celestial bodies with equal ease as to the minutest particles. The subtilty of the motions and actions in the internal parts of bodies, shows that his influence penetrates the inmost recesses of things, and that he is equally active and present every where. The simplicity of the laws that prevail in the world, the excellent disposition of things, in order to obtain the best ends, and the beauty which adorns the works of nature, far superior to any thing in art, suggest his consummate wisdom. The usefulness of the whole scheme, so well contrived for the intelligent beings that enjoy it, with the internal disposition and moral structure of these beings themselves, shows his unbounded goodness. These are arguments which are sufficiently open to the views and capacities of the unlearned, while at the same time they acquire new strength and lustre from the discoveries of the learned. The Deity's acting and interposing in the universe, show that he governs as well as formed it; and the depth of his counsels, even in conducting the material



universe, of which a great part surpasses our knowledge, keeps up an inward veneration and awe of this great Being, and disposes us to receive what may be otherwise revealed to us concerning him. It has been justly observed, that some of the laws of nature now known to us must have escaped us if we had wanted the sense of seeing. It may be in his power to bestow upon us other senses, of which we have at present no idea; without which it may be impossible for us to know all his works, or to have more adequate ideas of himself. In our present state, we know enough to be satisfied of our dependency upon him, and of the duty we owe to him, the Lord and Disposer of all things. He is not the object of sense; his essence, and, indeed, that of all other substances, are beyond the reach of all our discoveries; but his attributes clearly appear in his admirable works. We know that the highest conceptions we are able to form of them, are still beneath his real perfections; but his power and dominion over us, and our duty toward him, are manifest.

4. Though God has given us no innate ideas of himself, says Mr. Locke, yet, having furnished us with those faculties our minds are endowed with, he hath not left himself without a witness; since we have sense, perception, and reason, and cannot want a clear proof of him as long as we carry ourselves about us. To show, therefore, that we are capable of knowing, that is, of being certain that there is a God, and how we may come by this certainty, I think we need go no farther than ourselves, and that undoubted knowledge we have of our own existence. I think it is beyond question, that man has a clear perception of his own being; he knows certainly that he exists, and that he is something. In the next place, man knows, by an intuitive certainty, that bare nothing can no more produce any real being, than it can be equal to two right angles. If, therefore, we know there is some real Being, it is an evident demonstration, that from eternity there has been something; since what was not from eternity had a beginning; and what had a beginning must be produced by something else. Next it is evident, that what has its being from another must also have all that which is in, and belongs to, its being from another too; all the powers it has must be owing to, and derived from, the same source. This eternal source, then, of all being must be also the source and original of all power; and so this eternal Being must be also the most powerful. Again: man finds in himself perception and knowledge: we are certain, then, that there is not only some Being, but some knowing, intelligent Being, in the world. There was a time, then, when there was no knowing Being, or else there has been a knowing Being from eternity. If it be said there was a time when that eternal Being had no knowledge, I reply, that then it is impossible there should have ever been any knowledge; it being as impossible that things wholly void of knowledge, and operating blindly, and without any perception, should produce a knowing Being, as it is impossible that a triangle should make

itself three angles bigger than two right ones. Thus from the consideration of ourselves, and what we infallibly find in our own constitutions, our reason leads us to the knowledge of this certain and evident truth, that there is an eternal, most powerful, and knowing Being, which, whether any one will call God, it matters not. The thing is evident; and from this idea, duly considered, will easily be deduced all those other attributes we ought to ascribe to this eternal Being. From what has been said, it is plain to me, that we have a more certain knowledge of the existence of a God, than of any thing our senses have not immediately discovered to us. Nay, I presume I may say that we more certainly know that there is a God, than that there is any thing else without us. When I say we know, I mean, there is such a knowledge within our reach, which we cannot miss, if we will but apply our minds to that as we do to several other inquiries. It being then unavoidable for all rational creatures to conclude that something has existed from eternity, let us next see what kind of thing that must be. There are but two sorts of beings in the world that man knows or conceives; such as are purely material without sense or perception, and sensible, perceiving beings, such as we find ourselves to be. These two sorts we shall call cogitative and incogitative beings; which to our present purpose are better than material and immaterial. If, then, there must be something eternal, it is very obvious to reason that it must be a cogitative being; because it is as impossible to conceive that bare incogitative matter should ever produce a thinking, intelligent being, as that nothing should of itself produce matter. Let us suppose any parcel of matter eternal, we shall find it in itself unable to produce any thing. Let us suppose its parts firmly at rest together, if there were no other being in the world, must it not eternally remain so, a dead inactive lump? Is it possible to conceive that it can add motion to itself, or produce any thing? Matter, then, by its own strength cannot produce in itself so much as motion. The motion it has must also be from eternity, or else added to matter by some other being, more powerful than matter. But let us suppose motion eternal too, yet matter, incogitative matter, and motion could never produce thought: knowledge will still be as far beyond the power of nothing to produce. Divide matter into as minute parts as you will, vary its figure and motion as much as you please, it will operate no otherwise upon other bodies of proportionable bulk, than it did before this division. The minutest particles of matter knock, impel, and resist one another, just as the greater do; so that if we suppose nothing eternal, matter can never begin to be; if we suppose bare matter without motion eternal, motion can never begin to be; if we suppose only matter and motion to be eternal, thought can never begin to be; for it is impossible to conceive that matter, either with or without motion, could have originally in and from itself, sense, perception, and knowledge, as is evident from hence, that then sense, perception, and knowledge must be a property eternally inseparable from matter, and every particle of it. Since,

therefore, whatsoever is the first eternal Being must necessarily be cogitative; and whatsoever is first of all things must necessarily contain in it, and actually have, at least all the perfections that can ever after exist, it necessarily follows, that the first eternal Being cannot be matter. If, therefore, it be evident that something must necessarily exist from eternity, it is also evident that that something must necessarily be a cogitative Being. For it is as impossible that incogitative matter should produce a cogitative Being, as that nothing, or the negation of all being, should produce a positive Being or matter.

This discovery of the necessary existence of an eternal mind sufficiently leads us to the knowledge of God. For it will hence follow, that all other knowing beings that have a beginning must depend upon him, and have no other ways of knowledge or extent of power than what he gives them; and therefore if he made those, he made also the less excellent pieces of this universe, all inanimate bodies, whereby his omniscience, power, and providence will be established, and from thence all his other attributes necessarily follow.

5. In the Scriptures no attempt is made to prove the existence of a God; such an attempt would have been entirely useless, because the fact was universally admitted. The error of men consisted, not in denying a God, but in admitting too many; and one great object of the Bible is to demonstrate that there is but one. No metaphysical arguments, however, are employed in it for this purpose. The proof rests on facts recorded in the history of the Jews, from which it appears that they were always victorious and prosperous so long as they served the only living and true God, Jehovah, the name by which the Almighty made himself known to them, and uniformly unsuccessful when they revolted from him to serve other gods. What argument could be so effectual to convince them that there was no god in all the earth but the God of Israel? The sovereignty and universal providence of the Lord Jehovah are proved by predictions delivered by the Jewish prophets, pointing out the fate of nations and of empires, specifying distinctly their rise, the duration of their power, and the causes of their decline; thus demonstrating that one God ruled among the nations, and made them the unconscious instruments of promoting the purposes of his will. In the same manner, none of the attributes of God are demonstrated in Scripture by reasoning; they are simply affirmed and illustrated by facts; and instead of a regular deduction of doctrines and conclusions from a few admitted principles, we are left to gather them from the recorded feelings and devotional expressions of persons whose hearts were influenced by the fear of God. These circumstances point out a marked singularity in the Scriptures, considered as a repository of religious doctrines. The writers, generally speaking, do not reason, but exhort and remonstrate; they do not

attempt to fetter the judgment by the subtleties of argument, but to rouse the feelings by an appeal to palpable facts. This is exactly what might have been expected from teachers acting under a divine commission, and armed with undeniable facts to enforce their admonitions.

6. In three distinct ways do the sacred writers furnish us with information on this great and essential subject, the existence and the character of God; from the names by which he is designated; from the actions ascribed to him; and from the attributes with which he is invested in their invocations and praises; and in those lofty descriptions of his nature which, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have recorded for the instruction of the world. These attributes will be considered under their respective heads; but the impression of the general view of the divine character, as thus revealed, is too important to be omitted.

7. The names of God as recorded in Scripture convey at once ideas of overwhelming greatness and glory, mingled with that awful mysteriousness with which, to all finite minds, and especially to the minds of mortals, the divine essence and mode of existence must ever be invested. Though One he is אלהים, Elohim, Gods, persons adorable. He is יהוה, Jehovah, self-existing; אל, El, strong, powerful; אהיה, Ehieh, I am, I will be, self-existence, independency, all-sufficiency, immutability, eternity; שדי, Shaddai, almighty, all-sufficient; אדון, Adon, Supporter, Lord, Judge. These are among the adorable appellatives of God which are scattered throughout the revelation that he has been pleased to make of himself: but on one occasion he was pleased more particularly to declare his name, that is, such of the qualities and attributes of the divine nature as mortals are the most interested in knowing; and to unfold, not only his natural, but also those of his moral attributes by which his conduct toward his creatures is regulated. "And the Lord passed by and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and fourth generation," Exodus xxxiv. This is the most ample and particular description of the character of God, as given by himself in the sacred records; and the import of the several titles by which he has thus in his infinite condescension manifested himself, has been thus exhibited. He is not only Jehovah, self-existent, and El, the strong or mighty God; but he is, says Dr. A. Clarke, רחום, Rochum, the merciful Being, who is full of tenderness and compassion; חנון, Chanun, the gracious One, he whose nature is goodness itself, the loving God. ארך פים, Erec Apayim, long-suffering, the Being who, because of his tenderness, is not easily irritated, but suffers long and is kind; רב, Rab, the great or mighty One; חסד, Chesed,

the bountiful Being, he who is exuberant in his beneficence; אֵפֶת, Emeth, the Truth, or True One, he alone who can neither deceive nor be deceived; נֹצֵר חֶסֶד, Notser Chesed, the Preserver of bountifulness, he whose beneficence never ends, keeping mercy for thousands of generations, showing compassion and mercy while the world endures; נִשָּׂא עוֹן וּפְשָׁע, Nose avon vapesha vechataah, he who bears away iniquity, transgression, and sin; properly the Redeemer, the Pardoner, the Forgiver, the Being whose prerogative it is to forgive sin, and save the soul; נִקְהָה לֹא, Nakeh lo yinnakeh, the righteous Judge, who distributes justice with an impartial hand; and פָּקֵד עֵין, Paked avon, &c, he who visits iniquity, he who punishes transgressors, and from whose justice no sinner can escape; the God of retributive and vindictive justice.”

8. The second means by which the Scriptures convey to us the knowledge of God, is by the actions which they ascribe to him. They contain, indeed, the important record of his dealings with men in every age which is comprehended within the limit of the sacred history; and, by prophetic declaration, they also exhibit the principles on which he will govern the world to the end of time: so that the whole course of the divine administration may be considered as exhibiting a singularly illustrative comment upon those attributes of his nature which, in their abstract form, are contained in such declarations as those which have been just quoted. The first act ascribed to God is that of creating the heavens and the earth out of nothing; and by his fiat alone arranging their parts, and peopling them with living creatures. By this were manifested--his eternity and self-existence, as he who creates must be before all creatures, and he who gives being to others can himself derive it from none:--his almighty power, shown both in the act of creation and in the number and vastness of the objects so produced:--his wisdom, in their arrangement, and in their fitness to their respective ends:--and his goodness, as the whole tended to the happiness of sentient beings. The foundations of his natural and moral government are also made manifest by his creative acts. In what he made out of nothing he had an absolute right and prerogative: it awaited his ordering, and was completely at his disposal; so that to alter or destroy his own work, and to prescribe the laws by which the intelligent and rational part of his creatures should be governed, are rights which none can question. Thus on the one hand his character of Lord or Governor is established, and on the other our duty of lowly homage and absolute obedience.

9. Agreeably to this, as soon as man was created, he was placed under a rule of conduct. Obedience was to be followed with the continuance of the divine favour; transgression, with death. The event called forth new manifestations of the character of God. His tender mercy, in the

compassion showed to the fallen pair; his justice, in forgiving them only in the view of a satisfaction to be hereafter offered to his justice by an innocent representative of the sinning race; his love to that race, in giving his own Son to become this Redeemer, and in the fulness of time to die for the sins of the whole world; and his holiness, in connecting with this provision for the pardon of man the means of restoring him to a sinless state, and to the obliterated image of God in which he had been created. Exemplifications of the divine mercy are traced from age to age, in his establishing his own worship among men, and remitting the punishment of individual and national offences in answer to prayer offered from penitent hearts, and in dependence upon the typified or actually offered universal sacrifice:--of his condescension, in stooping to the cases of individuals; in his dispensations both of providence and grace, by showing respect to the poor and humble; and, principally, by the incarnation of God in the form of a servant, admitting men into familiar and friendly intercourse with himself, and then entering into heaven to be their patron and advocate, until they should be received unto the same glory, "and so be for ever with the Lord:"--of his strictly righteous government, in the destruction of the old world, the cities of the plain, the nations of Canaan, and all ancient states, upon their "filling up the measure of their iniquities;" and, to show that "he will by no means clear the guilty;" in the numerous and severe punishments inflicted even upon the chosen seed of Abraham, because of their transgressions:--of his long-suffering, in frequent warnings, delays, and corrective judgments inflicted upon individuals and nations, before sentence of utter excision and destruction:--of faithfulness and truth, in the fulfilment of promises, often many ages after they were given, as in the promises to Abraham respecting the possession of the land of Canaan by his seed, and in all the "promises made to the fathers" respecting the advent, vicarious death, and illustrious offices of the "Christ," the Saviour of the world:--of his immutability, in the constant and unchanging laws and principles of his government, which remain to this day precisely the same, in every thing universal, as when first promulgated, and have been the rule of his conduct in all places as well as through all time:--of his prescience of future events, manifested by the predictions of Scripture:--and of the depth and stability of his counsel, as illustrated in that plan and purpose of bringing back a revolted world to obedience and felicity, which we find steadily kept in view in the Scriptural history of the acts of God in former ages; which is still the end toward which all his dispensations bend, however wide and mysterious their sweep; and which they will finally accomplish, as we learn from the prophetic history of the future, contained in the Old and New Testaments.

Thus the course of divine operation in the world has from age to age been a manifestation of the divine character, continually receiving new and

stronger illustrations until the completion of the Christian revelation by the ministry of Christ and his inspired followers, and still placing itself in brighter light and more impressive aspects as the scheme of human redemption runs on to its consummation. From all the acts of God as recorded in the Scriptures, we are taught that he alone is God; that he is present every where to sustain and govern all things; that his wisdom is infinite, his counsel settled, and his power irresistible; that he is holy, just, and good; the Lord and the Judge, but the Father and the Friend, of man.

10. More at large do we learn what God is, from the declarations of the inspired writings. As to his substance, that "God is a Spirit." As to his duration, that "from everlasting to everlasting he is God;" "the King, eternal, immortal, invisible." That, after all the manifestations he has made of himself, he is, from the infinite perfection and glory of his nature, incomprehensible: "Lo, these are but parts of his ways, and how little a portion is heard of him!" "Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out." That he is unchangeable: "The Father of Lights, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." That "he is the fountain of life," and the only independent Being in the universe: "Who only hath immortality." That every other being, however exalted, has its existence from him: "For by him were all things created, which are in heaven and in earth, whether they are visible or invisible." That the existence of every thing is upheld by him, no creature being for a moment independent of his support: "By him all things consist;" "upholding all things by the word of his power." That he is omnipresent: "Do not I fill heaven and earth with my presence, saith the Lord?" That he is omniscient: "All things are naked and open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do." That he is the absolute Lord and Owner of all things: "The heavens, even the heaven of heavens, are thine, and all the parts of them:" "The earth is thine, and the fulness thereof, the world and them that dwell therein:" "He doeth according to his will in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth." That his providence extends to the minutest objects: "The hairs of your head are all numbered:" "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father." That he is a Being of unspotted purity and perfect rectitude: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts!" "A God of truth, and in whom is no iniquity:" "Of purer eyes than to behold iniquity." That he is just in the administration of his government: "Shall not the Judge of the whole earth do right?" "Clouds and darkness are round about him; judgment and justice are the habitation of his throne." That his wisdom is unsearchable: "O the depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" And, finally, that he is good and merciful: "Thou art good, and thy mercy endureth for ever:" "His tender mercy is over all his works:" "God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love

wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ:” “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them:” “God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.”

11. Under these deeply awful but consolatory views, do the Scriptures present to us the supreme object of our worship and trust; and they dwell upon each of the above particulars with inimitable sublimity and beauty of language, and with an inexhaustible variety of illustration. Nor can we compare these views of the divine nature with the conceptions of the most enlightened of Pagans, without feeling how much reason we have for everlasting gratitude, that a revelation so explicit, and so comprehensive, should have been made to us on a subject which only a revelation from God himself could have made known. It is thus that Christian philosophers, even when they do not use the language of the Scriptures, are able to speak on this great and mysterious doctrine, in language so clear, and with conceptions so noble; in a manner too so equable, so different from the sages of antiquity, who, if at any time they approach the truth when speaking of the divine nature, never fail to mingle with it some essentially erroneous or grovelling conception. “By the Word of God,” 414 says Dr. Barrow, “we mean a Being of infinite wisdom, goodness, and power, the Creator and the Governor of all things, to whom the great attributes of eternity and independency, omniscience and immensity, perfect holiness and purity, perfect justice and veracity, complete happiness, glorious majesty, and supreme right of dominion belong; and to whom the highest veneration, and most profound submission and obedience are due.” “Our notion of Deity,” says Bishop Pearson, “doth expressly signify a Being or Nature of infinite perfection; and the infinite perfection of a being or nature consists in this, that it be absolutely and essentially necessary; an actual Being of itself; and potential, or causative of all beings beside itself, independent from any other, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed.” “God is a Being,” says Lawson, “and not any kind of being; but a substance, which is the foundation of other beings. And not only a substance, but perfect. Yet many beings are perfect in their kind, yet limited and finite. But God is absolutely, fully, and every way infinitely perfect; and therefore above spirits, above angels, who are perfect comparatively. God’s infinite perfection includes all the attributes, even the most excellent. It excludes all dependency, borrowed existence, composition, corruption, mortality, contingency, ignorance, unrighteousness, weakness, misery, and all imperfections whatever. It includes necessity of being, independency, perfect unity, simplicity, immensity, eternity, immortality; the most perfect life, knowledge, wisdom, integrity, power, glory, bliss, and all these in the highest degree. We cannot pierce into the secrets of this eternal Being. Our reason



comprehends but little of him, and when it can proceed no farther, faith comes in, and we believe far more than we can understand; and this our belief is not contrary to reason; but reason itself dictates unto us, that we must believe far more of God than it can inform us of." To these we may add an admirable passage from Sir Isaac Newton: "The word God frequently signifies Lord; but every lord is not God; it is the dominion of a spiritual Being or Lord that constitutes God; true dominion, true God; supreme, the Supreme; feigned, the false god. From such true dominion it follows, that the true God is living, intelligent, and powerful; and from his other perfections, that he is supreme, or supremely perfect; he is eternal and infinite; omnipotent and omniscient; that is, he endures from eternity to eternity; and is present from infinity to infinity. He governs all things that exist, and knows all things that are to be known; he is not eternity or infinity, but eternal and infinite; he is not duration or space, but he endures and is present; he endures always, and is present every where; he is omnipresent, not only virtually, but also substantially; for power without substance cannot subsist. All things are contained and move in him, but without any mutual passion; he suffers nothing from the motions of bodies; nor do they undergo any resistance from his omnipresence. It is confessed, that God exists necessarily, and by the same necessity he exists always and every where. Hence also he must be perfectly similar, all eye, all ear, all arm, all the power of perceiving, understanding, and acting; but after a manner not at all corporeal, after a manner not like that of men, after a manner wholly to us unknown. He is destitute of all body, and all bodily shape; and therefore cannot be seen, heard, or touched; nor ought he to be worshipped under the representation of any thing corporeal. We have ideas of the attributes of God, but do not know the substance of even any thing; we see only the figures and colours of bodies, hear only sounds, touch only the outward surfaces, smell only odours, and taste tastes; and do not, cannot, by any sense, or reflex act, know their inward substances; and much less can we have any notion of the substance of God. We know him by his properties and attributes."

12. Many able works in proof of the existence of God have been written, the arguments of which are too copious for us even to analyze. It must be sufficient to say that they all proceed, as it is logically termed, either *à priori*, from cause to effect, or, which is the safest and most satisfactory mode, *à posteriori*, from the effect to the cause. The irresistible argument from the marks of design with which all nature abounds, to one great intelligent, designing Cause, is by no writers brought out in so clear and masterly a manner as by Howe, in his "Living temple," and Paley, in his "Natural Theology."

GODS, in the plural, is used of the false deities of the Heathens, many of which were only creatures to whom divine honours and worship were superstitiously paid. The Greeks and Latins, it is observable, did not mean, by the name God, an all-perfect being, whereof eternity, infinity, omnipresence, &c, were essential attributes: with them the word only implied an excellent and superior nature; and, accordingly, they give the appellation gods to all beings of a rank or class, higher or more perfect than that of men, and especially to those who were inferior agents in the divine administration, all subject to the one Supreme. Thus men themselves, according to their system, might become gods after death, inasmuch as their souls might attain to a degree of excellence superior to what they were capable of in life. The first idols, or false gods, that are said to have been adored were the stars, sun, moon, &c, on account of the light, heat, and other benefits which we derive from them. (See Idolatry.) Afterward the earth came to be deified, for furnishing fruits necessary for the subsistence of men and animals: then fire and water became objects of divine worship, for their usefulness to human life. In process of time, and by degrees, gods became multiplied to infinity; and there was scarce any thing but the weakness or caprice of some devotee or other, elevated into the rank of deity: things useless or even destructive not excepted. The principal of the ancient gods, 415whom the Romans called *dii majorum gentium*, and Cicero celestial gods, Varro select gods, Ovid *nobiles deos*, others *consentes deos*, were Jupiter, Juno, Vesta, Minerva, Ceres, Diana, Venus, Mars, Mercury, Neptune, Vulcan, and Apollo. Jupiter is considered as the god of heaven; Neptune, as god of the sea; Mars, as the god of war; Apollo, of eloquence, poetry, and physic; Mercury, of thieves; Bacchus, of wine; Cupid, of love, &c. A second sort of gods, called *demi-gods*, *semi-dii*, *dii minorum gentium*, *indigetes*, or gods adopted, were men canonized and deified. As the greater gods had possession of heaven by their own right, these secondary deities had it by merit and donation, being translated into heaven because they had lived as gods upon earth.

2. The Heathen gods may be all reduced to the following classes: (1.) Created spirits, angels, or demons, whence good and evil gods; *Genii*, *Lares*, *Lemures*, *Typhones*, guardian gods, infernal gods, &c. (2.) Heavenly bodies; as, the sun, moon, and other planets; also, the fixed stars, constellations, &c. (3.) Elements; as air, earth, ocean, Ops, Vesta; the rivers, fountains, &c. (4.) Meteors. Thus the Persians adored the wind: thunder and lightning were honoured under the name of Geryon; and several nations of India and America have made themselves gods of the same. Castor, Pollux, Helena, and Iris, have also been preferred from meteors to be gods; and the like has been practised in regard to comets: witness that which appeared at the murder of Cæsar. (5.) They erected minerals or fossils into deities. Such was the *Bætylus*. The Finlanders

adored stones; the Scythians, iron; and many nations, silver and gold. (6.) Plants have been made gods. Thus leeks and onions were deities in Egypt; the Sclavi, Lithuanians, Celtæ, Vandals, and Peruvians, adored trees and forests; the ancient Gauls, Britons, and Druids, paid a particular devotion to the oak; and it was no other than wheat, corn, seed, &c, that the ancients adored under the names of Ceres and Proserpina. (7.) They took themselves gods from among the waters. The Syrians and Egyptians adored fishes; and what were the Tritons, the Nereids, Syrens, &c, but fishes? Several nations have adored serpents; particularly the Egyptians, Prussians, Lithuanians, Samogitians, &c. (8.) Insects, as flies and ants, had their priests and votaries. (9.) Among birds, the stork, raven, sparrowhawk, ibis, eagle, grisson, and lapwing have had divine honours; the last in Mexico, the rest in Egypt and at Thebes. (10.) Four-footed beasts have had their altars; as the bull, dog, cat, wolf, baboon, lion, and crocodile, in Egypt and elsewhere; the hog in the island of Crete; rats and mice in the Troas, and at Tenedos; weasels at Thebes; and the porcupine throughout all Zoroaster's school. (11.) Nothing was more common than to place men among the number of deities; and from Belus or Baal, to the Roman emperors before Constantine, the instances of this kind are innumerable: frequently they did not wait so long as their deaths for the apotheosis. Nebuchadnezzar procured his statue to be worshipped while living; and Virgil shows that Augustus had altars and sacrifices offered to him; as we learn from other hands that he had priests called Augustales, and temples at Lyons, Narbona, and several other places, and he must be allowed the first of the Romans in whose behalf idolatry was carried to such a pitch. The Ethiopians deemed all their kings gods: the Velleda of the Germans, the Janus of the Hungarians, and the Thaut, Woden, and Assa of the northern nations, were indisputably men. (12.) Not men only, but every thing that relates to man, has also been deified; as labour, rest, sleep, youth, age, death, virtues, vices, occasion, time, place, numbers, among the Pythagoreans; the generative power, under the name of Priapus. Infancy alone had a cloud of deities; as, Vegetanus, Levana, Rumina, Edufa, Potina, Cuba, Cumina, Carna, Ossilago, Statulinus, Fabulinus, &c. They also adored the gods Health, Fever, Fear, Love, Pain, Indignation, Shame, Impudence, Opinion, Renown, Prudence, Science, Art, Fidelity, Felicity, Calumny, Liberty, Money, War, Peace, Victory, Triumph, &c. Lastly, Nature, the universe, or τὸ πᾶν, was reputed a great god.

3. Hesiod has a poem under the title of Θεογονία, that is, “The Generation of the Gods,” in which he explains their genealogy and descent, sets forth who was the first and principal, who next descended from him, and what issue each had: the whole making a sort of system of Heathen theology. Beside this popular theology, each philosopher had his system, as may be seen from the “Timæus” of Plato, and Cicero “De Natura Deorum.” Justin

Martyr, Tertullian, Arnobius, Minutius Felix, Lactantius, Eusebius, St. Augustine, and Theodoret, show the vanity of the Heathen gods. It is very difficult to discover the real sentiments of the Heathens with respect to their gods: they are exceedingly intricate and confused, and even frequently contradictory. They admitted so many superior and inferior gods, who shared the empire, that every place was full of gods. Varro reckons up no less than thirty thousand adored within a small extent of ground, and yet their number was every day increasing. In modern oriental Paganism they amount to many millions, and are, in fact, innumerable.

4. The name of God, in Hebrew, Elohim, is very ambiguous in Scripture. The true God is often called so, as are sometimes angels, judges, and princes, and sometimes idols and false gods; for example: "God created the heaven and the earth," Gen. i, 1. The Hebrew Elohim denotes, in this place, the true God. "He who sacrificeth unto any god, (Elohim,) shall be put to death," Exodus xxii, 20. And again: "Among the gods there is none like unto thee," Psalm lxxxvi, 8. Princes, magistrates, and great men are called gods in the following passages: "If a slave is desirous to continue with his master, he shall be brought to the judges," Exod. xxi, 6, in the original, to the gods. Again: "If the thief be not found, then the master of the house shall be brought unto the judges," Exod. xxii, 8, in the original, to the gods; and in the twenty-eighth verse of the same chapter, "Thou shalt not speak evil of the gods;" that is, of the judges or great men. The Psalmist says that the Lord "judgeth among the gods," Psalm lxxxii, 1. And again, God says to Moses, "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh," Exod. vii, 1. The pious Israelites had so great an aversion and such an extreme contempt for strange gods, that they scorned even to mention them; they disguised and disfigured their names by substituting in the room of them some term of contempt; for example, instead of Elohim, they called them Elilim, "nothings, gods of no value;" instead of Mephibaal, Meribaal, and Jerubaal, they said "Mephibosheth, Meribosheth, and Jeribosheth." Baal signifies master, husband; and bosheth, something to be ashamed of, something apt to put one in confusion. God forbade the Israelites to swear by strange gods, and to pronounce the names of them in their oaths, Exod. xxiii, 13.

GODLINESS, strictly taken, signifies right worship, or devotion; but, in general, it imports the whole of practical religion, 1 Tim. iv, 8; 2 Peter i, 6.

GOEL, גֹּאֵל, the avenger of blood. The inhabitants of the east, it is well known, are now, what they anciently were, exceedingly revengeful. If, therefore, an individual should unfortunately happen to lay violent hands upon another person and kill him, the next of kin is bound to avenge the death of the latter, and to pursue the murderer with unceasing vigilance

until he have caught and killed him, either by force or by fraud. The same custom exists in Arabia, and it appears to have been alluded to by Rebecca: when she learned that Esau was threatening to kill his brother Jacob, she endeavoured to send the latter out of the country, saying, "Why should I be bereft of you both in one day?" Gen. xxvii, 15. She could not be afraid of the magistrate for punishing the murderer, for the patriarchs were subject to no superior in Palestine; and Isaac was much too partial to Esau for her to entertain any expectation that he would condemn him to death for it. It would therefore appear that she dreaded lest he should fall by the hand of the blood avenger, perhaps of some Ishmaelite. The office, therefore, of the goel was in use before the time of Moses; and it was probably filled by the nearest of blood to the party killed, as the right of redeeming a mortgage field is given to him. To prevent the unnecessary loss of life through a sanguinary spirit of revenge, the Hebrew legislator made various enactments concerning the blood avenger. In most ages and countries, certain reputed sacred places enjoyed the privileges of being asylums; Moses, therefore, taking it for granted that the murderer would flee to the altar, commanded that when the crime was deliberate and intentional, he should be torn even from the altar, and put to death, Exod. xxi, 14. But in the case of unintentional murder, the man-slayer was enjoined to flee to one of the six cities of refuge, which were appropriated for his residence. The roads to these cities, it was enacted, should be kept in such a state that the unfortunate individual might meet with no impediment whatever in his way, Deut. xix, 3. If the goel overtook the fugitive before he reached an asylum, and put him to death, he was not considered as guilty of blood; but if the man-slayer had reached a place of refuge, he was immediately protected, and an inquiry was instituted whether he had a right to such protection and asylum, that is, whether he had caused his neighbour's death undesignedly, or was a deliberate murderer. In the latter case he was judicially delivered to the goel, who might put him to death in whatever way he chose; but in the former case the homicide continued in the place of refuge until the high priest's death, when he might return home in perfect security. If, however, the goel found him without the city, or beyond its suburbs, he might slay him without being guilty of blood, Numbers xxxv, 26, 27. Farther, to guard the life of man, and prevent the perpetration of murder, Moses positively prohibited the receiving of a sum of money from a murderer in the way of compensation, Numbers xxxv, 31. It would seem that if no avenger of blood appeared, or if he were dilatory in the pursuit of the murderer, it became the duty of the magistrate himself to inflict the sentence of the law; and thus we find that David deemed this to be his duty in the case of Joab, and that Solomon, in obedience to his father's dying entreaty, actually discharged it by putting that murderer to death, 1 Kings ii, 5; vi, 28–34. There is a beautiful allusion to the blood avenger in Heb. vi, 17, 18.

The following extracts will prove how tenaciously the eastern people adhere to the principle of revenging the death of their relations and friends:-

-"Among the Circassians," says Pallas, "all the relatives of the murderers are considered as guilty. This customary infatuation to revenge the blood of relations generates most of the feuds, and occasions great bloodshed among all the tribes of Caucasus; for unless pardon be purchased, or obtained by intermarriage between the two families, the principle of revenge is propagated to all succeeding generations. If the thirst of vengeance is quenched by a price paid to the family of the deceased, this tribute is called thlil-uasa, or, 'the price of blood;' but neither princes nor usdens accept such compensation, as it is an established law among them to demand blood for blood." "The Nubians," observes Light, "possess few traces among them of government, or law, or religion. They know no master, although the cashief claims a nominal command of the country. They look for redress of injuries to their own means of revenge, which, in cases of blood, extends from one generation to another, till blood is repaid by blood. On this account they are obliged to be ever on the watch, and armed: and in this manner even their daily labours are carried on; the very boys are armed." "If one Nubian," remarks Burckhardt, "happen to kill another, he is obliged to pay the debt of blood to the family of the deceased, and a fine to the governors of six camels, a cow, and seven sheep, or they are taken from his relations. Every wound inflicted has its stated fine, consisting of sheep and dhourra, but varying in quantity, according to the parts of the body wounded." "When a man or woman is murdered," says Malcolm, "the moment the person by whom the act was perpetrated is discovered, the heir-at-law to the deceased demands vengeance for the blood. Witnesses are examined, and if the guilt be established, the criminal is delivered into his hands, to deal with as he chooses. It is alike legal for him to forgive him, to accept a sum of money as the price of blood, or to put him to death. It is only a few years ago that the English resident at Abusheher saw three persons delivered into the hands of the relations of those whom they had murdered. They led their victims bound to the burial ground, where they put them to death; but the part of the execution that appeared of the most importance, was to make the infant children of the deceased stab the murderers with knives, and imbrue their little hands in the blood of those who had slain their father. The youngest princes of the blood that could hold a dagger were made to stab the assassins of Aga Mahomed Khan. When they were executed, the successor of Nadir Shah sent one of the murderers of that monarch to the females of his harem, who, we are told, were delighted to become his executioners."

GOG AND MAGOG. Moses speaks of Magog, son of Japheth, but says nothing of Gog, Gen. x, 2. According to Ezekiel, Gog was prince of Magog,

Ezek. xxxviii, 2, 3, &c; xxxix, 1, 2, &c. Magog signifies the country or people, and Gog the king of that country; the general name of the northern nations of Europe and Asia, or the districts north of the Caucasus, or Mount Taurus. The prophecy of Ezekiel, xxxix, 1–22, seems to be revived in the Apocalypse, where the hosts of Gog and Magog are represented as coming to invade “the beloved city,” and perishing with immense slaughter likewise in Armageddon, “the mount of Mageddo,” or Megiddo, Rev. xvi, 14–16; xx, 7–10.

GOLD, זהב, Gen. xxiv, 22, and very frequently in all other parts of the Old Testament; χρυσος, Matt. xxiii, 16, 17, &c; the most perfect and valuable of the metals. In Job xxviii, 15–18, 19, gold is mentioned five times, and four of the words are different in the original: 1. סגור, which may mean “gold in the mine,” or “shut up,” as the root signifies, “in the ore.” 2. כתם, kethem, from כתם, catham, “to sign,” “seal,” or “stamp;” gold made current by being coined; standard gold, exhibiting the stamp expressive of its value. 3. זהב, wrought gold, pure, highly polished gold. 4. פז, denoting solidity, compactness, and strength; probably gold formed into different kinds of plate, or vessels. Jerom, in his comment on Jer. x, 9, writes “Septem dominibus apud Hebræos appellatur aurum.” The seven names, which he does not mention, are as follows, and thus distinguished by the Hebrews: 1. Zahab, gold in general. 2. Zahab tob, good gold, of a more valuable kind, Gen. ii, 12. 3. Zahab Ophir, gold of Ophir, 1 Kings ix, 28, such as was brought by the navy of Solomon. 4. Zahab muphaz, solid gold, pure, wrought gold, translated, 1 Kings x, 18, “the best gold.” 5. Zahab shachut, beaten gold, 2 Chron. ix, 15. 6. Zahab segor, shut up gold; either as mentioned above, gold in the ore, or as the rabbins explain it, “gold shut up in the treasuries,” gold in bullion. 7. Zahab parvaim, 2 Chron. iii, 6. To these Buxtorf adds three others: 1. כתם, pure gold of the circulating medium. 2. לצר, gold in the treasury. 3. הרצו, choice, fine gold. Arabia had formerly its golden mines. “The gold of Sheba,” Psalm lxxii, 15, is, in the Septuagint and Arabic versions, “the gold of Arabia.” Sheba was the ancient name of Arabia Felix. Mr. Bruce, however, places it in Africa, at Azab. The gold of Ophir, so often mentioned, must be that which was procured in Arabia, on the coast of the Red Sea. We are assured by Sanchoniathon, as quoted by Eusebius, and by Herodotus, that the Phenicians carried on a considerable traffic with this gold even before the days of Job, who speaks of it, xxii, 24.

GOLIATH, a famous giant of the city of Gath, who was slain by David, 1 Sam. xvii, 4, 5, &c. See Giants.

GOMER, the eldest son of Japheth, by whom a great part of Asia Minor was first peopled, and particularly that extensive tract which was called

Phrygia, including the sub-divisions of Mysia, Galatia, Bithynia, Lycaonia, &c. The colonies of Gomer extended into Germany, Gaul, (in both of which traces of the name are preserved,) and Britain, which was undoubtedly peopled from Gaul. Among the descendants of the ancient inhabitants of this island, namely, the Welsh, the words Kumero and Kumeraeg, the names of the people and the language, sufficiently point out their origin. In fact, under the names of Cimmerii, Cimbri, Cymrig, Cumbri, Umbri, and Cambri, the tribes of Gomerians extended themselves from the Euxine to the Atlantic, and from Italy to the Baltic; having added to their original names those of Celts, Gauls, Galatæ, and Gaels, superadded.

GOMORRAH, one of the five cities of the Pentapolis, consumed by fire, Genesis xix, 24, &c. See Dead Sea.

GOSHEN. This was the most fertile pasture ground in the whole of Lower Egypt; thence called Goshen, from gush, in Arabic, signifying “a heart,” or whatsoever is choice or precious. There was also a Goshen in the territory of the tribe of Judah, so called for the same reason, Joshua x, 41. Hence Joseph recommended it to his family as “the best of the land,” Gen. xlvii, 11, and “the fat of the land,” Gen. xlv, 18. The land of Goshen lay along the most easterly branch of the Nile, and on the east side of it; for it is evident that, at the time of the exode, the Israelites did not cross the Nile. In ancient times, the fertile land was considerably more extensive, both in length and breadth, than at present, in consequence of the general failure of the eastern branches of the Nile; the main body of the river verging more and more to the west continually, and deepening the channels on that side.

GOSPEL, a history of the life, actions, death, resurrection, ascension, and doctrine of Jesus Christ. The word is Saxon, and of the same import with the Latin term *evangelium*, or the Greek *εὐαγγέλιον*, which signifies “glad tidings,” or “good news;” the history of our Saviour being the best history ever published to mankind. This history is contained in the writings of St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John, who from thence are called evangelists. The Christian church never acknowledged any more than these four Gospels as canonical: notwithstanding which, several apocryphal gospels are handed down to us, and others are entirely lost. The four Gospels contain each of them the history of our Saviour’s life and ministry; but we must remember, that no one of the evangelists undertook to give an account of all the miracles which Christ performed, or of all the instructions which he delivered. They are written with different degrees of conciseness; but every one of them is sufficiently full to prove that Jesus was the promised Messiah, the Saviour of the world, who had been



predicted by a long succession of prophets, and whose advent was expected at the time of his appearance, both by Jews and Gentiles.

2. That all the books which convey to us the history of events under the New Testament were written and immediately published by persons contemporary with the events, is most fully proved by the testimony of an unbroken series of authors, reaching from the days of the evangelists to the present times; by the concurrent belief of Christians of all denominations; and by the unreserved confession of avowed enemies to the Gospel. In this point of view the writings of the ancient fathers of the Christian church are invaluable. They contain not only frequent references and allusions to the books of the New Testament, but also such numerous professed quotations from them, that it is demonstratively certain that these books existed in their present state a few years after the conclusion of Christ's ministry upon earth. No unbeliever in the apostolic age, in the age immediately subsequent to it, or, indeed, in any age whatever, was ever able to disprove the facts recorded in these books; and it does not appear that in the early times any such attempt was made. The facts, therefore, related in the New Testament must be admitted to have really happened. But if all the circumstances of the history of Jesus, that is, his miraculous conception in the womb of the virgin, the time at which he was born, the place where he was born, the family from which he was descended, the nature of the doctrines which he preached, the meanness of his condition, his rejection, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension, with many other minute particulars; if all these various circumstances in the history of Jesus exactly accord with the predictions of the Old Testament relative to the promised Messiah, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed, it follows that Jesus was that Messiah. And again: if Jesus really performed the miracles as related in the Gospels, and was perfectly acquainted with the thoughts and designs of men, his divine mission cannot be doubted. Lastly: if he really foretold his own death and resurrection, the descent of the Holy Ghost, its miraculous effects, the sufferings of the Apostles, the call of the Gentiles, and the destruction of Jerusalem, it necessarily follows that he spake by the authority of God himself. These, and many other arguments, founded in the more than human character of Jesus, in the rapid propagation of the Gospel, in the excellence of its precepts and doctrines, and in the constancy, intrepidity, and fortitude of its early professors, incontrovertibly establish the truth and divine origin of the Christian religion, and afford to us, who live in these latter times, the most positive confirmation of the promise of our Lord, that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

3. The Gospels recount those wonderful and important events with which the Christian religion and its divine Author were introduced into the world,

and which have produced so great a change in the principles, the manners, the morals, and the temporal as well as spiritual condition of mankind. They relate the first appearance of Christ upon earth, his extraordinary and miraculous birth, the testimony borne to him by his forerunner, John the Baptist, the temptation in the wilderness, the opening of his divine commission, the pure, the perfect, and sublime morality which he taught, especially in his inimitable sermon on the mount, the infinite superiority which he showed to every other moral teacher, both in the matter and manner of his discourses, more particularly by crushing vice in its very cradle, in the first risings of wicked desires and propensities in the heart, by giving a decided preference to the mild, gentle, passive, conciliating virtues, before that violent, vindictive, high-spirited, unforgiving temper, which has been always too much the favourite character of the world; by requiring us to forgive our very enemies, and to do good to them that hate us; by excluding from our devotions, our alms, and all our virtues, all regard to fame, reputation, and applause; by laying down two great general principles of morality, love to God, and love to mankind, and deducing from thence every other human duty; by conveying his instructions under the easy, familiar, and impressive form of parables; by expressing himself in a tone of dignity and authority unknown before; by exemplifying every virtue that he taught in his own unblemished and perfect life and conversation; and, above all, by adding those awful sanctions, which he alone, of all moral instructors, had the power to hold out, eternal rewards to the virtuous, and eternal punishments to the wicked. The sacred narratives then represent to us the high character that he assumed; the claim he made to a divine original; the wonderful miracles he wrought in proof of his divinity; the various prophecies which plainly marked him out as the Messiah, the great Deliverer of the Jews; the declarations he made that he came to offer himself a sacrifice for the sins of all mankind; the cruel indignities, sufferings, and persecutions to which, in consequence of this great design, he was exposed; the accomplishment of it, by the painful and ignominious death to which he submitted, by his resurrection after three days from the grave, by his ascension into heaven, by his sitting there at the right hand of God, and performing the office of a Mediator and Intercessor for the sinful sons of men, till he shall come a second time in his glory to sit in judgment on all mankind, and decide their final doom of happiness or misery for ever. These are the momentous, the interesting, truths on which the Gospels principally dwell.

4. We find in the ancient records a twofold order, in which the evangelists are arranged. They stand either thus, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark; or thus, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. The first is made with reference to the character and the rank of the persons, according to which the Apostles precede their assistants and attendants (*ἀκολουθοῖς*, *comitibus*.) It is

observed in the oldest Latin translations and in the Gothic; sometimes also in the works of Latin teachers; but among all the Greek MSS. only in that at Cambridge. But the other, namely, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, is, in all the old translations of Asia and Africa, in all catalogues of the canonical books, and in Greek MSS. in general, the customary and established one as it regarded not personal circumstances, but as it had respect to chronological; which is to us a plain indication what accounts concerning the succession of the evangelists, the Asiatic, and Greek churches, and also those of Africa, had before them, when the Christian books were arranged in collections. It is a considerable advantage, says Michaëlis, that a history of such importance as that of Jesus Christ has been recorded by the pens of separate and independent writers, who, from the variations which are visible in these accounts, have incontestably proved that they did not unite with a view of imposing a fabulous narrative on mankind. That St. Matthew had never seen the Gospel of St. Luke, nor St. Luke the Gospel of St. Matthew, is evident from a comparison of their writings. The Gospel of St. Mark, which was written later, must likewise have been unknown to St. Luke; and that St. Mark had ever read the Gospel of St. Luke, is at least improbable, because their Gospels so frequently differ. It is a generally received opinion, that St. Mark made use of St. Matthew's Gospel in the composition of his own; but this is an unfounded hypothesis. The Gospel of St. John, being written after the other three, supplies what they had omitted. Thus have we four distinct and independent writers of one and the same history; and, though trifling variations may seem to exist in their narratives, yet these admit of easy solutions; and in all matters of consequence, whether doctrinal or historical, there is such a manifest agreement between them as is to be found in no other writings whatever. Though we have only four original writers of the life of Jesus, the evidence of the history does not rest on the testimony of four men. Christianity had been propagated in a great part of the world before any of them had written, on the testimony of thousands and tens of thousands, who had been witnesses of the great facts which they have recorded; so that the writing of these particular books is not to be considered as the cause, but rather the effect, of the belief of Christianity; nor could those books have been written and received as they were, namely, as authentic histories, of the subject of which all persons of that age were judges, if the facts they have recorded had not been well known to be true.

5. The term Gospel is often used in Scripture to signify the whole Christian doctrine: hence, "preaching the Gospel" is declaring all the truths, precepts, promises, and threatenings of Christianity. This is termed, "the Gospel of the grace of God," because it flows from God's free love and goodness, Acts xx, 24; and when truly and faithfully preached, is accompanied with

the influences of the divine Spirit. It is called, “the Gospel of the kingdom,” because it treats of the kingdom of grace, and shows the way to the kingdom of glory. It is styled, “the Gospel of Christ,” because he is the Author and great subject of it, Romans i, 16; and “the Gospel of peace and salvation,” because it publishes peace with God to the penitent and believing, gives, to such, peace of conscience and tranquillity of mind, and is the means of their salvation, present and eternal. As it displays the glory of God and of Christ, and ensures to his true followers eternal glory, it is entitled, “the glorious Gospel,” and, “the everlasting Gospel,” because it commenced from the fall of man, is permanent throughout all time, and produces effects which are everlasting.

GOVERNMENT OF THE HEBREWS. The posterity of Jacob, while remaining in Egypt, maintained, notwithstanding the augmentation of their numbers, that patriarchal form of government which is so prevalent among the nomades. Every father of a family exercised a father’s authority over those of his own household. Every tribe obeyed its own prince, *בשיא*, who was originally the first-born of the founder of the tribe, but who, in process of time, appears to have been elected. As the people increased in numbers, various heads of families united together, and selected some individual from their own body, who was somewhat distinguished, for their leader. Perhaps the choice was made merely by tacit consent; and, without giving him the title of ruler in form, they were willing, while convinced of his virtues, to render submission to his will. Such a union of families was denominated “the house of the father;” and “the house of the father of the families,” 420Num. iii, 24, 30, 35. In other instances, although the number varied, being sometimes more and sometimes less than a thousand, it was denominated, *אלף אלפים*, a thousand. “Now therefore present yourselves before the Lord by your tribes, and by your thousands;” “the thousands of Judah;” “the thousands of Israel,” &c, 1 Sam. x, 19; xxiii, 23; Judges vi, 15; Num. xxvi, 5–50. The heads of these united families were designated “heads of thousands,” Num. i, 16; x, 4. They held themselves in subjection to the “princes of the tribes.” Both the princes and heads of families are mentioned under the common names of *זקנים*, seniors or senators, and *ראשי שבטים* heads of tribes. Following the law of reason, and the rules established by custom, they governed with a paternal authority the tribes and united families; and, while they left the minor concerns to the heads of individual families, aimed to superintend and promote the best interests of the community generally. Originally, it fell to the princes of the tribes themselves to keep genealogical tables: subsequently, they employed scribes especially for this purpose, who, in the progress of time, acquired so great authority, that under the name of *שוטרים*, translated, in the English version, officers, they were permitted to exercise a share in the government of the nation. It was by magistrates of this description that the Hebrews

were governed while they remained in Egypt; and the Egyptian kings made no objection to it, Exod. iii, 16; v, 1, 14, 15, 19.

2. The posterity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were set apart and destined to the great object of preserving and transmitting the true religion, Gen. xviii, 16–20; xvii, 9–14; xii, 3; xxii, 18; xxviii, 14. Having increased in numbers, it appeared very evident that they could not live among nations given to idolatry without running the hazard of becoming infected with the same evil. They were, therefore, in the providence of God, assigned to a particular country, the extent of which was so small, that they were obliged, if they would live independently of other nations, to give up in a great measure the life of shepherds, and devote themselves to agriculture. Farther: very many of the Hebrews during their residence in Egypt had fallen into idolatrous habits. These were to be brought back again to the knowledge of the true God, and all were to be excited to engage in those undertakings which should be found necessary for the support of the true religion. All the Mosaic institutions aim at the accomplishment of these objects. The fundamental principle, therefore, of those institutions was this,--that the true God, the Creator and Governor of the universe, and none other, ought to be worshipped. To secure this end the more certainly, God became king to the Hebrews. Accordingly, the land of Canaan, which was destined to be occupied by them, was declared to be the land of Jehovah, of which he was to be the king, and the Hebrews merely the hereditary occupants. God promulgated, from the clouds of Mount Sinai, the prominent laws for the government of his people, considered as a religious community, Exod. xx. These laws were afterward more fully developed and illustrated by Moses. The rewards which should accompany the obedient, and the punishments which should be the lot of the transgressor, were at the same time announced, and the Hebrews promised by a solemn oath to obey, Exodus xxi-xxiv; Deut. xxvii-xxx.

3. In order to keep the true nature of the community fully and constantly in view, all the ceremonial institutions had reference to God, not only as the Sovereign of the universe, but as the King of the people. The people were taught to feel that the tabernacle was not only the temple of Jehovah, but the palace of their King; that the priests were the royal servants, and were bound to attend not only to sacred but to secular affairs, and were to receive, as their salary, the first tithes, which the people, as subjects, were led to consider a part of that revenue which was due to God, their immediate Sovereign. Other things of a less prominent and important nature had reference to the same great end. Since, therefore, God was the Sovereign, in a civil point of view as well as others, of Palestine and its inhabitants, the commission of idolatry by any inhabitant of that country, even a foreigner, was a defection from the true King. It was, in fact, treason;

was considered a crime equal in aggravation to that of murder; and was, consequently, attended with the severest punishment. Whoever invited or exhorted to idolatry was considered seditious, and was obnoxious to the same punishment. Incantations also, necromancy, and other practices of this nature, were looked upon as arts of a kindred aspect with idolatry itself; and the same punishment was to be inflicted upon the perpetrators of them as upon idolaters. The same rigour of inquiry after the perpetrators of idolatry was enforced, that was exhibited in respect to other crimes of the deepest aggravation; and the person who knew of the commission of idolatry in another was bound by the law to complain of the person thus guilty before the judge, though the criminal sustained the near relationship of a wife or a brother, a daughter or a son.

4. Many things in the administration of the government remained the same under the Mosaic economy, as it had been before. The authority which they had previously possessed, was continued in the time of Moses and after his time, to the princes of the tribes, to the heads of families and combinations of families, and to the genealogists, Num. xi, 16; Deut. xvi, 18; xx, 5; xxxi, 28. Yet Moses, by the advice of Jethro, his father-in-law, increased the number of rulers by the appointment of an additional number of judges; some to judge over ten, some over fifty, some over a hundred, and some over a thousand, men, Exodus xviii, 13–26. These judges were elected by the suffrages of the people from those who, by their authority and rank, might be reckoned among the rulers or princes of the people. The inferior judges, that is, those who superintended the judicial concerns of the smaller numbers, were subordinate to the superior judges, or those who judged a larger number; and cases, accordingly, of a difficult nature went up from the inferior to the superior judges. Those of a very difficult character, so much so as to be perplexing to the superior judges, were appealed to Moses himself, and in some cases from Moses to the high priest. The judges, of whom we have now spoken, sustained a civil as well as a judicial authority, and were included in the list of those who are denominated the elders and princes of Israel: that is to say, supposing they were chosen from the elders and princes, they did not forfeit their seat among them by accepting a judicial office; and, on the contrary, the respectability attached to their office, supposing they were not chosen from them, entitled them to be reckoned in their number, Deut. xxxi, 28; Joshua viii, 33; xxiii, 2; xxiv, 1. The various civil officers that have been mentioned, namely, judges, heads of families, genealogists, elders, princes of the tribes, &c, were dispersed, as a matter of course, in different parts of the country. Those of them, accordingly, who dwelt in the same city, or the same neighbourhood, formed the comitia, senate or legislative assembly of their immediate vicinity, Deut. xix, 12; xxv, 8, 9; Judges viii, 14; ix, 3–46; xi, 5; 1 Sam. viii, 4; xvi, 4. When all that dwelt in any particular tribe were

convened, they formed the legislative assembly of the tribe; and when they were convened in one body from all the tribes, they formed in like manner the legislative assembly of the nation, and were the representatives of all the people, Joshua xxiii, 1, 2; xxiv, 1. The priests, who were the learned class of the community, and beside were hereditary officers in the state, being set apart for civil as well as religious purposes, had, by the divine command, a right to a sitting in this assembly, Exod. xxxii, 29; Num. xxxvi, 15; viii, 5–26. Being thus called upon to sustain very different and yet very important offices, they became the subjects of that envy which would naturally be excited by the honour and the advantages attached to their situation. In order to confirm them in the duties which devolved upon them, and to throw at the greatest distance the mean and lurking principle just mentioned, God, after the sedition of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, sanctioned the separation of the whole tribe, which had been previously made to the service of religion and the state, by a most evident and striking miracle, Num. xvi, 1–7.

5. Each tribe was governed by its own rulers, and consequently to a certain extent constituted a civil community, independent of the other tribes, Judges xx, 11–46; 2 Sam. ii, 4; Judges i, 21. If any affair concerned the whole or many of the tribes, it was determined by them in conjunction in the legislative assembly of the nation, Judges xi, 1–11; 1 Chron. v, 10, 18, 19; 2 Sam. iii, 17; 1 Kings xii, 1–24. If one tribe found itself unequal to the execution of any proposed plan, it might connect itself with another, or even a number of the other tribes, Judges i, 1–3, 22; iv, 10; vii, 23, 24; viii, 1–3. But, although in many things each tribe existed by itself, and acted separately, yet in others they were united, and formed but one community: for all the tribes were bound together, so as to form one church and one civil community, not only by their common ancestors, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; not only by the common promises which they had received from those ancestors; not only by the need in which they stood of mutual counsel and assistance; but also by the circumstance that God was their common King, and that they had a common tabernacle for his palace, and a common sacerdotal and Levitical order for his ministers. Accordingly, every tribe exerted a sort of inspection over the others, as respected their observance of the law. If any thing had been neglected, or any wrong had been done, the particular tribe concerned was amenable to the others; and, in case justice could not be secured in any other way, might be punished with war, Joshua xxii, 9–34; Judges xx, 1, &c.

6. When we remember that God was expressly chosen the King of the people, and that he enacted laws and decided litigated points of importance, Numbers xvii, 1–11; xxvii, 1–11; xxxvi, 1–10; when we remember also that he answered and solved questions proposed, Num. xv, 32–41; Joshua

vii, 16–22; Judges i, 1, 2; xx, 18, 27, 28; 1 Sam. xiv, 37; xxiii, 9–12; xxx, 8; 2 Sam. ii, 1; that he threatened punishment, and that, in some instances, he actually inflicted it upon the hardened and impenitent, Num. xi, 33–35; xii, 1–15; xvi, 1–50; Lev. xxvi, 3–46; Deut. xxvi–xxx; when, finally, we take into account, that he promised prophets, who were to be, as it were, his ambassadors, Deut. xviii, and afterward sent them according to his promise, and that, in order to preserve the true religion, he governed the whole people by a striking and peculiar providence, we are at liberty to say, that God was, in fact, the Monarch of the people, and that the government was a theocracy. But, although the government of the Jews was a theocracy, it was not destitute of the usual forms which exist in civil governments among men. God, it is true, was the King, and the high priest, if we may be allowed so to speak, was his minister of state; but still the political affairs were in a great measure under the disposal of the elders, princes, &c. It was to them that Moses gave the divine commands, determined expressly their powers; and submitted their requests to the decision of God, Num. xiv, 5; xvi, 4, &c; xxvii, 5; xxxvi, 5, 6. It was in reference to the great power possessed by these men, who formed the legislative assembly of the nation, that Josephus pronounced the government to be aristocratical. But from the circumstance that the people possessed so much influence, as to render it necessary to submit laws to them for their ratification, and that they even took upon themselves sometimes to propose laws or to resist those which were enacted; from the circumstance also that the legislature of the nation had not the power of laying taxes, and that the civil code was regulated and enforced by God himself, independently of the legislature, Lowman and Michaëlis are in favour of considering the Hebrew government a democracy. In support of their opinion such passages are exhibited as the following, Exodus xix, 7, 8; xxiv, 3–8; Deut. xxix, 9–14; Joshua ix, 18, 19; xxiii, 1, &c; xxiv, 2, &c; 1 Samuel x, 24; xi, 14, 15; Num. xxvii, 1–8; xxxvi, 1–9. The truth seems to lie between these two opinions. The Hebrew government, putting out of view its theocratical feature, was of a mixed form, in some respects approaching to a democracy, in others assuming more of an aristocratical character.

7. From what has been said, it is clear, that the Ruler and supreme Head of the political community in question was God, who, with the design of promoting the good of his subjects, condescended to exhibit his visible presence in the tabernacle, wherever it travelled and wherever it dwelt. If, in reference to the assertion, that God was the Ruler of the Jewish state, it should be inquired what part was sustained by Moses, the answer is, that God was the Ruler, the people were his subjects, and Moses was the mediator or internuncio between them. But the title most appropriate to Moses, and most descriptive of the part he sustained, is that of legislator of the Israelites and their deliverer from the Egyptians. If the same question



should be put in respect to Joshua, the answer would be, that he was not properly the successor of Moses, and that, so far from being the ruler of the state, he was designated by the ruler to sustain the subordinate office of military leader of the Israelites in their conquest of the land of Canaan.

8. But, although the Hebrew state was so constituted, that beside God, the invisible King, and his visible servant, the high priest, there was no other general ruler of the commonwealth, yet it is well known that there were rulers of a high rank, appointed at various times, called שופט, a word which not only signifies a judge in the usual sense of the term, but any governor, or administrator of public affairs, 1 Sam. viii, 20; Isaiah xi, 4; 1 Kings iii, 9. The power lodged in these rulers, who are called judges in the Scriptures, seems to have been in some respects paramount to that of the general comitia of the nation, and we find that they declared war, led armies, concluded peace; and that this was not the whole, if indeed it was the most important part, of their duties. For many of the judges, for instance, Jair, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon, Eli, and Samuel, ruled the nation in peace. They might appropriately enough be called the supreme executive, exercising all the rights of sovereignty, with the exception of enacting laws, and imposing taxes. They were honoured, but they bore no external badges of distinction; they were distinguished, but they enjoyed no special privileges themselves, and communicated none to their posterity. They subserved the public good without emolument, that the state might be prosperous, that religion might be preserved, and that God alone might be King in Israel. It ought to be observed, however, that not all the judges ruled the whole nation: some of them presided over only a few separate tribes.

9. God, in the character of King, had governed the Israelites for sixteen ages. He ruled them, on the terms which he himself, through the agency of Moses, had proposed to them, namely, that if they observed their allegiance to him, they should be prosperous; if not, adversity and misery would be the consequence, Exod. xix, 4, 5; xxiii, 20–33; Lev. xxvi, 3–46; Deut. xxviii–xxx. We may learn from the whole book of Judges, and from the first eight chapters of Samuel, how exactly the result, from the days of Joshua down to the time of Samuel, agreed with these conditions. But in the time of Samuel, the government, in point of form, was changed into a monarchy. The election of king, however, was committed to God, who chose one by lot: so that God was still the Ruler, and the king the vicegerent. The terms of the government, as respected God, were the same as before, and the same duties and principles were inculcated on the Israelites as had been originally, 1 Sam. viii, 7; x, 17–23; xii, 14, 15, 20–22, 24, 25. In consequence of the fact, that Saul did not choose at all times to obey the commands of God, the kingdom was taken from him and given to another, 1 Sam. xiii, 5–14; xv, 1–31. David, through the agency of

Samuel, was selected by Jehovah for king, who thus gave a proof that he still retained, and was disposed to exercise, the right of appointing the ruler under him, 1 Samuel xvi, 1–3. David was first made king over Judah; but as he received his appointment from God, and acted under his authority, the other eleven tribes submitted to him, 2 Sam. v, 1–3; 1 Chron. xxviii, 4–6. David expressly acknowledged God as the Sovereign, and, as having a right to appoint the immediate ruler of the people, 1 Chron. xxviii, 7–10; he religiously obeyed his statutes, the people adhered firmly to God, and his reign was prosperous. The paramount authority of God, as the King of the nation, and his right to appoint one who should act in the capacity of his vicegerent, are expressly recognized in the books of Kings and Chronicles.

10. On the subversion of the Babylonian empire by Cyrus, the founder of the Persian monarchy, (B. C. 543,) he authorized the Jews, by an edict, to return into their own country, with full permission to enjoy their laws and religion, and caused the city and temple of Jerusalem to be rebuilt. In the following year, part of the Jews returned under Zerubbabel, and renewed their sacrifices: but the reërection of the city and temple being interrupted for several years by the treachery and hostility of the Samaritans or Cutheans, the avowed enemies of the Jews, the completion and dedication of the temple did not take place until the year B. C. 511, six years after the accession of Cyrus. The rebuilding of Jerusalem was accomplished, and the reformation of their ecclesiastical and civil polity was effected, by the two divinely inspired and pious governors, Ezra and Nehemiah; but the theocratic government does not appear to have been restored. The new temple was not, as formerly, God's palace; and the cloud of his presence did not take possession of it. After their death the Jews were governed by their high priests, in subjection however to the Persian kings, to whom they paid tribute, Ezra iv, 13; vii, 24, but with the full enjoyment of their other magistracies, as well as their liberties, civil and religious. Nearly three centuries of uninterrupted prosperity ensued, until the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, when they were most cruelly oppressed, and compelled to take up arms in their own defence. Under the able conduct of Judas, surnamed Maccabeus, and his valiant brothers, the Jews maintained a religious war for twenty-six years with five successive kings of Syria; and after destroying upward of two hundred thousand of their best troops, the Maccabees finally established the independence of their own country and the aggrandizement of their family. This illustrious house, whose princes united the regal and pontifical dignity in their own persons, administered the affairs of the Jews during a period of one hundred and twenty-six years; until, disputes arising between Hyrcanus II, and his brother Aristobulus, the latter was defeated by the Romans under Pompey, who captured Jerusalem, and reduced Judea to dependence, B. C. 59.

GOVERNOR. Judea having been reduced into a province by the Romans, they sent governors thither, who were subject not only to the emperors, but also to the governors of Syria, whereof Judea made a part.

GOURD, קיקיון, Jonah iv, 6, 7, 9, 10. Michaëlis, in his remarks on this subject, says, "Celsius appears to me to have proved that it is the kiki of the Egyptians." He refers it to the class of the ricinus, the great catapucus. According to Dioscorides, it is of rapid growth, and bears a berry from which an oil is expressed. In the Arabic version of this passage, which is to be found in Avicenna, it is rendered, "from thence is pressed the oil which they call oil of kiki, which is the oil of Alkeroa." So Herodotus says: "The inhabitants of the marshy grounds in Egypt make use of an oil, which they term the kiki, expressed from the Sillicyprian plant. In Greece this plant springs spontaneously, without any cultivation; but the Egyptians sow it on the banks of the river and of the canals; it there produces fruit in great abundance, but of a very strong odour. When gathered, they obtain from it, either by friction or pressure, an unctuous liquid, which diffuses an offensive smell, but for burning it is equal in quality to the oil of olives." This plant rises with a strong herbaceous stalk to the height of ten or twelve feet; and is furnished with very large leaves, not unlike those of the plane tree. Rabbi Kimchi says that the people of the east plant them before their shops for the sake of the shade, and to refresh themselves under them. Niebuhr says, "I saw, for the first time at Basra, the plant ei-keroa, mentioned in Michaëlis's 'Questions.' It has the form of a tree. The trunk appeared to me rather to resemble leaves than wood; nevertheless, it is harder than that which bears the Adam's fig. Each branch of the keroa has but one large leaf, with six or seven foldings in it. This plant was near to a rivulet, which watered it amply. At the end of October, 1765, it had risen in five months' time about eight feet, and bore at once flowers and fruit, ripe and unripe. Another tree of this species, which had not had so much water, had not grown more in a whole year. The flowers and leaves of it which I gathered withered in a few minutes; as do all plants of a rapid growth. This tree is called at Aleppo, palma Christi. An oil is made from it called oleum de keroa; oleum cicinum; oleum ficus infernalis. The Christians and Jews of Mosul (Nineveh) say, it was not the keroa whose shadow refreshed Jonah, but a sort of gourd, el-kera, which has very large leaves, very large fruit, and lasts but about four months." The epithet which the prophet uses in speaking of the plant, "son of the night it was, and, as a son of the night it died," does not compel us to believe that it grew in a single night, but, either by a strong oriental figure that it was of rapid growth, or akin to night in the shade it spread for his repose. The figure is not uncommon in the east, and one of our own poets has called the rose "child of the summer." Nor are we bound to take the expression "on the

morrow,” as strictly importing the very next day, since the word has reference to much more distant time, Exod. xiii, 14; Deut. vi, 20; Joshua iv, 6. It might be simply taken as afterward. But the author of “Scripture Illustrated” justly remarks, “As the history in Jonah expressly says, the Lord prepared this plant, no doubt we may conceive of it as an extraordinary one of its kind, remarkably rapid in its growth, remarkably hard in its stem, remarkably vigorous in its branches, and remarkable for the extensive spread of its leaves and the deep gloom of their shadow; and, after a certain duration, remarkable for a sudden withering, and a total uselessness to the impatient prophet.”

2. We read of the wild gourd in 2 Kings iv, 39; that Elisha, being at Gilgal during a great famine, bade one of his servants prepare something for the entertainment of the prophets who were in that place. The servant, going into the field, found, as our translators render it, some wild gourds, gathered a lapful of them, and, having brought them with him, cut them in pieces and put them into a pot, not knowing what they were. When they were brought to table, the prophets, having tasted them, thought they were mortal poison. Immediately, the man of God called for flour, threw it into the pot, and desired them to eat without any apprehensions. They did so, and perceived nothing of the bitterness whereof they were before sensible. This plant or fruit is called in Hebrew פקיעות and פקיעים 424. There have been various opinions about it. Celsius supposes it the colocynth. The leaves of the plant are large, placed alternate; the flowers white, and the fruit of the gourd kind, of the size of a large apple, which, when ripe, is yellow, and of a pleasant and inviting appearance, but, to the taste intolerably bitter, and proves a drastic purgative. It seems that the fruit, whatever it might have been, was early thought proper for an ornament in architecture. It furnished a model for some of the carved work of cedar in Solomon’s temple, 1 Kings vi, 18; vii, 24.

GRACE. This word is understood in several senses: for beauty, graceful form, and agreeableness of person, Prov. i, 9; iii, 22. For favour, friendship, kindness, Gen. vi, 8; xviii, 3; Rom. xi, 6; 2 Tim. i, 9. For pardon, mercy, undeserved remission of offences, Eph. ii, 5; Col. i, 6. For certain gifts of God, which he bestows freely, when, where, and on whom, he pleases; such are the gifts of miracles, prophecy, languages, &c, Rom. xv, 15; 1 Cor. xv, 10; Eph. iii, 8, &c. For the Gospel dispensation, in contradistinction to that of the law, Rom. vi, 14; 1 Peter v, 12. For a liberal and charitable disposition, 2 Cor. viii, 7. For eternal life, or final salvation, 1 Peter i, 13. In theological language grace also signifies divine influence upon the soul; and it derives the name from this being the effect of the great grace or favour of God to mankind. Austin defines inward actual grace to be the inspiration of love, which prompts us to practise according to what we

know, out of a religious affection and compliance. He says, likewise, that the grace of God is the blessing of God's sweet influence, whereby we are induced to take pleasure in that which he commands, to desire and to love it; and that if God does not prevent us with this blessing, what he commands, not only is not perfected, but is not so much as begun in us. Without the inward grace of Jesus Christ, man is not able to do the least thing that is good. He stands in need of this grace to begin, continue, and finish all the good he does, or rather, which God does in him and with him, by his grace. This grace is free; it is not due to us: if it were due to us, it would be no more grace; it would be a debt, Rom. xi, 6; it is in its nature an assistance so powerful and efficacious, that it surmounts the obstinacy of the most rebellious human heart, without destroying human liberty. There is no subject on which Christian doctors have written so largely, as on the several particulars relating to the grace of God. The difficulty consists in reconciling human liberty with the operation of divine grace; the concurrence of man with the influence and assistance of the Almighty. And who is able to set up an accurate boundary between these two things? Who can pretend to know how far the privileges of grace extend over the heart of man, and what that man's liberty exactly is, who is prevented, enlightened, moved, and attracted by grace?

GRAPE, עֵנָב, the fruit of the vine. There were fine vineyards and excellent grapes in the promised land. The bunch of grapes which was cut in the valley of Eshcol, and was brought upon a staff between two men to the camp of Israel at Kadeshbarnea, Num. xiii, 23, may give us some idea, of the largeness of the fruit in that country. It would be easy to produce a great number of witnesses to prove that the grapes in those regions grow to a prodigious size. By Calmet, Scheuchzer, and Harmer, this subject has been exhausted. Doubdan assures us, that in the valley of Eshcol were clusters of grapes to be found of ten or twelve pounds. Moses, in the law, commanded that when the Israelites gathered their grapes, they should not be careful to pick up those that fell, nor be so exact as to leave none upon the vines: what fell, and what were left behind, the poor had liberty to glean, Lev. xix, 10; Deut. xxiv, 21, 22. For the same beneficent purpose the second vintage was reserved: this, in those warm countries, was considerable, though never so good nor so plentiful as the former. The wise son of Sirach says, "I waked up last of all, as one that gleaneth after grape gatherers. By the blessing of the Lord, I profited, and filled my wine-press like a gatherer of grapes," Eccles. xxxiii, 16. It is frequent in Scripture to describe a total destruction by the similitude of a vine, stripped in such a manner, that there was not a bunch of grapes left for those who came to glean. The prophecy, "He shall wash his clothes in wine, and his garments in the blood of the grape," Gen. xlix, 11, means that he shall reside in a country where grapes were in abundance. The vineyards of Engedi and of

Sorek, so famous in Scripture, were in the tribe of Judah; and so was the valley of Eshcol, whence the spies brought those extraordinary clusters. "It appears," says Manti, "that the cultivation of the vine was never abandoned in this country. The grapes, which are white, and pretty large, are, however, not much superior in size to those of Europe. This peculiarity seems to be confined to those in this neighbourhood; for at the distance of only six miles to the south, is the rivulet and valley called Escokol, celebrated in Scripture for its fertility, and for producing very large grapes. In other parts of Syria, also, I have seen grapes of such an extraordinary size, that a bunch of them would be a sufficient burden for one man. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that when the spies, sent by Moses to reconnoitre the promised land, returned to give him an account of its fertility, it required two of them to carry a bunch of grapes, which they brought with them suspended from a pole placed upon their shoulders." Many eye witnesses assure us, that in Palestine the vines, and bunches of grapes, are almost of an incredible size. "At Beidtdjin," says Schultz, a "village near Ptolemais, we took our supper under a large vine, the stem of which was nearly a foot and a half in diameter, the height about thirty feet, and covered with its branches and shoots (for the shoots must be supported) a hut of more than fifty feet long and broad. The bunches of these grapes are so large that they weigh from ten to twelve pounds, and the grapes may be compared to our plumbs. Such a bunch is cut off and laid on a board, round which they seat themselves, and each helps himself to as many as he pleases." Forster, in his Hebrew Dictionary, (under the word Eshcol,) says, that he knew at Nurnburg, a monk of the name of Acacius, who had resided eight years in Palestine, and had also preached at Hebron, where he had seen bunches of grapes which were as much as two men could conveniently carry.

The wild grapes, אבשם, are the fruit of the wild or bastard vine; sour and unpalatable, and good for nothing but to make verjuice. In Isaiah v, 2–4, the Lord complains that he had planted his people as a choice vine, excellent as that of Sorek; but that its degeneracy had defeated his purpose, and disappointed his hopes: when he expected that it should bring forth choice fruit, it yielded only such as was bad; not merely useless and unprofitable grapes, but clusters offensive and noxious. By the force and intent of the allegory, says Bishop Lowth, "good grapes" ought to be opposed "to fruit of a dangerous and pernicious quality," as, in the application of it, to judgment is opposed tyranny, and to righteousness oppression. Hasselquist is inclined to believe that the prophet here means the solanum incanum, "hoary nightshade," because it is common in Egypt and Palestine, and the Arabian name agrees well with it. The Arabs call it aneb el dib, "wolf's grapes." The prophet could not have found a plant more opposite to the vine than this; for it grows much in the vineyards, and is very pernicious to them. It is likewise a vine. Jeremiah uses the same

image, and applies it to the same purpose, in an elegant paraphrase of this part of Isaiah's parable, in his flowing and plaintive manner: "I planted thee a Sorek, a scion perfectly genuine. How then art thou changed, and become to me the degenerate shoot of a strange vine!" Jer. ii, 21. From some sort of poisonous fruits of the grape kind, Moses, Deut. xxxii, 32, 33, has taken those strong and highly poetical images with which he has set forth the future corruption and extreme degeneracy of the Israelites, in an allegory which has a near relation, both in its subject and imagery, to this of Isaiah:-

"Their vine is from the vine of Sodom,  
 And from the fields of Gomorrah.  
 Their grapes are grapes of gall;  
 And their clusters are bitter.  
 Their wine is the poison of dragons,  
 And the deadly venom of aspics."

GRASS,  $\alpha\psi\delta$ , Gen. i, 11, the well known vegetable upon which flocks and herds feed, and which decks our fields, and refreshes our sight with its grateful verdure. Its feeble frame and transitory duration are mentioned in Scripture as emblematic of the frail condition and fleeting existence of man. The inspired poets draw this picture with such inimitable beauty as the laboured elegies on mortality of ancient and modern times have never surpassed. See Psalm xc, 6, and particularly Isaiah xl, 6–8: "The voice said, Cry! And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, because the Spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it. Verily this people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever." As, in their decay, the herbs of the fields strikingly illustrate the shortness of human life, so, in the order of their growth, from seeds dead and buried, they give a natural testimony to the doctrine of a resurrection. The Prophet Isaiah, and the Apostle Peter, both speak of bodies rising from the dead, as of so many seeds springing from the ground to renovated existence and beauty, although they do not, as some have absurdly supposed, consider the resurrection as in any sense analogous to the process of vegetation, Isaiah xxvi, 19; 1 Peter i, 24, 25.

It is a just remark of Grotius, that the Hebrews ranked the whole vegetable system under two classes,  $\gamma\epsilon$ , and  $\epsilon\psi\beta$ . The first is rendered  $\xi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\nu$ , or  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\rho\nu$ , tree: to express the second, the LXX have adopted  $\chi\acute{o}\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , as their common way to translate one Hebrew word by one Greek word, though not quite proper, rather than by a circumlocution. It is accordingly used in their version of Genesis i, 11, where the distinction first occurs, and in most other places. Nor is it with greater propriety rendered grass in English than  $\chi\acute{o}\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in Greek. The same division occurs in Matt. vi, 30, and Rev. viii, 7,

where our translators have in like manner had recourse to the term grass. Dr. Campbell prefers and uses the word herbage, as coming nearer the meaning of the sacred writer. Under the name herb is comprehended every sort of plant which has not, like trees and shrubs, a perennial stalk. That many, if not all, sorts of shrubs were included by the Hebrews under the denomination, tree, is evident from Jotham's apologue of the trees choosing a king, Judges ix, 7, where the bramble is mentioned as one. See Hay.

GRASSHOPPER, צבצב, Lev. xi, 22; Num. xiii, 33; 2 Chron. vii, 13; Eccles. xii, 5; Isaiah xl, 22; 2 Esdras iv, 24; Wisdom xvi, 9; Eccles. xliii, 17. Bochart supposes that this species of the locust has its name from the Arabic verb hajaba, "to veil," because, when they fly, as they often do, in great swarms, they eclipse even the light of the sun. "But I presume," says Parkhurst, "this circumstance is not peculiar to any particular kind of locust: I should rather, therefore, think it denotes the cucullated species, so denominated by naturalists from the cucullus, "cowl" or "hood," with which they are furnished, and which distinguishes them from the other kinds. In Scheuchzer may be seen several of this sort; and it will appear that this species nearly resemble our grasshopper." Our translators render the Hebrew word locust in the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple, 2 Chron. vii, 13, and with propriety. But it is rendered grasshopper, in Eccles. xii, 5, where Solomon, describing the infelicities of old age, says, "The grasshopper shall be a burden." "To this insect," says Dr. Smith, "the preacher compares 426a dry, shrunk, shrivelled, crumpling, craggy old man; his backbone sticking out, his knees projecting forward, his arms backward, his head downward, and the apophyses or bunching parts of the bones in general enlarged. And from this exact likeness, without all doubt, arose the fable of Tithonus, who, living to extreme old age, was at last turned into a grasshopper." Dr. Hodgson, referring it to the custom of eating locusts, supposes it to imply that luxurious gratification will become insipid; and Bishop Reynolds, that the lightest pressure of so small a creature shall be uncomfortable to the aged, as not being able to bear any weight. Other commentators suppose the reference to the chirping noise of the grasshopper, which must be disagreeable to the aged and infirm, who naturally love quiet, and are commonly unable to bear much noise. It is probable that here, also, a kind of locust is meant; and these creatures are proverbially loquacious. They make a loud, screaming, and disagreeable noise with their wings. If one begins, others join, and the hateful concert becomes universal. A pause then ensues, and, as it were, on a signal given, it again commences; and in this manner they continue squalling for two or three hours without intermission. The Prophet Isaiah contrasts the grandeur and power of God, and every thing reputed great in this world, by a very expressive reference to this insect: Jehovah sitteth on the circle of the earth,



and the inhabitants are to him as grasshoppers, Isaiah xl, 22. What atoms and inanities are they all before him, who sitteth on the circle of the immense heavens, and views the potentates of the earth in the light of grasshoppers, those poor insects that wander over the barren heath for sustenance, spend the day in insignificant chirpings, and take up their contemptible lodging at night on a blade of grass! See Locust.

GRECIA, or GREECE, both names occurring in the English Scriptures. The boundaries of the country which received this name differed under the different governments which ruled over it. Thus the Greece of the Old Testament is not exactly the same as that of the New: the former including Macedonia, Thessaly, Epirus, Hellas or Greece Proper, and the Peloponnesus or Morea; while the latter excludes Macedonia, Thessaly, and Epirus. But the Romans, in the time of the Apostles, had, in fact, made two divisions of these countries. The first, which was that of Macedonia, included also Thessaly and Epirus; and the other, that of Achaia, all the rest of Greece, which is, properly speaking, the Greece of the New Testament. But the term Greek admits of a larger interpretation, and applies not only to the inhabitants of Greece Proper, but to those of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, over nearly the whole of the former of which countries, and great part of the two latter, Grecian colonies and the Grecian language had extended themselves. In fact, in the two books of the Maccabees, and in those of the New Testament, the word Greek commonly implies a Gentile.

2. The Scripture has but little reference to Greece till the time of Alexander, whose conquests extended into Asia, where Greece had hitherto been of no importance. Yet that some intercourse was maintained with these countries from Jerusalem, may be inferred from the desire of Baasha to shut up all passage between Jerusalem and Joppa, which was its port, by the building of Ramah; and the anxiety of Asa to counteract his scheme, 1 Kings xv, 2, 17. Greece was certainly intended by the Prophet Daniel under the symbol of the single-horned goat; and it is probable that when he calls Greece Chittim, he spoke the language of the Hebrew nation, rather than that of the Persian court. After the establishment of the Grecian dynasties in Asia, Judea could not but be considerably affected by them; and the books of the Maccabees afford proofs of this. The Roman power, superseding the Grecian establishments, yet left traces of Greek language, customs, &c, to the days of the Herods, when the Gospel history commences. By the activity of the Apostles, and especially by that of St. Paul, the Gospel was propagated in those countries which used the Grecian dialects: hence, we are interested in the study of this language. Moreover as Greece, like all other countries, had its peculiar manners, we are not able to estimate properly an epistle written to those who dwell where they prevailed, without a competent acquaintance with the manners themselves, with the

sentiments and reasonings of those who practised them, and with the arguments employed in their defence by those who adhered to them.

GREEK LANGUAGE. It was because of the wide diffusion of this language that the New Testament was written in Greek. Its diction is not, however, that of the classical Greek, but it was chosen, no doubt, with a view to greater usefulness. In the age which succeeded Alexander the Great, the Greek language underwent an internal change of a double nature. In part, a prosaic language of books was formed, ἡ κοινὴ διαλεκτὸς, which was built on the Attic dialect, but was intermixed with not a few provincialisms; but a language of popular intercourse was also formed, in which the various dialects of the different Grecian tribes, heretofore separate, were more or less mingled together, while the Macedonian dialect was peculiarly prominent. The latter language constitutes the basis of the diction employed by the LXX, the writers of the Apocrypha, and of the New Testament. The style of the New Testament has a considerable affinity with that of the Septuagint version which was executed at Alexandria, although it approaches somewhat nearer to the idiom of the Greek language; but the peculiarities of the Hebrew phraseology are discernible throughout: the language of the New Testament being formed by a mixture of oriental idioms and expressions with those which are properly Greek. Hence it has, by some philologists, been termed Hebraic Greek, and (from the Jews having acquired the Greek language, rather by practice than by grammar, among the Greeks, in whose countries they resided in large communities) Hellenistic Greek. The propriety of this appellation was severely contested toward the close of the seventeenth, and in the early part of the eighteenth, century; and numerous publications were written on both sides of the question, with considerable asperity, which, together with the controversy, are now almost forgotten. The dispute, however interesting to the philological antiquarian, is after all a mere "strife of words;" and as the appellation of Hellenistic or Hebraic Greek is sufficiently correct for the purpose of characterizing the language of the New Testament, it is now generally adopted. A large proportion, however, of the phrases and constructions of the New Testament is pure Greek; that is to say, of the same degree of purity as the Greek which was spoken in Macedonia, and that in which Polybius wrote his Roman history. It should farther be noticed, that there occur in the New Testament, words that express both doctrines and practices which were utterly unknown to the Greeks; and also words bearing widely different interpretations from those which are ordinarily found in Greek writers. It contains examples of all the dialects occurring in the Greek language, as the Æolic, Bœtic, Doric, Ionic, and especially of the Attic; which, being most generally in use on account of its elegance, pervades every book of the New Testament.

2. A variety of solutions has been given to the question, why the New Testament was written in Greek. The true reason is, that it was the language most generally understood both by writers and readers; being spoken and written, read and understood, throughout the Roman empire, and particularly in the eastern provinces. To the universality of the Greek language, Cicero, Seneca, and Juvenal bear ample testimony: and the circumstances of the Jews having long had political, civil, and commercial relations with the Greeks, and being dispersed through various parts of the Roman empire, as well as their having cultivated the philosophy of the Greeks, of which we have evidence in the New Testament, all sufficiently account for their being acquainted with the Greek language. And if the eminent Jewish writers, Philo and Josephus, had motives for preferring to write in Greek, there is no reason, at least there is no general presumption, why the first publishers of the Gospel might not use the Greek language. It is indeed probable, that many of the common people were acquainted with it; though it is also certain the Christian churches being in many countries composed chiefly of that class of persons, some did not understand Greek. But in every church, says Macknight, there were persons endowed with the gift of tongues, and of the interpretation of tongues, who could readily turn the Apostles' Greek epistles into the language of the church to which they were sent. In particular, the president or the spiritual man, who read the Apostle's Greek letter to the Hebrews in their public assemblies, could without any hesitation render it into the Hebrew language, for the edification of those who did not understand Greek. And with respect to the Jews in the provinces, Greek being the native language of most of them, this epistle was much better calculated for their use, written in the Greek language, than if it had been written in the Hebrew, which few of them understood. Farther, it was proper that all the apostolical epistles should be written in the Greek language, because the different doctrines of the Gospel being delivered and explained in them, the explanation of these doctrines could with more advantage be compared so as to be better understood, being expressed in one language, than if, in the different epistles, they had been expressed in the language of the churches and persons to whom they were sent. Now what should that one language be, in which it was proper to write the Christian revelation, but the Greek, which was then generally understood, and in which there were many books extant; that treated of all kinds of literature, and on that account were likely to be preserved, and by the reading of which Christians, in after ages, would be enabled to understand the Greek of the New Testament? This advantage none of the provincial dialects used in the Apostles' days could pretend to. Being limited to particular countries, they were soon to be disused; and few (if any) books being written in them which merited to be preserved, the meaning of such of the Apostles' letters as were composed in the provincial languages could not easily have been ascertained.

GREEK CHURCH. As the Gospel spread in the first ages both east and west, the first Christian churches were so denominated. From the languages respectively used in their devotions, they were also called the Greek and Latin or Roman churches. For the first seven centuries these churches preserved a friendly communion with each other, notwithstanding they disagreed as to the time of keeping Easter, and some other points. But about the middle of the eighth century, disputes arose, which terminated in a schism, that continues to this day. It arose out of a controversy respecting the use of images in the churches. It happened that at this time both churches were under prelates equally dogmatical and ambitious. The patriarch of Constantinople insisted on putting down the use of all images and pictures, not only in his own church, but at Rome also, which the pope resented with equal violence and asperity. They mutually excommunicated each other; and the pope of Rome excommunicated not only the patriarch of Constantinople, but the emperor also. The controversy respecting images engendered another, no less bitter, respecting the procession of the Holy Ghost both from the Father and the Son, which the Greeks flatly denied, and charged the Romans with interpolating the word *filioque* into the ancient creeds. These controversies occupied the eighth and ninth centuries, after which some intervals of partial peace occurred; but in the eleventh century, the flame broke out afresh, and a total separation took place. At that time, the Patriarch Michael Cerularius, who was desirous to free himself from the papal authority, published an invective against the Latin church, and accused its members of maintaining various errors. Pope Leo retorted the charge, and sent legates from Rome to Constantinople. The Greek patriarch refused to see them; upon which they excommunicated him and his adherents, publicly, in the church of St. Sophia, A. D. 1054. The Greek patriarch excommunicated those legates, with all their adherents and followers, in a public council; and procured an order of the emperor for burning the act of excommunication which they had pronounced against the Greeks. Thus the separation was completed, and at this day a very considerable part of the world profess the religion of the Greek or eastern church. The Nicene and Athanasian creeds, with the exception of the words above-mentioned, are the symbols of their faith.

2. The principal points which distinguish the Greek church from the Latin, are as follows: they maintain that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only, and not from the Father and Son. They disown the authority of the pope, and deny that the church of Rome is the only true catholic church. They do not affect the character of infallibility, and utterly disallow works of supererogation, and indulgences. They admit of prayers and services for the dead, as an ancient and pious custom; but they will not admit the

doctrine of purgatory, nor determine any thing dogmatically concerning the state of departed souls. In baptism they practise triune immersion, or dip three times; but some, as the Georgians, defer the baptism of their children till they are three, four, or more years of age. The chrism, or baptismal unction, immediately follows baptism. This chrism, solemnly consecrated on Maunday Thursday, is called the unction with ointment, and is a mystery peculiar to the Greek communion, holding the place of confirmation in that of the Roman: it is styled, “the seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost.” They administer the Lord’s Supper in both kinds, dipping the bread in the cup of wine, in which a small portion of warm water is also inserted. They give it both to the clergy and laity, and to children after baptism. They exclude confirmation and extreme unction out of the number of sacraments; but they use the holy oil, which is not confined to persons in the close of life, like extreme unction, but is administered, if required, to all sick persons. Three priests, at least, are required to administer this sacrament, each priest, in his turn, anointing the sick person, and praying for his recovery. They deny auricular confession to be a divine command; but practise confession attended with absolution, and sometimes penance. Though they believe in transubstantiation, or rather consubstantiation, they do not worship the elements. They pay a secondary kind of adoration to the virgin and other saints. They do not admit of images or figures in bas-relief, or embossed work; but use paintings and silver shrines. They admit matrimony to be a sacrament, and celebrate it with great formality. Their secular clergy, under the rank of bishops, are allowed to marry once, and laymen twice; but fourth marriages they hold in abomination. They observe a great number of holy days, and keep four fasts in the year more solemn than the rest, of which Good Friday is the chief.

3. The service of the Greek church is too long and complicated to be particularly described in this work; the greater part consists in psalms and hymns. Five orders of priesthood belong to the Greek church; namely, bishops, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, and readers; which last includes singers, &c. The episcopal order is distinguished by the titles of metropolitan, archbishops, and bishops. The head of the Greek church, the patriarch of Constantinople, is elected by twelve bishops, who reside nearest that famous capital. This prelate calls councils by his own authority to govern the church. The other patriarchs are those of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, all nominated by the patriarch of Constantinople, who enjoys a most extensive jurisdiction. For the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, a synod, convened monthly, is composed of the heads of the church resident in Constantinople. In this assembly, the patriarch of Constantinople presides, with those of Antioch and Jerusalem, and twelve archbishops. In regard to discipline and worship, the Greek church has the same division of the clergy into regular and secular, the same spiritual

jurisdiction of bishops and their officials, the same distinction of ranks and offices, with the church of Rome.

4. The Greek church comprehends a considerable part of Greece, the Grecian isles, Wallachia, Moldavia, Egypt, Abyssinia, Nubia, Lybia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia, and Palestine; Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; the whole of the Russian empire in Europe; great part of Siberia in Asia, Astrachan, Casan, and Georgia.

GRIND. See Mill.

GROVE. It is proper to observe, that in order the more effectually to guard the Israelites from idolatry, the blessed God, in instituting the rites of his own worship, went directly counter to the practice of the idolatrous nations. Thus, because they worshipped in groves, he expressly forbade "the planting a grove of trees near his altar," Deut. xvi, 21. Nor would he suffer his people to offer their sacrifices on the tops of hills and mountains, as the Heathens did, but ordered that they should be brought to one altar in the place which he appointed, Deut. xii, 13, 14. And as for the groves, which the Canaanites had planted, and the idols and altars which they had erected on the tops of high mountains and hills for the worship of their gods, the Israelites are commanded utterly to destroy them, Deut. xii, 2, 3. The groves and high places do not seem to have been different, but <sup>429</sup>the same places, or groves planted on the tops of hills, probably round an open area, in which the idolatrous worship was performed, as may be inferred from the following words of the Prophet Hosea: "They sacrifice upon the tops of mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under oaks, and poplars, and elms," Hosea iv, 13. The use of groves for religious worship is generally supposed to have been as ancient as the patriarchal ages; for we are informed, that "Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the Lord," Gen. xxi, 33. However, it is not expressly said, nor can it by this passage be proved, that he planted the grove for any religious purpose; it might only be designed to shade his tent. And this circumstance perhaps is recorded to intimate his rural way of living, as well as his religious character; that he dwelt in a tent, under the shade of a grove, or tree, as the word *אֵשֶׁל*, *eshel*, may more properly be translated; and in this humble habitation led a very pious and devout life. The reason and origin of planting sacred groves is variously conjectured; some imagining it was only hereby intended to render the service more agreeable to the worshippers, by the pleasantness of the shade; whereas others suppose it was to invite the presence of the gods. The one or the other of these reasons seems to be intimated in the fore-cited passage of Hosea: "They burn incense under oaks, and poplars, and elms, because the shade thereof is good," Hosea iv, 13. Others conceive their worship was performed in the

midst of groves, because the gloom of such a place is apt to strike a religious awe upon the mind; or else, because such dark concealments suited the lewd mysteries of their idolatrous worship. Another conjecture, which seems as probable as any, is, that this practice began with the worship of demons, or departed souls. It was an ancient custom to bury the dead under trees, or in woods. "Deborah was buried under an oak, near Bethel," Genesis xxxv, 8; and the bones of Saul and Jonathan under a tree at Jabesh, 1 Samuel xxxi, 13. Now an imagination prevailing among the Heathen, that the souls of the deceased hover about their graves, or at least delight to visit their dead bodies, the idolaters, who paid divine honours to the souls of their departed heroes, erected images and altars for their worship in the same groves where they were buried; and from thence it grew into a custom afterward to plant groves, and build temples, near the tombs of departed heroes, 2 Kings xxiii, 15, 16, and to surround their temples and altars with groves and trees; and these sacred groves being constantly furnished with the images of the heroes or gods that were worshipped in them, a grove and an idol came to be used as convertible terms, 2 Kings xxiii, 6.

HABAKKUK, the author of the prophecy bearing his name, Habakkuk i, 1, &c. Nothing is certainly known concerning the tribe or birth place of Habakkuk. He is said to have prophesied about B. C. 605, and to have been alive at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. It is generally believed that he remained and died in Judea. The principal predictions contained in this book are, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the captivity of the Jews by the Chaldeans or Babylonians; their deliverance from the oppressor "at the appointed time;" and the total ruin of the Babylonian empire. The promise of the Messiah is confirmed; the overruling providence of God is asserted; and the concluding prayer, or rather hymn, recounts the wonders which God had wrought for his people, when he led them from Egypt into Canaan, and expresses the most perfect confidence in the fulfilment of his promises. The style of Habakkuk is highly poetical, and the hymn in the third chapter is perhaps unrivalled for sublimity, simplicity, and power.

HABITS. The dress of oriental nations, to which the inspired writers often allude, has undergone almost no change from the earliest times. Their stuffs were fabricated of various materials; but wool was generally used in their finer fabrics; and the hair of goats, camels, and even of horses, was manufactured for coarser purposes, especially for sackcloth, which they wore in time of mourning and distress. Sackcloth of black goat's hair was manufactured for mournings; the colour and the coarseness of which being reckoned more suitable to the circumstances of the wearer, than the finer and more valuable texture which the hair of white goats supplied. This is

the reason why a clouded sky is represented, in the bold figurative language of Scripture, as covered with sackcloth and blackness, the colour and dress of persons in affliction. In Egypt and Syria, they wore also fine linen, cotton, and byssus, probably fine muslin from India, in Hebrew כרצ, the finest cloth known to the ancients. In Canaan, persons of distinction were dressed in fine linen of Egypt; and according to some authors, in silk, and rich cloth, shaded with the choicest colours, or, as the Vulgate calls it, with feathered work, embroidered with gold. The beauty of their clothes consisted in the fineness and colour of the stuffs; and it seems, the colour most in use among the Israelites, as well as among the Greeks and Romans, was white, not imparted and improved by the dyer's art, but the native colour of the wool. The general use of this colour seems to be recognized by Solomon in his direction: "Let thy garments be always white," Eccles. ix, 8. But garments in the native colour of the wool were not confined to the lower orders; they were also in great esteem among persons of superior station, and are particularly valued in Scripture, as the emblem of knowledge and purity, gladness and victory, grace and glory. The priests of Baal were habited in black; a colour which appears to have been peculiar to themselves, and which few others in those countries, except mourners, would choose to wear. Blue was a colour in great esteem among the Jews, and other oriental nations. The robe of the ephod, in the gorgeous dress of the high priest, was made all of blue; it was a prominent colour in the sumptuous hangings of the tabernacle; and the whole people of Israel were required to put a fringe of blue upon the border of their garments, and on the fringe a ribband of the same colour. The palace of Ahasuerus, the king of Persia, was furnished with curtains of this colour, on a pavement of red, and blue, and white marble; a proof that it was not less esteemed in Persia than on the Jordan. And from Ezekiel we learn, that the Assyrian nobles were habited in robes of this colour: "She doated on the Assyrians, her neighbours, which were clothed with blue, captains and rulers, all of them desirable young men."

2. The Jewish nobles and courtiers, upon great and solemn occasions, appeared in scarlet robes, dyed, not as at present with madder, with cochineal, or with any modern tincture, but with a shrub, whose red berries give an orient tinge to the cloth. Crimson or vermilion, a colour, as the name imports, from the blood of the worm, was used in the temple of Solomon, and by many persons of the first quality; sometimes they wore purple, the most sublime of all earthly colours, says Mr. Harmer, having the gaudiness of red, of which it retains a shade, softened with the gravity of blue. This was chiefly dyed at Tyre, and was supposed to take the tincture from the liquor of a shell fish, anciently found in the adjacent sea; though Mr. Bruce, in his Travels, inclines to the opinion, that the murex, or purple fish at Tyre, was only a concealment of their knowledge of



cochineal, as, if the whole city of Tyre had applied to nothing else but fishing, they would not have coloured twenty yards of cloth in a year. The children of wealthy and noble families were dressed in vestments of different colours. This mark of distinction may be traced to the patriarchal age; for Joseph was arrayed, by his indulgent and imprudent father, in a coat of many colours. A robe of divers colours was anciently reserved for the kings' daughters who were virgins; and in one of these was Tamar, the virgin daughter of David, arrayed, when she was met by her brother.

3. In these parts of the world, the fashion is in a state of almost daily fluctuation, and different fashions are not unfrequently seen contending for the superiority; but in the east, where the people are by no means given to change, the form of their garments continues nearly the same from one age to another. The greater part of their clothes are long and flowing, loosely cast about the body, consisting only of a large piece of cloth, in the cutting and sewing of which very little art or industry is employed. They have more dignity and gracefulness than ours, and are better adapted to the burning climates of Asia. From the simplicity of their form, and their loose adaptation to the body, the same clothes might be worn, with equal ease and convenience, by many different persons. The clothes of those Philistines whom Samson slew at Askelon required no altering to fit his companions; nor the robe of Jonathan, to answer his friend. The arts of weaving and fulling seem to have been distinct occupations in Israel, from a very remote period, in consequence of the various and skilful operations which were necessary to bring their stuffs to a suitable degree of perfection; but when the weaver and the fuller had finished their part, the labour was nearly at an end; no distinct artizan was necessary to make them into clothes; every family seems to have made their own. Sometimes, however, this part of the work was performed in the loom; for they had the art of weaving robes with sleeves all of one piece: of this kind was the coat which our Saviour wore during his abode with men. The loose dresses of these countries, when the arm is lifted up, expose its whole length: to this circumstance the Prophet Isaiah refers: "To whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" that is, uncovered: who observes that he is about to exert the arm of his power?

4. The chosen people were not allowed to wear clothes of any materials or form they chose; they were forbidden by their law to wear a garment of woollen and linen. This law did not prevent them from wearing many different substances together, but only these two; nor did the prohibition extend to the wool of camels and goats, (for the hair of these animals they called by the same name,) but only to that of sheep. It was lawful for any man who saw an Israelite dressed in such a garment to fall upon him and put him to death. In the opinion of Maimonides, this was principally

intended as a preservative from idolatry; for the Heathen priests of those times wore such mixed garments of woollen and linen, in the superstitious hope, it was imagined, of having the beneficial influence of some lucky conjunction of the planets or stars, to bring down a blessing upon their sheep and their flax. The second restraint referred to the sexes, of which one was not to wear the dress appropriated to the other. This practice is said to be an abomination to the Lord; which plainly intimates that the law refers to some idolatrous custom, of which Moses and the prophets always spoke in terms of the utmost abhorrence. Nothing, indeed, was more common among the Heathen, in the worship of some of their false deities, than for the males to assist in women's clothes, and the females in the dress appropriated to men; in the worship of Venus, in particular, the women appeared before her in armour, and the men in women's apparel; and thus the words literally run in the original Scriptures, "Women shall not put on the armour of a man, nor a man the stole of a woman." Maimonides says he found this precept in an old magical book, "That men ought to stand before the star of Venus in the flowered garments of women, and women to put on the armour of men before the star of Mars." But whatever there may be in these observations, it is certain that, if there were no distinction of sexes made by their habits, there would be danger of involving mankind in all manner of licentiousness and impurity.

4315. The ancient Jews very seldom wore any covering upon the head, except when they were in mourning, or worshipping in the temple, or in the synagogue. To pray with the head covered, was, in their estimation, a higher mark of respect for the majesty of heaven, as it indicated the conscious unworthiness of the suppliant to lift up his eyes in the divine presence. To guard themselves from the wind or the storm, or from the still more fatal stroke of the sun-beam, to which the general custom of walking bare headed particularly exposed them, they wrapped their heads in their mantles, or upper garments. But during their long captivity in Babylon, the Jews began to wear turbans, in compliance with the customs of their conquerors; for Daniel informs us, that his three friends were cast into the fiery furnace with their hats, or, as the term should be rendered, their turbans. It is not, however, improbable, that the bulk of the nation continued to follow their ancient custom; and that the compliance prevailed only among those Jews who were connected with the Babylonish court; for many ages after that, we find Antiochus Epiphanes introducing the habits and fashions of the Grecians among the Jews; and as the history of the Maccabees relates, he brought the chief young men under his subjection, and made them wear a hat, or turban. Their legs were generally bare; and they never wore any thing upon the feet, but soles fastened in different ways, according to the taste or fancy of the wearer.

HADAD, son to the king of East Edom, was carried into Egypt by his father's servants, when Joab, general of David's troops, extirpated the males of Edom. Hadad was then a child. The king of Egypt gave him a house, lands, and every necessary subsistence, and married him to the sister of Tahpenes, his queen. By her he had a son, named Genubath, whom Queen Tahpenes educated in Pharaoh's house with the king's children. Hadad being informed that David was dead, and that Joab was killed, desired leave to return into his own country. Pharaoh wished to detain him, but at last permitted his return to Edom. Here he began to raise disturbances against Solomon; but the Scripture does not mention particulars. Josephus says, that Hadad did not return to Edom till long after the death of David, when Solomon's affairs began to decline, by reason of his impieties. He also observes, that, not being able to engage the Edomites to revolt, because of the strong garrisons which Solomon had placed there, Hadad got together such people as were willing, and carried them to Razon, then in rebellion against Hadadezer, king of Syria. Razon received Hadad with joy, and assisted him in conquering part of Syria, where he reigned, and from whence he insulted Solomon's territories.

HAGAR. After ten years' residence in the land of Canaan, Abram, by the persuasion of his wife, who had been barren heretofore, and now despaired of bearing children herself when she was seventy-five years old, took, as a second wife, or concubine, her handmaid, Hagar, an Egyptian. When Hagar conceived, she despised her mistress, who dealt hardly with her, Abram giving her up to his wife's discretion; so that she fled toward Egypt from the face of her mistress, but was stopped in her flight by the angel of the Lord, who foretold that she should bear a son called Ishmael, because the Lord heard her affliction, and that his race should be numerous, warlike, and unconquered; a prediction, as seen under the article Arabia, remarkably fulfilled to the present day. Abram was eighty-six years old when Hagar bare Ishmael. When Isaac was weaned, Ishmael, the son of Hagar, who was now about fifteen years of age, offended Sarah by some mockery or ill treatment of Isaac; the original word signifies elsewhere, "to skirmish," or "fight," 2 Samuel ii, 14; and St. Paul represents Ishmael as "persecuting" him, Gal. iv, 29. Sarah therefore complained to Abraham, and said, "Cast out this bond-woman and her son, for the son of this bond-woman shall not be heir with my son Isaac. And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight, because of his son Ishmael;" but God approved of Sarah's advice, and again excluded Ishmael from the special covenant of grace: "For in Isaac shall thy seed be called: nevertheless, the son of the bond-woman will I make a nation also, because he is thy seed." God renewed this promise also to Hagar, during her wanderings in the wilderness of Beersheba, when she despaired of support: "Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hands, for I will make him a great nation. And God was with

the lad, and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness of Paran, and became an archer. And his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt.” See Abraham and Ishmael.

We do not know when Hagar died. The rabbins say she was Pharaoh’s daughter; but Chrysostom asserts that she was one of those slaves which Pharaoh gave to Abraham, Gen. xii, 16. The Chaldee paraphrasts, and many of the Jews, believe Hagar and Keturah to be the same person; but this is not credible. Philo thinks that Hagar embraced Abraham’s religion, which is very probable. The Mussulmans and Arabians, who are descended from Ishmael, the son of Hagar, speak mightily in her commendation. They call her in eminency, Mother Hagar, and maintain that she was Abraham’s lawful wife; the mother of Ishmael, his eldest son; who, as such, possessed Arabia, which very much exceeds, say they, both in extent and riches, the land of Canaan, which was given to his younger son Isaac.

HAGARENES, the descendants of Ishmael: called also Ishmaelites and Saracens, or Arabians, from their country. Their name, Saracens, is not derived, as some have thought, from Sarah, Abraham’s wife, but from the Hebrew sarak, which signifies “to rob” or “to steal;” because they mostly carry on the trade of thieving: or from Sahara, the desert; Saracens, inhabitants of the desert. But some writers think Hagarene imports south, conformably to the Arabic; hence Hagar, that is, 432the southern woman; and Mount Sinai is called Hagar, that is, the southern mountain, Gal. iv, 25. But there seems also to have been a particular tribe who bore this name more exclusively, as the Hagarenes are sometimes mentioned in Scripture distinct from the Ishmaelites, Psalm lxxxiii, 6; 1 Chron. v, 19.

HAGGAI was one of the Jews who returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem in consequence of the edict of Cyrus; and it is believed that he was born during the captivity, and that he was of the sacerdotal race. His prophecy consists of four distinct revelations, all which took place in the second year of Darius, king of Persia, B. C. 520. The prophet reproves the people for their delay in building the temple of God, and represents the unfruitful seasons which they had experienced as a divine punishment for this neglect. He exhorts them to proceed in the important work; and by way of encouragement predicts, that the glory of the second temple, however inferior in external magnificence, shall exceed that of the first; which was accomplished by its being honoured with the presence of the Saviour of mankind. He farther urges the completion of the temple by promises of divine favour, and under the type of Zerubbabel he is supposed by some to foretel the great revolutions which shall precede the second advent of Christ. The style of Haggai is in general plain and simple; but in some passages it rises to a considerable degree of sublimity.

HAIR. The eastern females wear their hair, which the prophet emphatically calls the “instrument of their pride,” very long, and divided into a great number of tresses. In Barbary, the ladies all affect to have their hair hang down to the ground, which, after they have collected into one lock, they bind and plait with ribands. Where nature has been less liberal in its ornaments, the defect is supplied by art, and foreign is procured to be interwoven with the natural hair. The Apostle’s remark on this subject corresponds entirely with the custom of the east, as well as with the original design of the Creator: “Does not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given her for a covering,” 1 Cor. xi, 14. The men in the east, Chardin observes, are shaved; the women nourish their hair with great fondness, which they lengthen by tresses, and tufts of silk down to the heels. But among the Hebrews the men did not shave their heads; they wore their natural hair, though not long; and it is certain that they were, at a very remote period, initiated in the art of cherishing and beautifying the hair with fragrant ointments. The head of Aaron was anointed with a precious oil, compounded after the art of the apothecary; and in proof that they had already adopted the practice, the congregation were prohibited, under pain of being cut off, to make any other like it, after the composition of it, Exod. xxx, 32, 33. The royal Psalmist alludes to the same custom in the twenty-third Psalm: “Thou anointest my head with oil.” We may infer from the direction of Solomon, that the custom had at least become general in his time: “Let thy garments be always white, and let thy head lack no ointment,” Eccles. ix, 8. After the hair is plaited and perfumed, the eastern ladies proceed to dress their heads, by tying above the lock into which they collect it, a triangular piece of linen, adorned with various figures in needlework. This, among persons of better fashion, is covered with a sarmah, as they call it, which is made in the same triangular shape, of thin flexible plates of gold or silver, carefully cut through, and engraven in imitation of lace, and might therefore answer to *השהרנים*, the moonlike ornament mentioned by the prophet in his description of the toilette of a Jewish lady, Isaiah iii, 18. Cutting off the hair was a sign of mourning, Jer. vii, 29; but sometimes in mourning they suffered it to grow long. In ordinary sorrows they neglected their hair; and in violent paroxysms they plucked it off with their hands.

John Baptist was clothed in a garment made of camel’s hair, not with a camel’s skin, as painters and sculptors represent him, but with coarse camlet made of camel’s hair. The coat of the camel in some places yields very fine silk, of which are made stuffs of very great price; but in general this animal’s hair is hard, and scarcely fit for any but coarse habits, and a kind of hair cloth. Some are of opinion that camlet derives its name from

the camel, being originally composed of the wool and hair of camels; but at present there is no camel's hair in the composition of it, as it is commonly woven and sold among us.

HAM, or CHAM, חם, son of Noah, and brother to Shem and Japheth, is believed to have been Noah's youngest son. Ham, says Dr. Hales, signifies burnt or black, and this name was peculiarly significant of the regions allotted to his family. To the Cushites, or children of his eldest son, Cush, were allotted the hot southern regions of Asia, along the coasts of the Persian Gulf, Susiana or Chusistan, Arabia, &c; to the sons of Canaan, Palestine and Syria; to the sons of Misraim, Egypt and Libya, in Africa. The Hamites, in general, like the Canaanites of old, were a sea-faring race, and sooner arrived at civilization and the luxuries of life than their simpler pastoral and agricultural brethren of the other two families. The first great empires of Assyria and Egypt were founded by them; and the republics of Tyre, Sidon, and Carthage, were early distinguished for their commerce: but they sooner also fell to decay; and Egypt, which was one of the first, became the last and "basest of the kingdoms," Ezek. xxix, 15; and has been successively in subjection to the Shemites, and Japhethites; as have also the settlements of the other branches of the Hamites. See Canaan.

HAMAN, son of Hammedatha, the Amalekite, of the race of Agag; or, according to other copies, son of Hamadath the Bugean or Gogean, that is, of the race of Gog; or it may be read, Haman the son of Hamadath, which 433Haman was Bagoas or Bagoas, eunuch, that is, officer to the king of Persia. We have no proof of Haman's being an Amalekite; but Esther iii, 1, reads of the race of Agag. In the apocryphal Greek, Esther ix, 24, and the Latin, Esther xvi, 10, he is called a Macedonian, animo et gente Macedo. King Ahasuerus, having taken him into favour, promoted him above all the princes of his court, who bent the knee to him (probably prostrated themselves wholly before him, as to a deity) when he entered the palace: this Mordecai the Jew declined, for which slight, Haman plotted the extirpation of the whole Jewish nation; which was providentially prevented. He was hanged on a gibbet fifty cubits high, which he had prepared for Mordecai; his house was given to Queen Esther; and his employments to Mordecai. His ten sons were likewise executed. See Esther.

HAMATH, a city of Syria, capital of a province of the same name, lying upon the Orontes, Joshua xiii, 5; Judges iii, 3; 2 Kings xiv, 25; 2 Chron. vii, 8. The king of Hamath cultivated a good understanding with David, 2 Sam. viii, 9. This city was taken by the kings of Judah, and afterward retaken by the Syrians, and recovered from them by Jeroboam the Second, 2 Kings xiv, 28.

HAND sometimes denotes the vengeance of God: "The hand of the Lord was heavy upon them of Ashdod," after they had taken the ark, 1 Samuel v, 6, 7. To pour water on any one's hands, signifies to serve him, 2 Kings iii, 11. To wash one's hands, denotes innocence: Pilate washed his hands to denote his being innocent of the blood of Jesus, Matthew xxvii, 24. To kiss one's hand, is an act of adoration, 1 Kings xix, 18. "If I beheld the sun when it shined, and my mouth hath kissed my hand," Job xxxi, 27. To fill one's hands, is to take possession of the priesthood, to perform the functions of that office; because in this ceremony, those parts of the victim which were to be offered, were put into the hand of the newly created priest, Judges xvii, 5, 12; 1 Kings xiii, 33. To lean upon any one's hand, is a mark of familiarity and superiority. The king of Israel had a confidant on whom he thus leaned, 2 Kings vii, 17. The king of Syria leaned on the hand or arm of Naaman when he went up to the temple of Rimmon, 2 Kings v, 18. To lift up one's hand, is a way of taking an oath which has been in use among all nations. To give one's hand, signifies to grant peace, to swear friendship, to promise entire security, to make alliance, 2 Kings x, 15. The Jews say, they were obliged to give the hand to the Egyptians and Assyrians, that they might procure bread, 2 Macc. xiii, 22; that is, to surrender to them, to submit. To stretch out one's hand, signifies to chastise, to exercise severity or justice, Ezek. xxv, 7. God delivered his people with a high hand, and arm stretched out; by performing many wonders, and inflicting many chastisements, on the Egyptians. To stretch out one's hand, sometimes denotes mercy: "I have spread out my hands," entreated, "all the day unto a rebellious people," Isaiah lxv, 2. Hand is also frequently taken for the power and impression of the Holy Spirit felt by a prophet: "The hand of the Lord was on Elijah," 1 Kings xviii, 46. It is said that God gave his law by the hand of Moses, that he spoke by the hand of prophets, &c; that is, by their means, by them, &c. The right hand denotes power, strength. The Scripture generally imputes to God's right hand all the effects of his omnipotence: "Thy right hand, O Lord, hath dashed in pieces the enemy," Exodus xv, 6. The Son of God is often represented as sitting at the right hand of his heavenly Father: "The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand," Psalm cx, 1; thou hast done thy work upon earth, now take possession of that sovereign kingdom and glory which by right belongeth unto thee; do thou rule with authority and honour, as thou art Mediator. The right hand commonly denotes the south, as the left does the north; for the Hebrews speak of the quarters of the world, in respect of themselves, having their faces turned to the east, their backs to the west, their right hands to the south, and their left to the north. For example: "Doth not David hide himself with us in strong holds, in the woods, in the hill of Hachilah, which is on the south of Jeshimon?" in Hebrew, "on the right hand of Jeshimon." The accuser was commonly at the right hand of the

accused: "Let Satan stand at his right hand," Psalm cix, 6. And in Zech. iii, 1, Satan was at the right hand of the high priest Joshua, to accuse him. Often, in a contrary sense, to be at one's right hand signifies to defend, to protect, to support him: "I have set the Lord always before me; because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved," Psalm xvi, 8. To turn from the law of God, neither to the right hand nor to the left, is a frequent Scripture expression, the meaning of which is, that we must not depart from it at all. Our Saviour, in Matt, vi, 3, to show with what privacy we should do good works, says that our left hand should not know what our right hand does. Above all things, we should avoid vanity and ostentation in all the good we undertake to do, and should not think that thereby we merit any thing. Laying on hands, or imposition of hands, is understood in different ways both in the Old and New Testament. It is often taken for ordination and consecration of priests and ministers, as well among the Jews as Christians, Num. viii, 10; Acts vi, 6; xiii, 3; 1 Tim. iv, 14. It is sometimes also made use of to signify the establishment of judges and magistrates, on whom it was usual to lay hands when they were entrusted with these employments. Thus, when Moses constituted Joshua his successor, God appointed him to lay his hands upon him, Numbers xxvii, 18. Jacob laid his hands on Ephraim and Manasseh, when he gave them his last blessing, Gen. xlviii, 14. The high priest stretched out his hands to the people, as often as he recited the solemn form of blessing, Lev. ix, 22. The Israelites, who presented sin offerings at the tabernacle, confessed their sins while they laid their hands upon them, Lev. i, 4. This testified that the person acknowledged himself worthy of death, that he laid his sins upon the sacrifice, that he trusted in Christ for the expiation of his sins, and that he devoted himself to God. Witnesses laid their hands upon the head of the accused person, as it were to signify that they charged upon him the guilt of his blood, and freed themselves from it, Deut. xiii, 9; xvii, 7. Our Saviour laid his hands upon the children that were presented to him, and blessed them, Mark x, 16. And the Holy Ghost was conferred on those who were baptized by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles, Acts viii, 17; xix, 6.

HANNAH. See Samuel.

HARAN, the eldest son of Terah, and brother to Abraham and Nahor. He was the father of Lot, Milcah, and Iscah, Gen. xi, 26, &c. Haran died before his father Terah.

2. Haran, otherwise called Charran, in Mesopotamia, a city celebrated for having been the place to which Abraham removed first, after he left Ur, Gen. xi, 31, 32, and where Terah was buried. Thither it was likewise that Jacob repaired to Laban, when he fled from Esau, Gen. xxvii, 43; xxviii, 10, &c. Haran was situated in the north-western part of Mesopotamia on a



river of the same name running into the Euphrates. Mr. Kinneir says, that Haran, which is still so called, or rather Harran, is now peopled by a few families of wandering Arabs, who have been led thither by a plentiful supply of good water from several small streams. It is situated in 36° 52' north latitude, and 39° 5' east longitude; in a flat and sandy plain. Some think that it was built by Terah, or by Haran, his eldest son.

HARE, אַרְנַב, Arabic arneb, Lev. xi, 6; Deut. xiv, 7. This name is derived, as Bochart and others suppose, from אָרַה, to crop, and גֵּיב, the produce of the ground; these animals being remarkable for devouring young plants and herbage. This animal resembles the rabbit, but is larger, and somewhat longer in proportion to its thickness. The hare in Syria, says Dr. Russel, is distinguished into two species, differing considerably in point of size. The largest is the Turkman hare, and chiefly haunts the plains; the other is the common hare of the desert: both are abundant. The difficulty as to this animal is, that Moses says the arnabeth chews the cud, which our hares do not: but Aristotle takes notice of the same circumstance, and affirms that the structure of its stomach is similar to that of ruminating animals. The animal here mentioned may then be a variety of the species.

HAROSHETH OF THE GENTILES, a city supposed to be situated near Hazor, in the northern parts of Canaan, called afterward Upper Galilee, or Galilee of the Gentiles, for the same reason that this place probably obtained that title, namely, from being less inhabited by Jews, and being near the great resorts of the Gentiles, Tyre and Sidon. This is said to have been the residence of Sisera, the general of the armies of Jabin, king of Canaan, who reigned at Hazor.

HARP, a stringed musical instrument. The Hebrew word kinaor, which is translated "harp" in our English version, very probably denoted all stringed instruments. By the Hebrews, the harp was called the pleasant harp; and it was employed by them, not only in their devotions, but also at their entertainments and pleasures. It is probable, that the harp was nearly the earliest, if not the earliest, instrument of music. David danced when he played on the harp: the Levites did the same. Hence it appears, that it was light and portable, and that its size was restricted within limits which admitted of that service, and of that manner of using it.

HART, אֵיל, Deut. xii, 15; xiv, 5; Psalm xlii, 1; Isaiah xxxv, 6, the stag, or male deer. Dr. Shaw considers its name in Hebrew as a generic word including all the species of the deer kind; whether they are distinguished by round horns, as the stag; or by flat ones, as the fallow deer; or by the smallness of the branches, as the roe. Mr. Good observes that the hind and roe, the hart and the antelope, were held, and still continue to be, in the

highest estimation in all the eastern countries, for the voluptuous beauty of their eyes, the delicate elegance of their form, or their graceful agility of action. The names of these animals were perpetually applied, therefore, to persons, whether male or female, who were supposed to be possessed of any of their respective qualities. In 2 Sam. i, 19, Saul is denominated “the roe of Israel;” and in the eighteenth verse of the ensuing chapter, we are told that “Asahel was as light of foot as a wild roe:” a phraseology perfectly synonymous with the epithet swift-footed, which Homer has so frequently bestowed upon his hero Achilles. Thus again: “Her princes are like harts which find no pasture; they are fled without strength before their pursuers,” Lam. i, 6. “The Lord Jehovah is my strength; he will make my feet like hinds’ feet; he will cause me to tread again on my own hills,” Hab. iii, 19. See Hind.

HARVEST. Three months intervened between the seed time and the first reaping, and a month between this and the full harvest. Barley is in full ear all over the Holy Land, in the beginning of April; and about the middle of the same month, it begins to turn yellow, particularly in the southern districts; being as forward near Jericho in the latter end of March, as it is in the plains of Acre a fortnight afterward. The reaping continues till the middle of Sivan, or till about the end of May or beginning of June, which, as the time of wheat harvest, finishes this part of the husbandman’s labours.

2. The reapers in Palestine and Syria make use of the sickle in cutting down their crops, and, according to the present custom in this country, “fill their hand” with the corn, and those who bind up the sheaves, their “bosom,” Psalm cxxix, 7; Ruth ii, 5. When the crop is thin and short, which is generally the case in light soils, and with their imperfect cultivation, it is not reaped with the sickle, but plucked up by the root with the hand. By this mode of reaping, they leave the most fruitful fields as naked as if nothing had ever grown on them; and as no hay is made in the east, this is done, that they may not lose any of the straw, which is necessary for the sustenance of their cattle. The practice of plucking up with the hand is perhaps referred to in these words of the Psalmist, to which reference has already been made: “Let them be as the grass upon the house tops, which withereth afore it groweth up; wherewith the mower filleth not his hand, nor he that bindeth sheaves his bosom.” The tops of the houses in Judea are flat, and, being covered with plaster of terrace, are frequently grown over with grass. As it is but small and weak, and from its elevation exposed to the scorching sun, it is soon withered. A more beautiful and striking figure, to display the weak and evanescent condition of wicked men, cannot easily be conceived.

3. The reapers go to the field very early in the morning, and return home betimes in the afternoon. They carry provisions along with them, and leathern bottles, or dried bottle gourds, filled with water. They are followed by their own children, or by others, who glean with much success, for a great quantity of corn is scattered in the reaping, and in their manner of carrying it. The greater part of these circumstances are discernible in the manners of the ancient Israelites. Ruth had not proposed to Naomi, her mother-in-law, to go to the field, and glean after the reapers; nor had the servant of Boaz, to whom she applied for leave, so readily granted her request, if gleaning had not been a common practice in that country. When Boaz inquired who she was, his overseer, after informing him, observes, that she came out to the field in the morning; and that the reapers left the field early in the afternoon, as Dr. Russel states, is evident from this circumstance, that Ruth had time to beat out her gleanings before evening. They carried water and provisions with them; for Boaz invited her to come and drink of the water which the young men had drawn; and at meal-time, to eat of the bread, and dip her morsel in the vinegar. And so great was the simplicity of manners in that part of the world, and in those times, that Boaz himself, although a prince of high rank in Judah, sat down to dinner in the field with his reapers, and helped Ruth with his own hand. Nor ought we to pass over in silence the mutual salutation of Boaz and his reapers, when he came to the field, as it strongly marks the state of religious feeling in Israel at the time, and furnishes another proof of the artless, the happy, and unsuspecting simplicity, which characterized the manners of that highly favoured people. "And, behold, Boaz came from Bethlehem, and said unto the reapers, The Lord be with you. And they answered him, The Lord bless thee," Ruth ii, 4.

4. It appears from the beautiful history of Ruth, that, in Palestine, the women lent their assistance in cutting down and gathering in the harvest; for Boaz commands her to keep fast by his maidens. The women in Syria shared also in the labours of the harvest; for Dr. Russel informs us, they sang the ziraleet, or song of thanks, when the passing stranger accepted their present of a handful of corn, and made a suitable return. It was another custom among the Jews to set a confidential servant over the reapers, to see that they executed their work properly, that they had suitable provisions, and to pay them their wages: the Chaldees call him rab, the master, ruler, or governor of the reapers. Such was the person who directed the labours of the reapers in the field of Boaz. The right of the poor in Israel to glean after the reapers was secured by a positive law, couched in these words: "And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy land; neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard: thou shalt leave them to the poor and the

stranger: I am the Lord your God," Lev. xix, 9. It is the opinion of some writers, that, although the poor were allowed the liberty of gleaning, the Israelitish proprietors were not obliged to admit them immediately into the field, as soon as the reapers had cut down the corn, and bound it up in sheaves, but when it was carried off: they might choose, also, among the poor, whom they thought most deserving, or most necessitous. These opinions receive some countenance from the request which Ruth presented to the servant of Boaz, to permit her to glean "among the sheaves;" and from the charge of Boaz to his young men, "Let her glean even among the sheaves;" a mode of speaking which seems to insinuate that though they could not legally hinder Ruth from gleaning in the field, they had a right, if they chose to exercise it, to prohibit her from gleaning among the sheaves, or immediately after the reapers.

**HATE.** To hate is not always to be understood rigorously, but frequently signifies merely a less degree of love. "If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated," Deut. xxi, 15; that is, less beloved. Our Saviour says that he who would follow him must hate father and mother; that is, he must love them less than Christ, less than his own salvation, and not prefer them to God. "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated;" that is, have deprived of the privileges of his primogeniture, through his own profanity; and visited him with severe judgment on account of his sins.

**HAURAN.** The tract of country of this name is mentioned only twice in Scripture, Ezek. xlvi, 16, 18. It was probably of small extent in the time of the Jews; but was enlarged under the Romans, by whom it was called Auranitis. At present it extends from about twenty miles south of Damascus to a little below Bozra, including the rocky district of El Ledja, the ancient Trachonitis, and the mountainous one of the Djebel Haouran. Within its limits are also included, beside Trachonitis, 436 Ituræa or Ittur, now called Djedour, and part of Batanæa or Bashan. It is represented by Burckhardt as a volcanic region, consisting of a porous tufa, pumice, and basalt, with the remains of a crater on the Tel Shoba, on its eastern side. It produces, however, crops of corn, and has many patches of luxuriant herbage, which are frequented in the summer by the Arab tribes for pasturage. It abounds, also, with many interesting remains of cities, scattered over its surface, with Grecian inscriptions. The chief of these are Bozra, Ezra, Medjel, Shoba, Shakka, Souerda, Kanouat, Hebran, Zarle, Oerman, and Aatyl; with Messema, Berak, and Om Ezzeitoun, in the Ledja.

**HAVILAH,** the son of Cush, Genesis x, 7. There must have been other, and perhaps many, Havilahs beside the original one, a part of the numerous and wide-spread posterity of Cush. By one and the first of these, it is probable that the western shores of the Persian Gulf were peopled; by another, the

country of Colchis; and by another, the parts about the southern border of the Dead Sea and the confines of Judea, the country afterward inhabited by the Amalekites.

HAWK, *נָז*, from the root *נָזַח*, to fly, because of the rapidity and length of flight for which this bird is remarkable, Lev. xi, 16; Deut. xiv, 15; Job xxxix, 26. Naz is used generically by the Arabian writers to signify both falcon and hawk; and the term is given in both these senses by Meninski. There can be little doubt that such is the real meaning of the Hebrew word, and that it imports various species of the falcon family, as jer-falcon, goshawk, and sparrow-hawk. As this is a bird of prey, cruel in its temper, and gross in its manners, it was forbidden as food, and all others of its kind, in the Mosaic ritual. The Greeks consecrated the hawk to Apollo; and among the Egyptians no animal was held in so high veneration as the ibis and the hawk. Most of the species of hawk, we are told; are birds of passage. The hawk, therefore, is produced, in Job xxxix, 26, as a specimen of that astonishing instinct which teaches birds of passage to know their times and seasons, when to migrate out of one country into another for the benefit of food, or a warmer climate, or both. The common translation does not give the full force of the passage: "Doth the hawk fly by thy wisdom?" The real meaning is, "Doth she know, through thy skill or wisdom, the precise period for taking flight, or migrating and stretching her wings toward a southern or warmer climate?" The passage is well rendered by Sandys:--

"Doth the wild haggard tower into the sky,  
And to the south by thy direction fly?"

Her migration is not conducted by the wisdom and prudence of man, but by the superintending and upholding providence of the only wise God.

HAY, *הַצִּיר*. In the two places where this word occurs, Prov. xxvii, 25, and Isaiah xv, 16, our translators have very improperly rendered it "hay." But in those countries they made no hay; and, if they did, it appears from inspection that hay could hardly be the meaning of the word in either of those texts. The author of "Fragments," in continuation of Calmet, has the following remarks: "There is a gross impropriety in our version of Prov. xxvii, 25: 'The hay appeareth, and the tender grass showeth itself, and the herbs of the mountains are gathered.' Now, certainly, if the tender grass is but just beginning to show itself, the hay, which is grass cut and dried after it has arrived at maturity, ought by no means to be associated with it, still less ought it to be placed before it. And this leads me to observe, that none of the dictionaries which I have seen seem to me to give the accurate import of the word, which, I apprehend, means the first shoots, the rising, budding, spires of grass. So, in the present passage, *גִּלְהָה הַצִּיר*, 'the tender shoots of

the grass rise up; and the buddings of grass,' grass in its early state, as is the peculiar import of אָרָא, 'appear; and the tufts of grass,' proceeding from the same root, 'collect themselves together, and, by their union, begin to clothe the mountain tops with a pleasing verdure.'" Surely, the beautiful progress of vegetation, as described in this passage, must appear too poetical to be lost; but what must it be to an eastern beholder! to one who had lately witnessed all surrounding sterility, a grassless waste!

**HAZAEI.** Elisha coming to Damascus, the capital of Syria, Benhadad, the reigning monarch, being then indisposed, sent Hazael, who was one of his principal officers, to wait upon the prophet, and consult him as to the issue of his disorder, 2 Kings viii, 7–13. The prophet told Hazael that certainly his master might recover, because his complaint was not mortal; yet he was very well assured that he would not recover; and, looking him steadfastly in the face, Elisha burst into tears. Surprised at this conduct, Hazael inquired the cause. "Because I know," said the prophet, "the evil that thou wilt do to the children of Israel: their strong holds wilt thou set on fire, and their young men wilt thou slay with the sword, and wilt dash their infants against the stones, and rip up their women with child." Hazael indignantly exclaimed, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing?" Elisha merely answered, "The Lord hath showed me that thou shalt be king over Syria," 2 Kings viii, 7–13. On his return home, Hazael concealed from his master Benhadad the prophet's answer, and inspired him with hopes of recovery; but on the following day, he took effectual means to prevent it, by stifling the king with a thick cloth dipped with water; and, as Benhadad had no son, and Hazael was a man much esteemed in the army, he was, without difficulty declared his successor, A. M. 3120. Hazael soon inflicted upon Israel all the cruelties which Elisha had foretold. For when Jehu broke up the siege of Ramoth-Gilead, and came with his army to Samaria, Hazael took advantage of his absence to fall upon his territories beyond Jordan, destroying all the land of Gilead, Gad, Reuben, and Manasseh, 437 from Aroer to Bashan, 2 Kings x, 32. Some years passed after this before Hazael undertook any thing against the kingdom of Judah, it being remote from Damascus; but in the reign of Joash, the son of Jehoahaz, A. M. 3165, he besieged the city of Gath, and, having taken it, marched against Jerusalem, 2 Kings xii, 17, 18. But Joash, conscious of his inferiority, bribed him at the price of all the money he could raise, to evacuate Judea, with which he for the moment complied; yet, in the following year, the army of Hazael returned, entered the territories of Judah, and the city of Jerusalem, slew all the princes of the people, and sent a valuable booty to their royal master, 2 Kings xiii, 22; 2 Chron. xxiv, 23.

**HEAD.** This word has several significations, beside its natural one, which denotes the head of a man. It is sometimes used in Scripture for the whole

man: "Blessings are upon the head of the just," Prov. x, 6; that is, upon their persons. God says of the wicked, "I will recompense their way upon their head," Ezek. ix, 10. It signifies a chief or capital city: "The head of Syria is Damascus," Isaiah vii, 8. It denotes a chief or principal members in society: "The Lord will cut off from Israel head and tail. The ancient and honourable he is the head," Isaiah ix, 14, 15. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent," Gen. iii, 15; that is, Christ Jesus, the blessed seed of the woman, shall overthrow the power, policy, and works of the devil. The river in paradise was divided into four heads or branches. In times of grief, the mourners covered their heads: they cut and plucked off their hair. Amos, speaking of unhappy times, says, "I will bring baldness upon every head," Amos viii, 10. In prosperity, they anointed their heads with sweet oils: "Let thy head lack no" perfumed "ointment," Eccles. ix, 8. To shake the head at any one, expresses contempt: "The virgin, the daughter of Zion, hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee," Isaiah xxxvii, 22.

Head is taken for one that hath rule and preëminence over others. Thus God is the head of Christ; as Mediator, from him he derives all his dignity and authority. Christ is the only spiritual head of the church, both in respect of eminence and influence; he communicates life, motion, and strength to every believer. Also the husband is the head of his wife, because by God's ordinance he is to rule over her, Gen. iii, 16; also in regard to preëminence of sex, 1 Peter iii, 7, and excellency of knowledge, 1 Cor. xiv, 35. The Apostle mentions this subordination of persons in 1 Cor. xi, 3: "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God." "The stone which the builders rejected was made the head of the corner," Psalm cxviii, 22. It was the first in the angle, whether it were disposed at the top of that angle to adorn and crown it, or at the bottom to support it. This, in the New Testament, is applied to Christ, who is the strength and beauty of the church, to unite the several parts of it, namely both Jews and Gentiles together.

HEAR, HEARING. This word is used in several senses in Scripture. In its obvious and literal acceptation, it denotes the exercise of that bodily sense of which the ear is the organ; and as hearing is a sense by which instruction is conveyed to the mind, and the mind is excited to attention and to obedience, so the ideas of attention and obedience are also grafted on the expression or sense of hearing. God is said, speaking after the manner of men, to hear prayer, that is, to attend to it, and comply with the requests it contains: "I love the Lord, because he hath heard," hath attended to, hath complied with, "the voice of my supplication," Psalm cxvi, 1. On the contrary, God is said not to hear, that is, not to comply with, the requests

of sinners, John ix, 31. Men are said to hear, when they attend to, or comply with, the request of each other, or when they obey the commands of God: "He who is of God heareth," obeyeth, practiseth, "God's words," John viii, 47. "My sheep hear my voice," and show their attention to it, by following me, John x, 27. "This is my beloved Son: hear ye him," Matt. xvii, 5. This seems to be an allusion to Deut. xviii, 15, 18, 19: "The Lord shall raise up unto you a prophet; him shall ye hear;" which is also expressly applied in Acts iii, 22. The other senses which may be attached to the word "hear," seem to rise from the preceding, and may be referred to the same ideas.

HEART. The Hebrews regarded the heart as the source of wit, understanding, love, courage, grief, and pleasure. Hence are derived many modes of expression. "An honest and good heart," Luke viii, 15, is a heart studious of holiness, being prepared by the Spirit of God to receive the word with due affections, dispositions, and resolutions. We read of a broken heart, a clean heart, an evil heart, a liberal heart. To "turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers," Mal. iv, 6, signifies to cause them to be perfectly reconciled, and that they should be of the same mind. To want heart, sometimes denotes to want understanding and prudence: "Ephraim is like a silly dove, without heart," Hosea vii, 11. "O fools, and slow of heart," Luke xxiv, 25; that is, ignorant, and without understanding. "This people's heart is waxed gross, lest they should understand with their heart," Matt. xiii, 15; their heart is become incapable of understanding spiritual things; they resist the light, and are proof against all impressions of truth. "The prophets prophesy out of their own heart," Ezekiel xiii, 2; that is, according to their own imagination, without any warrant from God.

The heart is said to be dilated by joy, contracted by sadness, broken by sorrow, to grow fat, and be hardened by prosperity. The heart melts under discouragement, forsakes one under terror, is desolate in affliction, and fluctuating in doubt. To speak to any one's heart is to comfort him, to say pleasing and affecting things to him. The heart expresses also the middle part of any thing: "Tyre is in the heart of the seas," Ezekiel xxvii, 4; in the midst of the seas. "We will not fear though the mountains be carried into the heart (middle) of the sea," Psalm xlvi, 2.

The heart of man is naturally depraved and inclined to evil, Jer. xvii, 9. A divine power is requisite for its renovation, John iii, 1–11. When thus renewed, the effects will be seen in the temper, conversation, and conduct at large. Hardness of heart is that state in which a sinner is inclined to, and actually goes on in, rebellion against God.



HEATH, ערער, Jer. xvii, 6; xlvi, 6. "He shall be like the heath in the desert. He shall not see when good cometh; but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, a salt land." The LXX and Vulgate render oror, "the tamarisk;" and this is strengthened by the affinity of the Hebrew name of this tree with the Turkish œrœr. Taylor and Parkhurst render it, "a blasted tree stripped of its foliage." If it be a particular tree, the tamarisk is as likely as any. Celsius thinks it to be the juniper; but from the mention of it as growing in a salt land, in parched places, the author of "Scripture Illustrated" is disposed to seek it among the lichens, a species of plants which are the last production of vegetation under the frozen zone, and under the glowing heat of equatorial deserts; so that it seems best qualified to endure parched places, and a salt land. Hasselquist mentions several kinds seen by him in Egypt, Arabia, and Syria. In Jer. xlvi, 6, the original word is ערוער, which the Septuagint translators have read ערוור, for they render it ὄνος ἄγκυρος, wild ass; and, as this seems best to agree with the flight recommended in the passage, it is to be preferred. See Wild Ass.

HEAVEN, the place of the more immediate residence of the Most High, Gen. xiv, 19. The Jews enumerated three heavens: the first was the region of the air, where the birds fly, and which are therefore called "the fowls of heaven," Job xxxv, 11. It is in this sense also that we read of the dew of heaven, the clouds of heaven, and the wind of heaven. The second is that part of space in which are fixed the heavenly luminaries, the sun, moon, and stars, and which Moses was instructed to call "the firmament or expanse of heaven," Gen. i, 8. The third heaven is the seat of God and of the holy angels; the place into which Christ ascended after his resurrection, and into which St. Paul was caught up, though it is not like the other heavens perceptible to mortal view.

2. It is an opinion not destitute of probability, that the construction of the tabernacle, in which Jehovah dwelt by a visible symbol, termed "the cloud of glory," was intended to be a type of heaven. In the holiest place of the tabernacle, "the glory of the Lord," or visible emblem of his presence, rested between the cherubims; by the figures of which, the angelic host surrounding the throne of God in heaven was typified; and as that holiest part of the tabernacle was, by a thick vail, concealed from the sight of those who frequented it for the purposes of worship, so heaven, the habitation of God, is, by the vail of flesh, hidden from mortal eyes. Admitting the whole tabernacle, therefore, in which the worship of God was performed according to a ritual of divine appointment, to be a representation of the universe, we are taught by it this beautiful lesson, that the whole universe is the temple of God; but that in this vast temple there is "a most holy place," where the Deity resides and manifests his presence to the angelic hosts and redeemed company who surround him. This view appears to be

borne out by the clear and uniform testimony of Scripture; and it is an interesting circumstance, that heaven, as represented by “the holiest of all,” is heaven as it is presented to the eye of Christian faith, the place where our Lord ministers as priest, to which believers now come in spirit, and where, they are gathered together in the disembodied state. Thus, for instance, St. Paul tells the believing Hebrews, “Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written,” or are enrolled, “in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than the blood of Abel,” Heb. xii, 22–24. Here we are presented with the antitype of almost every leading circumstance of the Mosaic dispensation. Instead of the land of Canaan, we have heaven; for the earthly Jerusalem, we have the heavenly, the city of the living God; in place of the congregation of Israel after the flesh, we have the general assembly and church of the first-born, that is, all true believers “made perfect;” for just men in the imperfect state of the old dispensation, we have just men made perfect in evangelical knowledge and holiness; instead of Moses, the mediator of the old covenant, we have Jesus the Mediator of the new and everlasting covenant; and instead of the blood of slaughtered animals, which was sprinkled upon the Israelites, the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the sanctuary, to make a typical atonement, we have the blood of the Son of God, which was shed for the remission of the sins of the whole world; that blood which doth not, like the blood of Abel, call for vengeance but for mercy, which hath made peace between heaven and earth, effected the true and complete atonement for sin, and which therefore communicates peace to the conscience of every sinner that believes the Gospel.

3. Among the numerous refinements of modern times that is one of the most remarkable which goes to deny the locality of heaven. “It is a state,” say many, “not a place.” But if that be the case, the very language of the 439 Scriptures, in regard to this point, is calculated to mislead us. For that God resides in a particular part of the universe, where he makes his presence known to his intelligent creatures by some transcendent, visible glory, is an opinion that has prevailed among Jews and Christians, Greeks and Romans, yea, in every nation, civilized or savage, and in every age; and, since it is confirmed by revelation, why should it be doubted? Into this most holy place, the habitation of the Deity, Jesus, after his resurrection, ascended; and there, presenting his crucified body before the manifestation of the divine presence, which is called “the throne of the Majesty in the heavens,” he offered unto God the sacrifice of himself, and made atonement for the sins of his people. There he is sat down upon his throne,

crowned with glory and honour, as king upon his holy hill of Zion, and continually officiates as our great High Priest, Advocate, and Intercessor, within the veil. There is his Father's house, into which he is gone before, to prepare mansions of bliss for his disciples; it is the kingdom conferred upon him as the reward of his righteousness, and of which he has taken possession as their forerunner, Acts i, 11; Heb. vi, 19, 20.

4. Some of the ancients imagined that the habitation of good men, after the resurrection, would be the sun; grounding this fanciful opinion on a mistaken interpretation of Psalm xix, 4, which they rendered, with the LXX and Vulgate, "He has set his tabernacle in the sun." Others, again, have thought it to lie beyond the starry firmament, a notion less improbable than the former. Mr. Whiston supposes the air to be the mansion of the blessed, at least for the present; and he imagines that Christ is at the top of the atmosphere, and other spirits nearer to or more remote from him according to the degree of their moral purity, to which he conceives the specific gravity of their inseparable vehicles to be proportionable. Mr. Hallet has endeavoured to prove that they will dwell upon earth, when it shall be restored to its paradisaical state. The passages of Scripture, however, on which he grounds his hypothesis, are capable of another and very different interpretation. After all, we may observe, that the place of the blessed is a question of comparatively little importance; and we may cheerfully expect and pursue it, though we cannot answer a multitude of curious questions, relating to various circumstances that pertain to it. We have reason to believe that heaven will be a social state, and that its happiness will, in some measure, arise from mutual communion and converse, and the expressions and exercises of mutual benevolence. All the views presented to us of this eternal residence of good men are pure and noble; and form a striking contrast to the low hopes, and the gross and sensual conceptions of a future state, which distinguish the Pagan and Mohammedan systems. The Christian heaven may be described to be a state of eternal communion with God, and consecration to hallowed devotional and active services; from which will result an uninterrupted increase of knowledge, holiness, and joy, to the glorified and immortalized assembly of the redeemed.

HEBER, or EBER, the father of Peleg, and the son of Salah, who was the grandson of Shem, one of Noah's sons, was born A. M. 1723; B. C. 2281. From him some have supposed that Abraham and his descendants derived the appellation of Hebrews. But others have suggested, with greater probability, that Abraham and his family were thus called, because they came from the other side of the Euphrates into Canaan; Heber signifying in the Hebrew language one that passes, or, a passage, that is, of the river Euphrates. According to this opinion, Hebrew signifies much the same as foreigner among us, or one that comes from beyond sea. Such were

Abraham and his family among the Canaanites; and his posterity, learning and using the language of the country, still retained the appellation originally given them, even when they became possessors and settled inhabitants.

2. Heber the Kenite, of Jethro's family, husband to Jael, who killed Sisera, Judges iv, 17, &c.

HEBREW OF THE HEBREWS, an appellation which the Apostle Paul applies to himself, Phil. iii, 5, concerning the meaning of which there has been some difference of opinion. Godwin, in his "Moses and Aaron," understands by this expression, a Hebrew both by father's and mother's side. But if it meant no more than this, there was little occasion for the Apostle's using it immediately after having declared that he was "of the stock of Israel, and the tribe of Benjamin," which, on Godwin's supposition, is the same as a Hebrew of the Hebrews; for the Jews were not allowed to marry out of their own nation. Beside, it is not likely that St. Paul would have mentioned it as a distinguishing privilege and honour, that his parents were not proselytes. It is more probable that a Hebrew of the Hebrews signifies a Hebrew both by nation and language, which many of Abraham's posterity, in those days, were not; or one of the Hebrew Jews who performed their public worship in the Hebrew tongue; for such were reckoned more honourable than the Jews born out of Judea, and who spoke the Greek tongue. See Hellenists.

HEBREW LANGUAGE, called also absolutely Hebrew, is the language spoken by the Hebrews, and in which all the books of the Old Testament are written; whence it is also called the holy or sacred language. It is said to have been preserved in the midst of the confusion at Babel, in the family of Heber, or Eber, who, as it is alleged, was not concerned in the building of Babel, and, consequently, did not share in the punishment inflicted on the actual transgressors. The Jews, in general, have been of opinion, that the Hebrew was the language of Heber's family, from whom Abraham sprung. On the other hand, it has been maintained that Heber's family, in the fourth generation after the dispersion, lived in Chaldea, where Abraham was born, Gen. xi, 44, 27, 28, and that there is no reason to think they used a different language from their neighbours around them. It appears, moreover, that the Chaldee, and not the Hebrew, was the language of Abraham's country, and of his kindred, Gen. xxiv, 4; xxxi, 46, 47; and it is probable that Abraham's native language was Chaldee, and that the Hebrew was the language of the Canaanites, which Abraham and his posterity learned by travelling among them. It is surprising that this adoption of the Phœnician language by the patriarchs should have escaped the notice of several intelligent readers of the Bible. Jacob and Laban, it is

clear, by the names they gave to the cairn, or memorial of stones, spoke two different dialects; and it is nearly equally evident, that the language of Laban was the dialect of Ur of the Chaldees, the original speech of the Hebrew race. As the patriarchs disused the true Hebrew dialect, it is manifest that they had conformed to the speech of Canaan; and that this conformity was complete, is proved by the identity between all the remains of Canaanitish names. At the same time, it must be remarked, that the Phenician and the Chaldean were merely different dialects of the same primitive language which had been spoken by the first ancestors of mankind.

2. There is no work in all antiquity written in pure Hebrew, beside the books of the Old Testament; and even some parts of those are in Chaldee. The Hebrew appears to be the most ancient of all the languages in the world; at least it is so with regard to us, who know of no older. Dr. Sharpe adopts the opinion, that the Hebrew was the original language; not indeed that the Hebrew is the unvaried language of our first parents, but that it was the general language of men at the dispersion; and, however it might have been improved and altered from the first speech of our first parents, it was the original of all the languages, or almost all the languages, rather dialects, that have since arisen in the world. Arguments have also been deduced from the nature and genius of the Hebrew language, in order to prove that it was the original language, neither improved nor debased by foreign idioms. The words of which it is composed are short, and admit of very little flexion. The names of places are descriptive of their nature, situation, accidental circumstances, &c. The compounds are few, and inartificially conjoined; and it is less burdened with those artificial affixes which distinguish other cognate dialects, such as the Chaldean, Syrian, Arabian, Phenician, &c.

The period, from the age of Moses to that of David, has been considered the golden age of the Hebrew language, which declined in purity from that time to the reign of Hezekiah or Manasseh, having received several foreign words, particularly Aramean, from the commercial and political intercourse of the Jews and Israelites with the Assyrians and Babylonians. This period has been termed the silver age of the Hebrew language. In the interval between the reign of Hezekiah and the Babylonish captivity, the purity of the language was neglected, and so many foreign words were introduced into it, that this period has not inaptly been designated its iron age. During the seventy years' captivity, though it does not appear that the Hebrews entirely lost their native tongue, yet it underwent so considerable a change from their adoption of the vernacular languages of the countries where they had resided, that afterward, on their return from exile, they spoke a dialect of Chaldee mixed with Hebrew words. On this account it

was, that, when the Scriptures were read, it was found necessary to interpret them to the people in the Chaldean language; as, when Ezra the scribe brought the book of the law of Moses before the congregation, the Levites are said to have caused the people to understand the law, because “they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading,” Nehem. viii, 8. Some time after the return from the great captivity, Hebrew ceased to be spoken altogether; though it continued to be cultivated and studied by the priests and Levites, as a learned language, that they might be enabled to expound the law and the prophets to the people, who, it appears from the New Testament, were well acquainted with their general contents and tenor: this last mentioned period has been called the leaden age of the language.

The present Hebrew characters, or letters, are twenty-two in number, and of a square form; but the antiquity of these letters is a point that has been most severely contested by many learned men. From a passage in Eusebius’s Chronicle, and another in St. Jerom, it was inferred by Joseph Scaliger, that Ezra, when he reformed the Jewish church, transcribed the ancient characters of the Hebrews into the square letters of the Chaldeans; and that this was done for the use of those Jews who, being born during the captivity, knew no other alphabet than that of the people among whom they had been educated. Consequently, the old character, which we call the Samaritan, fell into total disuse. This opinion Scaliger supported by passages from both the Talmuds, as well as from rabbinical writers, in which it is expressly affirmed that such characters were adopted by Ezra. But the most decisive confirmation of this point is to be found in the ancient Hebrew coins, which were struck before the captivity, and even previously to the revolt of the ten tribes. The characters engraven on all of them are manifestly the same with the modern Samaritan, though with some trifling variations in their forms, occasioned by the depredations of time.

HEBREWS, sometimes called Israelites, from their progenitor, Jacob, surnamed Israel, and in modern times Jews, as the descendants of Judah, the name of this leading tribe being given to all. See Jews.

Hebrews, Epistle to the. Though the genuineness of this epistle has been disputed both in ancient and modern times, its antiquity has never been questioned. It is generally allowed that there are references to it, although the author is not mentioned, in the remaining works of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Justin Martyr; and that it contains, as was first noticed by Chrysostom and Theodoret, internal evidence of having been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, Heb. viii, 4; ix, 25; x, 11, 37; xiii, 10. The earliest writer now extant who quotes this epistle as the work of St. Paul is Clement of Alexandria, toward the end of the second century;

but, as he ascribes it to St. Paul repeatedly and without hesitation, we may conclude that in his time no doubt had been entertained upon the subject, or, at least, that the common tradition of the church attributed it to St. Paul. Clement is followed by Origen, by Dionysius and Alexander, both bishops of Alexandria, by Ambrose, Athanasius, Hilary of Poitiers, Jerom, Chrysostom, and Cyril, all of whom consider this epistle as written by St. Paul; and it is also ascribed to him in the ancient Syriac version, supposed to have been made at the end of the first century. Eusebius says, "Of St. Paul there are fourteen epistles manifest and well known; but yet there are some who reject that to the Hebrews, urging for their opinion that it is contradicted by the church of the Romans, as not being St. Paul's." In Dr. Lardner we find the following remark: "It is evident that this epistle was generally received in ancient times by those Christians who used the Greek language, and lived in the eastern parts of the Roman empire." And in another place he says, "It was received as an epistle of St. Paul by many Latin writers in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries." The earlier Latin writers take no notice of this epistle, except Tertullian, who ascribes it to Barnabas. It appears, indeed, from the following expression of Jerom, that this epistle was not generally received as canonical Scripture by the Latin church in his time: "Licet eam Latina consuetudo inter canonicas Scripturas non recipiat." [Although the usage of the Latin church does not receive it among the canonical Scriptures.] The same thing is mentioned in other parts of his works. But many individuals of the Latin church acknowledged it to be written by St. Paul, as Jerom himself, Ambrose, Hilary, and Philaster; and the persons who doubted its genuineness were those the least likely to have been acquainted with the epistle at an early period, from the nature of its contents not being so interesting to the Latin churches, which consisted almost entirely of Gentile Christians, ignorant, probably, of the Mosaic law, and holding but little intercourse with Jews.

2. The moderns, who, upon grounds of internal evidence, contend against the genuineness of this epistle, rest principally upon the two following arguments, the omission of the writer's name, and the superior elegance of the style in which it is written. It is indeed certain that all the acknowledged epistles of St. Paul begin with a salutation in his own name, and that, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is nothing of that kind; but this omission can scarcely be considered as conclusive against positive testimony. St. Paul might have reasons for departing, upon this occasion, from his usual mode of salutation, which we at this distant period cannot discover. Some have imagined that he omitted his name, because he knew that it would not have much weight with the Hebrew Christians, to whom he was in general obnoxious, on account of his zeal in converting the Gentiles, and in maintaining that the observance of the Mosaic law was not essential to salvation: it is, however, clear, that the persons to whom this epistle was

addressed knew from whom it came, as the writer refers to some acts of kindness which he had received from them, and also expresses a hope of seeing them soon, Hebrews x, 34; xiii, 18, 19, 23. As to the other argument, it must be owned that there does not appear to be such superiority in the style of this epistle, as should lead to the conclusion that it was not written by St. Paul. Those who have thought differently have mentioned Barnabas, St. Luke, and Clement, as authors or translators of this epistle. The opinion of Jerom was, that the sentiments are the Apostle's, but the language and composition that of some one else, who committed to writing the Apostle's sense, and, as it were, reduced into commentaries the things spoken by his master. Dr. Lardner says, "My conjecture is, that St. Paul dictated the epistle in Hebrew, and another, who was a great master of the Greek language, immediately wrote down the Apostle's sentiments in his own elegant Greek; but who this assistant of the Apostle was, is altogether unknown." But surely the writings of St. Paul, like those of other authors, may not all have the same precise degree of merit; and if, upon a careful perusal and comparison, it should be thought that the Epistle to the Hebrews is written with greater elegance than the acknowledged compositions of this Apostle; it should also be remembered that the apparent design and contents of this epistle suggest the idea of more studied composition, and yet, that there is nothing in it which amounts to a marked difference of style: on the other hand, there is the same concise, abrupt, and elliptical mode of expression, and it contains many phrases and sentiments which are found in no part of Scripture, except in St. Paul's Epistles. We may farther observe, that the manner in which Timothy is mentioned in this epistle makes it probable that it was written by St. Paul. Compare Heb. xiii, 23, with 2 Cor. i, 1, and Col. i, 1. It was certainly written by a person who had suffered imprisonment in the cause of Christianity; and this is known to have been the case of St. Paul, but of no other person to whom this epistle has been attributed. Upon the whole, both the external and internal evidence appear to preponderate so greatly in favour of St. Paul's being the author of this epistle, that it cannot but be considered as written by that Apostle.

3. "They of Italy salute you," is the only expression in the epistle which can assist us in determining from whence it was written. The Greek words are, οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας which should have been translated, "Those from Italy salute you;" and the only inference to be drawn from them seems to be, that St. Paul, when he wrote this epistle, was at a place where some Italian converts were. This inference is not incompatible with the common opinion, that this epistle was written from Rome, and therefore we consider it as written from that city. It is supposed to have been written toward the end of St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, or immediately after it,



because the Apostle expresses an intention of visiting the Hebrews shortly: we therefore place the date of this epistle in the year 63.

4. Clement, of Alexandria, Eusebius, and Jerom, thought that this epistle was originally written in the Hebrew language; but all the other ancient fathers who have mentioned this subject speak of the Greek as the original work; and as no one pretends to have seen this epistle in Hebrew, as there are no internal marks of the Greek being a translation, and as we know that the Greek language was at this time very generally understood at Jerusalem, we may accede to the more common opinion, both among the ancients and moderns, and consider the present Greek as the original text. It is no small satisfaction to reflect, that those who have denied either the genuineness or the originality of this epistle have always supposed it to have been written or translated by some fellow labourer or assistant of St. Paul, and that almost every one admits that it carries with it the sanction and authority of the inspired Apostle.

5. There has been some little doubt concerning the persons to whom this epistle was addressed; but by far the most general and most probable opinion is, that it was written to those Christians of Judea who had been converted to the Gospel from Judaism. That it was written, notwithstanding its general title, to the Christians of one certain place or country, is evident from the following passages: "I beseech you the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner," Heb. xiii, 19. "Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty, with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you," Heb. xiii, 23. And it appears from the following passage in the Acts, "When the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews," Acts vi, 1, that certain persons were at this time known at Jerusalem by the name of Hebrews. They seem to have been native Jews, inhabitants of Judea, the language of which country was Hebrew, and therefore they were called Hebrews, in contradistinction to those Jews who, residing commonly in other countries, although they occasionally came to Jerusalem, used the Greek language, and were therefore called Grecians.

6. The general design of this epistle was to confirm the Jewish Christians in the faith and practice of the Gospel, which they might be in danger of deserting, either through the persuasion or persecution of the unbelieving Jews, who were very numerous and powerful in Judea. We may naturally suppose, that the zealous adherents to the law would insist upon the majesty and glory which attended its first promulgation, upon the distinguished character of their legislator, Moses, and upon the divine authority of the ancient Scriptures; and they might likewise urge the humiliation and death of Christ as an argument against the truth of his

religion. To obviate the impression which any reasoning of this sort might make upon the converts to Christianity, the writer of this epistle begins with declaring to the Hebrews, that the same God who had formerly, upon a variety of occasions, spoken to their fathers by means of his prophets, had now sent his only Son for the purpose of revealing his will; he then describes, in most sublime language, the dignity of the person of Christ, Heb. i; and thence infers the duty of obeying his commands, the divine authority of which was established by the performance of miracles, and by the gifts of the Holy Ghost; he points out the necessity of Christ's incarnation and passion, Heb. ii; he shows the superiority of Christ to Moses, and warns the Hebrews against the sin of unbelief, Heb. iii; he exhorts to steadfastness in the profession of the Gospel, and gives an animated description of Christ as our high priest, Heb. iv-vii; he shows that the Levitical priesthood and the old covenant were abolished by the priesthood of Christ, and by the new covenant, Heb. viii; he points out the efficacy of the ceremonies and sacrifices of the law, and the sufficiency of the atonement made by the sacrifice of Christ, Heb. ix, x; he fully explains the nature, merit, and effects of faith, Heb. xi; and in the last two chapters he gives a variety of exhortations and admonitions, all calculated to encourage the Hebrews to bear with patience and constancy any trials to which they might be exposed. He concludes with the valedictory benediction usual in St. Paul's Epistles: "Grace be with you all. Amen." The most important articles of our faith are explained, and the most material objections to the Gospel are answered with great force, in this celebrated epistle. The arguments used in it, as being addressed to persons who had been educated in the Jewish religion, are principally taken from the ancient Scriptures; and the connection between former revelations and the Gospel of Christ, is pointed out in the most perspicuous and satisfactory manner.

7. In addition, it may be observed, that Mr. Stuart, an American critic, has published an ample investigation of several of the points referred to in the above remarks, and the following are the results:--

(1.) As to the place in which the persons lived to whom the epistle is addressed, I have now examined all the objections against the opinion, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was directed to Palestine, which I have met with, and which seem to be of sufficient magnitude to deserve attention. I am unable to perceive that they are very weighty; and surely they come quite short of being conclusive. On the other hand, the positive proof, I acknowledge, is only of a circumstantial nature, and falls short of the weight which direct and unequivocal testimony in the epistle itself would possess. But uniting the whole of it together; considering the intimate knowledge of Jewish rites, the strong attachment to their ritual, and the

special danger of defection from Christianity in consequence of it, which the whole texture of the epistle necessarily supposes, and combining these things with the other circumstances above discussed, I cannot resist the impression, that the universal opinion of the ancient church respecting the persons to whom this epistle was addressed, was well founded, being built upon early tradition and the contents of the epistle; and that the doubts and difficulties thrown in the way by modern and recent critics, are not of sufficient importance to justify us in relinquishing the belief that Palestine Christians were addressed by the epistle to the Hebrews. Thousands of facts, pertaining to criticism and to history, are believed and treated as realities, which have less support than the opinion that has now been examined.

(2.) As to the author, we now come to the result of this investigation. In the Egyptian and eastern churches, there were, it is probable, at a pretty early period, some who had doubts whether St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews; but no considerable person or party is definitely known to us, who entertained these doubts; and it is manifest, from Origen and Eusebius, that there was not, in that quarter, any important opposition to the general and constant tradition of the church, that Paul did write it. Not a single witness of any considerable respectability is named, who has given his voice, in this part of the church, for the negative of the question which we are considering. What Jerom avers, appears to be strictly true, namely, *Ab ecclesiis orientis et ab omnibus retrò ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus, quasi Apostoli Pauli suscipi*. In the western churches a diversity of opinion prevailed; although the actual quantity of negative testimony, that can be adduced, is not great. Yet the concessions of Jerom and Augustine leave no room to doubt the fact, that the predominant opinion of the western churches, in their times, was in the negative. In early times, we have seen that the case was different, when Clement of Rome wrote his epistle, and when the old Latin version was brought into circulation. What produced a change of opinion in the west, we are left to conjecture. The scanty critical and literary records of those times afford us no means for tracing the history of it. But this is far from being a singular case. Many other changes in the opinions of the churches have taken place, which we are, for a similar reason, as little able to trace with any certainty or satisfaction. Storr has endeavoured to show, that Marcion occasioned this revolution, when he came from the east to Rome, and brought with him a collection of the sacred books, in which the Epistle to the Hebrews was omitted. But it is very improbable, that an extravagant man, excommunicated by the Roman church itself, should have produced such a revolution there in sentiment. Others have with more probability, attributed it to the zealous disputes at Rome against the Montanist party, whom the Epistle to the Hebrews was supposed particularly to favour. The

Montanists strenuously opposed the reception again into the bosom of the church of those persons who had so lapsed as to make defection from the Christian faith. The passages in Heb. vi, 4–8, and x, 26–31, at least seem strongly to favour the views which they maintained. The church at Rome carried the dispute against the Montanists very high; and Ernesti and many other critics have been led to believe, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was ultimately rejected by them, because the Montanists relied on it as their main support. As a matter of fact, this cannot be established by direct historical evidence. But, in the absence of all testimony in respect to this subject, it must be allowed as not improbable, that the Epistle to the Hebrews may have, in this way, become obnoxious to the Roman church. Many such instances might be produced from the history of the church. The Ebionites, the Manicheans, the Alogi, and many ancient and modern sects, have rejected some part of the canon of Scripture, because it stood opposed to their party views. The Apocalypse was rejected by many of the oriental churches, on account of their opposition to the Chiliasts, who made so much use of it. And who does not know, that Luther himself rejected the Epistle of James, because he viewed it as thwarting his favourite notions of justification; yea, that he went so far as to give it the appellation of *epistola straminea*? [an epistle of straw.] It cannot be at all strange, then, that the Romish church, exceedingly embittered by the dispute with the Montanists, should have gradually come to call in question the apostolic origin of the epistle; because it was to their adversaries a favourite source of appeal, and because, unlike St. Paul's other epistles, it was anonymous. That all, even of the Montanists, however, admitted the apostolic origin of our epistle, does not seem to be true. Tertullian, who took a very active part in favour of this sect, had, as we have already seen, doubts of such an origin, or rather, he ascribed it to Barnabas. But whatever might have been the cause that the epistle in question was pretty generally rejected by the churches of the west, the fact that it was so cannot be reasonably disputed. A majority of these churches, from the latter half of the second century to the latter half of the fourth, seem to have been generally opposed to receiving this epistle as St. Paul's; although there were some among them who did receive it. It remains, then, to balance the testimony thus collected together and compared. The early testimony is, of course, immeasurably the most important. And there seems to me sufficient evidence, that this was as general and as uniform for the first century after the apostolic age as in respect to many other books of the 444New Testament; and more so, than in respect to several. I cannot hesitate to believe, that the weight of evidence from tradition is altogether preponderant in favour of the opinion, that St. Paul was the author of our epistle.

(3.) As to the language in which the epistle was originally written, there has been a difference of opinion among critics, both in ancient and modern

times. Clement of Alexandria says that St. Paul wrote to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and that St. Luke carefully translated it into Greek. Eusebius in the same manner says, that Paul wrote to the Hebrews in his vernacular language, and that, according to report, either Luke or Clement translated it. So Jerom, also, scripserat ut Hebræus Hebræis Hebraicè; [as a Hebrew he had written to the Hebrews in Hebrew;] and then he adds that this epistle was translated into Greek, so that the colouring of the style was made diverse, in this way, from that of St. Paul's. Of the same opinion, in respect to this, was Clement, of Alexandria; and Origen, as we have seen above, supposes that the thoughts contained in the epistle were St. Paul's, while the diction or costume of it must be attributed to the person who wrote down the sentiments of the Apostle. By the Hebrew language, no one can reasonably doubt, that these fathers meant the Jerusalem dialect, which was spoken in the days of the Apostles, and not the ancient Hebrew, which had long ceased to be a vernacular language. It is quite plain also, that these fathers were led to the conclusion, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in the dialect of Palestine, from their belief, so universal in ancient times, of its having been addressed to some church, or to the churches, in that country. It was very natural to draw such a conclusion; for would not an epistle addressed to Hebrews in all probability be more acceptable, if written in their own vernacular language? Moreover, St. Paul was well acquainted with that language, for he was brought up at Jerusalem, and "at the feet of Gamaliel;" and when he had visited that city, he had addressed the Jewish multitude, who were excited against him, in their native tongue, Acts xxii, 1, 2. Why should it not be supposed, that if, as is probable, this epistle was originally directed to Palestine, it was written in the dialect of that country? So the fathers above quoted evidently thought and reasoned; although other fathers have said nothing on this point, and do not appear to have coincided in opinion with those to whom I have just referred. Among the moderns, also, several critics have undertaken to defend the same opinion; and particularly Michaëlis, who has discussed the subject quite at length, in his introduction to this epistle. I do not think it necessary minutely to examine his arguments. To my own mind they appear altogether unsatisfactory. Some of them are built on an exegesis most palpably erroneous, and which, if admitted, would deduce a very strange meaning from the words of the epistle. Yet, assuming such a meaning, he thence concludes, that the original writer must have expressed a different idea, and that the translator mistook his meaning. He then undertakes to conjecture what the original Hebrew must have been. In other cases, he deduces his arguments from considerations wholly à priori; as if these were admissible in a question of mere fact. He has not adduced a single instance of what he calls wrong translation, which wears the appearance of any considerable probability. On the other hand, Bolton, a sharp-sighted critic, and well acquainted with the Aramean language, who

has gone through with the New Testament, and found almost every where marks, as he thinks, of translation from Aramean documents, confesses, that, in respect to this epistle, he finds not a single vestige of incorrect translation from an Aramean original, and no marks that there ever was such an original. This testimony is of considerable importance in respect to the question before us, as it comes from a critic who spent many years on the study of that which is most intimately connected with the very subject under consideration, namely, the detection of the Aramean originals of the various parts of the New Testament.

(4.) The principal arguments in favour of a Hebrew original are deduced from two sources: That Hebrews are addressed in our epistle, to whom the Hebrew language would have been more acceptable and intelligible, and many of whom, indeed, could not understand Greek, certainly could not read it: That the diversity of style in the Epistle to the Hebrews is so great, when compared with that of St. Paul's epistles, that, unless we suppose the Greek costume did in fact come from another hand, we must be led to the conclusion that St. Paul did not write it. Both of these topics have been already discussed. I merely add here, therefore, that in case the writer of the epistle designed it should have a wide circulation among the Jews, to write in Greek was altogether the most feasible method of accomplishing this. Beside, if St. Paul did address it to the church at Cæsarea, it is altogether probable that he wrote in Greek, as Greek was the principal language of that city. Even if he did not, it was not necessary that he should write in Hebrew; for in every considerable place in Palestine, there were more or less who understood the Greek language. Whoever wishes to see this last position established beyond any reasonable doubt, may read Hug's "Introduction to the New Testament," vol. ii, pp. 32–50. When St. Paul wrote to the Romans, he did not write in Latin; yet there was no difficulty in making his epistle understood, for the knowledge of Greek was very common in Rome. If St. Paul understood the Latin language, which is nowhere affirmed, and he had not resided when he wrote this epistle, in any of the countries where it was commonly used, still he understood Greek so much better that he would of course prefer writing in it. For a similar reason, if no other could be given, one may regard it as more probable, that he would write the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Greek language. At the time of writing it, he had been abroad twenty-five years at least, in 445 Greek countries, and had been in Palestine, during all that period, only a few days. The Jews abroad, whom he every where saw, spoke Greek, not Hebrew. In Greek he preached and conversed. Is it any wonder, then, that, after twenty-five years' incessant labour or preaching, conversing, and writing, in this language, he should have preferred writing in it? Indeed, can it be probable, that, under circumstances like these, he still possessed an equal facility of writing in his native dialect of Palestine? I cannot think

it strange, therefore, that although the Epistle to the Hebrews was in all probability directed to some part of Palestine, yet it was written by St. Paul in Greek, and not in Hebrew. But, whatever may be the estimation put upon arguments of this nature, there are internal marks of its having been originally composed in Greek, which cannot well be overlooked.

HEBRON, one of the most ancient cities in the world; for it was built seven years before Zoan, the capital of Lower Egypt, Numbers xiii, 22. Now, as the Egyptians gloried much in the antiquity of their cities, and their country was indeed one of the first that was peopled after the dispersion of Babel, it may be from hence concluded that it was one of the most ancient. Some think it was founded by Arba, one of the oldest giants in Palestine; for which reason it was called Kirjath-arba, or Arba's city, Joshua xiv, 15; which name was afterward changed to that of Hebron, Joshua xv, 13. Arba was the father of Anak; and from Anak the giants, called Anakim, took their name, who were still dwelling at Hebron when Joshua conquered the land of Canaan. When it was first called Hebron, is uncertain; some think, not till it was conquered by Caleb, and that he called it so from his son of that name. But Calmet is of opinion that the name of Hebron is more ancient; and that Caleb, to do honour to his son, named him after this ancient and celebrated place. Hebron was situated upon an eminence, twenty miles southward from Jerusalem, and twenty miles north from Beersheba. Abraham, Sarah, and Isaac were buried near Hebron, in the cave of Machpelah, or the double cave, which Abraham bought of Ephron, Genesis xxiii, 7–9. Hebron was the allotment of Judah. The Lord assigned it for the inheritance of Caleb, Joshua xiv, 13; x, 3, 23, 37. Joshua first took Hebron, and killed the king, whose name was Hoham. But afterward Caleb again made a conquest of it, assisted by the troops of his tribe, and the valour of Othniel, Judges i, 12, 13. It was appointed to be a dwelling for priests, and declared to be a city of refuge, Joshua xxi, 13. David, after the death of Saul, fixed the seat of his government there, 2 Sam. ii, 2–5. At Hebron, Absalom began his rebellion, 2 Sam. xv, 7, 8, &c. During the captivity of Babylon, the Edomites having invaded the southern parts of Judea, made themselves masters of Hebron; hence Josephus sometimes makes it a part of Edom. Here Zacharias and Elizabeth are believed to have dwelt; and it is supposed to have been the birth place of John the Baptist. Hebron is now called El Khalil; though not a town of large dimensions, it has a considerable population. According to Ali Bey, it contains about four hundred families of Arabs; but he does not notice either the Jews, who are numerous, or the Turks. He describes it as situated on the slope of a mountain, and having a strong castle. Provisions, he says, are abundant, and there is a considerable number of shops. The streets are winding, and the houses unusually high. The country is well cultivated, to a considerable

extent. Hebron is computed to be twenty-seven miles south-west of Jerusalem.

HEIFER, a young cow, used in sacrifice at the temple, Num. xix, 1–10. Moses and Aaron were instructed to deliver the divine command to the children of Israel that they should procure “a red heifer, without spot,” that is, one that was entirely red, without one spot of any other colour; “free from blemish, and on which the yoke had never yet come,” that is, which had never yet been employed in ploughing the ground or in any other work; for according to the common sense of all mankind, those animals which had been made to serve other uses, became unfit to be offered to God,—a sentiment which we find in Homer and other Heathen writers. The animal was to be delivered to the priest, who was to lead her forth out of the camp, and there to slay her: the priest was then to take of the blood with his finger, and sprinkle it seven times before the tabernacle, and afterward to burn the carcass: then to take cedar wood and hyssop, and scarlet wood, and cast them into the flames. The ashes were to be gathered up, and preserved in a secure and clean place, for the use of the congregation, by the sprinkling of which ashes in water, it became a water of separation, by means of which a typical or ceremonial purification for sin was effected, Heb. ix, 13.

HELIOPOLIS. See On.

HELL. This is a Saxon word, which is derived from a verb which signifies to hide or conceal. A late eminent Biblical critic, Dr. Campbell, has investigated this subject with his usual accuracy; and the following is the substance of his remarks. In the Hebrew Scriptures the word sheol frequently occurs, and uniformly, he thinks, denotes the state of the dead in general, without regard to the virtuous or vicious characters of the persons, their happiness or misery. In translating that word, the LXX have almost invariably used the Greek term ᾠδης, hades, which means the receptacle of the dead, and ought rarely to have been translated hell, in the sense in which we now use it, namely, as the place of torment. To denote this latter object, the New Testament writers always make use of the Greek word γέεννα, which is compounded of two Hebrew words, Ge Hinnom, that is, “The Valley of Hinnom,” a place near Jerusalem, in which children were cruelly sacrificed by fire to Moloch, the idol of the Ammonites, 2 Chron. xxxiii, 6. This place was also called Tophet, 2 Kings xxiii, 10, alluding, as is supposed, to the noise of drums, (toph signifying a drum,) 446there raised to drown the cries of helpless infants. As in process of time this place came to be considered an emblem of hell, or the place of torment reserved for the punishment of the wicked in a future state, the name Tophet came gradually to be used in this sense, and at length to be confined to it. In this sense, also, the word gehenna, a synonymous term, is always



to be understood in the New Testament, where it occurs about a dozen times. The confusion that has arisen on this subject has been occasioned not only by our English translators having rendered the Hebrew word sheol and the Greek word gehenna frequently by the term hell; but the Greek word hades, which occurs eleven times in the New Testament, is, in every instance, except one, translated by the same English word, which it ought never to have been. In the following passages of the Old Testament it seems, however, that a future world of wo is expressed by sheol: "They," the wicked, "spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to sheol," Job xxi, 13. "The wicked shall be turned into sheol, and all the nations that forget God," Psalm ix, 17, 18. "Her feet go down to death, her steps take hold on sheol," Prov. v, 5. "But he knoweth not that the ghosts are there, and that her guests are in the depths of sheol," Prov. ix, 18. "Thou shalt beat him with a rod, and shalt deliver his soul from sheol," Prov. xxiii, 14. Thus, as Stuart observes, in his "Essay on Future Punishment," while the Old Testament employs sheol, in most cases to designate the grave, the region of the dead, the place of departed spirits, it employs it also, in some cases, to designate along with this idea the adjunct one of the place of misery, place of punishment, region of wo]. In this respect it accords fully with the New Testament use of hades. For though hades signifies the grave, and often the invisible region of separate spirits, without reference to their condition, yet, in Luke xvi, 23, "In hades ἐν τῷ ᾄδῃ, he lifted up his eyes, being in torments," it is clearly used for a place and condition of misery. The word hell is also used by our translators for gehenna, which means the world of future punishment, "How shall ye escape the damnation of hell, κρίσεως τῆς γέεννης?"

Hell, Gates of. See Gates.

HELLENISTS. On this appellation, Dr. Jennings observes, There is a very remarkable appellation which the Apostle Paul, after glorying in his being "of the stock of Israel, and of the tribe of Benjamin," applies to himself, namely, that he was "a Hebrew of the Hebrews," Phil. iii, 5. By this expression Godwin understands a Hebrew both by father's and mother's side. But if this be all that the phrase imports, there seems to be very little occasion for the Apostle's using it immediately after having declared, that he was "of the stock of Israel, and the tribe of Benjamin;" which, on Godwin's supposition, is the same as a Hebrew of the Hebrews; for the Jews were not allowed to marry out of their own nation; or if they sometimes married proselytes, yet their number was comparatively so small among them, especially while they were under oppression, as they were at that time by the Romans, that methinks Paul would hardly have mentioned it as a distinguishing privilege and honour, that neither of his parents were proselytes. It is therefore a much more probable sense, that a

Hebrew of the Hebrews signifies a Hebrew both by nation and language, which multitudes of Abraham's posterity, in those days, were not; or one of the Hebrew Jews, who performed their public worship in the Hebrew tongue; for such were reckoned more honourable than the Hellenistic Jews, who in their dispersion having, in a manner, lost the Hebrew, used the Greek language in sacris, and read the Scripture out of the Septuagint version. We meet with this distinction among the converted Jews, in the Acts of the Apostles: "In those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians or Hellenists against the Hebrews," Acts vi, 1. This is what St. Paul probably meant by his being a Hebrew, as distinguished from an Israelite: "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I," 2 Corinthians xi, 22. In one sense, these were convertible terms, both signifying Jews by nation and religion; but in the sense just mentioned, there were many, in those days, who were Israelites, but not Hebrews. St. Paul was both, not only an Israelite by birth, but a Hebrew, and not a Hellenistic Jew. Godwin expresses himself inaccurately, when he says that those who lived in Palestine, and who, as using the Hebrew text in their public worship, were opposed to the Ἑλληνισταί, are called Hebrews, or Jews. For, though Hebrew and Jew are convertible terms, when opposed to Gentiles, as denoting the seed of Abraham, and professors of the Mosaic religion, see Jer. xxxiv, 9; yet, as opposed to the Ἑλληνισταί, they are not convertible terms, there being Hebrew Jews and Hellenistic Jews; for it is said, that when "they, who were scattered by the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled into several countries, preaching the word to none but Jews only," yet they spoke, πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνιστάς, to the Hellenists or Grecians, Acts xi, 19, 20. In order to confirm the sense which is here given of the word Ἑλληνισταί, in opposition to the appellation Hebrews, it is proper we should take notice of the distinction between the Ἕλληνας and Ἑλληνισταί. The former were Greeks by nation, and as such distinguished from Jews, Acts xvi, 1; xix, 10; and the Greek empire having been rendered by Alexander in a manner universal, and their language being then the most common and general, the appellation Greeks is sometimes given to the whole Heathen world, or to all who were not Jews, Rom. i, 16; ii, 9. These Greeks, called Ἑλληνικοὶ by Josephus, are always styled Ἕλληνας in the New Testament. On which account Grotius, understanding by the Ἑλληνισταί, or "Grecians, to whom some of those who were dispersed on the persecution which arose about Stephen, preached the Lord Jesus," Acts xi, 19, 20, Greeks by nation, concludes there is a mistake in the text, and alters it according to the Syriac and Vulgate versions: "Certè legendum," [it ought certainly to be read,] saith he, "πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας." So indeed the Alexandrian manuscript reads, but it is supported by no other copy. And this is decisive against it--that from the words immediately preceding, it is evident that these Grecians were by nation Jews, and not Greeks; it being expressly

said, that those who were scattered on the persecution “preached the Gospel to the Jews only.” As for the Ἕλληνας, or Greeks mentioned in St. John’s Gospel, as being come to Jerusalem at the passover to worship in the temple, John xii, 20, and likewise those mentioned in the Acts, as worshipping along with the Jews in the synagogues, Acts xiv, 1; xviii, 4; they were doubtless Greeks by birth and nation, yet proselytes to the Jewish religion. There is a distinction made between Jews and proselytes, Acts ii, 10; but none between Hebrews and proselytes, because a proselyte might be either a Hebrew or a Hellenist, according to the language in which he performed public worship. That the Hellenists or Grecians, were Jews, is farther argued from the account we have, that when at Jerusalem St. Paul “disputed against the Grecians, they went about to slay him,” Acts ix, 29, as the Jews at Damascus had done before, Acts ix, 23. Now had these Grecians been strangers of a different nation, it cannot be imagined they durst have attempted to kill a Jew, among his own countrymen, in the capital, and without a formal accusation of him before any of their tribunals. Upon the whole, the Ἕλληνισαί, or Grecians being Jews who used the Greek tongue in their sacred exercises, the Hebrew Jews and Grecian Jews were distinguished in those days, in like manner as the Portuguese and Dutch Jews are among us, not so much by the place of their birth, (many being born in England, others abroad,) as by the language they use in their public prayers and sermons.

Among the wonderful dealings of God, says Dr. Neander, by which the coming of Christianity was prepared, must be placed the spreading of the Jews among the Greeks and Romans. Those among them who belonged to the Pharisees gave themselves much trouble to obtain proselytes; and the loss of respect for the old popular religion, and the unsatisfied religious wants of multitudes, farthered their views. Reverence for the national God of the Jews, as a mighty Being, and reverence for the secret sanctuary of the splendid temple of Jerusalem, had long gained admittance among the Heathen. Jewish goetæ (enchanters, jugglers, &c) permitted themselves to make use of a thousand acts of delusion, in which they were very skilful, to make an impression of astonishment on the minds of those around them. Confidence in Judaism had in consequence made such wide progress, especially in large capital towns, that the Roman writers in the time of the first emperors openly complain of it; and Seneca, in his book upon superstition, said of the Jews, “The conquered have given laws to the conquerors.” The Jewish proselyte-makers, “blind leaders of the blind,” who had themselves no conception of the real nature, of religion, could give to others no insight into it. They often allowed their converts to take up a kind of dead monotheism, and merely exchange one kind of superstition for another; they taught them, that, by the mere outward worship of one God, and outward ceremonials, they were sure of the grace

of God, without requiring any change of life; and they gave to them only new means of silencing their conscience, and new support in the sins which they were unwilling to renounce: and hence our Saviour reproached these proselyte-makers, that they made their converts ten times more the children of hell, than they themselves were. But we must here accurately distinguish between the two classes of proselytes. The proselytes in the strict sense of the word, the proselytes of righteousness, who underwent circumcision and took upon themselves the whole of the ceremonial law, were very different from the proselytes of the gate, who only bound themselves to renounce idolatry, to the worship of the one God, and to abstinence from all Heathenish excess, as well as from every thing which appeared to have any connection with idolatry. The former often embraced all the fanaticism and superstition of the Jews, and allowed themselves to be blindly led by their Jewish teachers. The more difficult it had been to them to subject themselves to the observance of the Jewish ceremonial law, necessarily so irksome to a Greek or a Roman, the less could they find it in their hearts to believe, that all this had been in vain, that they had obtained no advantage by it, and that they must renounce their presumed holiness. What Justin Martyr says to the Jews, holds good of these proselytes: "The proselytes not only do not believe, but they calumniate the name of Christ twice as much as you, and they wish to murder and torture us who believe on him, because they are desirous to resemble you in every thing." The proselytes of the gate, on the contrary, had taken many of the most admirable truths out of Judaism. Without becoming entirely Jews, they had become acquainted with the Holy Scriptures of the Jews, they had heard of the promised messenger from God, of the King armed with power from God, of whom a report had been spread, as Suetonius says in the life of Vespasian, over the whole of the east. Much of that which they had heard from their Jewish teachers, whose writings they had read, had remained dark to them, and they were still to seek in them. By the notions which they had received from the Jews, of one God, of the divine government of the world, of God's judgment, and of the Messiah, they were more prepared for the Gospel than other Heathens; and because they still thought that they had too little, because they had no determined religious system, and were curious after more instruction in divine things, and because they had not received many of the prejudices which swayed the Jews, they were more fitted to receive the Gospel than many of the Jews. From the very beginning they must have been attentive to the preaching of the Gospel, which secured to them, without making them Jews, a full share in the fulfilment of those promises of which the Jews had spoken to them. To these proselytes of the gate, (the φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεὸν, the εὐσεβεῖς of the New Testament,) passed, therefore, according to the Acts, the preaching of the Gospel, when it had been rejected by the blinded Jews; and here the seed of the divine word found a fitting soil in hearts desirous of holiness.

There were, however, doubtless, among the proselytes of the gate, some who, wanting in proper earnestness in their search after religious truth, only desired, in every case, an easy road to heaven, which did not require any self-denial; and who, in order to be sure of being on the safe side, whether power and truth lay with the Jews or the Heathens, sometimes worshipped in the synagogue of Jehovah, sometimes in the temples of the gods, and who, therefore, fluttered in suspense between Judaism and Heathenism.

HEMLOCK, רוש and ראש, Deut. xxix, 18; xxxii, 32; Psalm lxix, 21; Jer. viii, 14; ix, 15; xxiii, 15; Lam. iii, 5, 19; Hosea x, 4; Amos vi, 12. In the two latter places our translators have rendered the word hemlock in the others, gall. Hiller supposes it the centaureum, described by Pliny; but Celsius shows it to be the hemlock. It is evident, from Deut. xxix, 18, that some herb or plant is meant of a malignant or nauseous kind, being there joined with wormwood, and in the margin of our Bibles explained to be “a poisonous herb.” In like manner see Jer. viii, 14; ix, 15; and xxiii, 15. In Hosea x, 4, the comparison is to a bitter herb, which, growing among grain, overpowers the useful vegetable, and substitutes a pernicious weed. “If,” says the author of “Scripture Illustrated,” “the comparison be to a plant growing in the furrows of the field, strictly speaking, then we are much restricted in our plants likely to answer this character; but if we may take the ditches around, or the moist or sunken places within the field also, which I partly suspect, then we may include other plants; and I do not see why hemlock may not be intended. Scheuchzer inclines to this rather than wormwood or agrostes, as the LXX have rendered it. The prophet appears to mean a vegetable which should appear wholesome, and resemble those known to be salutary, as judgment, when just, properly is; but experience would demonstrate its malignity, as unjust judgment is when enforced. Hemlock is poisonous, and water-hemlock especially; yet either of these may be mistaken, and some of their parts, the root particularly, may deceive but too fatally.”

HEN, ὄρνις, 2 Esdras i, 30; Matt. xxiii, 37; Luke xiii, 34. In these last two passages our Saviour exclaims, “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!” The metaphor here used is a very beautiful one. When the hen sees a bird of prey coming, she makes a noise to assemble her chickens, that she may cover them with her wings from the danger. The Roman eagle was about to fall upon the Jewish state; our Lord invited them to himself in order to guard them from threatened calamities: they disregarded his invitations and warnings, and fell a prey to their adversaries. The affection of the hen to her brood is so strong as to have become proverbial. There is a beautiful Greek epigram in the Anthologia,

which affords a very fine illustration of the affection of this bird in another view. It has been thus translated:--

“Beneath her fostering wing the hen defends  
Her darling offspring, while the snow descends;  
And through the winter’s day unmoved defies  
The chilling fleeces and inclement skies;  
Till vanquish’d by the cold and piercing blast,  
True to her charge she perishes at last.”

Plutarch, in his book *De Philostorgiâ*, represents this parental attachment and care in a very pleasing manner: “Do we not daily observe with what care the hen protects her chickens; giving some shelter under her wings, supporting others upon her back, calling them around her, and picking out their food; and if any animal approaches that terrifies them, driving it away with a courage and strength truly wonderful?”

**HENOTICON**, a decree or edict of the Emperor Zeno, which was dated at Constantinople in the year 482, and by which he intended to unite all the parties in religion under one faith. For this reason the decree was called *henoticon*, which signifies “union” or “uniting.” It is generally agreed that it was published by the advice of Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, who wished to reconcile the contending parties. This decree repeated and confirmed all that had been enacted in the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, against the Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians, without particularly mentioning the council of Chalcedon. The *henoticon* was approved by all those of the two contending parties who were remarkable for their candour and moderation; but it was opposed by the violent and obstinate, who complained that it was injurious to the honour and authority of the most holy council of Chalcedon. Hence arose new contests and new divisions not less deplorable than those which this decree was intended to suppress. The Catholics opposed it with all their strength; and it was condemned in form by Pope Felix II.

**HERESY**, *hæresis*, *ἁίρεσις*, from *αἰρέω*, I choose, signifies an error in some essential point of Christian faith, publicly avowed, and obstinately maintained; or, according to the legal definition, “*Sententia rerum divinarum humano sensu excogitata, palam docta, et pertinaciter defensa.*” [An opinion of divine things invented by human reason, openly taught, and obstinately defended.] Among the ancients, the word *heresy* appears to have had nothing of that odious signification which has been attached to it by ecclesiastical writers in later times. It only signified a peculiar opinion, dogma, or sect, without conveying any reproach; being indifferently used, either of a party approved, or of one disapproved, by the writer. In this sense they spoke of the *heresy* of the Stoics, of the Peripatetics, Epicureans,

&c, meaning the sect or peculiar system of these philosophers. In the historical part of the New Testament, the word seems to bear very nearly the same signification, being employed indiscriminately to denote a sect or party, whether good or bad. Thus we read of the sect or heresy of the Sadducees, of the Pharisees, of the Nazarenes, &c. See Acts v, 17; xv, 5; xxiv, 5; xxvi, 5; xxviii, 22. In the two former of these passages, the term heresy seems to be adopted by the sacred historian merely for the sake of distinction, without the least appearance of any intention to convey either praise or blame. In Acts xxvi, 4, 5, St. Paul, in defending himself before King Agrippa, uses the same term, when it was manifestly his design to exalt the party to which he had belonged, and to give their system the preference over every other system of Judaism, both with regard to soundness of doctrine and purity of morals.

2. It has been suggested that the acceptation of the word ἄρπεις in the epistles is different from what it has been observed to be in the historical books of the New Testament. In order to account for this difference, it may be observed that the word sect has always something relative in it; and therefore, although the general import of the term be the same, it will convey a favourable or an unfavourable idea, according to the particular relation which it bears in the application. When it is used along with the proper name, by way of distinguishing one party from another, it conveys neither praise nor reproach. If any thing reprehensible or commendable be meant, it is suggested, not by the word ἄρπεις itself, but by the words with which it stands connected in construction. Thus we may speak of a strict sect, or a lax sect; or of a good sect, or a bad sect. Again: the term may be applied to a party formed in a community, when considered in reference to the whole. If the community be of such a nature as not to admit of such a subdivision, without impairing or corrupting its constitution, a charge of splitting into sects, or forming parties, is equivalent to a charge of corruption in that which is most essential to the existence and welfare of the society. Hence arises the whole difference in the word, as it is used in the historical part of the New Testament, and in the epistles of St. Peter and St. Paul; for these are the only Apostles who employ it. In the history, the reference is always of the first kind; in the epistles, it is always of the second. In these last, the Apostles address themselves only to Christians, and either reprehend them for, or warn them against, forming sects among themselves, to the prejudice of charity, to the production of much mischief within their community, and of great scandal to the unconverted world without. In both applications, however, the radical import of the word is the same; and even in the latter it has no necessary reference to doctrine, true or false. During the early ages of Christianity, the term heresy gradually lost the innocence of its original meaning, and came to be applied, in a reproachful sense, to any corruption of what was considered

as the orthodox creed, or even to any departure from the established rites and ceremonies of the church.

3. The heresies chiefly alluded to in the apostolical epistles are, first, those of the Judaizers, or rigid adherents to the Mosaic rites, especially that of circumcision; second, those of converted Hellenists, or Grecian Jews, who held the Greek eloquence and philosophy in too high an estimation, and corrupted, by the speculations of the latter, the simplicity of the Gospel; and third, those who endeavoured to blend Christianity with a mixed philosophy of magic, demonology, and Platonism, which was then highly popular in the world. With respect to the latter, the remarks of Hug will tend to illustrate some passages in the writings of St. Paul:--Without being acquainted with the notions of those teachers who caused the Apostle so much anxiety and so much vexation, a considerable part of these treatises must necessarily remain dark and unintelligible. From the criteria by which the Apostle points them out, at one time some deemed that they recognised the Gnostics; others perceived none but the Essenes; and every one found arguments for his assertions from the similarity of the doctrines, opinions, and morals. It would, however, be as difficult to prove that the Gnostic school had at that time indeed perfectly developed itself, as it is unjust to charge the Essenes with that extreme of immorality of which St. Paul accused these seducers, since the contemporaries and acquaintances of this Jewish sect mention them with honour and respect, and extol its members as the most virtuous men of their age. The similarity of the principles and opinions, which will have been observed in both parties compared with St. Paul's declarations, flows from a common source, from the philosophy of that age, whence both the one and the other have derived their share. We shall therefore go less astray, if we recede a step, and consider the philosophy itself, as the general modeller of these derivative theories. It found its followers among Judaism as well as among the Heathens; it both introduced its speculative preparations into Christianity, and endeavoured to unite them or to adjust them to it, as well as they were able, by which means Christianity would have become deformed and unlike to itself, and would have been merged in the ocean of philosophical reveries, unless the Apostles had on this occasion defended it against the follies of men. An oriental, or, as it is commonly called, a Babylonian or Chaldean, doctrinal system had already long become known to the Greeks, and even to the Romans, before Augustus, and still more so in the Augustan age, and was in the full progress of its extension over Asia and Europe. It set up different deities and intermediate spirits in explanation of certain phenomena of nature, for the office of governing the world, and for the solution of other metaphysical questions, which from time immemorial were reckoned among the difficult propositions of philosophy. The practical part of this system was occupied with the precepts by means of which a person might



enter into communication with these spirits or demons. But the result which they promised to themselves from this union with the divine natures, was that of acquiring, by their assistance, superhuman knowledge, that of predicting future events, and of performing supernatural works. These philosophers were celebrated under the name of magi and Chaldeans; who, for the sake of better accommodating themselves to the western nations, modified their system after the Greek forms, and then, as it appears, knew how to unite it with the doctrine of Plato, from whence afterward arose the Neo-Platonic and in Christendom the Gnostical school. These men forced their way even to the throne. Tiberius had received instruction in their philosophy, and was very confident that by means of an intelligence with the demons, it was possible to learn and perform extraordinary things. Nero caused a great number of them to be brought over from Asia, not unfrequently at the expense of the provinces. The supernatural spirits would not always appear, yet he did not discard his belief of them. The magi and Chaldeans were the persons who were consulted on great undertakings, who, when conspiracies arose, predicted the issue; who invoked spirits, prepared offerings, and in love affairs were obliged to afford aid from their art. Even the force of the laws, to which recourse was frequently necessary to be had at Rome, tended to nothing but the augmentation of their authority. As they found access and favour with people of all classes in the capital, so did they also in the provinces. Paul found a magus at the court of the proconsul at Paphos, Acts xiii, 6. Such was that Simon in Samaria, Acts viii, 10, who was there considered as a higher being of the spiritual class. The expression is remarkable, as it is a part of the technical language of the Theurgists; they called him Δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ μεγάλη, “The great power of God.” So also Pliny calls some of the demons and intermediate spirits, by whose coöperation particular results were effected, potestates. [Powers.] Justin Martyr, the fellow countryman of Simon, has preserved to us some technical expressions of his followers. He says that they ascribed to him the high title ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐξουσίας, καὶ δυνάμεως. [Far above all principality, and power, and might.] Of these classes of spirits, which appear under such different appellations, the superior were those who ruled; but the inferior, who had more of a material substance, and who, on that account, were able to connect themselves immediately with matter, were those who executed the commands of the superior. By an intelligence with the superior spirits a person might have the subaltern at his service and assistance; for the more powerful demons thus commanded the inferior to execute certain commissions in the material world: Ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων, “By the prince of the devils,” Matt. xii, 24.

4. The Syrian philosopher, Jamblichus, of Chalcis, has furnished us with a circumstantial representation of this system and its several varieties, in his

book on the mysteries of the Chaldeans and Egyptians:--The nature of the gods is a pure, spiritual, and perfect unity. With this highest and perfect immateriality no influence on matter is conceivable, consequently, no creation and dominion of the world. Certain subordinate deities must therefore be admitted, which are more compounded in their nature, and can act upon gross matter. These are the “creators of the world,” δημιουργοι, and the “rulers of the world,” κοσμοκράτορες. The superior deities are, however, the real cause of all that exists; and from their fulness, from their πλήρωμα, it derives its existence. The succession from the highest deities down to the lowest is not by a sudden descent, but by a continually graduating decrease from the highest, pure, and spiritual natures, down to those which are more substantial and material, which are the nearest related to the gross matter of the creation, and which consequently possess the property of acting upon it. In proportion to their purer quality, or coarser composition, they occupy different places as their residence, either in a denser atmosphere, or in higher regions. The highest among these classes of spirits are called ἄρχαι, or, ἀρχικὸν ἀπιόν. Others among the “divine natures,” θεῖαι οὐσίαι, are “intermediate beings,” μέσαι. Those which occupy themselves with the laws of the world are also called ἄρχοντες, and “the ministering spirits” are δυνάμεις and ἄγγελοι. The archangels are not generally recognised in this theory; this class is said to have been of a later origin, and to have been first introduced by Porphyry. (See Archangel.) If we take here also into consideration the ἐξουσία, of which Justin has before spoken, we shall have enumerated the greater part of the technical appellations of this demonology. But to arrive at a union with the higher orders of the spiritual world, in which alone the highest bliss of man consists, it is necessary, before all things, to become disengaged from the servitude of the body, which detains the soul from soaring up to the purely spiritual. Matrimony, therefore, and every inclination to sexual concupiscence, must be renounced before the attainment of this perfection. Hence, the offerings and initiations of the magi cannot, without great injury, be even communicated to those who have not as yet emancipated themselves from the libido procreandi, and the propensities to corporeal attachments. To eat meat, or to partake in general of any slain animal, nay, to even touch it, contaminates. Bodily exercises and purifications, though not productive of the gifts of prophecy, are nevertheless conducive to them. Though the gods only attend to the pure, they nevertheless sometimes mislead men to impure, 451actions. This may perhaps proceed from the totally different ideas of that which is good and righteous, which subsist between them and mankind.

5. This philosophy of which the elements had already existed a long time in the east, formed itself, in its progress to the west, into a doctrinal system, which found there far more approbation and celebrity than it ever had

deserved. It was principally welcome in those countries, to which the epistles of the Apostle are directed. When St. Paul had preached at Ephesus, a quantity of magical and theurgical books were brought forward by their possessors and burned before his eyes, Acts xix, 19. This city had long since been celebrated for them, and the Ἐφέσια ἀλεξιφάρμακα, and Ἐφέσια γράμματα, were spells highly extolled by the ancients for the purpose of procuring an authority over the demons. As late even as the fourth century, the synod at Laodicea was obliged to institute severe laws against the worship of angels, against magic, and against incantations. These opinions had taken such a deep root in the mind, that some centuries did not suffice for the extinction of the recollection of them. Now, there are passages in the Apostle which strikingly characterize this theory. He calls the doctrinal system of his opponents φιλοσοφία οὐ κατὰ Χριστὸν, “a philosophy incompatible with Christianity,” Col. ii, 8; θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων, “a worship of angels,” Col. ii, 18; διδασκαλῖαι δαιμονίων, “a demonology,” 1 Tim. iv, 1. He calls it still farther γοητεία, 2 Tim. iii, 13. This is the peculiar expression by which the ancients denoted magical arts and necromantic experiments; γόης is, according to Hesychius, μάγος, κόλαξ, περιεργός, and γοητεύει, ἀπατᾶ μαγεύει, φαρμακεύει, ἐξάιδει. λ. St. Paul compares these teachers to Jannes and Jambres, 2 Timothy iii, 8. These two persons are, according to the ancient tradition, the magicians who withstood Moses by their arts. They were from time immemorial names so notorious in the magical science, that they did not remain unknown even to the Neo-Platonics. When the Apostle enjoins the Ephesians to array themselves in the arms of faith, and courageously to endure the combat, Ephes. vi, 12, he says that it is the more necessary, because their combat is not against human force, οὐ πρὸς [not against] ἄμα καὶ σάρκα, “flesh and blood,” but against superhuman natures. Where he mentions these, he enumerates in order the names of this magico-spiritual world, ἀρχάς, ἐξουσίας, particularly the κοσμοκράτορας, “principalities,” “powers,” “rulers;” and likewise fixes their abode in the upper aërial regions, εἰς τὸν ἀέρα ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. In like manner, in the Epistle to the Colossians, for the sake of representing to them Christianity in an exalted and important light, and of praising the divine nature of Jesus, he says, that all that exists is his creation, and is subjected to him, not even the spiritual world excepted. He then selects the philosophic appellations to demonstrate that this supposititious demonocracy is wholly subservient to him; whether they be θρόνοι, or κυριότητες, ἀρχαὶ ἐξουσίαι, [thrones, dominions, principalities, powers,] Col. i, 16. Finally, to destroy completely and decisively the whole doctrinal system, he demonstrates, that Christ, through the work of redemption, has obtained the victory over the entire spiritual creation, that he drags in triumph the ἀρχάς [principalities] and ἐξουσίας [powers] as vanquished, and that henceforth their dominion and exercise of power have ceased, Col.

ii, 15. But what he says respecting the seared consciences of these heretics, respecting their deceptions, their avarice, &c, is certainly more applicable to this class of men, than to any other. None throughout all antiquity are more accused of these immoralities, than those pretended confidants of the occult powers. If he speaks warmly against any distinction of meats, against abstinence from matrimony, this also applies to them; and if he rejects bodily exercises, it was because they recommended them, because they imposed baths, lustrations, continence, and long preparations, as the conditions by which alone the connection with the spirits became possible. These, then, are the persons who passed before the Apostle's mind, and who, when they adopted Christianity, established that sect among the professors of Jesus, which gave to it the name of Gnostics, and which, together with the different varieties of this system, is accused by history of magical arts. Other adherents of this system among the Heathens, to which the Syrian philosophers, as well as some Egyptian, such as Plotinus and his scholars, belonged, formed the sect of Neo-Platonism.

6. But in the above remarks of this learned German, some considerations are wanting, necessary to the right understanding of several of the above passages quoted from St. Paul. The philosophic system above mentioned was built on the Scripture doctrine of good and evil angels, and so had a basis of truth, although abused to a gross superstition, and even idolatry. It was grounded, too, upon the notion of different orders among both good and evil spirits, with subordination and government; which also is a truth of which some intimation is given in Scripture. The Apostle then could use all these terms without giving any sanction to the errors of the day. He knew that the spiritual powers they had converted into subordinate deities, were either good or evil angels in their various ranks, and he uproots the whole superstition, by showing that the "thrones and dominions" of heaven are submissive created servants of Christ; and that the evil spirits, the rulers of "the darkness of this world," are put under his feet.

HERMON, a celebrated mountain in the Holy Land, often spoken of in Scripture. It was in the northern boundary of the country, beyond Jordan, and in the territories which originally belonged to Og, king of Bashan, Joshua xii, 5; xiii, 5. The Psalmist connects Tabor and Hermon together, upon more than one occasion, Psalm lxxxix, 12; cxxxiii, 3; from which it may be inferred that they lay contiguous to each other. This is agreeable to the account that is given us by travellers. Mr. Maundrell, in his journey from Aleppo, says that in three hours and a half from the river Kishon, he came to a small brook near which was an old village and a good kane, called Legune; not far from which his company took up their quarters for the night, and from whence they had an extensive prospect of the plain of Esdraëlon. At about six or seven hours' distance eastward, stood, within

view, Nazareth, and the two mountains Tabor and Hermon. He adds that they were sufficiently instructed by experience what the holy Psalmist means by the dew of Hermon; their tents being as wet with it as if it had rained all night, Psalm cxxxiii, 3.

HEROD, surnamed the Great, king of the Jews, second son of Antipater the Idumean, born B. C. 71. At the age of twenty-five he was made by his father governor of Galilee, and distinguished himself by the suppression of a band of robbers, with the execution of their leader, Hezekiah, and several of his comrades. As he had performed this act of heroism by his own authority, and had executed the culprits without the form of trial, he was summoned before the sanhedrim, but, through the strength of his party and zeal of his friends, he escaped any censure. In the civil war between the republican and Cæsarian parties, Herod joined Cassius, and was made governor of Cælo-Syria; and when Mark Antony arrived victorious in Syria, Herod and his brother found means to ingratiate themselves with him, and were appointed as tetrarchs in Judea; but in a short time an invasion of Antigonus, who was aided by the Jews, obliged Herod to make his escape from Jerusalem, and retire first to Idumea, and then to Egypt. He at length arrived at Rome, and obtained the crown of Judea upon occasion of a difference between the two branches of the Asmodean family. Hyrcanus had been for a considerable time prince and high priest of the Jewish nation; but while the Roman empire was in an unsettled state, after the death of Julius Cæsar, Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, brother of Hyrcanus, made himself master of the city and all Judea. In this state Herod found things when he came to Rome, and the most that he then aimed at was to obtain the kingdom for Aristobulus, his wife's brother; but the senate of Rome, moved by the recommendations of Mark Antony, conferred the kingdom of Judea upon Herod himself. Having met with this unexpected success at Rome, he returned without delay to Judea, and in about three years got possession of the whole country. He had, however, to fight his way to the throne, which, as we have seen, was in the possession of Antigonus. Though aided by the Roman army, he was obliged to lay siege to Jerusalem, which held out for six months, when it was carried by assault, and a vast slaughter was made of the inhabitants, till the intercession and bribes of Herod put an end to it. Antigonus was taken prisoner and put to death, which opened the way to Herod's quiet possession of the kingdom. His first cares were to replenish his coffers, and to repress the faction still attached to the Asmodean race, and which regarded him as a usurper. He was guilty of many extortions and cruelties in the pursuit of these objects. Shortly after this, an accusation was lodged against Herod before Mark Antony by Cleopatra, who had been influenced to the deed by his mother-in-law, Alexandra. He was summoned to answer to the charges exhibited against him before the triumvir; and on this

occasion he gave a most remarkable display of the conflict of opposite passions in a ferocious heart. Doatingly fond of his wife, Mariamne, and not being able to bear the thought of her falling into the hands of another, he exacted a solemn promise from Joseph, whom he appointed to govern in his absence, that should the accusation prove fatal to him he would put the queen to death. Joseph disclosed the secret to Mariamne, who, abhorring such a savage proof of his love, from that moment conceived the deepest and most settled aversion to her husband. Herod, by great pecuniary sacrifices, made his peace with Antony, and returned in high credit. Some hints were thrown out respecting Joseph's familiarity with Mariamne during his absence; he communicated his suspicions to his wife, who, recriminating, upbraided him with his cruel order concerning her. His rage was unbounded; he put Joseph to death for communicating the secret entrusted to him alone, and he threw his mother-in-law, Alexandra, into prison.

2. In the war between Antony and Octavius, Herod raised an army for the purpose of joining the former; but he was obliged first to engage Malchus, king of Arabia, whom he defeated and obliged to sue for peace. After the battle of Actium, his great object was to make terms with the conqueror; and, as a preliminary step, he put to death Hyrcanus, the only surviving male of the Asmodeans; and, having secured his family, he embarked for Rhodes, where Augustus at that time was. He appeared before the master of the Roman world in all the regal ornaments excepting his diadem, and with a noble confidence related the faithful services he had performed for his benefactor, Antony, concluding that he was ready to transfer the same gratitude to a new patron, from whom he should hold his crown and kingdom. Augustus was struck with the magnanimity of the defence, and replaced the diadem on the head of Herod, who remained the most favoured of the tributary sovereigns. When the emperor afterward travelled through Syria, in his way to and from Egypt, he was entertained with the utmost magnificence by Herod; in recompense for which he restored to him all his revenues and dominions, and even considerably augmented them. His good fortune as a prince, was poisoned by domestic broils, and especially by the insuperable aversion of Mariamne, whom at length he brought to trial, convicted, and executed. She submitted to her fate with all the intrepidity of innocence, and was sufficiently avenged by the remorse of her husband, who seems never after to have enjoyed a tranquil hour.

4533. His rage being quenched, Herod endeavoured to banish the memory of his evil acts from his mind by scenes of dissipation; but the charms of his once loved Mariamne haunted him wherever he went: he would frequently call aloud upon her name, and insist upon his attendants bringing her into his presence, as if willing to forget that she was no longer

among the living. At times he would fly from the sight of men, and on his return from solitude, which was ill suited to a mind conscious of the most ferocious deeds, he became more brutal than ever, and in fits of fury spared neither foes nor friends. Alexandra, whose malignity toward her daughter has been noticed, was an unpitied victim to his rage. At length he recovered some portion of self-possession, and employed himself in projects of regal magnificence. He built at Jerusalem a stately theatre and amphitheatre, in which he celebrated games in honour of Augustus, to the great displeasure of the zealous Jews, who discovered an idolatrous profanation in the theatrical ornaments and spectacles. Nothing, it is said, gave them so much offence as some trophies which he had set round his theatre in honour of Augustus, and in commemoration of his victories, but which the Jews regarded as images devoted to the purposes of idol worship. For this and other acts of the king a most serious conspiracy was formed against him, which he, fortunately for himself, discovered; and he exercised the most brutal revenge on all the parties concerned in it. He next built Samaria, which he named Sebaste, and adorned it with the most sumptuous edifices; and for his security he built several fortresses throughout the whole of Judea, of which the principal was called Cæsarea, in honour of the emperor. In his own palace, near the temple of Jerusalem, he lavished the most costly materials and curious workmanship; and his palace Herodion, at some miles' distance from the capital, by the beauty of its situation, and other appropriate advantages, drew round it the population of a considerable city.

4. To supply the place of his lost Mariamne, he married a new wife of the same name, the beautiful daughter of a priest, whom he raised to the high rank of the supreme pontificate. He sent his two sons, by the first Mariamne, to be educated at Rome, and so ingratiated himself with Augustus and his ministers, that he was appointed imperial procurator for Syria. To acquire popularity among the Jews, and to exhibit an attachment to their religion, he undertook the vast enterprise of rebuilding the temple of Jerusalem, which he finished in a noble style of magnificence in about a year and a half. During the progress of this work he visited Rome, and brought back his sons, who had attained to man's estate. These at length conspired against their father's person and government, and were tried, convicted, and executed. Another act deserving of notice, performed by Herod, was the dedication of his new city of Cæsarea, at which time he displayed such profuse magnificence, that Augustus said his soul was too great for his kingdom. Notwithstanding the execution of his sons, he was still a slave to conspiracies from his other near relations. In the thirty-third year of his reign, our Saviour was born. This event was followed, according to the Gospel of St. Matthew, by the massacre of the children of Bethlehem. About this time, Antipater, returning from Rome, was arrested by his father's orders, charged with treasonable practices, and was found guilty

of conspiring against the life of the king. This and other calamities, joined to a guilty conscience, preying upon a broken constitution, threw the wretched monarch into a mortal disease, which was doubtless a just judgment of Heaven on the many foul enormities and impieties of which he had been guilty. His disorder was attended with the most loathsome circumstances that can be imagined. A premature report of his death caused a tumult in Jerusalem, excited by the zealots, who were impatient to demolish a golden eagle which he had placed over the gate of the temple. The perpetrators of this rash act were seized, and by order of the dying king, put to death. He also caused his son Antipater to be slain in prison, and his remains to be treated with every species of ignominy. He bequeathed his kingdom to his son Archelaus, with tetrarchies to his two other sons. Herod, on his dying bed, had planned a scheme of horrible cruelty which was to take place at the instant of his own death. He had summoned the chief persons among the Jews to Jericho, and caused them to be shut up in the hippodrome, or circus, and gave strict orders to his sister Salome to have them all massacred as soon as he should have drawn his last breath: "for this," said he, "will provide mourners for my funeral all over the land, and make the Jews and every family lament my death, who would otherwise exhibit no signs of concern." Salome and her husband, Alexas, chose rather to break their oath extorted by the tyrant, than be implicated in so cruel a deed; and accordingly, as soon as Herod was dead, they opened the doors of the circus, and permitted every one to return to his own home. Herod died in the sixty-eighth year of his age. His memory has been consigned to merited detestation, while his great talents, and the active enterprise of his reign, have placed him high in the rank of sovereigns.

Herod Antipas. See Antipas.

HERODIANS, a sect among the Jews at the time of Jesus Christ, mentioned Matt. xxii, 16; Mark iii, 6; viii, 15; xii, 13; but passed over in silence both by Josephus and Philo. The critics and commentators on the New Testament are very much divided with regard to the Herodians; some making them to be a political party, and others a religious sect. The former opinion is favoured by the author of the Syriac version, who calls them the domestics of Herod; and also by Josephus's having passed them over in silence, though he professes to give an account of the several religious sects of the Jews. The latter opinion is countenanced by our Lord's caution against "the leaven of Herod," which implies that the Herodians were distinguished from the other Jews by some doctrinal tenets. M. Basnage supposes, that one thing meant by the leaven of the Herodians might be a conformity to Roman customs in some points which were forbidden the Jews: if this was the case, it is not strange that they are not mentioned by



Josephus among the Jewish sects. St. Jerom, in his Dialogue against the Luciferians, takes the name to have been given to such as owned Herod for the Messiah; and Tertullian, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Theophylact, among the ancients; and Grotius, and other moderns, are of the same sentiment. But the same St. Jerom, in his Comment on St. Matthew, treats this opinion as ridiculous; and indeed it must be highly improbable. He maintains that the Pharisees gave this appellation, by way of derision, to Herod's soldiers, who paid tribute to the Romans; agreeably to which the Syriac interpreters render the word by the domestics of Herod, that is, his courtiers. M. Simon, in his notes on the twenty-second chapter of St. Matthew, advances a more probable opinion. The name Herodian, he imagines to have been given to such as adhered to Herod's party and interest, and were for preserving the government in his family, about which there were, at that time, great divisions among the Jews. F. Hardouin will have the Herodians and Sadducees to have been the same; nor is it at all improbable that the Herodians were chiefly of the sect of the Sadducees; since that which is called by St. Mark "the leaven of Herod," is by St. Matthew styled "the leaven of the Sadducees."

2. Dr. Prideaux is of opinion that they derived their name from Herod the Great, and that they were distinguished from the other Jews by their concurrence with Herod's scheme of subjecting himself and his dominions to the Romans, and likewise by complying with many of their Heathen usages and customs. In their zeal for the Roman authority they were diametrically opposite to the Pharisees, who esteemed it unlawful to submit or pay taxes to the Roman emperor; an opinion which they grounded on their being forbidden by the law to set a stranger over them, who was not one of their own nation, as their king. The conjunction of the Herodians, therefore, with the Pharisees, against Christ, is a memorable proof of the keenness of their resentment and malice against him; especially when we consider that they united together in proposing to him an ensnaring question, on a subject which was the ground of their mutual dissension; namely, whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar. And provided he answered in the negative, the Herodians would accuse him of treason against the state; and should he reply in the affirmative, the Pharisees were as ready to excite the people against him, as an enemy of their civil liberties and privileges. Herod had introduced several Heathen idolatrous usages; for, as Josephus says, he built a temple to Cæsar, near the head of the river Jordan; he erected a magnificent theatre at Jerusalem, instituted Pagan games, and placed a golden eagle over the gate of the temple of Jehovah; and he furnished the temples, which he reared in several places out of Judea, with images for idolatrous worship, in order to ingratiate himself with the emperor and the people of Rome; though to the Jews he pretended that he did it against his will, and in obedience to the imperial command.

The Herodians probably complied with, acquiesced in, or approved these idolatrous usages. This symbolizing with idolatry upon views of interest and worldly policy, was probably that leaven of Herod, against which our Saviour cautioned his disciples.

HERON, הַרְנַנֵּס, Lev. xi, 19; Deut. xiv, 18. This word has been variously understood. Some have rendered it the kite, others the woodcock, others the curlew, some the peacock, others the parrot, and others the crane. The root, הַרְנַנֵּס, signifies to breathe short through the nostrils, to snuff, as in anger; hence to be angry; and it is supposed that the word is sufficiently descriptive of the heron, from its very irritable disposition. Bochart, however, thinks it the mountain falcon; the same that the Greeks call ἀνόπαια, mentioned by Homer; and this bears a strong resemblance to the Hebrew name.

HESHBON, a celebrated city beyond Jordan, twenty miles eastward of that river, according to Eusebius. It was given to the tribe of Reuben, Josh. xiii, 17. It was probably made over to Gad, since we meet with it among the cities which were given to the Levites, Joshua xxi, 39.

HETERODOX, formed of the Greek ἑτερόδοξος, a compound of ἕτερος, alter, and δόξα, opinion, something that is contrary to the faith or doctrine established in the true church. Thus, we say, a heterodox opinion, a heterodox divine, &c. The word stands in opposition to orthodox.

HETEROUSH, HETEROUSIANS, composed of ἕτερος, and οὐσία, substance, a sect or branch of Arians, the followers of Aëtius, and from him denominated Aëtians. They were called Heterousii, because they held, not that the Son of God was of a substance like, or similar to, that of the Father, which was the doctrine of another branch of Arians, thence called Homoousians, Homoousii; but that he was of another substance different from that of the Father.

HETH, the father of the Hittites, was the eldest son of Canaan, Gen. x, 15, and dwelt southward of the promised land, probably about Hebron. Ephron, who was an inhabitant of that city, was of the race of Heth; and in the time of Abraham the whole city were of the family of Heth.

HEXAPLA, formed of ἕξ, six, and ἀπλόω, I open, or unfold, a Bible disposed in six columns, containing the text, and divers versions of it, compiled and published by Origen, with a view of securing the sacred text from future corruptions, and to correct those that had been already introduced. Eusebius relates that Origen after his return from Rome under Caracalla, applied himself to learn Hebrew, and began to collect the

several versions that had been made of the sacred writings, and of these to compose his Tetrapla, and Hexapla: others, however, will not allow him to have begun till the time of Alexander, after he had retired into Palestine, about the year 231. To conceive what this Hexapla was, it must be observed that, beside the translation of the sacred writings called the Septuagint, made under Ptolemy Philadelphus, above 280 years B. C., the Scripture had been since translated into Greek by other interpreters. The first of those versions, or, reckoning the Septuagint, the second, was that of Aquila, a proselyte Jew, the first edition of which he published in the twelfth year of the Emperor Adrian, or about A. D. 128; the third was that of Symmachus, published as is commonly supposed, under Marcus Aurelius, but, as some say, under Septimius Severus, about the year 200; the fourth was that of Theodotion, prior to that of Symmachus, under Commodus, or about the year 175: these Greek versions, says Dr. Kennicott, were made by the Jews from their corrupted copies of the Hebrew, and were designed to stand in the place of the LXX, against which they were prejudiced, because it seemed to favour the Christians. The fifth was found at Jericho, in the reign of Caracalla, about the year 217; and the sixth was discovered at Nicopolis, in the reign of Alexander Severus, about the year 228: lastly, Origen himself recovered part of a seventh, containing only the Psalms. Now, Origen, who had held frequent disputations with the Jews in Egypt and Palestine, observing that they always objected against those passages of Scripture quoted against them, and appealed to the Hebrew text, the better to vindicate those passages and confound the Jews, by showing that the LXX had given the sense of the Hebrew, or rather, to show, by a number of different versions, what the real sense of the Hebrew was, undertook to reduce all these several versions into a body, along with the Hebrew text, so as they might be easily confronted, and afford a mutual light to each other. He made the Hebrew text his standard; and, allowing that corruptions might have happened, and that the old Hebrew copies might and did read differently, he contented himself with marking such words or sentences as were not in his Hebrew text, nor the later Greek versions, and to add such words or sentences as were omitted in the LXX, prefixing an asterisk to the additions, and an obelisk to the others. In order to this he made choice of eight columns: in the first he gave the Hebrew text in Hebrew characters; in the second, the same text in Greek characters: the rest were filled with the several versions above mentioned; all the columns answering verse for verse, and phrase for phrase; and in the Psalms there was a ninth column for the seventh version. This work Origen called Ἑξάπλα, Hexapla, that is, sextuple, or a work of six columns, as only regarding the first six Greek versions. Indeed, St. Epiphanius, taking in likewise the two columns of the text, calls the work Octapla, as consisting of eight columns. This celebrated work, which Montfaucon imagines consisted of fifty large volumes, perished long ago, probably with the library at Cæsarea, where it was

preserved, in the year 653; though several of the ancient writers have preserved us portions of it, particularly St. Chrysostom on the Psalms, Philoponus in his Hexameron, &c. Some modern writers have earnestly endeavoured to collect fragments of the Hexapla, Flaminius Nobilius, Drusius, and especially Montfaucon, in two folio volumes, printed at Paris in 1713. In his edition, Montfaucon has prefixed prolegomena, explaining the form and detailing the history of the Hexapla.

The object of Origen being to correct the differences found in the then existing copies of the Old Testament, he carefully noted all the alterations which he discovered; and for the information of those who might consult his work, he made use of the following marks: 1. Where any passages appeared in the Septuagint, that were not found in the Hebrew, he designated them by an obelus ÷ with two bold points : annexed. This mark was also used to denote words not extant in the Hebrew, but added by the Septuagint translators, either for the sake of elegance, or for the purpose of illustrating the sense. 2. To passages wanting in the copies of the Septuagint, and supplied by himself from the other Greek versions, he prefixed an asterisk with two bold points : also annexed, in order that his additions might be immediately perceived. These supplementary passages, we are informed by Jerom, were for the most part taken from Theodotion's translation; not unfrequently from that of Aquila; sometimes, though rarely, from the version of Symmachus; and sometimes from two or three together. But, in every case, the initial letter of each translator's name was placed immediately after the asterisk, to indicate the source whence such supplementary passage was taken. And in lieu of the very erroneous Septuagint version of Daniel, Theodotion's translation of that book was inserted entire. 3. Farther: not only the passages wanting in the Septuagint were supplied by Origen with the asterisks, as above noticed, but also where that version does not appear accurately to express the Hebrew original, having noted the former reading with an obelus :, he added the correct rendering from one of the other translators, with an asterisk subjoined. Concerning the shape and uses of the lemniscus and hypolemniscus, two other marks used by Origen, there is so great a difference of opinion among learned men, that it is difficult to determine what they were. Dr. Owen, after Montfaucon, supposes them to have been marks of better and more accurate renderings. These several marks of distinction have been carefully observed, so far as they have been recovered from various quarters, in the very accurate edition of the Septuagint commenced by our learned countryman, Dr. Holmes, and continued by his able successor, the Rev. J. Parsons, B. D.

For nearly fifty years was Origen's stupendous 456work buried in a corner of the city of Tyre, probably on account of the very great expense of

transcribing forty or fifty volumes, which far exceeded the means of private individuals; and here, perhaps, it might have perished in oblivion, if Eusebius and Pamphilus had not discovered it, and deposited it in the library of Pamphilus the martyr at Cæsarea, where Jerome saw it about the middle of the fourth century. As we have no account whatever of Origen's autograph after this time, it is most probable that it perished in the year 653, on the capture of that city by the Arabs; and a few imperfect fragments, collected from manuscripts of the Septuagint and the catenæ of the Greek fathers, are all that now remain of a work, which, in the present improved state of sacred literature, would most eminently have assisted in the interpretation and criticism of the Old Testament. The Syro-Estrangelo translation of Origen's edition of the Greek Septuagint was executed in the former part of the seventh century; the author of it is not known. This version exactly corresponds with the text of the Septuagint, especially in those passages in which the latter differs from the Hebrew. A manuscript of this translation is in the Ambrosian library at Milan; it contains the obelus and other marks of Origen's Hexapla; and a subscription at the end states it to have been literally translated from the Greek copy, corrected by Eusebius himself, with the assistance of Pamphilus, from the books of Origen, which were deposited in the library at Cæsarea. From this version Norberg edited the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel in 1787; and Bugati, the book of Daniel, 1788.

HEZEKIAH, king of Judah, was the son of Ahaz, and born in the year of the world 3251. At the age of five-and-twenty he succeeded his father in the government of the kingdom of Judah, and reigned twenty-nine years in Jerusalem, namely, from the year of the world 3277 to 3306, 2 Kings xviii, 1, 2; 2 Chron. xxix, 1. The reign of his father Ahaz had been most unpropitious for his subjects. A war had raged between the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, in which Pekah, king of Israel, overthrew the army of Ahaz, destroying a hundred and twenty thousand of his men; after which he carried away two hundred thousand women and children as captives into his own country: they were, however, released and sent home again, at the remonstrance of the Prophet Oded. As idolatry had been established in Jerusalem and throughout Judea, by the command of Ahaz, and the service of the temple either intermitted, or converted into an idolatrous worship, the first object of his son Hezekiah, on his accession to the throne, was to restore the legal worship of God, both in Jerusalem and throughout Judea. He cleansed and repaired the temple, and held a solemn passover. He improved the city, repaired the fortifications, erected magazines of all sorts, and built a new aqueduct. In the fourth year of his reign, Salmanezer, king of Assyria, invaded the kingdom of Israel, took Samaria, and carried away the ten tribes into captivity, replacing them by different people sent from his own country. But Hezekiah was not deterred by this alarming

example from refusing to pay that tribute to the Assyrians which had been imposed on Ahaz: this brought on the invasion of Sennacherib, in the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah, of which we have a very particular account in the writings of the Prophet Isaiah, who was then living, Isaiah xxxvi.

Immediately after the termination of this war, Hezekiah “was sick unto death,” owing, as the sacred historian strongly intimates, to his heart being improperly elevated on occasion of this miraculous deliverance, and not sufficiently acknowledging the hand of God in it, 2 Kings xx; Isaiah xxxviii. Isaiah was sent to bid him set his house in order, for he should die and not live. Hezekiah had instant recourse to God by prayer and supplications for his recovery; and the prophet had scarcely proceeded out of the threshold, when the Lord commanded him to return to Hezekiah, and to say to him, “Thus saith the Lord, I have heard thy prayer, and I have seen thy tears: I will heal thee: on the third day thou shalt go up to the house of the Lord, and I will add unto thy days fifteen years.” And to confirm to him the certainty of all these tokens of the divine regard, the shadow of the sun on the dial of Ahaz, at his request, went backward ten degrees. After his recovery, he composed an ode of thanksgiving to the God of all his mercies, which the Prophet Isaiah has recorded in his writings, Isaiah xxxviii, 10, 11. Yet, as an instance of human fickleness and frailty, we find Hezekiah, with all his excellencies, again forgetting himself, and incurring the divine displeasure. The king of Babylon having been informed of his sickness and recovery, sent ambassadors to congratulate him on his restoration: an honour with which the heart of Hezekiah was greatly elated; and, to testify his gratitude, he made a pompous display to them of all his treasures, his spices, and his rich vessels; and concealed from them nothing that was in his palace. In all this the pride of Hezekiah was gratified; and to humble him, Isaiah was sent to declare to him that his conduct was displeasing to God, and that a time should come when all the treasures of which he had made so vain a display should be removed to Babylon, and even his sons be made eunuchs to serve in the palace of the king of Babylon. Hezekiah bowed submissively to the will of God, and acknowledged the divine goodness toward him, in ordaining peace and truth to continue during the remainder of his reign. He accordingly passed the latter years of his life in tranquillity, and contributed greatly to the prosperity of his people and kingdom. He died in the year of the world 3306, leaving behind him a son, Manasseh, who succeeded him in the throne: a son every way unworthy of such a father.

HIDDEKEL. See Eden.

HIGH PLACES. The prophets reproach the Israelites for nothing with more zeal than for 457 worshipping upon the high places. The destroying of these high places is a commendation given only to few princes in Scripture; and many, though zealous for the observance of the law, had not courage to prevent the people from sacrificing upon these eminences. Before the temple was built, the high places were not absolutely contrary to the law, provided God only was there adored, and not idols. They seem to have been tolerated under the judges; and Samuel offered sacrifices in several places where the ark was not present. Even in David's time they sacrificed to the Lord at Shiloh, Jerusalem, and Gibeon. But after the temple was built at Jerusalem, and the ark had a fixed settlement, it was no longer allowed to sacrifice out of Jerusalem. The high places were much frequented in the kingdom of Israel. The people sometimes went upon those mountains which had been sanctified by the presence of patriarchs and prophets, and by appearances of God, to worship the true God there. This worship was lawful, except as to its being exercised where the Lord had not chosen. But they frequently adored idols upon these hills, and committed a thousand abominations in groves, and caves, and tents; and hence arose the zeal of pious kings and prophets to suppress the high places. Dr. Prideaux thinks it probable that the *proseuchæ*, open courts, built like those in which the people prayed at the tabernacle and the temple, were the same as those called high places in the Old Testament. His reason is, that the *proseuchæ* had groves in or near them, in the same manner as the high places.

HIN, הֵינ, a liquid measure, as of oil, or of wine, Exodus xxix, 40; xxx, 24; Lev. xxiii. According to Josephus, it contained two Attic congii, and was therefore the sixth part of an ephah. He says that they offered with an ox half a hin of oil; in English measure, six pints, twenty-five thousand five hundred and ninety-eight solid inches. With a ram they offered the third part of a hin, or three pints, ten thousand four hundred and sixty-nine solid inches: with a lamb, the fourth part of a hin, or two pints, fifteen thousand and seventy-one solid inches.

HIND, אֵילָה, Gen. xlix, 21; 2 Sam. xxii, 34; Job xxxix, 1; Psalm xviii, 33; xxix, 9; Prov. v, 19; Cant. ii, 7; iii, 5; Jer. xiv, 5; Hab. iii, 19; the mate or female of the stag. It is a lovely creature, and of an elegant shape. It is noted for its swiftness and the sureness of its step as it jumps among the rocks. David and Habakkuk both allude to this character of the hind. "The Lord maketh my feet like hinds' feet, and causeth me to stand on the high places," Psalm xviii, 33; Hab. iii, 19. The circumstance of their standing on the high places or mountains is applied to these animals by Xenophon. Our translators make Jacob, prophesying of the tribe of Naphtali, say, "Naphtali is a hind let loose: he giveth goodly words," Gen. xlix, 21. There

is a difficulty and incoherence here which the learned Bochart removes by altering a little the punctuation of the original; and it then reads, "Naphtali is a spreading tree, shooting forth beautiful branches." This, indeed, renders the simile uniform; but another critic has remarked that "the allusion to a tree seems to be purposely reserved by the venerable patriarch for his son Joseph, who is compared to the boughs of a tree; and the repetition of the idea in reference to Naphtali is every way unlikely. Beside," he adds, "the word rendered 'let loose,' imports an active motion, not like that of the branches of a tree, which, however freely they wave, are yet attached to the parent stock; but an emission, a dismissal, or sending forth to a distance: in the present case, a roaming, roaming at liberty. The verb 'he giveth' may denote shooting forth. It is used of production, as of the earth, which shoots forth, yields, its increase, Lev. xxvi, 4. The word rendered 'goodly' signifies noble, grand, majestic; and the noun translated 'words' radically signifies divergences, what is spread forth." For these reasons he proposes to read the passage, "Naphtali is a deer roaming at liberty; he shooteth forth spreading branches," or "majestic antlers." Here the distinction of imagery is preserved, and the fecundity of the tribe and the fertility of their lot intimated. In our version of Psalm xxix, 9, we read, "The voice of the Lord maketh the hinds to calve, and discovereth the forests." Mr. Merrick, in an ingenious note on the place, attempts to justify the rendering; but Bishop Lowth, in his "Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews," observes that this agrees very little with the rest of the imagery, either in nature or dignity; and that he does not feel himself persuaded, even by the reasonings of the learned Bochart on this subject: whereas the oak, struck with lightning, admirably agrees with the context. The Syriac seems, for אֵילֹת, hinds, to have read אֵלֹת, oaks, or rather, perhaps, terebinths. The passage may be thus versified:--

"Hark! his voice in thunder breaks,  
 And the lofty mountain quakes;  
 Mighty trees the tempests tear,  
 And lay the spreading forests bare!"

HINNOM, Valley of, called also Tophet, and by the Greeks Gehenna, a small valley on the south-east of Jerusalem, at the foot of Mount Zion, where the Canaanites, and afterward the Israelites, sacrificed their children to the idol Moloch, by making them "pass through the fire," or burning them. To drown the shrieks of the victims thus inhumanly sacrificed, musical instruments, called in the Hebrew taph, tympana or timbrels, were played; whence the spot derived the name of Tophet. Ge Hinnom, or "The Valley of Hinnom," from which the Greeks framed their Gehenna, is sometimes used in Scripture to denote hell or hell fire. See Hell.



HIRAM, king of Tyre, and son of Abibal, is mentioned by profane authors as distinguished for his magnificence, and for adorning the city of Tyre. When David was acknowledged king by all Israel, Hiram sent ambassadors with artificers, and cedar, to build his palace. Hiram also sent ambassadors to Solomon, to congratulate him on his accession to the crown 458 Solomon desired of him timber and stones for building the temple, with labourers. These Hiram promised, provided Solomon would furnish him with corn and oil. The two princes lived on the best terms with each other.

HIRELING. Moses requires that the hireling should be paid as soon as his work is over: "The wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night unto the morning," Lev. xix, 19. A hireling's days or year is a kind of proverb, signifying a full year, without abating any thing of it: "His days are like the days of a hireling," Job vii, 1; the days of man are like those of a hireling; as nothing is deducted from them, so nothing, likewise is added to them. And again: "Till he shall accomplish as a hireling his day," Job xiv, 6; to the time of death, which he waits for as the hireling for the end of the day. The following passage from Morier's Travels in Persia, illustrates one of our Lord's parables: "The most conspicuous building in Hamadan is the Mesjid Jumah, a large mosque now falling into decay, and before it a maidan or square, which serves as a market place. Here we observed, every morning before the sun rose, that a numerous band of peasants were collected with spades in their hands, waiting, as they informed us, to be hired for the day to work in the surrounding fields. This custom, which I have never seen in any other part of Asia, forcibly struck me as a most happy illustration of our Saviour's parable of the labourers in the vineyard in Matt. xx; particularly when, passing by the same place late in the day, we still found others standing idle, and remembered his words, 'Why stand ye here all the day idle?' as most applicable to their situation; for in putting the very same question to them, they answered us, 'Because no man hath hired us.'"

HITTITES, the descendants of Heth, Gen. xv, 20.

HIVITES, a people descended from Canaan, Gen. x, 17. They are also mentioned, Deut. ii, 23. The inhabitants of Shechem, and the Gibeonites, were Hivites, Joshua xi, 19; Gen. xxxiv, 2. Mr. Bryant supposes the Hivites to be the same as the Ophites, or ancient worshippers of the sun under the figure of a serpent; which was, in all probability, the deity worshipped at Baal-Hermon.

HOLY GHOST, the third person in the Trinity. The orthodox doctrine is, that as Christ is God by an eternal filiation, so the Spirit is God by procession from the Father and the Son. "And I believe in the Holy Ghost,"

says the Nicene Creed, “the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who, with the Father and the Son together, is worshipped and glorified.” And with this agrees the Athanasian Creed, “The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.” In the Articles of the English church it is thus expressed: “The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.” The Latin church introduced the term spiration, from *spiro*, “to breathe,” to denote the manner of this procession: on which Dr. Owen remarks, “As the vital breath of a man has a continual emanation from him, and yet is never separated utterly from his person, or forsaketh him, so doth the Spirit of the Father and the Son proceed from them by a continual divine emanation, still abiding one with them.” On this refined view little can be said which has clear Scriptural authority; and yet the very term by which the Third Person in the Trinity is designated, Wind or Breath, may, as to the Third Person, be designed, like the term Son applied to the Second, to convey, though imperfectly, some intimation of that manner of being by which both are distinguished from each other, and from the Father; and it was a remarkable action of our Lord, and one certainly which does not discountenance this idea, that when he imparted the Holy Ghost to his disciples, “He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost,” John xx, 22.

2. But, whatever we may think as to the doctrine of spiration, the procession of the Holy Ghost rests on more direct Scriptural authority, and is thus stated by Bishop Pearson: “Now this procession of the Spirit, in reference to the Father, is delivered expressly in relation to the Son, and is contained virtually in the Scriptures. 1. It is expressly said, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Saviour testifieth, ‘When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me,’ John xv, 26. And this is also evident from what hath been already asserted; for being the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and, being so the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in the personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other; and because the Father hath been already shown to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him. 2. Though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there; because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason, because he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son; and therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son, which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called

‘the Spirit of God,’ and ‘the Spirit of the Father.’ ‘It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you,’ Matt. x, 20. For by the language of the Apostle, ‘the Spirit of God’ is the Spirit which is of God, saying, ‘The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. And we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God,’ 1 Cor. ii, 11, 12. Now the same Spirit is also called ‘the Spirit of the Son:’ for ‘because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts,’ Gal. iv, 6. ‘The Spirit of Christ:’ ‘Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his,’ Romans viii, 9; ‘Even the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets,’ 1 Peter i, 11. ‘The Spirit of Jesus Christ,’ as the Apostle speaks: ‘I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ,’ Phil. i, 19. If then the Holy Ghost be called ‘the Spirit of the Father,’ because he proceedeth from the Father, it followeth that, being called also ‘the Spirit of the Son,’ he proceedeth also from the Son. Again: because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who hath, by the original communication, a right of mission; as, ‘the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send,’ John xiv, 26. But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father, is also sent by the Son, as he saith, ‘When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you.’ Therefore the Son hath the same right of mission with the Father, and consequently must be acknowledged to have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by the Son, because he received not the Godhead from him; but the Father sendeth the Son, because he communicated the Godhead to him: in the same manner, neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit; because neither of them received the divine nature from the Spirit: but both the Father and the Son sendeth the Holy Ghost, because the divine nature, common to the Father and the Son, was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As therefore the Scriptures declare expressly, that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father; so do they also virtually teach, that he proceedeth from the Son.”

3. Arius regarded the Spirit not only as a creature, but as created by Christ, κτίσμα κτίσματος, the creature of a creature. Some time afterward, his personality was wholly denied by the Arians, and he was considered as the exerted energy of God. This appears to have been the notion of Socinus, and, with occasional modifications, has been adopted by his followers. They sometimes regard him as an attribute; and at others, resolve the passages in which he is spoken of into a periphrasis, or circumlocution, for God himself; or, to express both in one, into a figure of speech.

4. In establishing the proper personality and deity of the Holy Ghost, the first argument may be drawn from the frequent association, in Scripture, of a Person under that appellation with two other Persons, one of whom, the

Father, is by all acknowledged to be divine; and the ascription to each of them, or to the three in union, of the same acts, titles, and authority, with worship, of the same kind, and, for any distinction that is made, of an equal degree. The manifestation of the existence and divinity of the Holy Spirit may be expected in the law and the prophets, and is, in fact, to be traced there with certainty. The Spirit is represented as an agent in creation, "moving upon the face of the waters;" and it forms no objection to the argument, that creation is ascribed to the Father, and also to the Son, but is a great confirmation of it. That creation should be effected by all the three Persons of the Godhead, though acting in different respects, yet so that each should be a Creator, and, therefore, both a Person and a divine Person, can be explained only by their unity in one essence. On every other hypothesis this Scriptural fact is disallowed, and therefore no other hypothesis can be true. If the Spirit of God be a mere influence, then he is not a Creator, distinct from the Father and the Son, because he is not a Person; but this is refuted both by the passage just quoted, and by Psalm xxxiii, 6: "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath (Heb. Spirit) of his mouth." This is farther confirmed by Job xxxiii, 4: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life;" where the second clause is obviously exegetic of the former: and the whole text proves that, in the patriarchal age, the followers of the true religion ascribed creation to the Spirit, as well as to the Father; and that one of his appellations was, "the Breath of the Almighty." Did such passages stand alone, there might, indeed, be some plausibility in the criticism which resolves them into a personification; but, connected as they are with the whole body of evidence, as to the concurring doctrine of both Testaments, they are inexpugnable. Again: If the personality of the Son and the Spirit be allowed, and yet it is contended that they were but instruments in creation, through whom the creative power of another operated, but which creative power was not possessed by them; on this hypothesis, too, neither the Spirit nor the Son can be said to create, any more than Moses created the serpent into which his rod was turned, and the Scriptures are again contradicted. To this association of the three Persons in creative acts, may be added a like association in acts of preservation, which has been well called a continued creation, and by that term is expressed in the following passage: "These wait all upon thee, that thou mayest give them their meat in due season. Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to dust: thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth," Psalm civ, 27–30. It is not surely here meant, that the Spirit by which the generations of animals are perpetuated, is wind; and if he be called an attribute, wisdom, power, or both united, where do we read of such attributes being "sent," "sent forth from God?" The personality of the Spirit is here as clearly marked as when St. Paul speaks of God "sending forth the Spirit of

his Son,” and when our Lord promises to “send” the Comforter; and as the upholding and preserving of created things is ascribed to the Father and the Son, so here they are ascribed, also, to the Spirit, 460“sent forth from” God to “create and renew the face of the earth.”

5. The next association of the three Persons we find in the inspiration of the prophets: “God spake unto our fathers by the prophets,” says St. Paul, Heb. i, 1. St. Peter declares that these “holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” 2 Peter i, 21; and also that it was “the Spirit of Christ which was in them,” 1 Peter i, 11. We may defy any Socinian to interpret these three passages by making the Spirit an influence or attribute, and thereby reducing the term Holy Ghost into a figure of speech. “God,” in the first passage, is, unquestionably, God the Father; and the “holy men of God,” the prophets, would then, according to this view, be moved by the influence of the Father; but the influence, according to the third passage, which was the source of their inspiration, was the Spirit, or the influence of “Christ.” Thus the passages contradict each other. Allow the trinity in unity, and you have no difficulty in calling the Spirit, the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son, or the Spirit of either; but if the Spirit be an influence, that influence cannot be the influence of two persons,—one of them God, and the other a creature. Even if they allowed the pre-existence of Christ, with Arians, these passages are inexplicable by the Socinians; but, denying his præexistence, they have no subterfuge but to interpret, “the Spirit of Christ,” the spirit which prophesied of Christ, which is a purely gratuitous paraphrase; or “the spirit of an anointed one, or prophet;” that is, the prophet’s own spirit, which is just as gratuitous and as unsupported by any parallel as the former. If, however, the Holy Ghost be the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, united in one essence, the passages are easily harmonized. In conjunction with the Father and the Son, he is the source of that prophetic inspiration under which the prophets spoke and acted. So the same Spirit which raised Christ from the dead, is said by St. Peter to have preached by Noah while the ark was preparing;—in allusion to the passage, “My Spirit shall not always strive (contend, debate) with man.” This, we may observe, affords an eminent proof, that the writers of the New Testament understood the phrase, “the Spirit of God,” as it occurs in the Old Testament, personally. For, whatever may be the full meaning of that difficult passage in St. Peter, Christ is clearly declared to have preached by the Spirit in the days of Noah; that is, he, by the Spirit, inspired Noah to preach. If, then, the Apostles understood that the Holy Ghost was a Person, a point which will presently be established, we have, in the text just quoted from the book of Genesis, a key to the meaning of those texts in the Old Testament where the phrases, “My Spirit,” “the Spirit of God,” and “the Spirit of the Lord,” occur; and inspired authority is thus afforded us to interpret them as of a Person; and if of a Person, the very effort made by

Socinians to deny his personality, itself, indicates that that Person must, from the lofty titles and works ascribed to him, be inevitably divine. Such phrases occur in many passages of the Hebrew Scriptures; but, in the following, the Spirit is also eminently distinguished from two other Persons: "And now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me," Isaiah xlvi, 16; or, rendered better, "hath sent me and his Spirit," both terms being in the accusative case. "Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read: for my mouth it hath commanded, and his Spirit it hath gathered them," Isaiah xxxiv, 16. "I am with you, saith the Lord of Hosts, according to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not. For thus saith the Lord of Hosts, I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come," Hag. ii, 4-7. Here, also, the Spirit of the Lord is seen collocated with the Lord of Hosts and the Desire of all nations, who is the Messiah.

6. Three Persons, and three only, are associated also, both in the Old and New Testament, as objects of supreme worship; and form the one "name" in which the religious act of solemn benediction is performed, and to which men are bound by solemn baptismal covenant. In the plural form of the name of God, each received equal adoration. This threefold personality seems to have given rise to the standing form of triple benediction used by the Jewish high priest. The very important fact, that, in the vision of Isaiah, the Lord of hosts, who spake unto the prophet, is, in Acts xxviii, 25, said to be the Holy Ghost, while St. John declares that the glory which Isaiah saw was the glory of Christ, proves, indisputably, that each of the three Persons bears this august appellation; it gives also the reason for the threefold repetition, "Holy, holy, holy!" and it exhibits the prophet and the very seraphs in deep and awful adoration before the Triune Lord of hosts. Both the prophet and the seraphim were, therefore, worshippers of the Holy Ghost and of the Son, at the very time and by the very acts in which they worshipped the Father; which proves that, as the three Persons received equal homage in a case which does not admit of the evasion of pretended superior and inferior worship, they are equal in majesty, glory, and essence.

7. As in the tabernacle form of benediction, the Triune Jehovah is recognised as the source of all grace and peace to his creatures; so also we have the apostolic formula: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all. Amen." Here the personality of the three is kept distinct; and the prayer is, that Christians may have a common participation of the Holy Spirit, that is, doubtless, as he was promised by our Lord to his disciples, as a Comforter, as the Source of light and spiritual life, as the Author of regeneration. Thus the Spirit is acknowledged, equally with the Father and the Son, to be the Source and the Giver of the highest spiritual blessings; while this solemn

ministerial benediction is, from its specific character, to be regarded as an act of prayer to each of the three Persons, and therefore 461 is at once, an acknowledgment of the divinity and personality of each. The same remark applies to Revelation i, 4, 5: "Grace be unto you, and peace, from Him which was, and which is, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne," (an emblematical reference, probably to the golden branch with its seven lamps,) "and from Jesus Christ." The style of this book sufficiently accounts for the Holy Spirit being called "the seven spirits;" but no created spirit or company of created spirits is ever spoken of under that appellation: and the place assigned to the seven spirits, between the mention of the Father and the Son, indicates, with certainty, that one of the sacred Three, so eminent, and so exclusively eminent in both dispensations, is intended.

8. The form of baptism next presents itself with demonstrative evidence on the two points before us, the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is the form of covenant by which the sacred Three become our one or only God, and we become his people: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In what manner is this text to be disposed of, if the personality of the Holy Ghost is denied? Is the form of baptism to be so understood as to imply that baptism is in the name of one God, one creature, and one attribute? The grossness of this absurdity refutes it, and proves that here, at least, there can be no personification. If all the Three, therefore, are persons, are we to have baptism in the name of one God and two creatures? This would be too near an approach to idolatry, or, rather, it would be idolatry itself; for, considering baptism as an act of dedication to God, the acceptance of God as our God, on our part, and the renunciation of all other deities and all other religions, what could a Heathen convert conceive of the two creatures so distinguished from all other creatures in heaven and in earth, and so associated with God himself as to form together the one name, to which, by that act, he was devoted, and which he was henceforward to profess and honour, but that they were equally divine, unless special care were taken to instruct him that but one of the Three was God, and the two others but creatures? But of this care, of this cautionary instruction, though so obviously necessary upon this theory, no single instance can be given in all the writings of the Apostles.

9. But other arguments are not wanting to prove both the personality and the divinity of the Holy Spirit. With respect to the former, (1.) The mode of his subsistence in the sacred Trinity proves his personality. He proceeds from the Father and the Son, and cannot, therefore, be either. To say that an attribute proceeds and comes forth, would be a gross absurdity. (2.) Many passages of Scripture are wholly unintelligible and even absurd,

unless the Holy Ghost is allowed to be a person. For as those who take the phrase as ascribing no more than a figurative personality to an attribute, make that attribute to be the energy or power of God, they reduce such passages as the following to utter unmeaningness: "God anointed Jesus with the Holy Ghost and with power;" that is, with the power of God and with power. "That ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost;" that is, through the power of power. "In demonstration of the Spirit and of power;" that is, in demonstration of power and of power.

(3.) Personification of any kind is, in some passages in which the Holy Ghost is spoken of, impossible. The reality which this figure of speech is said to present to us, is either some of the attributes of God, or else the doctrine of the Gospel. Let this theory, then, be tried upon the following passages: "He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." What attribute of God can here be personified? And if the doctrine of the Gospel be arrayed with personal attributes, where is there an instance of so monstrous a *prosopopœia* as this passage would exhibit?--the doctrine of the Gospel not speaking "of himself," but speaking "whatsoever he shall hear!"--"The Spirit maketh intercession for us." What attribute is capable of interceding, or how can the doctrine of the Gospel intercede? Personification, too, is the language of poetry, and takes place naturally only in excited and elevated discourse; but if the Holy Spirit be a personification, we find it in the ordinary and cool strain of mere narration and argumentative discourse in the New Testament, and in the most incidental conversations. "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." How impossible is it here to extort, by any process whatever, even the shadow of a personification of either any attribute of God, or of the doctrine of the Gospel! So again: "The Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." Could it be any attribute of God which said this, or could it be the doctrine of the Gospel? Finally, that the Holy Ghost is a person, and not an attribute, is proved by the use of masculine pronouns and relatives in the Greek of the New Testament, in connection with the neuter noun Πνεῦμα, Spirit, and also by many distinct personal acts being ascribed to him, as, "to come," "to go," "to be sent," "to teach," "to guide," "to comfort," "to make intercession," "to bear witness," "to give gifts," "dividing them to every man as he will," "to be vexed," "grieved," and "quenched." These cannot be applied to the mere fiction of a person, and they therefore establish the Spirit's true personality.

10. Some additional arguments to those before given to establish the divinity of the Holy Ghost may also be adduced. The first is taken from his being the subject of blasphemy: "The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men," Matt. xii, 31. This blasphemy consisted in



ascribing his miraculous works to Satan; and that he is capable of being blasphemed proves him to be as much a person as the Son; and it proves him to be divine, because it shows that he may be sinned against, and so sinned against that the blasphemer shall not be forgiven. A person he must be, or he could not be blasphemed: a divine person he must be, to constitute this blasphemy a sin against him in the proper sense, and of so malignant a kind as to place it beyond the reach of mercy. He is called God: "Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost? Why hast thou conceived this in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God," Acts v, 3, 4. Ananias is said to have lied particularly "unto the Holy Ghost," because the Apostles were under his special direction in establishing the temporary regulation among Christians that they should have all things in common: the detection of the crime itself was a demonstration of the divinity of the Spirit, because it showed his omniscience, his knowledge of the most secret acts. In addition to the proof of his divinity thus afforded by this history, he is also called God: "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." He is also called the Lord: "Now the Lord is that Spirit," 2 Cor. iii, 17. He is eternal: "The eternal Spirit," Heb. ix, 14. Omnipresence is ascribed to him: "Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost," 1 Cor. vi, 19. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God," Rom. viii, 14. For, as all true Christians are his temples, and are led by him, he must be present to them at all times and in all places. He is omniscient: "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God," 1 Cor. ii, 10. Here the Spirit is said to search or know "all things" absolutely; and then, to make this more emphatic, that he knows even "the deep things of God," things hidden from every creature, the depths of his essence, and the secrets of his counsels; for, that this is intended, appears from the next verse, where he is said to know "the things of God," as the spirit of a man knows the things of a man. Supreme majesty is also attributed to him, so that to "lie" to him, to "blaspheme" him, to "vex" him, to do him "despite," are sins, and as such render the offender liable to divine punishment. How impracticable then is it to interpret the phrase, "the Holy Ghost," as a periphrasis for God himself! A Spirit, which is the Spirit of God, which is so often distinguished from the Father, which "sees" and "hears" the Father, which searches "the deep things" of God, which is "sent" by the Father, which "proceedeth" from him, and who has special prayer addressed to him at the same time as the Father, cannot, though "one with him," be the Father; and that he is not the Son is acknowledged on both sides. As a divine person, our regards are therefore justly due to him as the object of worship and trust, of prayer and blessing.

11. Various are the gracious offices of the Holy Spirit in the work of our redemption. He it is that first quickens the soul, dead in trespasses and sins, to spiritual life; it is by him we are "born again," and made new creatures;

he is the living root of all the Christian graces, which are therefore called “the fruits” of the Spirit; and by him all true Christians are aided in the “infirmities” and afflictions of this present life. Eminently, he is promised to the disciples as “the Comforter,” which is more fully explained by St. Paul by the phrase “the Spirit of adoption;” so that it is through him that we receive a direct inward testimony to our personal forgiveness and acceptance through Christ, and are filled with peace and consolation. This doctrine, so essential to the solid and habitual happiness of those who believe in Christ, is thus clearly explained in a sermon on that subject by the Rev. John Wesley:--

“(1.) But what is the witness of the Spirit? The original word, μαρτυρία, may be rendered either, as it is in several places, the witness, or, less ambiguously, the testimony, or, the record: so it is rendered in our translation: ‘This is the record,’ the testimony, the sum of what God testifies in all the inspired writings, ‘that God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son,’ 1 John v, 11. The testimony now under consideration is given by the Spirit of God to and with our spirit. He is the person testifying. What he testifies to us is, ‘that we are the children of God.’ The immediate result of this testimony is, ‘the fruit of the Spirit;’ namely, ‘love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness.’ And without these, the testimony itself cannot continue. For it is inevitably destroyed, not only by the commission of any outward sin, or the omission of known duty, but by giving way to any inward sin: in a word, by whatever grieves the Holy Spirit of God. (2.) I observed many years ago, It is hard to find words in the language of men to explain the deep things of God. Indeed, there are none that will adequately express what the Spirit of God works in his children. But, perhaps, one might say, (desiring any who are taught of God to correct, soften, or strengthen the expression,) by the ‘testimony of the Spirit,’ I mean, an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God immediately and directly witnesses with my spirit, that I am a child of God; that ‘Jesus Christ hath loved me, and given himself for me;’ that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God. (3.) After twenty years’ farther consideration, I see no cause to retract any part of this. Neither do I conceive how any of these expressions may be altered, so as to make them more intelligible. I can only add, that if any of the children of God will point out any other expressions which are more clear, or more agreeable to the word of God, I will readily lay these aside. (4.) Meantime, let it be observed, I do not mean hereby, that the Spirit of God testifies this by any outward voice; no, nor always by an inward voice, although he may do this sometimes. Neither do I suppose, that he always applies to the heart, though he often may, one or more texts of Scripture. But he so works upon the soul by his immediate influence, and by a strong, though inexplicable, operation, that the stormy wind and

troubled waves subside, and there is 463a sweet calm: the heart resting as in the arms of Jesus, and the sinner being clearly satisfied that all his 'iniquities are forgiven, and his sins covered.' (5.) Now what is the matter of dispute concerning this? Not, whether there be a witness or testimony of the Spirit. Not, whether the Spirit does testify with our spirit, that we are the children of God. None can deny this, without flatly contradicting the Scriptures, and charging a lie upon the God of truth. Therefore, that there is a testimony of the Spirit, is acknowledged by all parties. (6.) Neither is it questioned, whether there is an indirect witness or testimony, that we are the children of God. This is nearly, if not exactly, the same with 'the testimony of a good conscience toward God;' and is the result of reason or reflection on what we feel in our own souls. Strictly speaking, it is a conclusion drawn partly from the word of God, and partly from our own experience. The word of God says, Every one who has the fruit of the Spirit is a child of God. Experience or inward consciousness tells me, that I have the fruit of the Spirit; and hence I rationally conclude, Therefore I am a child of God. This is likewise allowed on all hands, and so is no matter of controversy. (7.) Nor do we assert, that there can be any real testimony of the Spirit, without the fruit of the Spirit. We assert, on the contrary, that the fruit of the Spirit immediately springs from this testimony; not always indeed in the same degree even when the testimony is first given; and much less afterward: neither joy nor peace is always at one stay. No, nor love: as neither is the testimony itself always equally strong and clear. (8.) But the point in question is, whether there be any direct testimony of the Spirit at all; whether there be any other testimony of the Spirit, than that which arises from a consciousness of the fruit. I believe there is, because that is the plain, natural meaning of the text, 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.' It is manifest here are two witnesses mentioned, who together testify the same thing, the Spirit of God, and our own spirit. The late bishop of London, in his sermon on this text, seems astonished that any one can doubt of this, which appears upon the very face of the words. Now, 'the testimony of our own spirit,' says the bishop, 'is one which is the consciousness of our own sincerity;' or, to express the same thing a little more clearly, the consciousness of the fruit of the Spirit. When our spirit is conscious of this, of love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, it easily infers from these premises, that we are the children of God. It is true, that great man supposes the other witness to be 'the consciousness of our own good works.' This, he affirms, is 'the testimony of God's Spirit.' But this is included in the testimony of our own spirit: yea, and in sincerity, even according to the common sense of the word. So the Apostle: 'Our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity we have our conversation in the world;' where it is plain, sincerity refers to our words and actions, at least, as much as to our inward dispositions. So that this is not another

witness, but the very same that he mentioned before: the consciousness of our good works being only one branch of the consciousness of our sincerity. Consequently, here is only one witness still. If therefore, the text speaks of two witnesses, one of these is not the consciousness of our good works, neither of our sincerity; all this being manifestly contained in ‘the testimony of our spirit.’ What, then, is the other witness? This might easily be learned, if the text itself were not sufficiently clear, from the verse immediately preceding: ‘Ye have received, not the spirit of bondage, but the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.’ It follows, ‘The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.’ This is farther explained by the parallel text, Gal. iv, 6: ‘Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.’ Is not this something immediate and direct, not the result of reflection or argumentation? Does not this Spirit cry, ‘Abba, Father,’ in our hearts, the moment it is given? antecedently to any reflection upon our sincerity, yea, to any reasoning whatsoever? And is not this the plain, natural sense of the words, which strikes any one as soon as he hears them? All these texts, then, in their most obvious meaning, describe a direct testimony of the Spirit. That the testimony of the Spirit of God, must, in the very nature of things, be antecedent to the testimony of our own spirit, may appear from this single consideration: We must be holy in heart and life, before we can be conscious that we are so. But we must love God before we can be holy at all, this being the root of all holiness. Now, we cannot love God, till we know he loves us: ‘We love him, because he first loved us.’ And we cannot know his love to us, till his Spirit witnesses it to our spirit. Since, therefore, the testimony of his Spirit must precede the love of God and all holiness, of consequence it must precede our consciousness thereof.”

12. The precedence of the direct witness of the Spirit of God to the indirect witness of our own, and the dependence of the latter upon the former, are also clearly stated by other divines of great authority. Calvin, on Romans viii, 16, says, “St. Paul means that the Spirit of God gives such a testimony to us, that he being our guide and teacher, our spirit concludes our adoption of God to be certain. For our own mind, of itself, independent of the preceding testimony of the Spirit, [*nisi præunte Spiritûs testimonio,*] could not produce this persuasion in us. For while the Spirit witnesses that we are the sons of God, he at the same time inspires this confidence into our minds, that we are bold to call God our Father.” On the same passage Dr. John Owen says, “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits that we are the sons of God; the witness which our own spirits do give unto our adoption is the work and effect of the Holy Spirit in us; if it were not, it would be false, and not confirmed by the testimony of the Spirit himself, who is the Spirit of truth. ‘And none knoweth the things of God but the

Spirit of God,' 1 Cor. ii, 11. If he declare not our sonship in us and to us, we cannot know it. How doth he then bear witness to our spirits? What is the distinct testimony? It must be some such act of his as evidenceth itself to be from him immediately, unto them that are concerned in it, that is, those unto whom it is given." Poole on the same passage remarks, "The Spirit of adoption doth not only excite us to call upon God as our Father, but it doth ascertain and assure us, as before, that we are his children. And this it doth not by an outward voice, as God the Father to Jesus Christ, nor by an angel, as to Daniel and the Virgin Mary, but by an inward and secret suggestion, whereby he raiseth our hearts to this persuasion, that God is our Father, and we are his children. This is not the testimony of the graces and operations of the Spirit, but of the Spirit itself." Bishop Pearson, in his elaborate work on the Creed, and Dr. Barrow, in his Sermons, are equally explicit in stating this Scriptural doctrine.

HOMOIUSIANS, a branch of the high Arians, who maintained that the nature of the Son, though not the same, was similar to that of the Father.

HOMOIOUSIANS, or HOMOUSIASTS, was, on the other hand, a name applied to the Athanasians, who held the Son to be homousios, or consubstantial with the Father, that is, of the same nature and substance.

HONEY, דבש. It is probable, that it was in order to keep the Jews at a distance from the customs of the Heathen, who were used to offer honey in their sacrifices, that God forbade it to be offered to him, that is to say, burnt upon the altar, Lev. ii, 11; but at the same time he commanded that the first-fruits of it should be presented. These first-fruits and offerings were designed for the support and sustenance of the priests, and were not consumed upon the altar. In hot weather, the honey burst the comb, and ran down the hollow trees or rocks, where, in the land of Judea, the bees deposited great store of it. This, flowing spontaneously, was the best and most delicious, as it was quite pure, and clear from all dregs and wax. The Israelites called it יערה, wood honey. It is therefore improperly rendered "honeycomb," 1 Sam. xiv, 27; Cant. v, 1; in both which places it means the honey that has distilled from the trees, as distinguished from the domestic, which was eaten with the comb. Hasselquist says, that between Acra and Nazareth, great numbers of wild bees breed, to the advantage of the inhabitants; and Maundrell observes of the great plain near Jericho, that he perceived in it, in many places, a smell of honey and wax as strong as if he had been in an apiary. Milk and honey were the chief dainties of the earlier ages, and continue to be so of the Bedoween Arabs now. So butter and honey are several times mentioned in Scripture as among the most delicious refreshments, 2 Sam. xvii, 29; Job xx, 17; Cant. iv, 11; Isaiah vii, 15. Thus Irby and Mangles, in their Travels, relate, "They gave us some

honey and butter together, with bread to dip in it, Narsah desiring one of his men to mix the two ingredients for us, as we were awkward at it. The Arab, having stirred the mixture up well with his fingers, showed his dexterity at consuming, as well as mixing, and recompensed himself for his trouble by eating half of it." The wild honey, μέλι ἄγριον, mentioned to have been a part of the food of John the Baptist, Matt. iii, 4, was probably such as he got in the rocks and hollows of trees. Thus, "honey out of the stony rock," Psalm lxxxi, 16; Deut. xxxii, 13.

HOPHNI. See Eli.

HOPKINSIANS, or HOPKINSONIANS, so called from the Rev. Samuel Hopkins, D.D., pastor of the first Congregational church at Newport, Rhode Island, North America, about A. D. 1770. Dr. Hopkins, in his sermons and tracts, made several additions to the sentiments previously advanced by the celebrated President Edwards, of New-Jersey College. The following is a summary of their distinguishing tenets:--

1. That all true virtue or real holiness consists in disinterested benevolence. The object of benevolence is universal being, including God, and all intelligent creatures. It wishes and seeks the good of every individual, so far as is consistent with the greatest good of the whole, which is comprised in the glory of God, and the perfection and happiness of his kingdom. The law of God is the standard of all moral rectitude or holiness. This is reduced into love to God and to our neighbour; and universal good will comprehends all the love to God, our neighbour, and ourselves, required in the divine law, and therefore must be the whole of holy obedience. Let any person reflect on what are the particular branches of true piety, and he will find that disinterested affection is the distinguishing characteristic of each. For instance, all which distinguishes pious fear from the fear of the wicked consists in love. Holy gratitude is nothing but good will to God and man, ourselves included, excited by a view of the good will and kindness of God. Justice, truth, and faithfulness, are comprised in universal benevolence. So are temperance and chastity; for an undue indulgence of our appetites and passions is contrary to benevolence, as tending to hurt ourselves or others, and so opposite to the general good, and the divine command. In short, all virtue is nothing but love to God and our neighbour, made perfect in all its genuine exercises and expressions.

2. That all sin consists in selfishness. By this is meant an interested affection, by which a person sets himself up as the supreme or only object of regard; and nothing is lovely in his view, unless suited to promote his private interest. This self-love is, in its whole nature, and every degree of it, enmity against God: it is not subject to the law of God, and 465it is the

only affection that can oppose it. It is the foundation of all spiritual blindness, and the source of all idolatry and false religion. It is the foundation of all covetousness and sensuality; of all falsehood, injustice, and oppression; as it excites mankind, by undue methods, to invade the property of others. Self-love produces all the violent passions, envy, wrath, clamour, and evil speaking; and every thing contrary to the divine law is briefly comprehended in this fruitful source of iniquity, self-love.

3. That there are no promises of regenerating grace made to the actions of the unregenerate. For as far as men act from self-love, they act from a bad end; for those who have no true love to God really fulfil no duty when they attend on the externals of religion. Also, that inability, which consists in disinclination, never renders any thing improper to be the subject of a command.

4. That the impotency of sinners, with respect to believing in Christ, is not natural, but moral; for it is a plain dictate of common sense, that natural impossibility excludes all blame. But an unwilling mind is universally considered as a crime, and not as an excuse; and is the very thing wherein our wickedness consists.--Also,

5. That in order to faith in Christ, a sinner must approve in his heart of the divine conduct, even though God should cast him off for ever; which, however, neither implies love to misery, nor hatred of happiness. But as a particle of water is small, in comparison of a generous stream, so the man of humility feels small before the great family of his fellow creatures. He values his soul; but, when he compares it to the great soul of mankind, he almost forgets and loses sight of it: for the governing principle of his heart is, to estimate things according to their worth. When, therefore, he indulges an humble comparison with his Maker, he feels lost in the infinite fulness and brightness of divine love, as a ray of light is lost in the sun, and a particle of water in the ocean. It inspires him with the most grateful feelings of heart, that he has opportunity to be in the hand of God, as clay in the hand of the potter; and as he considers himself in this humble light, he submits the nature and size of his future vessel entirely to God. As his pride is lost in the dust, he looks up with pleasure toward the throne of God, and rejoices, with all his heart, in the rectitude of the divine administration. He also considers that, if the law be good, death is due to those who have broken it; and "the Judge of all the earth cannot but do right," Gen. xviii, 25. It would bring everlasting reproach upon his government to spare us, considered merely as in ourselves. When this is felt in our hearts, and not till then, we shall be prepared to look to the free grace of God, through Christ's redemption.

6. That the infinitely wise and holy God has exerted his omnipotent power, in such a manner as he purposed should be followed with the existence and entrance of moral evil in the system: for it must be admitted, on all hands, that God has a perfect knowledge, foresight, and view of all possible existences and events. If that system and scene of operation, in which moral evil should never have existence, was actually preferred in the divine mind, certainly the Deity is infinitely disappointed in the issue of his own operations. Dr. Hopkins maintains, therefore, that “God was the author, origin, and positive cause of Adam’s sin:” yea, “that he is the origin and cause of moral evil, as really as he is of the existence of any thing that he wills.”

7. That the introduction of sin is, upon the whole, for the general good. For the wisdom and power of the Deity are displayed in carrying on designs of the greatest good: and the existence of moral evil has, undoubtedly, occasioned a more full, perfect, and glorious discovery of the infinite perfections of the divine nature, than could otherwise have been made to the view of creatures.

8. That repentance is before faith in Christ. By this, is not intended, that repentance is before a speculative conviction of the being and perfections of God, and of the person and character of Christ; but only, that true repentance is previous to a saving faith in Christ, by which the believer is united to Christ, and entitled to the benefits of his mediation and atonement. So Christ commanded, “Repent ye, and believe the Gospel;” and Paul preached “repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.”

9. That though men became sinners by Adam, according to a divine constitution, yet they were and are accountable for no sins but personal: for, (1.) Adam’s act, in eating the forbidden fruit, was not the act of his posterity; therefore they did not sin at the same time that he did. (2.) The sinfulness of that act could not be transferred to them afterward; because the sinfulness of an act can no more be transferred from one person to another, than an act itself. (3.) Therefore Adam’s act, in eating the forbidden fruit, was not the cause, but only the occasions of his posterity being sinners. Adam sinned, and now God brings his posterity into the world sinners.

10. That though believers are justified through Christ’s righteousness, yet his righteousness is not transferred to them. For personal righteousness cannot be transferred from one person to another, nor personal sin; otherwise the sinner would become innocent, and Christ the sinner. The Scripture, therefore, represents believers as receiving only the benefits of



Christ's righteousness in justification, or their being pardoned and accepted for Christ's righteousness' sake; and this is the proper Scripture notion of imputation. Jonathan's righteousness was imputed to Mephibosheth, when David showed kindness to him for his father Jonathan's sake, 2 Samuel ix, 7.

11. The Hopkinsians warmly advocate the doctrine of the divine decrees, not only particular election, but also reprobation; they hold also the total depravation of human nature, the special influences of the Spirit of God in regeneration, justification by faith alone, the final perseverance of the saints, and the consistency between entire freedom and absolute dependence; and therefore claim it as their just due, since the world will make distinctions, to be called Hopkinsian Calvinists. Calvinists, however, have demurred against several of these propositions, and a long and warm controversy was occasioned by them in the United States; to a few points of which we shall advert.--(1.) Selfishness, as confining our affections and exertions to ourselves, is confessedly a vice; but that self is not to be excluded from our affections, is evident even from the terms of the divine law,--"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." And the Scriptures teach us, that "no man hateth his own flesh." Such a "disinterested benevolence," therefore, as implies no peculiar anxiety for our personal salvation and happiness, can never be required of us. A good man may and must be convinced, that God would be just in his final condemnation, considered out of Christ; but it is impossible to acquiesce in such a prospect; it is making holiness to consist in being satisfied with remaining for ever unholy, which is as impious as it is contradictory; and the strong and strange things which some Hopkinsonians have said on this subject, can only be accounted for from the love of paradox. (2.) The other principal point on which Calvinists dissent, is the making God "the author and efficient cause of sin." It is true that the Doctor says elsewhere, that "in causing or originating sin, there is no sin;" this, however, is a position so dangerous, so unsupported, and so contrary to the common sense of mankind, that we may well shrink from it; and should risk no speculation that can implicate the divine character, or furnish an excuse for sin. "Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?" saith the Apostle. "God forbid! for how then shall God judge the world?" Rom. iii, 5, 6. Those who feel interested in the controversy, may be fully gratified in the "Contrast between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism," by Ezra Styles Ely, A. M., (New-York, 1811,) and other American publications. In this country the controversy is but little known; but we may remark that the theory of Hopkins appears to be an attempt to unite some points of mystic theology with the Calvinism commonly received, and that where it differs from the latter system, it relieves no difficulty.

HOR. This mountain, in its general acceptation, is probably the same with Mount Seir, Hor being the name by which that mountainous tract was denominated before it was exchanged for Seir. But one particular mountain of this region retained the name of Hor long after; as it was a mountain of this name, "by the coast of the land of Edom," that Aaron was commanded to ascend, in order to die there, Num. xx, 23. This mountain, or at least the one to which tradition assigns the tomb of Aaron, was visited by Burckhardt; from whose account it appears to form a conspicuous object in the chain of the Djebel Shera, or Mount Seir, rising abruptly from the valley of El Araba, or desert of Zin, about fifty miles north of Akaba, or Ezion-Geber.

HOREB, a mountain in Arabia Petraea, a part of which, or near to which, was Sinai. At Horeb God appeared to Moses in the burning bush, Exod. iii, 1, &c. Hither Elijah retired to avoid the persecution of Jezebel, 1 Kings xix, 8. Sinai and Horeb seem to be two parts of the same mountain; hence the law is sometimes said to be given there.

HORN. By horns the Hebrews sometimes understood an eminence, or angle, a corner, or a rising. By horns of the altar of burnt offerings, many understand the angles of that altar; but there were also horns, or eminences, at the corners of that altar, Exod. xxvii, 2; xxx, 2. Horn also signifies glory, brightness, rays. God's "brightness was as the light, he had horns coming out of his hand," Hab. iii, 4; that is, refulgent beams issuing from the hollow of it. As the ancients frequently used horns to hold liquors, vessels containing oil and perfumes are often called horns, whether made of horn or not. "Fill thine horn with oil," says the Lord to Samuel, "and anoint David," 1 Sam. xvi, 1. Zadok took a horn of oil out of the tabernacle, and anointed Solomon, 1 Kings i, 39. Job called one of his daughters Kerenhappuch, horn of antimony, or horn to put antimony (stibium) in, which the women of the east still use at this day, Job xliiii, 14. The principal defence and strength of horned beasts consist in their horns; and hence the Scripture mentions the horn as a symbol of strength. The Lord exalted the horn of David, the horn of his people; he breaketh the horn of the ungodly; he cutteth off the horn of Moab; he cutteth off the horn of Israel; he promiseth to make the horn of Israel to bud forth; to reestablish the honour of it, and restore its former vigour. Moses compares Joseph to a young bull, and says that he has horns like those of a unicorn. Kingdoms and great powers are often in Scripture described by the symbol of horns. In Daniel vii, viii, horns represent the power of the Persians, of the Greeks, of Syria, of Egypt, or of Pagan and Papal Rome. The prophet represents three animals as having many horns, one of which grew from the other. This emblem is a natural one, since in the east are rams which have many horns.

HORNET, הַצְרָעָה, *Exod.* xxiii, 28; *Deut.* vii, 20; *Joshua* xxiv, 12. The hornet, in natural history, belongs to the species *crabo*, of the genus *vespa* or wasp. It is a most voracious insect, and is exceedingly strong for its size, which is generally an inch in length, and sometimes more. In each of the instances where this creature is mentioned in Scripture, it is as sent among the enemies of the Israelites, to drive them out of the land. Some explain the word metaphorically, as “I will send my terror as the hornet,” &c. But Bochart contends that it is to be taken in its proper literal meaning, and has accumulated examples of several other people having been chased from their habitations by insects of different kinds. Ælian records that the Phaselites, who dwelt about the mountains of Solyma, were driven out of their country by wasps. As these people were Phenicians or Canaanites, it is probable that the event to which he refers is the same as took place in the days of Joshua. How distressing and destructive a multitude of these fierce and severely stinging insects might be, any person may conjecture. No armour, no weapons could avail against them. A few thousands of them would be sufficient to overthrow the best disciplined army and put it into confusion and rout. From *Joshua* xxiv, 12, we find that two kings of the Amorites were actually driven out of the land by these hornets, so that the Israelites were not obliged to use either sword or bow in the conquest. One of these, according to the Jewish commentaries of R. Nachman, was the nation of the Girgashites, who retired into Africa, fearing the power of God. And Procopius, in his history of the Vandals, mentions an ancient inscription in Mauritania Tingitana, stating, that the inhabitants had fled thither from the face of Joshua, the son of Nun. This account accords with Scripture, in which, though the Girgashites are included in the general list of the seven devoted nations either to be driven out or destroyed by the Israelites, *Gen.* xv, 20, 21; *Deut.* vii, 1; *Josh.* iii, 10; xxiv, 11; yet they are omitted in the list of those to be utterly destroyed, *Deut.* xx, 17; and among whom, in neglect of the divine decree, the Israelites lived and intermarried, *Judges* iii, 1–6. That the name of the Girgashites, however, was not extirpated, we may collect from the Gergesenes, in our Saviour’s time, inhabiting the same country, *Matt.* viii, 28. Other tribes of the Hivites, Canaanites, and Hittites, were also expelled by the hornet gradually; not in one year, lest the land should become desolate, and the wild beasts multiply to the prejudice of the Israelites, *Exod.* xxiii, 28–30.

The “arms of Jove,” to which Virgil refers, (*Æneid* viii, 355–358,) in describing the flight of Saturn from the east, were the hornets sent by the God of Israel, Iahoh, or by contraction Io, to which also his description of the Asilus exactly corresponds:--

Plurimus--volitans, (cui nomen Asilo  
Romanum est; οἶστρον, Graii vertere vocantes,)

Asper, acerba sonans, quo tota exterrita sylvis  
Diffugiunt armenta.

Georg. iii, 145.

“About the Alburnian groves, with holly green,  
Of winged insects mighty swarms are seen;  
This flying plague, to mark its quality,  
Æstros the Grecians call; ASYLUS, we:  
A fierce loud buzzing breeze; their stings draw blood,  
And drive the cattle gadding through the wood.  
Seized with unusual pains, they loudly cry.”

Dryden.

Dr. Hales is of opinion, that the Latin *asilus* and Greek *οιστρον*, were probably only different pronunciations of the same oriental term, *הצרעה*, *hatsiraah*, as this fly is called by Moses and Joshua. The vindictive power that presided over this dreadful scourge was worshipped at Ekron, in Palestine, through fear, the reigning motive of Pagan superstition, under the title of Baal-zebul, “master or lord of the hornet,” whence Beelzebub, in the New Testament, “the prince of demons,” Matt. xii, 24. Isaiah, denouncing a wo against Abyssinia, describes it as “the land of the winged cymbal,” (*tsaltsal canaphim*,) Isaiah xviii, 1; by the same analogy that *tsaltsal* signifies “a locust,” Deut. xxviii, 42; a *streperâ voce sic dictam*. [So called from its streperous sound.] Bruce, in his Travels in Abyssinia, has given an accurate description of this tremendous fly, which in Arabic is called *zimb*, and by the Abyssinians *tsaltsal-ya*, “the cymbal of the Lord,” from its sonorous buzzing. And in his Appendix he has given a drawing of it, magnified, for distinctness’ sake, something above twice the natural size: after which he observes, “He has no sting, though he seems to me to be rather of the bee kind; but his motion is more rapid and sudden than that of the bee, (*volitans*,) and resembles that of the gad-fly in England. There is something particular in the sound or buzzing of this insect; it is a jarring noise, together with a humming, (*acerba sonans*,) which induces me to believe it proceeds, in part at least, from a vibration made with the three hairs at his snout.” Bruce does not cite or refer to Virgil’s description, though his account furnishes the most critical and exact explanation of it. Such undesigned coincidences are most satisfactory and convincing; they show that the poet and the naturalist both copied from nature. And the terror impressed by this insect on all the cattle, *quo tota exterrita sylvis diffugiunt*, [affrighted at which the entire herds flee to the thickets,] according to Virgil, is thus illustrated by Bruce: “As soon as this plague appears, and their buzzing is heard, all the cattle forsake their food, and run wildly about the plain till they die, worn out with fatigue, fright, and hunger. No remedy remains but to leave the black earth, where they breed, and hasten down to the sands of Atbara; and there they remain while the periodical rains last, this cruel enemy (*asper*) never daring to pursue them

farther. The camel, emphatically called by the Arabs the ship of the desert, though his size is immense as is his strength, and his body covered with a thick skin, defended with strong hair, still is not able to sustain the violent punctures the fly makes with his pointed proboscis. He must lose no time in removing to the sands of Atbara; for when once attacked by this fly, his body, head, and legs, break out into large bosses, which swell, break, and putrefy, to the certain destruction of the creature. I have found some of these tubercles upon almost every elephant and rhinoceros that I have seen, and attribute them to this cause. All the inhabitants of the sea coast are obliged to put themselves in motion, and remove to the next sand, in the beginning of the rainy season, to prevent all their stock of cattle from being destroyed. Nor is there any alternative, or means of avoiding this, though a hostile band was in the way, capable of spoiling them of half their substance, as was actually the case when we were at Sennaar. Of such consequence is the weakest instrument in the hand of Providence." See Flies and Beelzebub.

HORSE, סוס. Horses were very rare among the Hebrews in the early ages. The patriarchs had none; and after the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, God expressly forbade their ruler to procure them: "He shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the Lord hath said, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way," Deut. xvii, 16. As horses appear to have been generally furnished by Egypt, God prohibits these, 1. Lest there should be such commerce with Egypt as might lead to idolatry. 2. Lest the people might depend on a well appointed cavalry, as a means of security, and so cease from trusting in the promised aid and protection of Jehovah. 3. That they might not be tempted to extend their dominion by means of cavalry, and so get scattered among the surrounding idolatrous nations, and thus cease in process of time, to be that distinct and separate people which God intended they should be, and without which the prophecies relative to the Messiah could not be known to have their due and full accomplishment. In the time of the Judges we find horses and war chariots among the Canaanites, but still the Israelites had none; and hence they were generally too timid to venture down into the plains, confining their conquests to the mountainous parts of the country. In the reign of Saul, it would appear, that horse breeding had not yet been introduced into Arabia; for, in a war with some of the Arabian nations, the Israelites got plunder in camels, sheep, and asses, but no horses. David's enemies brought against him a strong force of cavalry into the field; and in the book of Psalms the horse commonly appears only on the side of the enemies of the people of God; and so entirely unaccustomed to the management of this animal had the Israelites still continued, that, after a battle, in which they took a considerable body of cavalry prisoners, 2 Sam. viii, 4, David caused

most of the horses to be cut down, because he did not know what use to make of them. Solomon was the first who established a cavalry force. Under these circumstances, it is not wonderful that the Mosaic law should take no notice of an animal which we hold in such high estimation. To Moses, educated as he was in Egypt, and, with his people, at last chased out by Pharaoh's cavalry, the use of the horse for war and for travelling was well known; but as it was his object to establish a nation of husbandmen, and not of soldiers for the conquest of foreign lands, and as Palestine, from its situation, required not the defence of cavalry, he might very well decline introducing among his people the yet unusual art of horse breeding. Solomon, having married a daughter of Pharaoh, procured a breed of horses from Egypt; and so greatly did he multiply them, that he had four hundred stables, forty thousand stalls, and twelve thousand horsemen, 1 Kings iv, 26; 2 Chron. ix, 25. It seems that the Egyptian horses were in high repute, and were much used in war. When the Israelites were disposed to place too implicit confidence in the assistance of cavalry, the prophet remonstrated in these terms: "The Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses are flesh, not spirit," Isaiah xxxi, 3.

HORSE-LEECH, עלוקה, from a root which signifies to adhere, stick close, or hang fast, Prov. xxx, 15. A sort of worm that lives in water, of a black or brown colour, which fattens upon the flesh, and does not quit it till it is entirely full of blood. Solomon says, "The horse-leech hath two daughters, Give, give." This is so apt an emblem of an insatiable rapacity and avarice, that it has been generally used by different writers to express it. Thus Plautus makes one say, speaking of the determination to get money, "I will turn myself into a horse-leech, and suck out their blood;" and Cicero, in one of his letters to Atticus, calls the common people of Rome horse-leeches of the treasury. Solomon, having mentioned those that devoured the property of the poor as the worst of all the generations which he had specified, proceeds to state the insatiable cupidity with which they prosecuted their schemes of rapine and plunder. As the horse-leech had two daughters, cruelty and thirst of blood, which cannot be satisfied, so the oppressor of the poor has two dispositions, rapacity and avarice, which never say they have enough, but continually demand additional gratifications.

HOSANNA, "Save, I beseech thee," or, "Give salvation," a well known form of blessing, Matthew xxi, 9, 15; Mark xi, 9, 10; John xii, 13.

HOSEA, son of Beerai, the first of the minor prophets. He is generally considered as a native and inhabitant of the kingdom of Israel, and is supposed to have begun to prophesy about B. C. 800. He exercised his office sixty years; but it is not known at what periods his different

prophecies now remaining were delivered. Most of them are directed against the people of Israel, whom he reproveth and threatens for their idolatry and wickedness, and exhorts to repentance, with the greatest earnestness, as the only means of averting the evils impending over their country. The principal predictions contained in this book, are the captivity and dispersion of the kingdom of Israel; the deliverance of Judah from Sennacherib; the present state of the Jews; their future restoration, and union with the Gentiles in the kingdom of the Messiah; the call of our Saviour out of Egypt, and his resurrection on the third day. The style of Hosea is peculiarly obscure; it is sententious, concise, and abrupt; the transitions of persons are sudden; and the connexive and adversative particles are frequently omitted. The 469 prophecies are in one continued series, without any distinction as to the times when they were delivered, or the different subjects to which they relate. They are not so clear and detailed, as the predictions of those prophets who lived in succeeding ages. When, however, we have surmounted these difficulties, we shall see abundant reason to admire the force and energy with which this prophet writes, and the boldness of the figures and similitudes which he uses.

2. Hosea, or Hoshea, son of Elah, was the last king of Israel. Having conspired against Pekah, son of Remaliah, king of Israel, he killed him, A. M. 3265; B. C. 739. However, the elders of the land seem to have taken the government into their hands; for Hoshea was not in possession of the kingdom till nine years after, 2 Kings xv, 30; xvii, 1. Hoshea did evil in the sight of the Lord, but not equal to the kings of Israel who preceded him; that is, say the Jewish doctors, he did not restrain his subjects from going to Jerusalem to worship, if they would; whereas the kings of Israel, his predecessors, had forbidden it, and had placed guards on the road to prevent it. Salmaneser, king of Assyria, being informed that Hoshea meditated a revolt, and had concerted measures with So, king of Egypt, to shake off the Assyrian yoke, marched against him, and besieged Samaria. After a siege of three years, in the ninth year of Hoshea's reign, the city was taken, and was reduced to a heap of ruins, A. M. 3282. The king of Assyria removed the Israelites of the ten tribes to countries beyond the Euphrates, and thus terminated the kingdom of the ten tribes.

**HOSPITALITY.** Instances of ancient hospitality occur frequently in the Old Testament. So in the case of Abraham, Gen. xviii, where he invites the angels who appeared in the form of men to rest and refreshment, "And he stood by them under the tree, and they did eat." "Nothing is more common in India," says Mr. Ward, "than to see travellers and guests eating under the shade of trees. Even feasts are never held in houses. The house of a Hindoo serves for the purposes of sleeping and cooking, and of shutting up the women; but is never considered as a sitting or a dining room." "On my

return to the boat," says Belzony, "I found the aga and all his retinue seated on a mat, under a cluster of palm trees, close to the water. The sun was then setting, and the shades of the western mountains had reached across the Nile, and covered the town. It is at this time the people recreate themselves in various scattered groups, drinking coffee, smoking their pipes, and talking of camels, horses, asses, dhourra, caravans, or boats." "The aga having prepared a dinner for me," says Mr. Light, "invited several of the natives to sit down. Water was brought in a skin by an attendant, to wash our hands. Two fowls roasted were served up on wheaten cakes, in a wooden bowl, covered with a small mat, and a number of the same cakes in another: in the centre of these were liquid butter, and preserved dates. These were divided, broken up, and mixed together by some of the party, while others pulled the fowls to pieces: which done, the party began to eat as fast as they could: getting up, one after the other, as soon as their hunger was satisfied." "Hospitality to travellers," says Mr. Forbes, "prevails throughout Guzerat: a person of any consideration passing through the province is presented, at the entrance of a village, with fruit, milk, butter, fire wood, and earthen pots for cookery; the women and children offer him wreaths of flowers. Small bowers are constructed on convenient spots, at a distance from a well or lake, where a person is maintained by the nearest villages, to take care of the water jars, and supply all travellers gratis. There are particular villages, where the inhabitants compel all travellers to accept of one day's provisions: whether they be many or few, rich or poor, European or native, they must not refuse the offered bounty."

"So when angelic forms to Syria sent  
 Sat in the cedar shade, by Abraham's tent,  
 A spacious bowl th' admiring patriarch fills  
 With dulcet water from the scanty rills;  
 Sweet fruits and kernels gathers from his hoard,  
 With milk and butter piles the plenteous board;  
 While on the heated hearth his consort bakes  
 Fine flour well kneaded in unleavened cakes,  
 The guests ethereal quaff the lucid flood,  
 Smile on their hosts, and taste terrestrial food;  
 And while from seraph lips sweet converse springs,  
 They lave their feet, and close their silver wings."

Darwin.

HOURS. See Day.

HOUSES. The following description of oriental houses will serve to illustrate several passages of Scripture. From the gate of the porch, one is conducted into a quadrangular court, which, being exposed to the weather, is paved with stone, in order to carry off the water in the rainy season. The



principal design of this quadrangle, is to give light to the house, and admit the fresh air into the apartments; it is also the place where the master of the house entertains his company, who are seldom or never honoured with admission into the inner apartments. This open space bears a striking resemblance to the impluvium, or cava ædium, of the Romans, which was also an uncovered area, from whence the chambers were lighted. For the accommodation of the guests, the pavement is covered with mats or carpets; and as it is secured against all interruption from the street, is well adapted to public entertainments. It is called, says Dr. Shaw, the middle of the house, and literally answers to τὸ μέσον of the evangelist, into which the man afflicted with the palsy was let down through the ceiling, with his couch, before Jesus, Luke v, 19. Hence, he conjectures that our Lord was at this time instructing the people in the court of one of these houses; and it is by no means improbable, that the quadrangle was to him and his Apostles a favourite situation, while they were engaged in disclosing the mysteries of redemption. To defend the company from the scorching sunbeams, or “windy storm and tempest,” 470a veil was expanded upon ropes from one side of the parapet wall to the other, which might be unfolded or folded at pleasure. The court is for the most part surrounded with a cloister, over which, when the house has a number of stories, a gallery is erected of the same dimensions with the cloister, having a balustrade, or else a piece of carved or latticed work, going round about, to prevent people from falling from it into the court. The doors of the enclosure round the house are made very small; but the doors of the houses very large, for the purpose of admitting a copious stream of fresh air into their apartments. The windows which look into the street are very high and narrow, and defended by lattice work; as they are only intended to allow the cloistered inmate a peep of what is passing without, while he remains concealed behind the casement. This kind of window the ancient Hebrews called arubah, which is the same term that they used to express those small openings through which pigeons passed into the cavities of the rocks, or into those buildings which were raised for their reception. Thus the prophet asks: “Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves, אֵל-אַרְבַּחִיהֶם, to their small or narrow windows.” The word is derived from a root which signifies to lie in wait for the prey; and is very expressive of the concealed manner in which a person examines through that kind of window an external object. Irwin describes the windows in Upper Egypt as having the same form and dimensions; and says expressly, that one of the windows of the house in which they lodged, and through which they looked into the street, more resembled a pigeon hole than any thing else. But the sacred writers mention another kind of window, which was large and airy; it was called חֶלֶק, and was large enough to admit a person of mature age being cast out of it; a punishment which that profligate woman Jezebel suffered by the command of Jehu, the authorized extirminator of her family. These large windows

admit the light and the breeze into spacious apartments of the same length with the court, but which seldom or never communicate with one another. In the houses of the fashionable and the gay, the lower part of the walls is adorned with rich hangings of velvet or damask, tinged with the liveliest colours, suspended on hooks, or taken down at pleasure. A correct idea of their richness and splendour may be formed from the description, which the inspired writer has given of the hangings in the royal garden at Shushan, the ancient capital of Persia: "Where were white, green, and blue hangings, fastened with cords of fine linen and purple, to silver rings and pillars of marble," Esther i, 6. The upper part of the walls is adorned with the most ingenious wreathings and devices, in stucco and fret-work. The ceiling is generally of wainscot, painted with great art, or else thrown into a variety of pannels with gilded mouldings. In the days of Jeremiah the prophet, when the profusion and luxury of all ranks in Judea were at their height, their chambers were ceiled with fragrant and costly wood, and painted with the richest colours. Of this extravagance the indignant seer loudly complains: "Wo unto him that saith, I will build me a wide house and large chambers, and cutteth him out windows: and it is ceiled with cedar, and painted with vermilion," Jer. xxii, 14. The floors of these splendid apartments were laid with painted tiles, or slabs of the most beautiful marble. A pavement of this kind is mentioned in the book of Esther; at the sumptuous entertainment which Ahasuerus made for the princes and nobles of his vast empire, "the beds," or couches, upon which they reclined, "were of gold and silver, upon a pavement of red and blue, and white and black marble." Plaster of terrace is often vised for the same purpose; and the floor is always covered with carpets, which are for the most part of the richest materials. Upon these carpets, a range of narrow beds, or mattresses, is often placed along the sides of the wall, with velvet or damask bolsters, for the greater ease and convenience of the company. To these luxurious indulgences the prophets occasionally seem to allude: Ezekiel was commanded to pronounce a "wo to the women that sew pillows to all armholes," Ezek. xiii, 18; and Amos denounces the judgments of his God against them "that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall," Amos vi, 4. At one end of each chamber is a little gallery, raised three or four feet above the floor, with a balustrade in front, to which they go up by a few steps. Here they place their beds; a situation frequently alluded to in the Holy Scriptures. Thus Jacob addressed his undutiful son, in his last benediction: "Thou wentest up to thy father's bed,--he went up to my couch," Gen. xlix, 4. The allusion is again involved in the declaration of Elijah to the king of Samaria: "Now, therefore, thus saith the Lord, Thou shalt not come down from that bed on which thou art gone up, but shalt surely die," 2 Kings i, 4, 16. And the Psalmist sware unto the Lord, and vowed unto the mighty God of Jacob,

“Surely I will not come into the tabernacle of my house, nor go up into my bed, until I find out a place for the Lord,” Psalm cxxxii, 3. This arrangement may likewise illustrate the circumstance of Hezekiah’s “turning his face to the wall, when he prayed,” that the greatness of his sorrow, and the fervour of his devotion, might, as much as possible, be concealed from his attendants, 2 Kings xx.

The roof is always flat, and often composed of branches of wood laid across rude beams; and, to defend it from the injuries of the weather, to which it is peculiarly exposed in the rainy season, it is covered with a strong plaster of terrace. It is surrounded by a wall breast-high, which forms the partition with the contiguous houses, and prevents one from falling into the street on the one side, or into the court on the other. This answers to the battlements which Moses commanded the people of Israel to make for the roof of their 471 houses, for the same reason. “When thou buildest a new house, then thou shalt make a battlement, מַעֲקֵה, for thy roof, that thou bring not blood upon thine house, if any man fall from thence,” Deut. xxii, 8. Instead of the parapet wall, some terraces are guarded, like the galleries, with balustrades only, or latticed work. Of the same kind, probably, was the lattice or net, as the term שֶׁבַח seems to import, through which Ahaziah, the king of Samaria, fell down into the court, 2 Kings i, 2. This incident proves the necessity of the law which was graciously dictated from Sinai, and furnishes a beautiful example of God’s paternal care and goodness; for the terrace was a place where many offices of the family were performed, and business of no little importance was occasionally transacted. Rahab concealed the spies on the roof, with the stalks of flax which she had laid in order to dry, Joshua ii, 6; the king of Israel, according to the custom of his country, rose from his bed, and walked upon the roof of his house, to enjoy the refreshing breezes of the evening, 2 Sam. xi, 2; upon the top of the house the prophet conversed with Saul, about the gracious designs of God, respecting him and his family, 1 Sam. ix, 25; to the same place Peter retired to offer up his devotions, Acts x, 9; and in the feast of tabernacles, under the government of Nehemiah, booths were erected, as well upon the terraces of their houses, as in their courts, and in the streets of the city, Neh. viii, 16. In Judea, the inhabitants sleep upon the tops of their houses during the heats of summer, in arbours made of the branches of trees, or in tents of rushes. When Dr. Pococke was at Tiberias, in Galilee, he was entertained by the sheik’s steward, and with his company supped upon the top of the house for coolness, according to their custom, and lodged there likewise, in a sort of closet of about eight feet square, formed of wicker-work, plastered round toward the bottom, but without any door, each person having his cell. In like manner, the Persians take refuge during the day in subterraneous chambers, and pass the night on the flat roofs of their houses.

The expression, "to dig through houses," occurs, Job xxiv, 16. "Thieves," says Mr. Ward, "in Bengal very frequently dig through the mud walls, and under the clay floors of houses, and, entering unperceived, plunder them while the inhabitants are asleep." Our Lord's parable of the foolish man who built his house on the sand derives illustration from the following passages in Ward's "View," and Belzoni's "Travels:" "The fishermen in Bengal build their huts in the dry season on the beds of sand, from which the river has retired. When the rains set in, which they often do very suddenly, accompanied by violent north-west winds, the water pours down in torrents from the mountains. In one night multitudes of these huts are frequently swept away, and the place where they stood is the next morning undiscoverable." "It so happened, that we were to witness one of the greatest calamities that have occurred in Egypt in the recollection of any one living. The Nile rose this season three feet and a half above the highest mark left by the former inundation, with uncommon rapidity, and carried off several villages, and some hundreds of their inhabitants. I never saw any picture that could give a more correct idea of a deluge than the valley of the Nile in this season. The Arabs had expected an extraordinary inundation this year, in consequence of the scarcity of water the preceding season; but they did not apprehend it would rise to such a height. They generally erect fences of earth and reeds around their villages, to keep the water from their houses; but the force of this inundation baffled all their efforts. Their cottages, being built of earth, could not stand one instant against the current; and no sooner did the water reach them, than it levelled them with the ground. The rapid stream carried off all that was before it; men, women, children, cattle, corn, every thing was washed away in an instant, and left the place where the village stood without any thing to indicate that there had ever been a house on the spot."

House is taken for family: "The Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house," Gen. xii, 17. "What is my house, that thou hast brought me hitherto?" 2 Sam. vii, 18. So Joseph was of the house of David, Luke i, 27; ii, 4; but more especially he was of his royal lineage, or family; and, as we conceive, in the direct line or eldest branch of the family; so that he was next of kin to the throne, if the government had still continued in possession of the descendants of David. House is taken for kindred: it is a Christian's duty to provide first for those of his own house, 1 Tim. v, 8, his family, his relatives.

**HUSBANDRY.** In the primitive ages of the world, agriculture, as well as the keeping of flocks, was a principal employment among men Gen. ii, 15; iii, 17-19; iv, 2. It is an art which has ever been a prominent source, both of the necessaries and the conveniences of life. Those states and nations,

especially Babylon and Egypt, which made the cultivation of the soil their chief business, arose in a short period to wealth and power. To these communities just mentioned, which excelled in this particular all the others of antiquity, may be added that of the Hebrews, who learned the value of the art while remaining in Egypt, and ever after that time were famous for their industry in the cultivation of the earth. Moses, following the example of the Egyptians, made agriculture the basis of the state. He accordingly apportioned to every citizen a certain quantity of land, and gave him the right of tilling it himself, and of transmitting it to his heirs. The person who had thus come into possession could not alienate the property for any longer period than the year of the coming jubilee: a regulation which prevented the rich from coming into possession of large tracts of land, and then leasing them out in small parcels to the poor: a practice which anciently prevailed, and does to this day, in the east. It was another law of Moses, that the vender of a piece of land, or his nearest relative, had a right to redeem the land sold, whenever they chose, by paying the amount of profits up to the year of jubilee, Ruth iv, 4; Jer. xxxii, 7. Another law enacted by Moses on this subject was, that the Hebrews, as was the case among the Egyptians after the time of Joseph, should pay a tax of two-tenths of their income unto God, whose servants they were to consider themselves to be, and whom they were to obey as their King and Lord, Lev. xxvii, 30; Deut. xii, 17–19; xiv, 22–29; Gen. xxviii, 22. The custom of marking the boundaries of lands by stones, although it prevailed a long time before, Job xxiv, 2, was confirmed and perpetuated in the time of Moses by an express law; and a curse was pronounced against him who without authority removed them. These regulations having been made in respect to the tenure, incumbrances, &c, of landed property, Joshua divided the whole country which he had occupied, first among the respective tribes, and then among individual Hebrews, running it out with the aid of a measuring line, Joshua xvii, 5, 14; Amos vii, 17; Micah ii, 5; Psalm lxxviii, 55; Ezek. xl, 3. The word, חבל, a line, is accordingly used by a figure of speech, for the heritage itself, Psalm xvi, 6: “The lines have fallen to me in pleasant places, yea I have a goodly heritage.” Though Moses was the friend of the agriculturist, he by no means discouraged the keeper of the flock.

The occupation of the husbandman was held in honour, not only for the profits which it brought, but from the circumstance that it was supported and protected by the fundamental laws of the state. All who were not set apart for religious duties, such as the priests and the Levites, whether inhabitants of the country, or of towns and cities, were considered by the laws, and were, in fact, agriculturists. The rich and the noble, it is true, in the cultivation of the soil, did not always put themselves on a level with their servants; but none were so rich or so noble as to disdain to put their

hand to the plough, 1 Sam. xi, 7; 1 Kings xix, 19; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10. The priests and Levites were indeed engaged in other employments, yet they could not withhold their honour from an occupation which supplied them with their income. The esteem in which agriculture was held diminished as luxury increased; but it never wholly came to an end. Even after the captivity, when many of the Jews had become merchants and mechanics, the esteem and honour attached to this occupation still continued, especially under the dynasty of the Persians, who were agriculturists from motives of religion.

The soil of Palestine is very fruitful, if the dews and vernal and autumnal rains are not withheld. The country, in opposition to Egypt, is eulogized for its rains in Deut. xi, 10. The Hebrews, notwithstanding the richness of the soil, endeavoured to increase its fertility in various ways. They not only divested it of stones, but watered it by means of canals, communicating with the rivers or brooks; and thereby imparted to their fields the richness of gardens, Psalm i, 3; lxv, 10; Prov. xxi, 1; Isa. xxx, 25; xxxii, 2, 20. Springs, therefore, fountains, and rivulets, were held in as much honour and worth by husbandmen as by shepherds, Joshua xv, 9; Judges i, 15; and we accordingly find that the land of Canaan was extolled for those fountains of water of which Egypt was destitute. The soil was enriched, also, in addition to the method just mentioned, by means of ashes; to which the straw, the stubble, the husks, the brambles, and grass, that overspread the land during the sabbatical year, were reduced by fire. The burning over the surface of the land had also another good effect, namely, that of destroying the seeds of the noxious herbs, Isa. vii, 23; xxxii, 13; Prov. xxiv, 31. Finally, the soil was manured with dung.

The Hebrew word, *גן*, which is translated variously by the English words, grain, corn, &c, is of general signification, and comprehends in itself different kinds of grain and pulse, such as wheat, millet, spelt, wall-barley, barley, beans, lentils, meadow-cumin, pepperwort, flax, cotton; to these may be added various species of the cucumber, and perhaps rice. Rye and oats do not grow in the warmer climates; but their place is, in a manner, supplied by barley. Barley, mixed with broken straw, affords the fodder for beasts of burden, which is called *כליל*. Wheat, *חטה*, which, by way of eminence, is called *גן*, grew in Egypt in the time of Joseph, as it now does in Africa, on several branches from one stalk, each one of which produced an ear, Gen. xii, 47. This sort of wheat does not flourish in Palestine: the wheat of Palestine is of a much better kind.

HUSKS, *κεράτιον*, Luke xv, 16; the husks of leguminous plants, so named from their resemblance to *κέρας*, a horn; but Bochart thinks that the *κερατία* were the ceretonia, the husks or fruit of the carob tree, a tree very

common in the Levant. We learn from Columella, that these pods afforded food for swine; and they are mentioned as what the prodigal desired to eat, when reduced to extreme hunger.

HUTCHINSONIANS, the followers of John Hutchinson, Esq., a learned and respectable layman, who was born at Spennythorn, in Yorkshire, in 1674. In 1724, he published the first part of that curious work, "Moses's Principia," in which he ridiculed Dr. Woodward's "Natural History of the Earth," and exploded the doctrine of gravitation established in Sir Isaac Newton's "Principia." In the second part of this work, published in 1727, he maintained, in opposition to the Newtonian system, that a plenum is the principle of the Scripture philosophy. In this work he also intimated that the idea of a Trinity is to be taken from the grand agents in the natural system, fire, light, and spirit. From this time he continued to publish a volume every year or two till his death; and a correct and elegant edition of his works, including the MSS. which he left was published in 1748, in 12 vols. 8vo. Mr. Hutchinson thought that the Hebrew Scriptures comprise a perfect system of natural philosophy, theology, and religion. He entertained so high an opinion of the Hebrew language, that he thought the Almighty must have employed it to communicate every species of knowledge, human and divine; and that, accordingly, every species of knowledge is to be found in the Old Testament. Both he and his followers laid a great stress on the evidence of Hebrew etymology. After Origen, and other eminent commentators, he asserted that the Scriptures are not to be understood and interpreted in a literal but in a typical sense, and according to the radical import of the Hebrew expressions; that even the historical parts, and particularly those relating to the Jewish ceremonies and Levitical law, are to be considered in this light; and he also asserted that, agreeably to this mode of interpretation, the Hebrew Scriptures would be found amply to testify concerning the nature and offices of Jesus Christ. His plan was to find natural philosophy in the Bible, where hitherto it had been thought no such thing was to be met with, or ever intended. His editors tell us, he found, upon examination, that the Hebrew Scriptures nowhere ascribe motion to the body of the sun, nor fixedness to the earth; that they describe the created system to be a plenum without any vacuum at all, and reject the assistance of gravitation, attraction, or any such occult qualities, for performing the stated operations of nature, which are carried on by the mechanism of the heavens, in their threefold condition of fire, light, and spirit, or air, the material agents set to work at the beginning; that the heavens, thus framed by almighty Wisdom, are an instituted emblem and visible substitute of Jehovah Aleim, the eternal Three, the coëqual and coadorable Trinity in Unity; that the unity of substance in the heavens points out the unity of essence and the distinction of conditions, the personality in Deity, without confounding the persons or dividing the substance; and

that, from their being made emblems, they are called in Hebrew shemim, the names, representatives, or substitutes, expressing by their names that they are emblems, and, by their conditions or offices, what it is they are emblems of. He also found that the Hebrew Scriptures have some capital words, which he has proved, or endeavoured to prove, contain, in their radical meaning, the greatest and most comfortable truths. Thus, the word Elohim, which we call God, or, as he reads it, Aleim, he refers to the oath or conditional execration, by which the eternal covenant of grace among the persons in Jehovah was and is confirmed. The word berith, which our translation renders "covenant," signifies, "he or that which purifies" and so the Purifier or purification for, not with, man. The cherubim, which have been thought "angels placed as a guard to deter Adam from breaking into Eden again," he explains to have been a hieroglyphic of divine construction, or a sacred image, to describe, as far as figures could go, the Aleim and man taken in, or humanity united to deity. In like manner, he treats several other words of similar, though not quite so solemn, import. Hence he drew this conclusion, "that all the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish dispensation were so many delineations of Christ, in what he was to be, to do, and to suffer; and that the early Jews knew them to be types of his actions and sufferings, and, by performing them as such, were in so far Christians, both in faith and practice." His followers maintain, that the cherubim, and the glory around them, with the divine presence in them, were not only emblematical figures, representing the persons of the ever blessed Trinity, as engaged in covenant for the redemption of man, but also that they were intended "to keep or preserve the way of the tree of life, to show man the way to life eternal, and keep him from losing or departing from it." That Melchizedec was an eminent type of Christ, there can be little doubt; but that he was actually the second person of the Trinity, in a human form, is a tenet of the Hutchinsonians, though not entirely peculiar to them. Mr. Hutchinson supposes that "the air exists in three conditions, fire, light, and spirit; the two latter are the finer and grosser parts of the air in motion: from the earth to the sun, the air is finer and finer till it becomes pure light near the confines of the sun, and fire in the orb of the sun, or solar focus." From the earth toward the circumference of this system, in which he includes the fixed stars, the air becomes grosser and grosser till it becomes stagnant, in which condition it is at the utmost verge of this system; from whence, in his opinion, the expression of "outer darkness," and "blackness of darkness," used in the New Testament, seems to be taken. These are some of the principal outlines of this author's doctrines, which have been patronized by several eminent divines, both of the church and among the Dissenters.

2. The followers of Mr. Hutchinson have not erected themselves into a sect or separate community. Among them may be reckoned some eminent and



respectable divines, both in England and Scotland; but their numbers seem at present to be rather on the decrease. Of those who, in their day, were ranked in the list of Hutchinsonians, perhaps the most eminent were the following: Mr. Julius Bate, and Mr. Parkhurst, the lexicographers; Mr. Holloway, author of "Originals," and "Letter and Spirit;" Dr. Hodges, provost of Oriel College, Oxford; Mr. Henry Lee, author of "Sophron, or Nature's Characteristics of the Truth;" Dr. Wetherell, late master of University College, Oxford; Mr. Romaine; Bishop Horne; and Mr. William Jones, the bishop's learned friend and biographer.

**HYMN**, a song, or ode, composed in honour of God. The Jewish hymns were accompanied with trumpets, drums, and cymbals, to assist the voices of the Levites and people. The word is used as synonymous with canticle, song, or psalm, which the Hebrews scarcely distinguish, having no particular term for a hymn, as distinct from a psalm or canticle. St. Paul requires Christians to edify one another with "psalms, and hymns, and spiritual 474songs." St. Matthew says, that Christ, having supped, sung a hymn, and went out. He recited the hymns or psalms which the Jews were used to sing after the passover; which they called the Halal; that is, the Hallelujah Psalms.

**HYPERBOLE**. This figure, in its representation of things or objects, either magnifies or diminishes them beyond or below their proper limits: it is common in all languages, and is of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures. Thus, things which are lofty are said to reach up to heaven, Deut. i, 28; ix, 1; Psalm cvii, 26. So things which are beyond the reach or capacity of man are said to be in "heaven," in the "deep," or "beyond the sea," Deut. xxx, 12; Rom. x, 6, 7. So a great quantity or number is commonly expressed by the "sand of the sea," the "dust of the earth," and the "stars of heaven," Genesis xiii, 16; xli, 49; Judges vii, 12; 1 Sam. xiii, 5; 1 Kings iv, 29; 2 Chron. i, 9; Jer. xv, 8; Heb. xi, 12. In like manner we meet with "smaller than grasshoppers," Num. xiii, 33, to denote extreme diminutiveness; "swifter than eagles," 2 Sam. i, 23, to intimate extreme celerity; the "earth trembled," the "mountains melted," Judges v, 4, 5; the "earth rent," 1 Kings i, 40. "I make my bed to swim;" "rivers of tears run down mine eyes." So we read of "angels' food," Psalm vi, 6; cxix, 136; lxxviii, 25; the "face of an angel," Acts vi, 15; and the "tongue of an angel," 1 Cor. xiii, 1. See also Gal. i, 8; iv, 14. We read "sigh with the breaking of thy loins," Ezek. xxi, 6, that is, most deeply. So we read that "the stones would cry out," and "they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another," Luke xix, 40, 44; that is, there shall be a total desolation.

**HYPOCRITE**, a word from the Greek, which signifies one who feigns to be what he is not; who puts on a masque or character, like actors in

tragedies and comedies. It is generally applied to those who assume appearances of a virtue, without possessing it in reality. Our Saviour accused the Pharisees of hypocrisy. In the Old Testament, the Hebrew word *caneph*, which is rendered “hypocrite,” “counterfeit,” signifies also a profane wicked man, a man polluted, corrupted, a man of impiety, a deceiver. It was ingeniously said by Basil, that the hypocrite did not put off the old man, but put the new man upon it.

**HYPOSTATICAL UNION;** the union of the divine and human natures of Christ in one person. This is the doctrine generally received in the church of Christ; but there have been some who have denied this, who yet acknowledge our Lord’s divinity. Nestorius, who had been taught to distinguish accurately between the divine and human nature of Christ, was offended with some expressions commonly used by Christians in the beginning of the fifth century, which seemed to destroy that distinction, and particularly with their calling the Virgin Mary *θεότοκος*, as if it were possible for the Godhead to be born. His zeal provoked opposition; in the eagerness of controversy he was led to use unguarded expressions; and he was condemned by the third of the general councils, the council of Ephesus, in the year 431. It is a matter of doubt whether the opinions of Nestorius, if he had been allowed by his adversaries fairly to explain them, would have appeared inconsistent with the doctrine established by the council of Ephesus, that Christ is one person, in whom two natures were most closely united. But whatever was the extent of the error of Nestorius, from him is derived that system concerning the incarnation of Christ, which is held by a large body of Christians in Chaldea, Assyria, and other regions of the east, and which is known in the ecclesiastical history of the west by the name of the Nestorian heresy. The object of the Nestorians is to avoid every appearance of ascribing to the divinity of Christ the weakness of humanity; and therefore they distinguish between Christ, and God who dwelt in Christ as in a temple. They say, that from the moment of the virgin’s conception, there commenced an intimate and indissoluble union between Christ and God, that these two persons presented in Jesus Christ one *πρόσωπον*, or aspect, but that the union between them is merely a union of will and affection, such in kind as that which subsists between two friends, although much closer in degree. Opposite to the Nestorian opinion is the Eutychian, which derives its name from Eutyches, an abbot of Constantinople, who, about the middle of the fifth century, in his zeal to avoid the errors of Nestorius, was carried to the other extreme. Those who did not hold the Nestorian opinions had been accustomed to speak of the “one incarnate nature” of Christ. But Eutyches used this phrase in such a manner as to appear to teach that the human nature of Christ was absorbed in the divine, and that his body had no real existence. This opinion was condemned in the year 451, by the council of Chalcedon, the fourth general

council, which declared, as the faith of the catholic church, that Christ is one person; that in this unity of person there are two natures, the divine and the human; and that there is no change, or mixture, or confusion of these two natures, but that each retains its distinguishing properties. The decree of Chalcedon was not universally submitted to. But many of the successors of Eutyches, wishing to avoid the palpable absurdity which was ascribed to him, of supposing that one nature was absorbed by another, and anxious at the same time to preserve that unity which the Nestorians divided, declared their faith to be, that in Christ there is one nature, but that this nature is twofold or compounded. From this tenet the successors of Eutyches derive the name of Monophysites; and from Jacob Baradaeus, who in the following century was a zealous and successful preacher, of the system of the Monophysites, they are more commonly known by the name of Jacobites. The Monophysites, or Jacobites, are found chiefly near the Euphrates and Tigris; they are much less numerous than the Nestorians; and, although they profess to have corrected the errors which were supposed to adhere to the Eutychian heresy, they may be considered as having formed their peculiar opinions upon the general principles of that system. The Monothelites, an ancient sect, of whom a remnant is found in the neighbourhood of Mount Libanus, disclaim any connection with Eutyches, and agree with the Catholics in ascribing two natures to Christ; but they have received their name from their conceiving that Christ, being one person, can only have one will: whereas the Catholics, considering both natures as complete, think it essential to each to have a will, and say that every inconvenience which can be supposed to arise from two wills in one person, is removed by the perfect harmony between that will which belongs to the divine, and that which belongs to the human nature of Christ.

HYSSOP, *אזוב*, Exod. xii, 22; Lev. xiv, 4, 6, 49, 51, 52; Num. xix, 6, 18; 1 Kings iv, 33; Psalm li, 7; Matt, xxvii, 48; Mark xv, 36; ὑσσωπός, John xix, 29; Heb. ix, 19. It grows plentifully on the mountains near Jerusalem. It is of a bitter taste; and, from being considered as possessing detersive and cleansing qualities, derived probably its Hebrew name. The original word has been variously translated; and Celsius has devoted forty-two pages to remove difficulties, occasioned by the discordant opinions of the Talmudical writers, and to ascertain the plant intended. That it is the hyssop seems most probable: the passage in Heb. ix, 19, sufficiently identifies it. Under the law, it was commonly used in purifications as a sprinkler. When the children of Israel came out of Egypt, they were commanded to take a bunch of hyssop, to dip it in the blood of the paschal lamb, and sprinkle it on the lintel and the two side-posts of the door. It was also used in sprinkling the leper. The hyssop is extremely well adapted to such purposes, as it grows in bunches, and puts out many suckers from a single root.

ICONIUM, the chief city of Lycaonia, in Asia Minor. An assault being meditated at the place by the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles upon the Apostles Paul and Barnabas, who, by preaching in the synagogue, had converted many Jews and Greeks, they fled to Lystra; where the designs of their enemies were put in execution, and St. Paul miraculously escaped with his life, Acts xiv. The church planted at this place by St. Paul continued to flourish, until, by the persecutions of the Saracens, and afterward of the Seljukian Turks, who made it the capital of one of their sultanies, it was nearly extinguished. But some Christians of the Greek and Armenian churches, with a Greek archbishop, are yet found in the suburbs of this city, who are not permitted to reside within the walls. Iconium is now called Cogni, and is still a considerable city; being the capital of the extensive province of Caramania, as it was formerly of Lycaonia, and the seat of a Turkish beglerberg, or viceroy. It is the place of chief strength and importance in the central parts of Asiatic Turkey, being surrounded by a strong wall of four miles in circumference; but, as is the case with most eastern cities, much of the enclosed space is waste. It is situated about a hundred and twenty miles inland from the Mediterranean, on the lake Trogilis. Mr. Kinneir says, Iconium, the capital of Lycaonia, is mentioned by Xenophon, and afterward by Cicero and Strabo; but does not appear to have been a place of any consideration until after the taking of Nice by the crusaders in 1099, when the Seljukian sultans of Roum chose it as their residence. These sultans rebuilt the walls, and embellished the city: they were, however, expelled in 1189 by Frederic Barbarossa, who took it by assault; but after his death they reëntered their capital, where they reigned in splendour till the irruption of Tchengis Khan, and his grandson, Holukow, who broke the power of the Seljukians. Iconium, under the name of Cogni, or Konia, has been included in the dominions of the grand seignior ever since the time of Bajazet, who finally extirpated the Ameers of Caramania. The modern city has an imposing appearance from the number and size of its mosques, colleges, and other public buildings; but these stately edifices are crumbling into ruins, while the houses of the inhabitants consist of a mixture of small huts built of sun-dried bricks, and wretched hovels thatched with reeds. The city, according to the same authority, contains about eighty thousand inhabitants, principally Turks, with only a small proportion of Christians. It is represented as enjoying a fine climate, and pleasantly situated among gardens and meadows; while it is nearly surrounded, at some distance, with mountains which rise to the regions of perpetual snow. It was formerly the capital of an extensive government, and the seat of a powerful pasha, who maintained a military force competent to the preservation of peace and order, and the defence of his territories. But it has now dwindled into insignificance, and exhibits upon the whole a mournful scene of desolation and decay.

ICONOCLASTES, image breakers; or Iconomachi, image opposers, were names given to those who rejected the use of images in churches, and, on certain occasions, vented their zeal in destroying them. The great opposition to images began under Bardanes, a Greek emperor, in the beginning of the eighth century; and was revived again, a few years after, under Leo, the Isaurian, who issued an edict against image worship, which occasioned a civil war in the islands of the Archipelago, and afterward in Italy; the Roman pontiffs and Greek councils alternately supporting it. At length images were rejected by the Greek church, which however retains pictures in churches, though her members do not worship them; but the Latin church, more corrupt, not only retained images, but made them the medium, if not the object, of their worship, and are therefore Iconoduli, or Iconolatræ, image worshippers.

IDDO, a prophet of the kingdom of Judah, who wrote the actions of Rehoboam's and 476 Abijah's reigns, 2 Chron. xii, 15. It seems by 2 Chron. xiii, 22, that he had entitled his work, Midrasch, or, "Inquiries." We know nothing particularly concerning the life of this prophet. It is probable that he likewise wrote some prophecies against Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, 2 Chron. ix, 29, wherein part of Solomon's life was included. Josephus, and many others after him, are of opinion that it was Iddo who was sent to Jeroboam, while he was at Bethel, and was there dedicating an altar to the golden calves; and that it was he who was killed by a lion, 1 Kings xiii.

IDOLATRY, from *ειδωλολατρεία*, composed of *ειδος*, image, and *λατρεύειν*, to serve, the worship and adoration of false gods; or the giving those honours to creatures, or the works of man's hands, which are only due to God. Several have written of the origin and causes of idolatry: among the rest, Vossius, Selden, Godwyn, Tenison, and Faber; but it is still a doubt who was the first author of it. It is generally allowed, however, that it had not its beginning till after the deluge; and many are of opinion, that Belus, who is supposed to be the same with Nimrod, was the first man that was deified. But whether they had not paid divine honours to the heavenly bodies before that time, cannot be determined; our acquaintance with those remote times being extremely slender. The first mention we find made of idolatry is where Rachel is said to have taken the idols of her father; for though the meaning of the Hebrew word *תַּרְפִּים*, be disputed, yet it is pretty evident they were idols. Laban calls them his gods, and Jacob calls them strange gods, and looks on them as abominations. The original idolatry by image worship is by many attributed to the age of Eber, B. C. 2247, about a hundred and one years after the deluge, according to the Hebrew chronology; four hundred and one years according to the Samaritan; and five hundred and thirty-one years according to the Septuagint; though most

of the fathers place it no higher than that of Serug; which seems to be the more probable opinion, considering that for the first hundred and thirty-four years of Eber's life all mankind dwelt in a body together; during which time it is not reasonable to suppose that idolatry broke in upon them; then some time must be allowed after the dispersion of the several nations, which were but small at the beginning, to increase and settle themselves; so that if idolatry was introduced in Eber's time, it must have been toward the end of his life, and could not well have prevailed so universally, and with that obstinacy which some authors have imagined. Terah, the father of Abraham, who lived at Ur, in Chaldea, about B. C. 2000, was unquestionably an idolater; for he is expressly said in Scripture to have served other gods. The authors of the Universal History think, that the origin and progress of idolatry are plainly pointed out to us in the account which Moses gives of Laban's and Jacob's parting, Gen. xxxi, 44, &c. From the custom once introduced of erecting monuments in memory of any solemn covenants, the transition was easy into the notion, that some deity took its residence in them, in order to punish the first aggressors; and this might be soon improved by an ignorant and degenerate world, till not only birds, beasts, stocks, and stones, but sun, moon, and stars, were called into the same office; though used, perhaps, at first, by the designing part of mankind, as scare-crows, to overawe the ignorant.

Sanchoniathon, who wrote his "Phenician Antiquities," apparently with a view to apologize for idolatry, traces its origin to the descendants of Cain, the elder branch, who began with the worship of the sun, and afterward added a variety of other methods of idolatrous worship: proceeding to deify the several parts of nature, and men after their death; and even to consecrate the plants shooting out of the earth, which the first men judged to be gods, and worshipped as those that sustained the lives of themselves and of their posterity. The Chaldean priests, in process of time, being by their situation early addicted to celestial observations, instead of conceiving as they ought to have done concerning the omnipotence of the Creator and Mover of the heavenly bodies, fell into the impious error of esteeming them as gods, and the immediate governors of the world, in subordination, however, to the Deity, who was invisible except by his works, and the effects of his power. Concluding that God created the stars and great luminaries for the government of the world, partakers with himself and as his ministers, they thought it but just and natural that they should be honoured and extolled, and that it was the will of God they should be magnified and worshipped. Accordingly, they erected temples, or sacella, to the stars, in which they sacrificed and bowed down before them, esteeming them as a kind of mediators between God and man. Impostors afterward arose, who gave out, that they had received express orders from God himself concerning the manner in which particular heavenly bodies should be represented, and the

nature and ceremonies of the worship which was to be paid them. When they proceeded to worship wood, stone, or metal, formed and fashioned by their own hands, they were led to apprehend, that these images had been, in some way or other, animated or informed with a supernatural power by supernatural means; though Dr. Prideaux imagines, that, being at a loss to know how to address themselves to the planets when they were below the horizon, and invisible, they recurred to the use of images. But it will be sufficient to suppose, that they were persuaded that each star or planet was actuated by an intelligence; and that the virtues of the heavenly body were infused into the image that represented it. It is certain, that the sentient nature and divinity of the sun, moon, and stars, was strenuously asserted by the philosophers, particularly by Pythagoras and his followers, and by the Stoics, as well as believed by the common people, and 477 was, indeed, the very foundation of the Pagan idolatry. The heavenly bodies were the first deities of all the idolatrous nations, were esteemed eternal, sovereign, and supreme; and distinguished by the title of the natural gods. Thus we find that the primary gods of the Heathens in general were Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Apollo, Mercury, Venus, and Diana; by which we can understand no other than the sun and moon, and the five greatest luminaries next to these. Plutarch expressly censures the Epicureans for asserting that the sun and moon, whom all men worshipped, are void of intelligence.

Sanchoniathon represents the most ancient nations, particularly the Phenicians and Egyptians, as acknowledging only the natural gods, the sun, moon, planets, and elements; and Plato declares it as his opinion, that the first Grecians likewise held these only to be gods, as many of the barbarians did in his time. Beside these natural gods, the Heathens believed that there were certain spirits who held a middle rank between the gods and men on earth, and carried on all intercourse between them; conveying the addresses of men to the gods, and the divine benefits to men. These spirits were called demons. From the imaginary office ascribed to them, they became the grand objects of the religious hopes and fears of the Pagans, of immediate dependence and divine worship. In the most learned nations, they did not so properly share, as engross, the public devotion. To these alone sacrifices were offered, while the celestial gods were worshipped only with a pure mind, or with hymns and praises. As to the nature of these demons, it has been generally believed, that they were spirits of a higher origin than the human race; and, in support of this opinion, it has been alleged, that the supreme deity of the Pagans is called the greatest demon; that demons are described as beings placed between the gods and men; and that demons are expressly distinguished from heroes, who were the departed souls of men. Some, however, have combatted this opinion, and maintained, on the contrary, that by demons, such as were the more immediate objects of the established worship among the ancient nations, particularly the Egyptians,

Greeks, and Romans, we are to understand beings of an earthly origin, or such departed human souls as were believed to become demons.

Although the Hindoo inhabitants of the East Indies deny the charge of idolatry, using the same description of arguments as are so inconclusively urged by superstitious Europeans in defence of image worship, it is still evident that the mass of the Hindoos are addicted to gross idolatry. The gods of Rome were even less numerous, certainly less whimsical and monstrous, than those at Benares. In Moore's Hindoo Pantheon are given exact portraits of many scores of deities worshipped, with appropriate ceremonies, and under various forms and names, by different sects of that grossly superstitious race. Some of these portraits are of images colossal to a degree perhaps unequalled by any existing statues; others are exceedingly diminutive. Some are metallic casts, and some apparently extremely ancient, which exhibit every gradation of art from the rudest imaginable specimen, up to a very respectable portion of skill, so as to approach to elegance of form, and to ease and expression of attitude.

The principal causes which have been assigned for idolatry are, the indelible idea which every man has of God, and the evidence which he gives of it to himself; an inviolable attachment to the senses, and a habit of judging and deciding by them, and them only; the pride and vanity of the human mind, which is not satisfied with simple truth, but mingles and adulterates it with fables; men's ignorance of antiquity, or of the first times, and the first men, of whom they had but very dark and confused knowledge by tradition, they having left no written monuments, or books; the ignorance and change of languages; the style of the oriental writings, which is figurative and poetical, and personifies every thing; the scruples and fears inspired by superstition; the flattery and fictions of poets; the false relations of travellers; the imaginations of painters and sculptors; a smattering of physics, that is, a slight acquaintance with natural bodies and appearances, and their causes; the establishment of colonies, and the invention of arts, mistaken by barbarous people; the artifices of priests; the pride of certain men, who affected to pass for gods; the love and gratitude borne by the people to certain of their great men and benefactors; and, finally, the historical events of the Scriptures ill understood. "One great spring and fountain of all idolatry," says Sir William Jones, "was the veneration paid by men to the sun, or vast body of fire, which 'looks from his sole dominion like the god of this world;' and another, the immoderate respect shown to the memory of powerful or virtuous ancestors and warriors, of whom the sun and the moon were wildly supposed to be the parents." But the Scriptural account of the matter refers the whole to wilful ignorance and a corrupt heart: "They did not like to retain God in their knowledge." To this may be added, what indeed proceeds from the same



sources, the disposition to convert religion into outward forms; the endeavour to render it more impressive upon the imagination through the senses; the substitution of sentiment for real religious principle; and the license which this gave to inventions of men, which in process of time became complicated and monstrous. That debasement of mind, and that alienation of the heart from God, and the gross immoralities and licentious practices which have ever accompanied idolatry, will sufficiently account for the severity with which it is denounced, both in the Old and New Testaments.

The veneration which the Papists pay to the Virgin Mary, and other saints and angels, and to the bread in the sacrament, the cross, relics, and images, affords ground for the Protestants to charge them with being idolaters, though they deny that they are so. It is evident that they worship these persons and things, and that they justify the worship, but deny the idolatry of it, by distinguishing subordinate from supreme worship. This distinction is justly thought by Protestants to be futile and nugatory, and certainly has no support from Holy Writ.

Under the government of Samuel, Saul, and David, there was little or no idolatry in Israel. Solomon was the first Hebrew king, who, in complaisance to his foreign wives, built temples and offered incense to strange gods. Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who succeeded him in the greater part of his dominions, set up golden calves at Dan and Bethel. Under the reign of Ahab, this disorder was at its height, occasioned by Jezebel, the wife of Ahab, who did all she could to destroy the worship of the true God, by driving away and persecuting his prophets. God, therefore, incensed at the sins and idolatry of the ten tribes, abandoned those tribes to the kings of Assyria and Chaldea, who transplanted them beyond the Euphrates, from whence they never returned. The people of Judah were no less corrupted. The prophets give an awful description of their idolatrous practices. They were punished after the same manner, though not so severely, as the ten tribes; being led into captivity several times, from which at last they returned, and were settled in the land of Judea, after which we hear no more of their idolatry. They have been, indeed, ever since that period, distinguished for their zeal against it. See Image.

IDUMÆA is properly the Greek name for the land of Edom, which lay to the south of Judea, and extended from the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf of the Red Sea, where were the ports of Elath and Ezion-Gaber. But the Idumæa of the New Testament applies only to a small part adjoining Judea on the south, and including even a portion of that country; which was taken possession of by the Edomites, or Idumæans, while the land lay unoccupied during the Babylonish captivity. The capital of this country was Hebron,

which had formerly been the metropolis of the tribe of Judah. These Idumæans were so reduced by the Maccabees, that, in order to retain their possessions, they consented to embrace Judaism; and their territory became incorporated with Judea; although, in the time of our Saviour, it still retained its former name of Idumæa, Mark iii, 8. The proper Idumæans, or those who remained in the ancient land of Edom, became in process of time mingled with the Ishmaelites; the two people thus blended, being, from Nabaioth, or Nabath, the son of Ishmael, termed Nabathæans; under which names they are frequently mentioned in history. See Edom.

ILLYRICUM, a province lying to the north and north-west of Macedonia, along the eastern coast of the Adriatic Gulf, or Gulf of Venice. It was distinguished into two parts: Liburnia to the north, where is now Croatia, and Dalmatia to the south, which still retains the same name, and to which, as St. Paul informs Timothy, Titus went, 2 Tim. iv, 10. St. Paul says, that he preached the Gospel from Jerusalem round about to Illyricum, Rom. xv, 19.

IMAGE, in a religious sense, is an artificial representation of some person or thing used as an object of adoration, and is synonymous with idol. Nothing can be more clear, full, and distinct, than the expressions of Scripture prohibiting the making and worship of images, Exod. xx, 4, 5; Deut. xvi, 22. No sin is so strongly and repeatedly condemned in the Old Testament as that of idolatry, to which the Jews, in the early part of their history, were much addicted, and for which they were constantly punished. St. Paul was greatly affected, when he saw that the city of Athens was “wholly given to idolatry,” Acts xvii, 16; and declared to the Athenians, that they ought not “to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device,” Acts xvii, 29. He condemns those who “changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things,” Romans i, 23.

That the first Christians had no images, is evident from this circumstance, - that they were reproached by the Heathens, because they did not use them; and we find almost every ecclesiastical writer of the first four centuries arguing against the Gentile practice of image worship, from the plain declarations of Scripture, and from the pure and spiritual nature of God. The introduction of images into places of Christian worship, dates its origin soon after the times of Constantine the Great; but the earlier Christians reprobated every species of image worship in the strongest language. It is sometimes pretended by the Papists, that they do not worship the images, but God through the medium of images; or, that the worship which they pay to images is inferior to that which they pay to the Deity himself. These

distinctions would be scarcely understood by the common people; and formerly an enlightened Heathen or Jew would probably have urged the same thing. The practice is in direct opposition to the second commandment, and notwithstanding every sophistical palliation, it has always led to a transfer of human trust from God to something else. Hence idolatry, in general, is condemned in Scripture; and all use of images in the worship of God, making or bowing to any likeness, is absolutely forbidden. See Iconoclastes and Idolatry.

IMMATERIALITY, abstraction from matter; or what we understand by pure spirit.

IMMORTAL. That which will endure to all eternity, as having in itself no principle of alteration or corruption. God is absolutely immortal,--he cannot die. Angels are immortal; but God, who made them, can terminate their being. Man is immortal in part, that is, in his spirit; but his body dies. Inferior creatures are not immortal; they die wholly. Thus the principle of immortality is differently communicated according to the will of him who can render any creature immortal, by prolonging its life; who can confer immortality on the body of man, together with his soul; and will do so at the resurrection. God only is absolutely perfect, and, therefore, absolutely immortal. See Soul.

IMPOSITION OF HANDS. An ecclesiastical action, by which, among Episcopalians, a bishop lays his hands on the head of a person, in ordination, confirmation, or in uttering a blessing. In Presbyterian churches, the imposition is by the hands of the presbytery. This practice is also frequently observed by the Independents and others at their ordinations, when all the ministers present place their hands on the head of him whom they are ordaining, while one of them prays for a blessing on him and his future labours. This they retain as an ancient practice, justified by the example of the Apostles, when no extraordinary gifts were conveyed. However, Christians are not agreed as to the propriety of this ceremony; nor do they all consider it as an essential part of ordination.

Imposition of hands was a Jewish ceremony, introduced, not by any divine authority, but by custom; it being the practice among that people, whenever they prayed to God for any person, to lay their hands on his head. Our Saviour observed the same custom, both when he conferred his blessing on children, and when he cured the sick. The Apostles likewise laid hands on those upon whom they bestowed the Holy Ghost, but it was a form accompanied by prayer, through which only the blessing was obtained. And the Apostles themselves sometimes underwent the imposition of hands afresh, when they entered upon any new design. In the ancient

church, imposition of hands was practised on persons when they married; which custom the Abyssinians still observe. But this ceremony of laying on of hands is now restrained, by custom, chiefly to that imposition which is practised at the ordination of ministers.

[In the Methodist Episcopal Church, a bishop is constituted by the election of the general conference, and the laying on of the hands of three bishops, or at least of one bishop and two elders; unless it happen that, by death or otherwise, there be no bishop remaining in the church: in this case, the general conference is empowered to elect a bishop, and the elders, or any three of them appointed by the general conference for that purpose, to ordain him. An elder is constituted by the election of an annual conference, and the laying on of the hands of a bishop and of two or more elders. A deacon, by the election of an annual conference, and the laying on of the hands of a bishop.]

IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS. See Justification.

INCENSE. Thus; so called by the dealers of drugs in Egypt from *thur*, or *thor*, the name of a harbour in the north bay of the Red Sea, near Mount Sinai; thereby distinguishing it from the gum arabic, which is brought from Suez, another port in the Red Sea, not far from Cairo. It differs also in being more pellucid and white. It burns with a bright and strong flame, not easily extinguished. It was used in the temple service as an emblem of prayer, Psalm cxli, 2; Rev. viii, 3, 4. Authors give it, or the best sort of it, the epithets white, pure, pellucid; and so it may have some connection with a word, derived from the same root, signifying unstained, clear, and so applied to moral whiteness and purity, Psalm li, 7; Dan. xii, 10. This gum is said to distil from incisions made in the tree during the heat of summer. What the form of the tree is which yields it, we do not certainly know. Pliny one while says, it is like a pear tree; another, that it is like a mastic tree; then, that it is like the laurel; and, in fine, that it is a kind of turpentine tree. It has been said to grow only in the country of the Sabeans, a people in Arabia Felix; and Theophrastus and Pliny affirm that it is found in Arabia. Dioscorides, however, mentions an Indian as well as an Arabian frankincense. At the present day it is brought from the East Indies, but not of so good a quality as that from Arabia. The "sweet incense," mentioned Exodus xxx, 7, and elsewhere, was a compound of several drugs, agreeably to the direction in the thirty-fourth verse. To offer incense was an office peculiar to the priests. They went twice a day into the holy place; namely, morning and evening, to burn incense there. Upon the great day of expiation, the high priest took incense, or perfume, pounded and ready for being put into the censers, and threw it upon the fire, the moment he went into the sanctuary. One reason of this was, that so the smoke which rose

from the censer might prevent his looking with too much curiosity on the ark and mercy-seat. God threatened him with death upon failing to perform this ceremony, Lev. xvi, 13. Generally incense is to be considered as an emblem of the “prayers of the saints,” and is so used by the sacred writers.

INCEST, an unlawful conjunction of persons related within the degrees of kindred prohibited by God. In the beginning of the world, and again, long after the deluge, marriages between near relations were allowed. In the time of Abraham and Isaac, these marriages were permitted, and among the Persians much later: it is even said to be esteemed neither criminal nor ignominious among the remains of the old Persians at this day. Some authors believe that marriages between near relations were permitted, or, at least, tolerated, till the time of Moses, who first prohibited them among the Hebrews; and that among other people they were allowed even after him. Others hold the contrary; but it is hard to establish either of these opinions, for want of historical documents. The degrees of consanguinity within which marriage was prohibited are stated in Lev. xviii, 6–18. Most civilized people have looked on incests as abominable crimes. St. Paul, speaking of the incestuous man of Corinth, says, “It is reported commonly, that there is fornication among you, and such fornication <sup>480</sup>as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father’s wife,” 1 Cor. v, 1. In order to preserve chastity in families, and between persons of different sexes, brought up and living together in a state of unreserved intimacy, it is necessary, by every method possible, to inculcate an abhorrence of incestuous conjunctions; which abhorrence can only be upholden by the absolute reprobation of all commerce of the sexes between near relations. Upon this principle, the marriage, as well as other cohabitations, of brothers and sisters, of lineal kindred, and of all who usually live in the same family, may be said to be forbidden by the law of nature. Restrictions which extend to remoter degrees of kindred than what this reason makes it necessary to prohibit from intermarriage, are founded in the authority of the positive law which ordains them, and can only be justified by their tendency to diffuse wealth, to connect families, or to promote some political advantage. The Levitical law, which is received in this country, and from which the rule of the Roman law differs very little, prohibits marriages between relations within three degrees of kindred; computing the generations, not from, but through, the common ancestor, and accounting affinity the same as consanguinity. The issue, however, of such marriages are not bastardized, unless the parents be divorced during their life time.

INCHANTMENTS. The law of God condemns enchantments and inchanters. Several terms are used in Scripture to denote enchantments: 1. *שחל*, which signifies to mutter, to speak with a low voice, like magicians in

their evocations and magical operations, Psalm lviii, 6. 2. לְטִיִּים, secrets, whence Moses speaks of the enchantments wrought by Pharaoh's magicians. 3. כַּשְׁף, meaning those who practise juggling, legerdemain, tricks, and witchery, deluding people's eyes and senses, 2 Chron. xxxiii, 6. 4. הִבְרָה, which signifies, properly, to bind, assemble, associate, reunite: this occurs principally among those who charm serpents, who tame them, and make them gentle and sociable, which before were fierce, dangerous, and untractable, Deut. xviii, 11. We have examples of each of these ways of enchanting. It was common for magicians, sorcerers, and inchanters, to speak in a low voice, to whisper: they are called ventriloqui, because they spake, as one would suppose, from the bottom of their stomachs. They affected secrecy and mysterious ways, to conceal the vanity, folly, or infamy of their pernicious art. Their pretended magic often consisted in cunning tricks only, in sleight of hand, or some natural secrets, unknown to the ignorant. They affected obscurity and night, or would show their skill only before the uninformed or mean persons, and feared nothing so much as serious examinations, broad day-light, and the inspection of the intelligent. Respecting the enchantments practised by Pharaoh's magicians, (see Exod. viii, 18, 19,) in order to imitate the miracles which were wrought by Moses, it must be said either that they were mere illusions, whereby they imposed on the spectators; or that, if they performed such miracles, and produced real changes of their rods, and the other things said to be performed by them, it must have been by a supernatural power which God had permitted Satan to give them, but the farther operation of which he afterward thought proper to prevent.

INDEPENDENTS, a denomination of Protestants in England and Holland, originally called Brownists. They derive their name from their maintaining that every particular congregation of Christians has, according to the New Testament, a full power of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over its members, independent of the authority of bishops, synods, presbyteries, or any other ecclesiastical assemblies. This denomination appeared in England in the year 1616. John Robinson, a Norfolk divine, who, being banished from his native country for non-conformity, afterward settled at Leyden, was considered as their founder and father. He possessed sincere piety, and no inconsiderable share of learning. Perceiving defects in the denomination of the Brownists, to which he belonged, he employed his zeal and diligence in correcting them and in new modelling the society. Though the Independents considered their own form of ecclesiastical government as of divine institution, and as originally introduced by the authority of the Apostles, nay, by the Apostles themselves; yet they did not always think it necessary to condemn other denominations, but often acknowledged that true religion might flourish in those communities which were under the jurisdiction of bishops, or the government of presbyteries. They approved,

also, of a regular and educated ministry; nor is any person among them now permitted to speak in public before he has submitted to a proper examination of his capacity and talents, and has been approved of by the church to which he belonged. Their grounds of separation from the established church are different from those of other puritans. Many of the latter objected chiefly to certain rites, ceremonies, vestments, or forms, or to the government of the church; while yet they were disposed to arm the magistrate in support of the truth, and regretted and complained that they could not on these accounts conform to it. But Robinson and his companions not only rejected the appointments of the church on these heads, but denied its authority to enact them; contending, that every single congregation of Christians was a church, and independent of all legislation, save that of Christ; standing in need of no such provision or establishment as the state can bestow, and incapable of soliciting or receiving it. Hence they sought not to reform the church, but chose to dissent from it. They admitted there were many godly men in its communion, and that it was reformed from the grossest errors of the man of sin; but thought it still wanted some things essential to a true church of Christ; in particular, a power of choosing its own ministers, and a stricter discipline among its members. The creed of the Independents 481 is uniformly Calvinistic, though with considerable shades of difference; and many in Scotland and Ireland have symbolized with the Sandemanians, or the Scottish Baptist denominations. The Congregationalist and Independent have been generally considered as convertible and synonymous: many, however, in the present day, prefer the former appellation, considering it desirable, in many cases, to unite, for mutual advice and support, more closely than the term independent seems to warrant.

INDULGENCES. In the primitive church very severe penalties were inflicted on those who had been guilty of any sins, whether public or private; and, in particular, they were forbidden to partake, for a certain time, of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or to hold any communion with the church. General rules were formed upon these subjects; but as it was often found expedient to make a discrimination in the degrees of punishment, according to the different circumstances of the offenders, and especially when they showed marks of contrition and repentance, power was given to bishops, by the council of Nice, to relax or remit those punishments as they should see reason. Every favour of this kind was called an indulgence or pardon. After the bishops had enjoyed this privilege for some centuries, and had begun to abuse it, the popes discovered that in their own hands it might be rendered a powerful instrument to promote both their ambition and their avarice. They could not but perceive that if they could persuade men they had the power of granting pardon for sin, it would give them a complete influence over their consciences; and if they

could at the same time prevail upon them to purchase these pardons for money, it must add greatly to the wealth of the Roman see. In the eleventh century, therefore, when the dominion of the popes was rising to its zenith, and their power was almost irresistible, they took to themselves the exclusive prerogative of dispensing indulgences, which they carried to a most unwarrantable length. Instead of confining them, according to their original institution, to the ordinary purposes of ecclesiastical discipline, they extended them to the punishment of the wicked in the world to come; instead of shortening the duration of earthly penance, they pretended that they could deliver men from the pains of purgatory; instead of allowing them gratuitously, and upon just grounds, to the penitent offender, they sold them in the most open and corrupt manner to the profligate and abandoned, who still continued in their vices. They did not scruple to call these indulgences a plenary remission of all sins, past, present, and future, and to offer them as a certain and immediate passport from the troubles of this world to the eternal joys of heaven. To give some sort of colour and support to this infamous traffic, they confidently asserted that the superabundant merits of Christ, and of his faithful servants, formed a fund of which the pope was the sole manager; and that he could, at his own discretion, dispense those merits, as the sure means of procuring pardon from God, in any proportions, for any species of wickedness, and to any person he pleased. The bare statement of this doctrine is a sufficient refutation of it; and it is scarcely necessary to add, that it has no foundation whatever in Scripture. It is an arrogant and impious usurpation of a power which belongs to God alone; and it has an obvious tendency to promote licentiousness and sin of every description, by holding out an easy and certain method of absolution. The popes derived very large sums from the sale of these indulgences; and it is well known that the gross abuses practised in granting them were among the immediate and principal causes of bringing about the reformation. They continue still to be sold at Rome, and are to be purchased by any who are weak enough to buy them. The sums required for indulgences were first published by Anthony Egane, a Franciscan friar, in 1673; and the original pamphlet was republished by Baron Maseres, in 1809, in his last volume of "Occasional Essays."

INK. The ink of the ancients was not so fluid as ours. Demosthenes reproaches Æschines with labouring in the grinding of ink, as painters do in the grinding of their colours. The substance also found in an inkstand at Herculaneum, looks like a thick oil or paint, with which the manuscripts there have been written in a relieve visible in the letters, when you hold a leaf to the light in a horizontal direction. Such vitriolic ink as has been used on the old parchment manuscripts would have corroded the delicate leaves of the papyrus, as it has done the skins of the most ancient manuscripts of Virgil and Terence, in the Vatican library; the letters are sunk into the



parchment, and some have eaten quite through it, in consequence of the corrosive acid of the vitriolic ink, with which they were written. The inkhorn is also mentioned in Scripture: "And one man among them was clothed with linen, with a writer's inkhorn by his side," Ezek. ix, 2. The eastern mode and apparatus for writing differs so materially from those with which we are conversant, that it is necessary particularly to describe them. D'Arvieux informs us that "the Arabs of the desert, when they want a favour of their emir, get his secretary to write an order agreeable to their desire, as if the favour were granted, this they carry to the prince, who, after having read it, sets his seal to it with ink, if he grants it; if not, he returns the petitioner his paper torn, and dismisses him. These papers are without date, and have only the emir's flourish or cypher at the bottom, signifying the poor, the abject Mohammed, son of Turabeye." Pococke says, that "they make the impression of their name with their seal, generally of cornelian, which they wear on their finger, and which is blacked when they have occasion to seal with it." The custom of placing the inkhorn by the side, Olearius says, continues in the east to this day. Dr. Shaw informs us, that, among the Moors in Barbary, "the hojas, 482 that is, the writers or secretaries, suspend their inkhorns in their girdles; a custom as old as the Prophet Ezekiel, ix, 2." And in a note he adds, "that part of these inkhorns (if an instrument of brass may be so called) which passes between the girdle and the tunic, and holds their pens, is long and flat; but the vessel for the ink which rests upon the girdle is square, with a lid to clasp over it." So Mr. Hanway: "Their writers carry their ink and pens about them in a case, which they put under their sash."

INN. The inns or caravanserais of the east, in which travellers are accommodated, are not all alike, some being simply places of rest, by the side of a fountain, if possible, and at a proper distance on the road. Many of these places are nothing more than naked walls; others have an attendant, who subsists either by some charitable donation, or the benevolence of passengers; others are more considerable establishments, where families reside, and take care of them, and furnish the necessary provisions. "Caravanserais," says Campbell, "were originally intended for, and are now pretty generally applied to, the accommodation of strangers and travellers, though, like every other good institution, sometimes perverted to the purposes of private emolument, or public job. They are built at proper distances through the roads of the Turkish dominions, and afford to the indigent or weary traveller an asylum from the inclemency of the weather, are in general built of the most solid and durable materials, have commonly one story above the ground floor, the lower of which is arched, and serves for warehouses to store goods, for lodgings, and for stables, while the upper is used merely for lodgings; beside which they are always accommodated with a fountain, and have cooks' shops and other

conveniences to supply the wants of lodgers. In Aleppo, the caravanserais are almost exclusively occupied by merchants, to whom they are, like other houses, rented." "In all other Turkish provinces," observes Antes, "particularly those in Asia, which are often thinly inhabited, travelling is subject to numberless inconveniences, since it is necessary not only to carry all sorts of provisions along with one, but even the very utensils to dress them in, beside a tent for shelter at night and in bad weather, as there are no inns, except here and there a caravanserai, where nothing but bare rooms, and those often very bad, and infested with all sorts of vermin, can be procured." "There are no inns anywhere," says Volney, "but the cities, and commonly the villages, have a large building called a kan or kervanserai, which serves as an asylum for all travellers. These houses of reception are always built without the precincts of towns, and consist of four wings round a square court, which serves by way of enclosure for the beasts of burden. The lodgings are cells, where you find nothing but bare walls, dust, and sometimes scorpions. The keeper of this kan gives the traveller the key and a mat, and he provides himself the rest; he must therefore carry with him his bed, his kitchen utensils, and even his provisions, for frequently not even bread is to be found in the villages. On this account the orientals contrive their equipage in the most simple and portable form. The baggage of a man who wishes to be completely provided, consists in a carpet, a mattress, a blanket, two sauce pans with lids contained within each other, two dishes, two plates, and a coffee pot, all of copper, well tinned, a small wooden box for salt and pepper, a round leathern table, which he suspends from the saddle of his horse, small leathern bottles or bags for oil, melted butter, water, and brandy, if the traveller be a Christian, a tinder box, a cup of cocoa nut, some rice, dried raisins, dates, Cyprus cheese, and, above all, coffee berries, with a roaster and wooden mortar to pound them." The Scriptures use two words to express a caravanserai, in both instances translated inn: "There was no room for them in the inn," καταλύματι, Luke ii, 7; the place of untying, that is, of beasts for rest. "And brought him to the inn," πανδοχείον, Luke x, 34, whose keeper is called in the next verse πανδοχεύς. This word properly signifies "a receptacle open to all comers." "The serai or principal caravansary at Surat," observes Forbes, "was much neglected. Most of the eastern cities contain one, at least, for the reception of strangers; smaller places, called choultries, are erected by charitable persons, or munificent princes, in forests, plains, and deserts, for the accommodation of travellers. Near them is generally a well, and a cistern for the cattle; a brahmin, or fakeer, often resides there to furnish the pilgrim with food, and the few necessaries he may stand in need of. In the deserts of Persia and Arabia, these buildings are invaluable; in those pathless plains, for many miles together, not a tree, a bush, nor even a blade of grass, is to be seen; all is one undulating mass of sand, like waves on the trackless ocean. In these

ruthless wastes, where no rural village or cheerful hamlet, no inn or house of refreshment, is to be found, how noble is the charity that rears the hospitable roof, that plants the shady grove, and conducts the refreshing moisture into reservoirs!”

INSPIRATION, the conveying of certain extraordinary and supernatural notices or thoughts into the soul; or it denotes any supernatural influence of God upon the mind of a rational creature, whereby he is formed to a degree of intellectual improvement, to which he could not have attained in his present circumstances in a natural way. In the first and highest sense, the prophets, evangelists, and Apostles are said to have spoken and written by divine inspiration. This inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures is so expressly attested by our Lord and his Apostles, that among those who receive them as a divine revelation the only question relates to the inspiration of the New Testament. On this subject it has been well observed:--

1. That the inspiration of the Apostles appears to have been necessary for the purposes of their mission; and, therefore, if we admit 483that Jesus came from God, and that he sent them forth to make disciples, we shall acknowledge that some degree of inspiration is highly probable. The first light in which the books of the New Testament lead us to consider the Apostles, is, as the historians of Jesus. After having been his companions during his ministry, they came forth to bear witness of him; and as the benefit of his religion was not to be confined to the age in which he or they lived, they left in the four Gospels a record of what he did and taught. Two of the four were written by the Apostles Matthew and John. St. Mark and St. Luke, whose names are prefixed to the other two, were probably of the seventy whom our Lord sent out in his life time; and we learn from the most ancient Christian historians, that the Gospel of St. Mark was revised by St. Peter, and the Gospel of St. Luke by St. Paul, and that both were afterward approved by St. John; so that all the four may be considered as transmitted to the church with the sanction of apostolical authority. Now, if we recollect the condition of the Apostles, and the nature of their history, we shall perceive that, even as historians, they stood in need of some measure of inspiration. Plato might feel himself at liberty to feign many things of his master Socrates, because it mattered little to the world whether the instruction that was conveyed to them proceeded from the one philosopher or from the other. But the servants of a divine teacher, who appeared as his witnesses, and professed to be the historians of his life, were bound by their office to give a true record. And their history was an imposition upon the world, if they did not declare exactly and literally what they had seen and heard. This was an office which required not only a love of the truth, but a memory more retentive and more accurate than it was

possible for the Apostles to possess. To relate, at the distance of twenty years, long moral discourses, which were not originally written, and which were not attended with any striking circumstances that might imprint them upon the mind; to preserve a variety of parables, the beauty and significancy of which depended upon particular expressions; to record long and minute prophecies, where the alteration of a single phrase might have produced an inconsistency between the event and the prediction; and to give a particular detail of the intercourse which Jesus had with his friends and with his enemies;--all this is a work so very much above the capacity of unlearned men, that, had they attempted to execute it by their own natural powers, they must have fallen into such absurdities and contradictions as would have betrayed them to every discerning eye. It was therefore highly expedient, and even necessary, for the faith of future ages, that, beside those opportunities of information which the Apostles enjoyed, and that tried integrity which they possessed, their understanding and their memory should be assisted by a supernatural influence, which might prevent them from mistaking the meaning of what they had heard, which might restrain them from putting into the mouth of Jesus any words which he did not utter, or omitting what was important, and which might thus give us perfect security, that the Gospels are as faithful a copy as if Jesus himself had left in writing those sayings and those actions which he wished posterity to remember.

But we consider the Apostles in the lowest view, when we speak of them as barely the historians of their Master. In their epistles they assume a higher character, which renders inspiration still more necessary. All the benefit which they derived from the public and the private instructions of Jesus before his death had not so far opened their minds as to qualify them for receiving the whole counsel of God. And he who knows what is in man declares to them, the night on which he was betrayed, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now," John xv, 12. The purpose of many of his parables, the full meaning even of some of his plain discourses, had not been attained by them. They had marvelled when he spake to them of earthly things. But many heavenly things of his kingdom had not been told them; and they who were destined to carry his religion to the ends of the earth themselves needed, at the times of their receiving this commission, that some one should instruct them in the doctrine of Christ. It is true that, after his resurrection, Jesus opened their understandings, and explained to them the Scriptures; and he continued upon earth forty days, speaking to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. It appears, however, from the history which they have recorded in the book of Acts, that some farther teaching was necessary for them, Acts i. Immediately before our Lord ascended, their minds being still full of the expectation of a temporal kingdom, they say unto him, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore

the kingdom to Israel?" It was not till some time after they received the gift of the Holy Ghost, that they understood that the Gospel had taken away the obligation to observe the ceremonies of the Mosaic law; and the action of St. Peter in baptizing Cornelius, a devout Heathen, gave offence to some of the Apostles and brethren in Judea when they first heard it, Acts xi. Yet, in their epistles, we find just notions of the spiritual nature of the religion of Jesus as a kingdom of righteousness, the subjects of which are to receive remission of sins, and sanctification through his blood, and just notions also of the extent of this religion as a dispensation the spiritual blessings of which are to be communicated to all, in every land, who receive it in faith and love. These notions appear to us to be the explication both of the ancient predictions, and of many particular expressions that occur in the discourses of our Lord. But it is manifest that they had not been acquired by the Apostles during the teaching of Jesus. They are so adverse to every thing which men educated in Jewish 484 prejudices had learned and had hoped, that they could not be the fruit of their own reflections; and therefore they imply the teaching of that Spirit who gradually impressed them upon the mind, guiding the Apostles gently, as they were able to follow him, into all the truth connected with the salvation of mankind. As inspiration was necessary to give the minds of the Apostles possession of the system that is unfolded in their epistles, so many parts of that system are removed to such a distance from human discoveries, and are liable to such misapprehension, that unless we suppose a continued superintendence of the Spirit by whom it was taught, succeeding ages would not have a sufficient security that those who were employed to deliver it had not been guilty of gross mistakes in some most important doctrines.

Inspiration will appear still farther necessary, when we recollect that the writings of the Apostles contain several predictions of things to come. St. Paul foretels, in his epistles, the corruptions of the church of Rome, and many other circumstances which have taken place in the history of the Christian church; and the Revelation is a book of prophecy, of which part has been already fulfilled, while the rest will no doubt be explained by the events which are to arise in the course of Providence. But prophecy is a kind of writing which implies the highest degree of inspiration. When predictions, like those in Scripture, are particular and complicated, and the events are so remote and so contingent as to be out of the reach of human sagacity, it is plain that the writers of the predictions do not speak according to the measure of information which they had acquired by natural means, but are merely the instruments through which the Almighty communicates, in such measure and such language as he thinks fit, that knowledge of futurity which is denied to man. And although the full meaning of their own predictions was not understood by themselves, they will be acknowledged to be true prophets when the fulfilment comes to reflect

light upon that language, which, for wise purposes, was made dark at the time of its being put into their mouth.

Thus the nature of the writings of the Apostles suggests the necessity of their having been inspired. They could not be accurate historians of the life of Jesus without divine inspiration, nor safe expounders of his doctrine, nor prophets of distant events.

2. Inspiration was promised by our Lord to his Apostles. It is not unfair reasoning to adduce promises contained in the Scriptures themselves, as proofs of their divine inspiration. It were, indeed, reasoning in a circle, to bring the testimony of the Scriptures in proof of the divine mission of Jesus. But that being established by sufficient evidence, and the books of the New Testament having been proved to be the authentic genuine records of the persons whose names they bear, we are warranted to argue, from the declarations contained in them, what is the measure of inspiration which Jesus was pleased to bestow upon his servants. He might have been a divine teacher, and they might have been his Apostles, although he had bestowed none at all. But his character gives us security that they possessed all that he promised. We read in the Gospels that Jesus ordained twelve that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, Mark iii, 14. And as this was the purpose for which they were first called, so it was the charge left them at his departure. "Go," said he, "preach the Gospel to every creature: make disciples of all nations," Mark xvi, 16; Matt. xxviii, 19. His constant familiar intercourse with them was intended to qualify them for the execution of this charge; and the promises made to them have a special reference to the office in which they were to be employed. When he sent them, during his life, to preach in the cities of Israel, he said, "But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you," Matt. x, 19, 20. And when he spake to them in his prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, of the persecution which they were to endure after his death, he repeats the same promise: "For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist," Luke xxi, 15. It is admitted that the words in both these passages refer properly to that assistance which the inexperience of the Apostles was to derive from the suggestions of the Spirit, when they should be called to defend their conduct and their cause before the tribunals of the magistrates. But the fulfilment of this promise was a pledge, both to the Apostles and to the world, that the measure of inspiration necessary for the more important purpose implied in their commission would not be withheld; and, accordingly, when that purpose came to be unfolded to the Apostles, the promise of the assistance of the Spirit was expressed in a manner which

applies it to the extent of their commission. In the long affectionate discourse recorded by St. John, when our Lord took a solemn farewell of the disciples, after eating the last passover with them, he said, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him. But ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. I have yet many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak; and he will show you things to come," John xiv, 16, 17, 26; 485xvi, 12, 13. Here are all the degrees of inspiration which we have seen to be necessary for the Apostles: the Spirit was to bring to their remembrance what they had heard; to guide them into the truth, which they were not then able to bear; and to show them things to come; and all this they were to derive, not from occasional illapses, but from the perpetual inhabitation of the Spirit. That this inspiration was vouchsafed to them, not for their own sakes, but in order to qualify them for the successful discharge of their office as the messengers of Christ, and the instructors of mankind, appears from several expressions of that prayer which immediately follows the discourse containing the promise of inspiration; particularly from these words: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me," John xvii, 20, 21. In conformity to this prayer, so becoming him who was not merely the friend of the Apostles, but the light of the world, is that charge which he gives them immediately before his ascension: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," Matt. xxviii, 19, 20; I am with you alway, not by my bodily presence; for immediately after he was taken out of their sight; but I am with you by the Holy Ghost, whom I am to send upon you not many days hence, and who is to abide with you for ever.

The promise of Jesus, then, implies, according to the plain construction of the words, that the Apostles, in executing their commission, were not to be left wholly to their natural powers, but were to be assisted by that illumination and direction of the Spirit which the nature of the commission required; and we may learn the sense which our Lord had of the importance and effect of this promise from one circumstance, that he never makes any

distinction between his own words and those of his Apostles, but places the doctrines and commandments which they were to deliver upon a footing with those which he had spoken: "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me," Luke x, 16. These words plainly imply that Christians have no warrant to pay less regard to any thing contained in the epistles than to that which is contained in the Gospels; and teach us that every doctrine and precept clearly delivered by the Apostles comes to the Christian world with the same stamp of the divine authority as the words of Jesus, who spake in the name of him that sent him.

The Author of our religion having thus made the faith of the Christian world to hang upon the teaching of the Apostles, gave the most signal manifestation of the fulfilment of that promise which was to qualify them for their office, by the miraculous gifts with which they were endowed on the day of pentecost, and by the abundance of those gifts which the imposition of their hands was to diffuse through the church. One of the twelve, indeed, whose labours in preaching the Gospel were the most abundant and the most extensive, was not present at this manifestation; for St. Paul was not called to be an Apostle till after the day of pentecost. But it is very remarkable that the manner of his being called was expressly calculated to supply this deficiency. As he journeyed to Damascus, about noon, to bring the Christians who were there bound to Jerusalem, there shone from heaven a great light round about him. And he heard a voice, saying, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. And I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; and now I send thee to the Gentiles to open their eyes," Acts xxvi, 12–18. In reference to this manner of his being called, St. Paul generally inscribes his epistles with these words: "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will" or "by the commandment of God;" and he explains very fully what he meant by the use of this expression, in the beginning of his Epistle to the Galatians, where he gives an account of his conversion: "Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead. I neither received the Gospel of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Heathen: immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before me; but I went into Arabia," Gal. i, 1, 12, 15–17. All that we said of the necessity of inspiration, and of the import of the promise which Jesus made to the other Apostles, receives very great confirmation from this history of St. Paul, who, being called to be an Apostle after the ascension of Jesus, received the Gospel by



immediate revelation from heaven, and was thus put upon a footing with the rest, both as to his designation, which did not proceed from the choice of man, and as to his qualifications, which were imparted, not by human instruction, but by the teaching of the Author of Christianity. The Lord Jesus who appeared to him might furnish St. Paul with the same advantages which the other Apostles had derived from his presence on earth, and might give him the same assurance of the inhabitation of the Spirit that the promises, which we have been considering, had imparted to those.

3. Inspiration was claimed by the Apostles; and their claim may be considered as the interpretation of the promise of their Master. We shall not find the claim to inspiration formally advanced in the Gospels. This omission has sometimes been stated by those superficial critics, whose prejudices serve to account for their haste, as an objection against the existence of inspiration. But if you attend to the reason of the omission, you will perceive that it is only an instance of that delicate propriety which pervades all the New Testament. The Gospels are the record of the great facts which vouch the truth of Christianity. These facts are to be received upon the testimony of men who had been eye-witnesses of them. The foundation of Christian faith being laid in an assent to these facts, it would have been preposterous to have introduced in support of them that influence of the Spirit which preserved the minds of the Apostles from error. For there can be no proof of the inspiration of the Apostles, unless the truth of the facts be previously admitted. The Apostles, therefore, bring forward the evidence of Christianity in its natural order, when they speak in the Gospels as the companions and eye-witnesses of Jesus, claiming that credit which is due to honest men who had the best opportunities of knowing what they declared. This is the language of St. John: "Many other signs did Jesus in the presence of his disciples. But these are written that ye may believe; and this is the disciple which testifieth these things," John xx, 30, 31; xxi, 24. The Evangelist Luke appears to speak differently in the introduction to his Gospel, Luke i, 1-4; and opposite opinions have been entertained respecting the information conveyed by that introduction.

There is a difference of opinion, first, with regard to the time when St. Luke wrote his Gospel. It appears to some to be expressly intimated that he wrote after St. Matthew and St. Mark, because he speaks of other Gospels then in circulation; and it is generally understood that St. John wrote his after the other three. But the manner in which St. Luke speaks of these other Gospels does not seem to apply to those of St. Matthew and St. Mark. He calls them many, which implies that they were more than two, and which would confound these two canonical Gospels with imperfect accounts of our Lord's life, which we know from ancient writers were early circulated, but were rejected after the four Gospels were published. It is hardly

conceivable that St. Luke would have alluded to the two Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark without distinguishing them from other very inferior productions; and therefore it is probable that when he used this mode of expression, no accounts of our Lord's life were then in existence but those inferior productions. There appears, also, to very sound critics, to be internal evidence that St. Luke wrote first. He is much more particular than the other evangelists in his report of our Lord's birth, and of the meetings with his Apostles after his resurrection. They might think it unnecessary to introduce the same particulars into their Gospels after St. Luke. But if they wrote before him, the want of these particulars gives to their Gospels an appearance of imperfection which we cannot easily explain.

The other point suggested by this introduction, upon which there has been a difference of opinion, is, whether St. Luke, who was not an Apostle, wrote his Gospel from personal knowledge, attained by his being a companion of Jesus, or from the information of others. Our translation certainly favours the last opinion; and it is the more general opinion, defended by very able critics. Dr. Randolph, in the first volume of his works, which contains a history of our Saviour's life, supports the first opinion, and suggests a punctuation of the verses, and an interpretation of one word, according to which that opinion may be defended. Read the second and third verses in connection: Καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου Ἔδοξε καί μοι, παρακολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, "Even as they who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word from the beginning delivered them to us, it seemed good to me also, having accurately traced," &c. By ἡμῖν is understood the Christian world, who had received information, both oral and written, from those that had been αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται, "eye-witnesses and ministers." Κάμοι means St. Luke, who proposed to follow the example of those αὐτόπται in writing what he knew; and he describes his own knowledge by the word παρακολουθηκότι, which is more precise than the circumlocution, by which it is translated, "having had understanding of all things." Perfect understanding may be derived from various sources; but παρακολουθέω properly means, "I go along with as a companion, and derive knowledge from my own observation." And it is remarkable that the word is used in this very sense by the Jewish historian, Josephus, who published his history not many years after St. Luke wrote, and who, in his introduction, represents himself as worthy of credit, because he had not merely inquired of those who knew, but παρακολουθηκότα τοις γεγόνουσιν, which he explains by this expression: Πολλῶν μὲν αὐτουργὸς πραξέων, and to state in the third verse that he, πλεῖστων δ' αὐτόπτης γενόμενος, an actor in many things, and an eye-witness of most. If this interpretation is not approved of, then, according to the sense of those verses which is most commonly

adopted, St. Luke will be understood to give in the second verse an account of that ground upon which the knowledge of the Christian world with regard to these things rested, the reports of the “eye-witnesses and ministers,” having collected and collated these reports, and employed the most careful and minute investigation, he had resolved to write an account of the life of Jesus. Here he does not claim inspiration: he does not even say that he was an eye-witness. But he says that, having, like others, heard the report of eye-witnesses, he had accurately examined the truth of what they said, and presented to the Christian world the fruit of his researches.

The foundation is still the same as in St. John’s Gospel, the report of those in whose presence Jesus did and said what is recorded. To this report is added, (1.) The investigation of St. Luke, a contemporary of the Apostles, the companion of St. Paul in a great part of his journeyings, and honoured by him with this title, “Luke, the beloved physician,” Col. iv, 14. (2.) The approbation of St. Paul, who is said, by the earliest Christian writers, to have revised this Gospel written by his companion, so that it came abroad with apostolical authority. (3.) The universal consent of the Christian church, which, although jealous of the books that were then published, and rejecting many that claimed the sanction of the Apostles, has uniformly, from the earliest times, put the Gospel of St. Luke upon a footing with those of St. Matthew and St. Mark: a clear demonstration that they who had access to the best information knew that it had been revised by an Apostle.

As, then, the authors of the Gospels appear under the character of eye-witnesses, attesting what they had seen, there would have been an impropriety in their resting the evidence of the essential facts of Christianity upon inspiration. But after the respect which their character and their conduct procured to their testimony, and the visible confirmation which it received from heaven, had established the faith of a part of the world, a belief of their inspiration became necessary. They might have been credible witnesses of facts, although they had not been distinguished from other men. But they were not qualified to execute the office of Apostles without being inspired. And therefore, as soon as the circumstances of the church required the execution of that office, the claim which had been conveyed to them by the promise of their Master, and which is implied in the apostolical character, appears in their writings. They instantly exercised the authority derived to them from Jesus, by planting ministers in the cities where they had preached the Gospel, by setting every thing pertaining to these Christian societies in order, by controlling the exercise of those miraculous gifts which they had imparted, and by correcting the abuses which happened even in their time. But they demanded from all who had received the faith of Christ submission to the doctrines and commandments

of his Apostles, as the inspired messengers of Heaven. "But God hath revealed it," not them, as our translators have supplied the accusative, "revealed the wisdom of God, the dispensation of the Gospel unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things which are freely given us of God; which things, also, we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," 1 Cor. ii, 10, 12, 13. "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord," 1 Cor. xiv, 37; that is, Let no eminence of spiritual gifts be set up in opposition to the authority of the Apostles, or as implying any dispensation from submitting to it. "For this cause, also, thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God," 1 Thess. ii, 13. St. Peter, speaking of the epistles of St. Paul, says, "Even as our beloved brother Paul, also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you," 2 Peter iii, 15. And St. John makes the same claim of inspiration for the other Apostles, as well as for himself: "We are of God: he that knoweth God, heareth us: he that is not of God, heareth not us," 1 John iv, 6.

The claim to inspiration is clearly made by the Apostles in those passages where they place their own writings upon the same footing with the books of the Old Testament; for St. Paul, speaking of the *ἱερα γράμματα*, "Holy Scriptures," a common expression among the Jews, in which Timothy had been instructed from his childhood, says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," 2 Tim. iii, 16. St. Peter, speaking of the ancient prophets, says, "The Spirit of Christ was in them," 1 Peter i, 11; and, "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," 2 Peter i, 21. And the quotations of our Lord and his Apostles from the books of the Old Testament are often introduced with an expression in which their inspiration is directly asserted: "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias;" "By the mouth of thy servant David thou hast said," &c, Acts i, 16; iv, 25; xxviii, 25. But with this uniform testimony to that inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures, which was universally believed among that people, we are to conjoin this circumstance, that St. Paul and St. Peter in different places rank their own writings with the books of the Old Testament. St. Paul commands that his epistles should be read in the churches, where none but those books which the Jews believed to be inspired were ever read, Col. iv, 16. He says that Christians "are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets," ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, Eph. ii, 20: a conjunction which would have been highly improper, if the former had not

been inspired as well as the latter; and St. Peter charges the Christians to “be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the Apostles,” 2 Peter iii, 2. The nature of the book of Revelation led the Apostle John to assert most directly his personal inspiration; for he says that “Jesus sent and signified by his angel to his servant John the things that were to come to pass;” and that the divine Person, like the Son of man, who appeared to him when he was in the Spirit, commanded him to write in a book what he saw. And in one of the visions there recorded, when the dispensation of the Gospel was presented to St. John under the figure of a great city, the New Jerusalem, descending out of heaven, there is one part of the image which is a beautiful expression of that authority in settling the form of the Christian church, and teaching articles of faith, which the Apostles derived from their inspiration: “The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb,” Rev. i, 1, 10–19; xxi, 14.

These are only a few of the many passages to the same purpose which occur in reading the New Testament. But it is manifest, even from them, that the manner in which the Apostles speak of their own writings is calculated to mislead every candid reader, unless they really wrote under the direction of the Spirit of God. So gross and daring an imposture is absolutely inconsistent not only with their whole character, but also with those gifts of the Holy Ghost of which there is unquestionable evidence that they were possessed; and which, being the natural vouchers of the assertion made by them concerning their own writings, cannot be supposed, upon the principles of sound theism, to have been imparted for a long course of years to persons who continued during all that time asserting such a falsehood, and appealing to those gifts for the truth of what they said.

4. The claim of the Apostles derives much confirmation from the reception which it met with among the Christians of their days. It appears from an expression of St. Peter, that at the time when he wrote his second epistle, the epistles of St. Paul were classed with “the other Scriptures,” the books of the Old Testament; that is, were accounted inspired writings, 2 Peter iii, 16. It is well known to those who are versed in the early history of the church, with what care the first Christians discriminated between the apostolical writings and the compositions of other authors however much distinguished by their piety, and with what reverence they received those books which were known by their inscription, by the place from which they proceeded, or the manner in which they were circulated, to be the work of an Apostle. In Lardner’s “Credibility of the Gospel History,” will be found the most particular information upon this subject; and it will be perceived that the whole history of the supposititious writings which appeared in early times, conspires in attesting the veneration in which the authority of

the Apostles was held by the Christian church. We learn from Justin Martyr, that, before the middle of the second century, "the memoirs of the Apostles, and the compositions of the prophets," were read together in the Christian assemblies. We know, that from the earliest times, the church has submitted to the writings of the Apostles as the infallible standard of faith and practice; and we find the ground of this peculiar respect expressed by the first Christian writers as well as by their successors, who speak of the writings of the Apostles as "divine writings from the inspiration of the Holy Ghost."

To this general argument we may add that right views on the subject of the inspiration of the sacred writers are also necessary, because even some Christian writers have spoken obscurely and unsatisfactorily on the subject, dividing inspiration into different kinds, and assigning each to different portions of the holy volume. By inspiration we are to understand, that the sacred writers composed their works under so plenary and immediate an influence of the Holy Spirit, that God may be said to speak by those writers to man, and not merely that they spoke to men in the name of God, and by his authority; and there is a considerable difference between the two propositions. Each supposes an authentic revelation from God; but the former view secures the Scriptures from all error both as to the subjects spoken, and the manner of expressing them. This, too, is the doctrine taught in the Scriptures themselves, which declare not only that the prophets and Apostles spake in the name of God, but that God spake by them as his instruments. "The Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake." "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet." "The prophecy came not of old time, by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." For this reason, not only that the matter contained in the book of "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms," (the usual phrase by which the Jews designated the whole Old Testament,) was true; but that the books were written under divine inspiration, they are called collectively by our Lord and by his Apostles, "The Scriptures," in contradistinction to all other writings;--a term which the Apostle Peter, as stated above, applies also to the writings of St. Paul, and which therefore verifies them as standing on the same level with the books of the Old Testament as to their inspiration: "Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking of these things, in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction." The Apostles also, as we have seen, expressly claim an inspiration, not only as to the subjects on which they wrote, but as to the words in which they expressed themselves. Farther, our Lord promised to them the Holy Spirit "to guide them into all truth;" and that he was not to fulfil his office by suggesting thoughts only, but words,

is clear from Christ's discourse with them on the subject of the persecutions they were to endure for "his name's sake:" "And when they bring you into the synagogues, and unto magistrates and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say; for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say; for it is not ye that speak; but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." This inspiration of words is also asserted by St. Paul as to himself and his brethren, when he says to the Corinthians, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth; but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." Thus we find that the claim which the sacred writers make on this subject is, that they were in truth what they have been aptly called, "the penmen of the 489Holy Ghost;" and that the words in which they clothed "the wisdom given unto them" were words "taught" by the Holy Spirit.

But it may be asked, How are we to account for that difference of style which is observable in each? that manner, too, so natural to each, and so distinct in all? with those reasonings, recollections of memory, and other indications of the working of the mind of each writer in its own character and temperament? Some persons, indeed, observing this, have concluded their style and manner to be entirely human, while their thoughts were either wholly divine, or so superintended by the Holy Ghost as to have been adopted by him, and therefore, although sometimes natural, to be of equal authority as if they had been exclusively of divine suggestion. This, indeed, would be sufficient to oblige our implicit credence to their writings, as being from God; but it falls below the force of the passages above cited, and which attribute to a divine agency their words also. The matter may be rightly conceived by considering, that an inspiration of words took place either by suggesting those most fit to express the thoughts, or by overruling the selection of such words from the common as if they had been exclusively of divine suggestion. This, indeed, would be sufficient to oblige our implicit credence to their writings, as being from God; but it falls below the force of the passages above cited, and which attribute to a divine agency the store acquired by, and laid up in, the mind of each writer, which is quite compatible with the fact, that a peculiarity and appropriateness of manner might still be left to them separately. To suppose that an inspiration of terms, as well as thoughts, could not take place without producing one uniform style and manner, is to suppose that the minds of the writers would thus become entirely passive under the influence of the Holy Spirit; whereas it is easily conceivable that the verbiage, style, and manner of each, was not so much displaced, as elevated, enriched, and controlled by the Holy Spirit; and that there was a previous fitness, in all these respects, in all the sacred penmen, for which they were chosen to be the instruments under the aid and direction of the Holy Ghost, of writing such portions of the general revelation as the

wisdom of God assigned to each of them. On the other hand, while it is so conceivable that the words and manner of each might be appropriated to his own design by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, it by no means follows that both were not greatly altered, as well as controlled, although they still retained a general similarity to the uninfluenced style and manner of each, and still presented a characteristic variety. As none of their writings on ordinary occasions, and when uninspired, have come down to us, we cannot judge of the degree of this difference; and therefore no one can with any just reason affirm that their writings are “the word of God as to the doctrine, but the word of man as to the channel of conveyance.” Certain it is, that a vast difference may be remarked between the writings of the Apostles, and those of the most eminent fathers of the times nearest to them; and that not only as to precision and strength of thought, but also as to language. This circumstance is at least strongly presumptive, that although the style of inspired men was not stripped of the characteristic peculiarity of the writers, it was greatly exalted and influenced.

But the same force of inspiration, so to speak, was not probably exerted upon each of the sacred writers, or upon the same writer throughout his writings, whatever might be its subject. There is no necessity that we should so state the case, in order to maintain what is essential to our faith,--the plenary inspiration of each of the sacred writers. In miracles there was no needless application of divine power. Traditional history and written chronicles, facts of known occurrence, and opinions which were received by all, are often inserted or referred to by the sacred writers. There needed no miraculous operation upon the memory to recall what the memory was furnished with, or to reveal a fact which the writers previously and perfectly knew: but their plenary inspiration consisted in this, that they were kept from all lapses of memory, or inadequate conceptions, even on these subjects; and on all others the degree of communication and influence, both as to doctrine, facts, and the terms in which they were to be recorded for the edification of the church, was proportioned to the necessity of the case, but so that the whole was authenticated or dictated by the Holy Spirit with so full an influence, that it became truth without mixture of error, expressed in such terms as he himself ruled or suggested. This, then, seems the true notion of plenary inspiration, that for the revelation, insertion, and adequate enunciation of truth, it was full and complete.

The principal objections to this view of the inspiration of words are well answered by Dr. Woods, an American divine, in a recent publication, from which, as the subject has been lately debated in this country, the following extracts will be acceptable, although there is in them a repetition of some of the preceding observations:--



“One argument which has been urged against the supposition that divine inspiration had a respect to language, is, that the language employed by the inspired writers exhibits no marks of a divine interference, but is perfectly conformed to the genius and taste of the writers. The fact here alleged is admitted. But how does it support the opinion of those who allege it? Is it not evident, that God may exercise a perfect superintendency over inspired writers as to the language they shall use, and yet that each one of them shall write in his own style, and in all respects according to his own taste? May not God give such aid to his servants, that, while using their own style, they will certainly be secured against all mistakes, and exhibit the truth with perfect propriety? It is unquestionable, that 490Isaiah, and St. Paul, and St. John might be under the entire direction of the Holy Spirit, even as to language, and, at the same time, that each one of them might write in his own manner; and that the peculiar manner of each might be adopted to answer an important end; and that the variety of style, thus introduced into the sacred volume, might be suited to excite a livelier interest in the minds of men, and to secure to them a far greater amount of good, than could ever have been derived from any one mode of writing. The great variety existing among men as to their natural talents, and their peculiar manner of thinking and writing may, in this way, be turned to account in the work of revelation, as well as in the concerns of common life. Now, is it not clearly a matter of fact, that God has made use of this variety, and given the Holy Spirit to men, differing widely from each other in regard to natural endowments, and knowledge, and style, and employed them, with all their various gifts, as agents in writing the Holy Scriptures? And what colour of reason can we have to suppose, that the language which they used was less under the divine direction on account of this variety, than if it had been perfectly uniform throughout?

“To prove that divine inspiration had no respect to the language of the sacred writers, it is farther alleged, that even the same doctrine is taught and the same event described in a different manner by different writers. This fact I also admit. But how does it prove that inspiration had no respect to language? Is not the variety alleged a manifest advantage, as to the impression which is likely to be made upon the minds of men? Is not testimony, which is substantially the same, always considered as entitled to higher credit, when it is given by different witnesses in different language, and in a different order? And is it not perfectly reasonable to suppose, that, in making a revelation, God would have respect to the common principles of human nature and human society, and would exert his influence and control over inspired men in such a manner, that, by exhibiting the same doctrines and facts in different ways, they should make a more salutary impression, and should more effectually compass the great ends of a revelation? All I have to advance on this part of the subject may

be summed up in these two positions: 1. The variety of manner apparent among different inspired writers, even when treating of the same subjects, is far better suited to promote the object of divine revelation, than a perfect uniformity. 2. It is agreeable to our worthiest conceptions of God and his administration, that he should make use of the best means for the accomplishment of his designs; and, of course, that he should impart the gift of inspiration to men of different tastes and habits as to language, and should lead them, while writing the Scriptures, to exhibit all the variety of manner naturally arising from the diversified character of their minds.

“But there is another argument, perhaps the most plausible of all, against supposing that inspiration had any respect to language; which is, that the supposition of a divine influence in this respect is wholly unnecessary; that the sacred writers, having the requisite information in regard to the subjects on which they were to write, might, so far as language is concerned, be left entirely to their own judgment and fidelity. But this view of the subject is not satisfactory. For whatever may be said as to the judgment and fidelity of those who wrote the Scriptures, there is one important circumstance which cannot be accounted for, without supposing them to have enjoyed a guidance above that of their own minds; namely, that they were infallibly preserved from every mistake or impropriety in the manner of writing. If we should admit that the divine superintendence and guidance afforded to the inspired writers had no relation at all to the manner in which they exhibited either doctrines or facts; how easily might we be disturbed with doubts, in regard to the propriety of some of their representations? We should most certainly consider them as liable to all the inadvertencies and mistakes, to which uninspired men are commonly liable; and we should think ourselves perfectly justified in undertaking to charge them with real errors and faults as to style, and to show how their language might have been improved; and, in short, to treat their writings just as we treat the writings of Shakspeare and Addison. ‘Here,’ we might say, ‘Paul was unfortunate in the choice of words; and here his language does not express the ideas which he must have intended to convey.’ ‘Here the style of St. John was inadvertent; and here it was faulty: and here it would have been more agreeable to the nature of the subject, and would have more accurately expressed the truth, had it been altered thus.’ If the language of the sacred writers did not in any way come under the inspection of the Holy Spirit, and if they were left, just as other writers are, to their own unaided faculties in regard to every thing which pertained to the manner of writing; then, evidently, we might use the same freedom in animadverting upon their style, as upon the style of other writers. But who could treat the volume of inspiration in this manner, without impiety and profaneness? And rather than make any approach to this, who would not choose to go to an excess, if there could be an excess, in reverence for the word of God?

“On this subject, far be it from me to indulge a curiosity which would pry into things not intended for human intelligence. And far be it from me to expend zeal in supporting opinions not warranted by the word of God. But this one point I think it specially important to maintain; namely, that the sacred writers had such direction of the Holy Spirit, that they were secured against all liability to error, and enabled to write just what God pleased; so that what they wrote is, in truth, the word of God, and can never be subject to any charge of mistake either as to matter or form. Whether this perfect correctness and propriety as to language resulted from the divine guidance directly or indirectly, is a question of no particular consequence. If the Spirit of God directs the minds of inspired men, and gives them just conceptions relative to the subjects on which they are to write; and if he constitutes and maintains a connection, true and invariable, between their conceptions and the language they employ to express them, the language must, in this way, be as infallible, and as worthy of God, as though it were dictated directly by the Holy Spirit. But to assert that the sacred writers used such language as they chose, or such as was natural to them, without any special divine superintendence, and that, in respect to style, they are to be regarded in the same light, and equally liable to mistakes, as other writers, is plainly contrary to the representations which they themselves make, and is suited to diminish our confidence in the word of God. For how could we have entire confidence in the representations of Scripture, if, after God had instructed the minds of the sacred writers in the truth to be communicated, he gave them up to all the inadvertencies and errors to which human nature in general is exposed, and took no effectual care that their manner of writing should be according to his will?”

“Let us then briefly examine the subject, as it is presented in the Holy Scriptures, and see whether we find sufficient reason to affirm that inspiration had no relation whatever to language. 1. The Apostles were the subjects of such a divine inspiration as enabled them to speak ‘with other tongues:’ here inspiration related directly to language. 2. It is the opinion of most writers, that, in some instances, inspired men had not in their own minds a clear understanding of the things which they spoke or wrote. One instance of this, commonly referred to, is the case of Daniel, who heard and repeated what the angel said, though he did not understand it, Dan. xii, 7–9. This has also been thought to be in some measure the case with the prophets referred to, 1 Peter i, 10–12. And is there not reason to think this may have been the case with many of the prophetic representations contained in the Psalms, and many of the symbolical rites of the Mosaic institute? Various matters are found in the Old Testament, which were not intended so much for the benefit of the writers, or their contemporaries, as for the benefit of future ages. And this might have been a sufficient reason

why they should be left without a clear understanding of the things which they wrote. In such cases, if the opinion above stated is correct, inspired men were led to make use of expressions, the meaning of which they did not fully understand. And, according to this view, it would seem that the teaching of the Spirit which they enjoyed, must have related rather to the words than to the sense. 3. Those who deny that the divine influence afforded to the sacred writers had any respect to language, can find no support in the texts which most directly relate to the subject of inspiration. And it is surely in such texts, if any where, that we should suppose they would find support. The passage, 2 Peter i, 21, is a remarkable one. It asserts that 'holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' There is surely nothing here which limits the divine influence to the conceptions of their minds. They were moved by the Holy Ghost to speak or write. 'All Scripture is divinely inspired,' 2 Tim. iii, 16. Does this text afford any proof that the divine influence granted to the inspired penmen was confined to their inward conceptions, and had no respect whatever to the manner in which they expressed their conceptions? What is Scripture? Is it divine truth conceived in the mind, or divine truth written? In Heb. i, 1, it is said that 'God spake to the fathers by the prophets.' Does this afford any proof that the divine guidance which the prophets enjoyed related exclusively to the conceptions of their own minds, and had no respect to the manner in which they communicated those conceptions? Must we not rather think the meaning to be, that God influenced the prophets to utter or make known important truths? And how could they do this, except by the use of proper words?

"I have argued in favour of the inspiration of the Apostles, from their commission. They were sent by Christ to teach the truths of religion in his stead. It was an arduous work; and in the execution of it they needed and enjoyed much divine assistance. But forming right conceptions of Christianity in their own minds, was not the great work assigned to the Apostles. If the divine assistance reached only to this, it reached only to that which concerned them as private men, and which they might have possessed though they had never been commissioned to teach others. As Apostles, they were to preach the Gospel to all who could be brought to hear it, and to make a record of divine truth for the benefit of future ages. Now is it at all reasonable to suppose, that the divine assistance afforded them had no respect to their main business, and that, in the momentous and difficult work of communicating the truths of religion, either orally or by writing, they were left to themselves, and so exposed to all the errors and inadvertencies of uninspired men? But our reasoning does not stop here. For that divine assistance which we might reasonably suppose would have been granted to the Apostles in the work of teaching divine truth, is the very thing which Christ promised them in the texts before cited. I shall

refer only to Matt. x, 19, 20, 'When they shall deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in the same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.' This promise, as Knapp understands it, implies, that divine assistance should extend not only to what they should say, but to the manner in which they should say it. It is not, however, to be understood as implying, that the Apostles were not rational and voluntary agents in the discharge of their office. But it implies that, in consequence of the influence of the Spirit to be exercised over them, they should say what God would have them to say, without any liability to mistake, either as to matter or manner. From the above-cited promise, taken in connection with the instances of its accomplishment which are recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, it becomes evident that God may exert his highest influence upon his servants, so as completely to guide them in thought and in utterance, in regard to subjects which lie chiefly within the province of their natural faculties. For in those speeches of the Apostles which are left on record, we find that most of the things which they declared, were things which, for aught that appears, they might have known, and might have expressed to others, in the natural exercise of their own faculties. This principle being admitted, and kept steadily in view, will relieve us of many difficulties in regard to the doctrine of inspiration. The passage, 1 Cor. ii, 12, 13, already cited as proof of the inspiration of the Apostles, is very far from favouring the opinion that inspiration had no respect whatever to their language, or that it related exclusively to their thoughts. 'Which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.' The Apostle avoided the style and the manner of teaching which prevailed among the wise men of Greece, and made use of a style which corresponded with the nature of his subject, and the end he had in view. And this, he tells us, he did, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. His language, or manner of teaching, was the thing to which the divine influence imparted to him particularly referred. Storr and Flatt give the following interpretation of this text: Paul, they say, asserts that the doctrines of Christianity were revealed to him by the almighty agency of God himself; and, finally, that the inspiration of the divine Spirit extended even to his words, and to all his exhibitions of revealed truths. They add, that St. Paul clearly distinguishes between the doctrine itself, and the manner in which it is communicated."

INTERMEDIATE STATE. Beside questions concerning the nature of the happiness of heaven, there have also arisen questions concerning the state of the soul in the interval between death and the general resurrection. If we believe, with Dr. Priestley, that the soul is not a substance distinct from the body, we must believe with him that the whole of the human machine is at rest after death, till it be restored to its functions at the last day; but if we

are convinced of the immateriality of the soul, we shall not think it so entirely dependent in all its operations upon its present companion, but that it may exist and act in an unembodied state. And if once we are satisfied that a state of separate existence is possible, we shall easily attach credit to the interpretation commonly given of the various expressions in Scripture, which intimate that the souls of good men are admitted to the presence of God immediately after death, although we soon find that a bound is set to our speculations concerning the nature of this intermediate state. But when we leave philosophical probability, and come to the doctrine of Scripture, the only ground of certainty on all such subjects, a great number of passages are so explicit, that no ingenuity of interpretation has been sufficient to weaken their evidence on this point. One branch of the opinions that have been held concerning an intermediate state is the Popish doctrine of purgatory; a doctrine which appears upon the slightest inspection of the texts that have been adduced in support of it to derive no evidence from Scripture; which originated in the error of the church of Rome in assigning to personal suffering a place in the justification of a sinner; and which is completely overturned by the doctrine of justification by faith, and by the general strain of Scripture, which represents this life as a state of probation, upon our conduct during which our everlasting condition depends. The holy Lazarus is carried by angels into Abraham's bosom; and the rich and careless sinner lifts up his eyes in hell, and is separated from the place of bliss by an impassable gulf. This at once disproves the doctrine of purgatory, and demonstrates an intermediate conscious state of happiness and misery.

IRON, ברזל; occurs first in Gen. iv, 22, and afterward frequently; and the Chaldee פרזל, in Dan. ii, 33, 41, and elsewhere often in that book; σίδηρος, Rev. xviii, 12, and the adjectives, Acts xii, 10; Rev. ii, 27; ix, 9; xii, 5; xix, 15; a well known and very serviceable metal. The knowledge of working it was very ancient, as appears from Genesis iv, 22. We do not, however, find that Moses made use of iron in the fabric of the tabernacle in the wilderness, or Solomon in any part of the temple at Jerusalem. Yet, from the manner in which the Jewish legislator speaks of iron, the metal, it appears, must have been in use in Egypt before his time. He celebrates the great hardness of it, Lev. xxvi, 19; Deut. xxviii, 23, 48; takes notice that the bedstead of Og, king of Bashan, was of iron, Deut. iii, 11; he speaks of mines of iron, Deut. viii, 9; and he compares the severity of the servitude of the Israelites in Egypt to the heat of a furnace for melting iron, Deut. iv, 20. We find, also, that swords, Num. xxxv, 16, axes, Deut. xix, 5, and tools for cutting stones, Deut. xxvii, 5, were made of iron. By the "northern iron," Jer. xv, 12, we may probably understand the hardened iron, called in Greek χάλυψ, from the Chalybes, a people bordering on the Euxine sea, and consequently lying on the north of Judea, by whom the art of tempering

steel is said to have been discovered. Strabo speaks of this people by the name of Chalybes, but afterward Chaldæi; and mentions their iron mines. These, however, were a different people from the Chaldeans, who were united with the Babylonians.

ISAAC, the son of Abraham and Sarah, 493 was born in the year of the world 2108. His name, which signifies laughter, was given him by his mother, because when it was told her by an angel that she should have a son, and that at a time of life when, according to the course of nature, she was past child-bearing, she privately laughed, Gen. xviii, 10–12. And when the child was born she said, “God hath made me to laugh, so that all that hear will laugh with me,” Gen. xxi, 6. The life of Isaac, for the first seventy-five years of it, is so blended with that of his illustrious father, that the principal incidents of it have been already noticed under the article Abraham. His birth was attended with some extraordinary circumstances: it was the subject of various promises and prophecies; an event most ardently desired by his parents, and yet purposely delayed by Divine Providence till they were both advanced in years, no doubt for the trial of their faith, and that Isaac might more evidently appear to be the gift of God, and “the child of promise.” At an early period of life he was the object of the profane contempt of Ishmael, the son of the bond woman, by whom he was persecuted; and as in the circumstances attending his birth there was something typical of the birth of Abraham’s greater Son, the Messiah, the promised Seed; so, in the latter instance, we contemplate in him a resemblance of real Christians, who, as Isaac was, are “the children of promise,” invested in all the immunities and blessings of the new covenant; but, as then, “he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now,” Gal. iv, 29.

When Isaac had arrived at a state of manhood, he was required to give a signal proof of his entire devotedness to God. Abraham was commanded to offer up his beloved son in sacrifice, Genesis xxii, 1. This remarkable transaction, so far as Abraham was concerned in it, has already been considered under the article Abraham. But, if from this trial of the faith of the parent we turn our attention to the conduct of Isaac, the victim destined for the slaughter, we behold an example of faith and of dutiful obedience equally conspicuous with that of his honoured parent. Isaac submitted, as it should seem, without resistance, to be bound and laid on the altar, exposing his body to the knife that was lifted up to destroy him. How strikingly calculated is this remarkable history to direct our thoughts to a more exalted personage, whom Isaac prefigured; and to a more astonishing transaction represented by that on Mount Moriah! Behold Jesus Christ, that Seed of Abraham, in whom all the families of the earth were to be blessed,

voluntarily going forth, in obedience to the command of his heavenly Father, and laying down his life, as a sacrifice for the sins of the world.

In the progress of Isaac's history, we find him, in the time of his greatest activity and vigour, a man of retired habits and of remarkable calmness of mind. He appears to have been affectionately attached to his mother Sarah, and, even at the age of forty, was not insusceptible of great sorrow on occasion of her death. But he allows his father to choose for him a suitable partner in life; and Rebekah was selected from among his own kindred, in preference to the daughters of Canaan, in the midst of whom he dwelt. In a few years afterward, he who had mourned for his mother, was called to weep over his father's grave; and in that last act of filial duty, it is pleasing to find the two rival brothers, Isaac and Ishmael, meeting together for the interment of Abraham. The occasion, indeed, was well calculated to allay all existing jealousies and contentions, and cause every family broil to cease, Gen. xxv, 9. After the death of Abraham, "God blessed his son Isaac;" but, though the latter had now been married twenty years, Rebekah was childless. "Isaac entreated the Lord for his wife, because she was barren; and the Lord was entreated of him, and Rebekah his wife conceived," Gen. xxv, 21. God also promised to multiply Isaac's seed, and his promise was fulfilled. Two children were born to him at one time, concerning whom the divine purpose was declared to the mother, and no doubt to the father also, that "the elder should serve the younger." A famine which came upon the country in the days of Isaac, obliged him to remove his family and flocks and retire to Gerar, in the country of the Philistines, of which Abimelech was at that time king. The possessions of Isaac multiplied so prodigiously, that the inhabitants of the country became envious of him, and even Abimelech, to preserve peace among them, was under the necessity of requesting him to retire, because he was become too powerful. He accordingly withdrew, and pitched his tent in the valley of Gerar, where he digged new wells, and, after a time, returned to Beersheba, where he fixed his habitation, Genesis xxvi, 1–23. Here the Lord appeared to him, and renewed to him the covenant which he had made with Abraham, promising to be his God, and to make him a blessing to others. Abimelech now sought his friendship, and, to form an alliance with him, paid him a visit; on which occasion Isaac displayed his magnificence by a sumptuous entertainment, A. M. 2240.

When he was a hundred and thirty-seven years of age, and his sight had so failed him that he could not distinguish one of his sons from the other, Jacob craftily obtained from him the blessing of primogeniture. Yet Isaac survived many years after this, to him, distressing occurrence. He sent Jacob into Mesopotamia, there to take a wife of his own family, Genesis xxviii, 1, 2, and to prevent his marrying among the Canaanites as his



brother Esau had done. And when Jacob returned, after a lapse of twenty years, Isaac was still living, and continued to live twenty-three years longer. He then died at the age of a hundred and eighty years, and was buried with Abraham by his sons Esau and Jacob, Gen. xxxv, 29. See Esau and Jacob.

ISAIAH. Though fifth in the order of time, 494the writings of the Prophet Isaiah are placed first in order of the prophetic books, principally on account of the sublimity and importance of his predictions, and partly also because the book which bears his name is larger than all the twelve minor prophets put together. Concerning his family and descent, nothing certain has been recorded, except what he himself tells us, Isaiah, i, 1, namely, that he was the son of Amos, and discharged the prophetic office “in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah,” who successively flourished between A. M. 3194 and 3305. There is a current tradition that he was of the blood royal; and some writers have affirmed that his father Amoz or Amos was the son of Joash, and consequently brother of Uzziah, king of Judah. Jerom, on the authority of some rabbinical writers, says, that the prophet gave his daughter in marriage to Manasseh, king of Judah; but this opinion is scarcely credible, because Manasseh did not commence his reign until about sixty years after Isaiah had begun to discharge his prophetic functions. He must, indeed, have exercised the office of a prophet during a long period of time, if he lived to the reign of Manasseh; for the lowest computation, beginning from the year in which Uzziah died, when he is by some supposed to have received his first appointment to that office, brings it to sixty-one years. But the tradition of the Jews, which has been adopted by most Christian commentators, that he was put to death by Manasseh, is very uncertain; and Aben Ezra, one of the most celebrated Jewish writers, is rather of opinion that he died before Hezekiah; which Bishop Lowth thinks most probable. It is, however, certain, that he lived at least to the fifteenth or sixteenth year of Hezekiah; which makes the least possible term of the duration of his prophetic office to be about forty-eight years. The name of Isaiah, as Vitringa has remarked after several preceding commentators, is in some measure descriptive of his high character, since it signifies the salvation of Jehovah; and was given with singular propriety to him, who foretold the advent of the Messiah, through whom “all flesh shall see the salvation of God,” Isa. xl, 5; Luke iii, 6; Acts iv, 12. Isaiah was contemporary with the Prophets Amos, Hosea, Joel, and Micah.

Isaiah is uniformly spoken of in the Scriptures as a prophet of the highest dignity: Bishop Lowth calls him the prince of all the prophets, and pronounces the whole of his book to be poetical, with the exception of a few detached passages. It is remarkable, that his wife is styled a prophetess in Isaiah viii, 3; whence the rabbinical writers have concluded that she

possessed the spirit of prophecy: but it is very probable that the prophets' wives were called prophetesses, as the priests' wives were termed priestesses, only from the quality of their husbands. Although nothing farther is recorded in the Scriptures concerning the wife of Isaiah, we find two of his sons mentioned in his prophecy, who were types or figurative pledges; and their names and actions were intended to awaken a religious attention in the persons whom they were commissioned to address and to instruct. Thus, Shear-jashub signifies, "a remnant shall return," and showed that the captives who should be carried to Babylon should return thence after a certain time, Isaiah vii, 3; and Maher-shalal-hash-baz, which denotes, "make speed (or run swiftly) to the spoil," implied that the kingdoms of Israel and Syria would in a short time be ravaged, Isaiah viii, 1, 3. Beside the volume of prophecies, which we are now to consider, it appears from 2 Chron. xxvi, 22, that Isaiah wrote an account of "the acts of Uzziah," king of Judah: this has perished with some other writings of the prophets, which, as probably not written by inspiration, were never admitted into the canon of Scripture. There are also two apocryphal books ascribed to him, namely, The Ascension of Isaiah, and The Apocalypse of Isaiah; but these are evidently forgeries of a later date, and the Apocalypse has long since perished.

The scope of Isaiah's predictions is threefold, namely, 1. To detect, reprove, aggravate, and condemn, the sins of the Jewish people especially, and also the iniquities of the ten tribes of Israel, and the abominations of many Gentile nations and countries; denouncing the severest judgments against all sorts and degrees of persons, whether Jews or Gentiles. 2. To invite persons of every rank and condition, both Jews and Gentiles, to repentance and reformation, by numerous promises of pardon and mercy. It is worthy of remark, that no such promises are intermingled with the denunciations of divine vengeance against Babylon, although they occur in the threatenings against every other people. 3. To comfort all the truly pious, in the midst of all the calamities and judgments denounced against the wicked, with prophetic promises of the true Messiah, which seem almost to anticipate the Gospel history, so clearly do they foreshow the divine character of Christ.

Isaiah has, with singular propriety, been denominated the evangelical prophet, on account of the number and variety of his prophecies concerning the advent and character, the ministry and preaching, the sufferings and death, and the extensive permanent kingdom, of the Messiah. So explicit and determinate are his predictions, as well as so numerous, that he seems to speak rather of things past than of events yet future; and he may rather be called an evangelist than a prophet. No one, indeed, can be at a loss in applying them to the mission and character of Jesus Christ, and to the

events which are cited in his history by the writers of the New Testament. This prophet, says Bishop Lowth, abounds in such transcendent excellencies, that he may be properly said to afford the most perfect model of prophetic poetry. He is at once elegant and sublime, forcible and ornamented; he unites energy with copiousness, and dignity with variety. In his sentiments there is uncommon elevation and majesty; in his imagery, 495the utmost propriety, elegance, dignity, and diversity; in his language, uncommon beauty and energy; and, notwithstanding the obscurity of his subjects, a surprising degree of clearness and simplicity. To these we may add, that there is such sweetness in the poetical composition of his sentences, whether it proceed from art or genius, that, if the Hebrew poetry at present is possessed of any remains of its native grace and harmony, we shall chiefly find them in the writings of Isaiah: so that the saying of Ezekiel may most justly be applied to this prophet:--

“Thou art the confirmed exemplar of measures,  
Full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty.”  
Ezekiel xxviii, 12.

Isaiah also greatly excels in all the graces of method, order, connection, and arrangement: though in asserting this we must not forget the nature of the prophetic impulse, which bears away the mind with irresistible violence, and frequently in rapid transitions from near to remote objects, from human to divine. We must likewise be careful in remarking the limits of particular predictions, since, as they are now extant, they are often improperly connected, without any marks of discrimination; which injudicious arrangement, on some occasions, creates almost insuperable difficulties.

Bishop Lowth has selected the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth chapters of this prophet, as a specimen of the poetic style in which Isaiah delivers his predictions, and has illustrated at some length the various beauties which eminently distinguish the simple, regular, and perfect poem contained in those chapters. But the grandest specimen of his poetry is presented in the fourteenth chapter, which is one of the most sublime odes occurring in the Bible, and contains the noblest personifications to be found in the records of poetry. The prophet, after predicting the liberation of the Jews from their severe captivity in Babylon, and their restoration to their own country, verses 1–3, introduces a chorus of them, expressing their surprise and astonishment at the sudden downfall of Babylon, and the great reverse of fortune that had befallen the tyrant, who, like his predecessors, had oppressed his own, and harassed the neighbouring kingdoms. These oppressed kingdoms, or their rulers, are represented under the image of the fir trees and the cedars of Libanus, which is frequently used to express any thing in the political or religious world that is supereminently great and

majestic: the whole earth shouts for joy; the cedars of Libanus utter a severe taunt over the fallen tyrant, and boast their security now he is no more, verses 4–8. This is followed, verse 9, by one of the boldest and most animated personifications of hades, or the regions of the dead, that was ever executed in poetry. Hades excites his inhabitants, the shades of princes, and the departed spirits of monarchs. These illustrious shades rise at once from their couches as from their thrones; and, advancing to the entrance of the cavern to meet the king of Babylon, they insult and deride him on being reduced to the same low state of impotence and dissolution with themselves, verses 10, 11. The Jews now resume the speech, verse 12; they address the king of Babylon as the morning star fallen from heaven, as the first in splendour and dignity, in the political world fallen from his high state: they introduce him as uttering the most extravagant vaunts of his power and ambitious designs in his former glory; these are strongly contrasted, in the close, with his present low and abject condition, verses 13–15. Immediately follows a different scene, and a most happy image, to diversify the same subject, and give it a new turn and additional force. Certain persons are introduced, who light upon the corpse of the king of Babylon, cast out and lying naked upon the bare ground, among the common slain, just after the taking of the city, covered with wounds, and so disfigured, that it is some time before they know him. They accost him with the severest taunts, and bitterly reproach him with his destructive ambition, and his cruel usage of the conquered; which have deservedly brought upon him this ignominious treatment, so different from what those of his high rank usually meet with, and which shall cover his posterity with disgrace, verses 16–20. To complete the whole, God is introduced, declaring the fate of Babylon; the utter extirpation of the royal family, and the total desolation of the city; the deliverance of his people, and the destruction of their enemies; confirming the irreversible decree by the awful sanction of his oath, verses 21–27. How forcible, says Bishop Louth, is this imagery, how diversified, how sublime! How elevated the diction, the figures, the sentiments! The Jewish nation, the cedars of Lebanon, the ghosts of departed kings, the Babylonish monarch, the travellers who find his corpse, and last of all Jehovah himself, are the characters which support this beautiful lyric drama. One continued action is kept up, or rather, a series of interesting actions are connected together in an incomparable whole: this, indeed, is the principal and distinguished excellence of the sublimer ode, and is displayed in its utmost perfection in this poem of Isaiah, which may be considered as one of the most ancient, and certainly one of the most finished, specimens of that species of composition which has been transmitted to us. The personifications here are frequent, yet not confused; bold, yet not improbable; a free, elevated, and truly divine spirit pervades the whole; nor is there any thing wanting in this ode to defeat its claim to the character of perfect pathos and sublimity. There is not a single

instance in the whole compass of Greek and Roman poetry which, in every excellence of composition, can be said to equal or even to approach it.

ISCARIOT, the name of that disciple who betrayed our Saviour. He was so called, probably, as belonging to Karioth, or Cerioth; that is, a man of Kerioth, Matt. x, 4.

496ISHBOSHETH, a son of King Saul, and his successor in the throne. He was acknowledged king by a part of the tribes of Israel, A. M. 2949, while David reigned at Hebron, over the tribe of Judah, 2 Sam. ii, 8, 9, &c; iii. He reigned two years in peace, but the remaining eight years were spent in perpetual wars between his troops and those of David, till in the end he perished, and with him ended the royal dignity of the house of Saul.

ISHMAELITES, the descendants of Ishmael, the son of Abraham by Hagar, his Egyptian bond-maid. Ishmael was born B. C. 1910, and his name, founded on a circumstance which afforded relief to his mother, when she was wandering from her master's house toward Egypt, her native country, is derived from the Hebrew *ישמעאל*, formed of *שמע*, to hear, and *אל*, God, and denoting, "the Lord hath hearkened." The heavenly messenger who appeared to Hagar in the wilderness, and instructed her by what name to call her future son, predicted also that he and his posterity would prove fierce and warlike, engaged in repeated hostilities, and yet able to maintain their independence. Hagar, deriving encouragement from this circumstance, returned to the house of Abraham, and was soon delivered of her promised son. The father regarded Ishmael as the heir of his wealth, till Sarah had the promise of her son Isaac. After the birth of Isaac, Abraham was persuaded by his wife to dismiss Hagar and her son; and the patriarch probably provided for their subsistence in some distant situation, where they could not encroach on the patrimony of Isaac. Having wandered for some time in the wilderness of Beersheba, they proceeded farther to the wilderness of Paran, which bordered on Arabia; and here Ishmael arrived at maturity, and became an expert archer, or a hunter and warrior. In process of time his mother procured for him a wife out of Egypt, by whom he had twelve sons, who eventually established themselves as the heads of so many distinct Arabian tribes. Accordingly, the descendants of Ishmael are mentioned in history under the general name of Arabians and Ishmaelites. Of Ishmael's personal history, we merely learn from the sacred writings, that he joined with his brother Isaac in paying the last tribute of respect to the remains of their father; and that he died at the age of a hundred and thirty-seven years, B. C. 1773, Gen. xxv, 9, 18. His descendants, according to the Scripture account, spread themselves "from Havilah to Shur, that is, before Egypt, as thou goest toward Assyria." From this brief statement, we may conjecture how far their territory extended;

for Havilah, according to the generality of writers, was situated near the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates, and Shur, on the isthmus which separates Arabia from Egypt, now called the Isthmus of Suez. From thence we may well imagine, that they spread themselves on both sides so far as to have taken possession of the greatest part of Arabia; and, indeed, Josephus does not scruple to style their progenitor the founder of the Arabian nation. See Arabia.

ISHTOB, a country situated at the northern extremity of the mountains of Gilead, toward Mount Libanus, 2 Sam. x, 6. See Tob.

ISRAEL, a prince of God, or prevailing, or wrestling with God. This is the name which the angel gave Jacob, after having wrestled with him all night at Mahanaim, or Peniel, Genesis xxxii, 1, 2, 28, 29, 30; Hosea xii, 4. By the name of Israel is sometimes understood the person of Jacob, sometimes the whole people of Israel, the whole race of Jacob; sometimes the kingdom of Israel, or ten tribes, distinct from the kingdom of Judah; and finally, the spiritual Israel, the true church of God.

ISRAELITES, the descendants of Israel, who were first called Hebrews by reason of Abraham, who came from the other side of the Euphrates; and afterward Israelites, from Israel, the father of the twelve tribes; and, lastly, Jews, particularly after their return from the captivity of Babylon; because the tribe of Judah was then much stronger and more numerous than the other tribes, and foreigners had scarcely any knowledge but of this tribe. See Jews.

ISSACHAR, the fifth son of Jacob and Leah, Gen. xxx, 14–18. He had four sons, Tola, Phovah, Job, and Shimron. We know nothing particular of his life. The tribe of Issachar had its portion in one of the best parts of the land of Canaan, along the great plain or valley of Jezreel, with the half tribe of Manasseh to the south, that of Zebulun to the north, the Mediterranean to the west, and Jordan, with the extremity of the sea of Tiberias, to the east.

ITHAMAR, Aaron's fourth son, Exod. vi, 23. There is no probability that he ever exercised the high priesthood. He and his sons continued in the rank of simple priests, till this dignity came into his family in the person of Eli.

ITURÆA, so called from Itur, or Jetur, one of the sons of Ishmael, who settled in it, but whose posterity were either driven out or subdued by the Amorites; when it is supposed to have formed a part of the kingdom of Bashan, and subsequently of the half tribe of Manasseh east of Jordan; but as it was situated beyond the southern spur of Mount Hermon, called the

Djebel Heish, this is doubtful. It lay on the north-eastern side of the land of Israel, between it and the territory of Damascus, or Syria; and is supposed to have been the same country at present known by the name of Djedour, on the east of the Djebel Heish, between Damascus and the lake of Tiberias. The Ituræans being subdued by Aristobulus, the high priest and governor of the Jews, B. C. 106, were forced by him to embrace the Jewish religion; and were at the same time incorporated into the state. Philip, one of the sons of Herod the Great, was tetrarch, or governor, of this country when John the Baptist commenced his ministry.

497IVORY. שִׁנַּיִם; from שֵׁן, a tooth, and הַבַּיִם, elephants; ἑλεφάντινος, Rev. xviii, 12. The first time that ivory is mentioned in Scripture is in the reign of Solomon. If the forty-fifth Psalm was written before the Canticles, and before Solomon had constructed his royal and magnificent throne, then that contains the first mention of this commodity. It is spoken of as used in decorating those boxes of perfume, whose odours were employed to exhilarate the king's spirits. It is probable that Solomon, who traded to India, first brought thence elephants and ivory to Judea. "For the king had at sea a navy of Tharshish, with the navy of Hiram: once in three years came the navy of Tharshish, bringing gold and silver, and ivory," 1 Kings x, 22; 2 Chron. ix, 21. It seems that Solomon had a throne decorated with ivory, and inlaid with gold; the beauty of these materials relieving the splendour, and heightening the lustre of each other, 1 Kings x, 18. Cabinets and wardrobes were ornamented with ivory, by what is called marquetry, Psalm xlv, 8.

Quale per artem

Inclusum buxo aut Oricia terebintho

Lucet ebur.

Virgil.

"So shines a gem, illustrious to behold,  
On some fair virgin's neck, enchased in gold:  
So the surrounding ebon's darker hue  
Improves the polish'd ivory to the view."

Pitt.

These were named "houses of ivory," probably because made in the form of a house, or palace; as the silver ναοὶ of Diana, mentioned Acts xix, 24, were in the form of her temple at Ephesus; and as we have now ivory models of the Chinese pagodas, or temples. In this sense we may understand what is said of the ivory house which Ahab made, 1 Kings xxii, 39; for the Hebrew word translated "house is used," as Dr. Taylor well observes, for "a place, or case, wherein any thing lieth, is contained, or laid up." Ezekiel gives the name of house to chests of rich apparel, Ezek. xxvii, 24. Dr. Durell, in his note on Psalm xlv, 8, quotes places from Homer and

Euripides, where the same appropriation is made. Hesiod makes the same. As to dwelling houses, the most, I think, we can suppose in regard to them is, that they might have ornaments of ivory, as they sometimes have of gold, silver, or other precious materials, in such abundance as to derive an appellation from the article of their decoration; as the Emperor Nero's palace, mentioned by Suetonius, was named aurea, or "golden," because *lita auro*, "overlaid with gold." This method of ornamental buildings, or apartments, was very ancient among the Greeks. Homer mentions ivory as employed in the palace of Menelaus at Lacedæmon:--

Χαλκοῦ τε στεροπὴν, καδδῶματα ἠχίεντα  
Χρυσοῦ τ', ἠλέκτρῳ τε, καὶ ἀργύρῳ ἢ δ' ἐλέφαντος.  
Odys. iv, 72.

"Above, beneath, around the palace, shines  
The sunless treasure of exhausted mines;  
The spoils of elephants the roof inlay,  
And studded amber darts a golden ray."

Bacchylides, cited by Athenæus, says, that, in the island of Ceos, one of the Cyclades, the houses of the great men "glisten with gold and ivory."

JABBOK, a small river which falls into the Jordan below the sea of Tiberias. Near this brook the angel wrestled with Jacob, Gen. xxxii, 22. Mr. Buckingham thus describes it: "The banks of this stream are so thickly wooded with oleander and plane trees, wild olives, and wild almonds in blossom, with many flowers, the names of which were unknown to us; with tall and waving reeds, at least fifteen feet in height; that we could not perceive the water through them from above, though the presence of these luxuriant borders marked the winding of its course, and the murmur of its flow, echoing through its long deep channel, was to be heard distinctly from afar. On this side of the stream, at the spot where we forded it, was a piece of wall, solidly built upon the inclined slope, constructed in a uniform manner, though of small stones, and apparently finished at the end toward the river, so that it never could have been carried across, as we at first supposed, either for a bridge, or to close the pass. This was called by the Arabs 'Shugl beni Israel,' or the work of the sons of Israel; but they knew of no other traditions regarding it. The river, where we crossed it at this point, was not more than ten yards wide, but it was deeper than the Jordan, and nearly as rapid; so that we had some difficulty in fording it. As it ran in a rocky bed, its waters were clear, and we found their taste agreeable."

JABESH, or JABESH-GILEAD, the name of a city in the half tribe of Manasseh, east of Jordan. Naash, king of the Ammonites, besieged it, 1 Sam. xi, 1, &c. The inhabitants were friendly to Saul and his family, 1 Sam. xxxi, 11, 12.



JACHIN, the name of a pillar in Solomon's temple, 1 Kings vii, 21. See Boaz.

JACOB, the son of Isaac and Rebekah. He was the younger brother of Esau, and a twin. It was observed, that at his birth he held his brother Esau's heel, and for this reason was called Jacob, Gen. xxv, 26, which signifies "he supplanted." Jacob was of a meek and peaceable temper, and loved a quiet pastoral life; whereas Esau was of a fierce and turbulent nature, and was fond of hunting. Isaac had a particular fondness for Esau; but Rebekah was more attached to Jacob. The manner in which Jacob purchased his brother's birthright for a mess of pottage, and supplanted him by obtaining Isaac's blessing, is already referred to in the article Esau.

The events of the interesting and chequered life of Jacob are so plainly and consecutively narrated by Moses, that they are familiar to all; but upon some of them a few remarks may be useful. As to the purchase of the birthright, Jacob appears to have been innocent so far as any guile on his part or real necessity from hunger on the part of Esau is involved in the question; but his obtaining the ratification of this by the blessing of Isaac, though agreeable, indeed, to the purpose of God, that the elder should serve the younger, was blamable as to the means employed. The remarks of Dr. Hales on this transaction implicate Isaac also:--Thirty-seven years after, when Jacob was seventy-seven years old, according to Abulfaragi, and Isaac a hundred and thirty-seven, when he was old, and his sight had failed, and he expected soon to die, his partiality for Esau led him to attempt to set aside the oracle, and the cession of Esau's birthright to Jacob, by conferring on him the blessing of Abraham, in reward for bringing him savoury venison to eat, before his death. In this design, however, he was disappointed by the artifice of Rebekah, who dressed her favourite Jacob in his brother's clothes, and made him personate Esau, and thereby surreptitiously obtained for him the blessing: "Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee: cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee," Gen. xxvii, 1-29. It is remarkable that, notwithstanding the agitation of Isaac, when "he trembled very exceedingly," at the detection of the fraud, he did not attempt to rescind the blessing, nor transfer it to Esau; but, on the contrary, confirmed it on Jacob: "Yea, and he shall be blessed." His wishes were overruled and controlled by that higher power which he vainly endeavoured to counteract; and that he spoke as the Spirit gave him utterance, appears from his prediction respecting Esau's family: "And it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break thy brother's yoke from off thy neck," Gen. xxvii, 40; which was fulfilled in the days of Jehoram, king of Judah,

when “the Edomites revolted from under the dominion of Judah, and made themselves a king unto this day,” 2 Chron. xxi, 8–10.

According to this view, all the parties were more or less culpable; Isaac, for endeavouring to set aside the oracle which had been pronounced in favour of his younger son; but of which he might have an obscure conception; Esau, for wishing to deprive his brother of the blessing which he had himself relinquished; and Rebekah and Jacob, for securing it by fraudulent means, not trusting wholly in the Lord. That their principal object, however, was the spiritual part of the blessing, and not the temporal, was shown by the event. For Jacob afterward revered Esau as his elder brother, and insisted on Esau’s accepting a present from his band in token of submission, Gen. xxxiii, 3–15. Esau also appears to have possessed himself of his father’s property during Jacob’s long exile. But though the intention of Rebekah and Jacob might have been free from worldly or mercenary motives, they ought not to have done evil that good might come. And they were both severely punished in this life for their fraud, which destroyed the peace of the family, and planted a mortal enmity in the breast of Esau against his brother: “Is he not rightly named Jacob?” a supplanter; “for he hath supplanted me these two times: he took away my birthright, and lo, now he hath taken away my blessing. The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob,” Gen. xxvii, 36–41. And there can be little doubt of his intention of executing his threat, when he came to meet him on his return, with such an armed force as strongly alarmed Jacob’s fears, had not God changed the spirit of Esau into mildness, so that “he ran to meet Jacob, and fell on his neck, and they wept,” Gen. xxxiii, 4. Rebekah, also, was deprived of the society of her darling son, whom “she sent away for one year,” as she fondly imagined, “until his brother’s fury should turn away,” Genesis xxvii, 42–44; but whom she saw no more; for she died during his long exile of twenty years, though Isaac survived, Gen. xxxv, 27. Thus was “she pierced through with many sorrows.” Jacob, also, had abundant reason to say, “Few and evil have been the days of the years of my pilgrimage,” Gen. xlvii, 9. Though he had the consolation of having the blessing of Abraham voluntarily renewed to him by his father, before he was forced to fly from his brother’s fury, Gen. xxviii, 1–4, and had the satisfaction of obeying his parents in going to Padan-aram, or Charran, in quest of a wife of his own kindred, Gen. xxviii, 7; yet he set out on a long and perilous journey of six hundred miles and upward, through barren and inhospitable regions, unattended and unprovided, like a pilgrim, indeed, with only his staff in his hand, Gen. xxxii, 10. And though he was supported with the assurance of the divine protection, and the renewal of the blessing of Abraham by God himself, in his remarkable vision at Bethel, and solemnly devoted himself to his service, wishing only for food and raiment, and vowing to profess the

worship of God, and pay tithe unto him should he return back in peace, Gen. xxviii, 10–22; yet he was forced to engage in a tedious and thankless servitude of seven years, at first for Rachel, with Laban, who retaliated upon him the imposition he had practised on his own father; and substituted Leah, whom he hated, for Rachel, whom he loved; and thereby compelled him to serve seven years more; and changed his wages several times during the remainder of his whole servitude of twenty years; in the course of which, as he pathetically complained, “the drought consumed him by day, and the frost by night, and the sleep departed from his eyes,” in watching Laban’s flocks, Gen. xxxi, 40; and at last he was forced to steal away, and was only protected from Laban’s vengeance, as afterward from Esau’s, by divine interposition. Add to these his domestic troubles and misfortunes; the impatience of his favourite wife, “Give me children, or I die;” her death in bearing her second son, Benjamin; the rape of his daughter Dinah; the perfidy and cruelty of her brothers, Simeon and Levi, to the Shechemites; the misbehaviour of Reuben; the supposed death of Joseph, his favourite and most deserving son:--these were, all together, sufficient to have brought down his gray hairs with sorrow to the grave, had he not been divinely supported and encouraged throughout the whole of his pilgrimage. For the circumstances which led Jacob into Egypt, see Joseph.

When Jacob, at the invitation of Joseph, went down to Egypt, Joseph introduced his father to his royal master; and the patriarch, in his priestly character, blessed Pharaoh, and supplicated the divine favour for the king. The venerable appearance and the pious demeanour of Jacob led the monarch to inquire his years; to which he replied, “The days of the years of my pilgrimage are a hundred and thirty years: few and evil have the days of the years of my life been; and I have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage.” This answer of the patriarch was not the language of discontent, but the solemn reflection of a man who had experienced a large share of trouble, and who knew that the whole of human life is indeed but “a vain show,” Genesis xlvii, 1–10. Jacob spent the remainder of his days in tranquillity and prosperity, enjoying the society of his beloved child seventeen years. The close of his life was a happy calm, after a stormy voyage. The patriarch, perceiving that his dissolution was near, sent for Joseph, and bound him by a solemn promise to bury him with his fathers in Canaan. Shortly after this, Jacob was taken ill, and it being reported to Joseph, he hastened to the bedside of his father, taking with him his two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim. On hearing that his son was come, Jacob exerted all his strength, and sat up in his bed to receive him, and to impart that blessing which, in the spirit of prophecy, he was commissioned to bequeath. He next blessed the infant children of Joseph; but, as he placed his hands upon their heads, he crossed them, putting his right upon Ephraim the younger, and his left upon

Manasseh the elder. Joseph wished to correct the mistake of his father, but Jacob persisted, being guided by a divine impulse; and he gave to each of the lads a portion in Israel, at the same time declaring that the younger should be greater than the elder, Gen. xlviii, 22. When this interview was ended, Jacob caused all his sons to assemble round his dying bed, that he might inform them what would befall them in the last days, Gen. xlix, 1, 2. Of all the predictions which he pronounced with his expiring breath, the most remarkable and the most interesting is that relating to Judah: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be," Gen. xlix, 10. One grand personage was in the mind of the patriarch, as it had been in the contemplation of his predecessors, even the illustrious Deliverer who should arise in after ages to redeem his people, and bring salvation to the human race. The promised Seed was the constant object of faithful expectation; and all the patriarchal ordinances, institutions, and predictions, had an allusion, positive or incidental, to the Messiah. Hitherto the promise was confined generally to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that from them the glorious blessing should arise; but now, under the divine direction, the dying patriarch foretels in what tribe, and at what period, the great Restorer shall come. The sovereign authority was to continue in the possession of Judah, till from that tribe Shiloh should appear, and then the royalty must cease. This was fulfilled; for the tribe of Judah possessed legislative power till the time of Christ, and from that period the Jewish people have neither had dominion nor priesthood. Jesus Christ, therefore, must either be the true Shiloh, or the prophecy has failed; for the Jews cannot prove that they have had any thing like temporal power since his crucifixion. When they were so clamorous for the execution of Jesus, and Pilate told them to take the law into their own hands, they shrunk fearfully from the proposal, and acknowledged their slavish state by saying, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death," John xviii, 31. Here, then, we have a glorious proof of the veracity of Scripture, and an incontestible evidence of the truth of our religion.

When Jacob had finished blessing his sons, he charged them to bury him in the cave of Machpelah, with Abraham and Isaac, and, "gathering his feet into the bed, he yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people," Gen. xlix, 33. Joseph, having closed the eyes of his father, and wept over him, commanded the physicians to embalm the body. After a general mourning of seventy days, he solicited the king's permission to go with the remains of Jacob into Canaan, to which Pharaoh consented; and with Joseph went up all the state officers and principal nobility of Egypt, so that when they came to the place of interment, the Canaanites were astonished, and said, "This is a grievous mourning to the Egyptians," Gen. l, 1-11.

JACOBITES, a denomination of eastern Christians, who first made their appearance in the fifth century, and were called Monophysites. Jacob Albardai, or Baradæus, who flourished about A. D. 530, restored the sect, then almost expiring, to its former vigour, and modelled it anew; and hence from him they obtained the name of Jacobites. See Hypostatical Union.

JACOB'S WELL, or fountain, a well near Shechem, at which our Saviour conversed with the woman of Samaria, John iv, 12. Jacob dwelt near this place, before his sons slew the inhabitants of Shechem. If any thing, says Dr. E. D. Clarke, connected with the remembrance of past ages be calculated to awaken local enthusiasm, the land around this city is preëminently entitled to consideration. The sacred story of events transacted in the fields of Sichem, Gen. xxxvii, from our earliest years, is remembered with delight; but with the territory before our eyes, where those events took place, and in the view of objects existing as they were described above three thousand years ago, the grateful impression kindles into ecstasy. Along the valley may still be seen, as in the days of Reuben and Judah, "a company of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead, with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh," who would gladly purchase another Joseph of his brethren, and convey him as a slave to some Potiphar in Egypt. Upon the hills around, flocks and herds are seen feeding as of old; nor in the simple garb of the shepherds of Samaria, at this day, is there any thing repugnant to the notions we may entertain of the appearance formerly presented by the sons of Jacob. In the time of Alexander the Great, Sichem, or Napolose, as it is now called, was considered as the capital of Samaria. Its inhabitants were called Samaritans, not merely as people of Samaria, but as a sect at variance with the Jews; and they have continued to maintain their peculiar tenets to this day. The inhabitants, according to Procopius, were much favoured by the Emperor Justinian, who restored their sanctuaries, and added largely to the edifices of the city. The principal object of veneration among them is Jacob's well, over which a church was formerly erected. This is situated at a small distance from the town in the road to Jerusalem, and has been visited by pilgrims of all ages, but particularly since the Christian era, as the place where Christ revealed himself to the woman of Samaria. The spot is so distinctly marked by the evangelist, John iv, and so little liable to uncertainty from the circumstance of the well itself, and the features of the country, that, if no tradition existed to identify it, the site of it could scarcely be mistaken. Perhaps no Christian scholar ever read the fourth chapter of St. John's Gospel attentively, without being struck with the numerous internal evidences of truth which crowd upon the mind in its perusal. Within so small a compass, it is impossible to find in other writings so many sources of reflection and of interest. Independently of its importance as a theological document, it concentrates so much information, that a volume might be filled with the

illustration it reflects upon the history of the Jews, and upon the geography of their country. All that can be gathered from Josephus on these subjects seems to be as a comment to illustrate this chapter. The journey of our Lord from Judea into Galilee; the cause of it; his passage through the territory of Samaria; his approach to the metropolis of that country; its name; his arrival at the Amorite field, which terminates the narrow valley of Sichem; the ancient custom of halting at a well; the female employment of drawing water; the disciples sent into the city for food, by which its situation out of the town is so obviously implied; the question of the woman referring to existing prejudices which separated the Jews from the Samaritans; the depth of the well; the oriental allusion contained in the expression, "living water;" the history of the well, and the customs illustrated by it; the worship upon Mount Gerizim:--all these occur within the space of twenty verses; and if to these be added that remarkable circumstance mentioned in the fifty-first verse of the chapter, where it is stated that "as he was now going down, his servants met him," his whole route from Cana being a continual descent toward Capernaum, we may consider it as a record, signally confirmed in its veracity by circumstances which remain in indelible character, to give them evidence, to this day.

JAH, one of the names of God, which we meet with in the composition of many Hebrew words; as, Adonijah, Allelujah, Malachiah; that is, "My Lord," Praise the Lord," "The Lord is my King."

JAIR, of the family of Manasseh. He possessed a large canton beyond Jordan; the whole country of Argob, as far as the borders of Geshur and Maachathi, Judges x, 3. He succeeded Tola in the judicature or government of the Israelites, and was himself succeeded by Jephthah. His government continued twenty-two years; from A. M. 2795 to 2817. Jair had thirty sons, who rode on asses, and were lords or governors of thirty towns, called Havoth-jair. He was buried at Camon beyond Jordan.

JAMES, Ἰάκωβος, of the same import as Jacob. James, surnamed the greater or, the elder, to distinguish him from James the younger, was brother to John the evangelist, and son to Zebedee and Salome, Matt. iv, 21. He was of Bethsaida, in Galilee, and left all to follow Christ. Salome requested our Saviour, that her two sons, James and John, might sit at his right hand, when he should be in possession of his kingdom. Our Saviour answered, that it belonged to his heavenly Father alone to dispose of these places of honour, Matt. xx, 21. Before their vocation, James and John followed the trade of fishermen with their father Zebedee; and they did not quit their profession till our Saviour called them, Mark i, 18, 19. They were witnesses of our Lord's transfiguration, Matt. xvii, 2. When certain Samaritans refused to admit Jesus Christ, James and John wished for fire

from heaven to consume them, Luke ix, 54; and for this reason, it is thought, the name of Boanerges, or sons of thunder, was given them. Some days after the resurrection of our Saviour, James and John went to fish in the sea of Tiberias, where they saw Jesus. They were present at the ascension of our Lord. St. James is said to have preached to all the dispersed tribes of Israel; but for this there is only report. His martyrdom is related, Acts xii, 1, 2, about A. D. 42, or 44, for the date is not well ascertained. Herod Agrippa, king of the Jews, and grandson of Herod the Great, caused him to be seized and executed at Jerusalem. Clemens Alexandrinus informs us, that he who brought St. James before the judges was so much affected with his constancy in confessing Jesus Christ, that he also declared himself a Christian, and was condemned, as well as the Apostle, to be beheaded.

James the less, surnamed the brother of our Lord, Gal. i, 19, was the son of Cleophas, otherwise called Alpheus, and Mary, sister to the blessed virgin; consequently, he was 50<sup>1</sup>cousin-german to Jesus Christ. He was surnamed the Just, on account of the admirable holiness and purity of his life. He is said to have been a priest, and to have observed the laws of the Nazarites from his birth. Our Saviour appeared to James the less, eight days after his resurrection, 1 Cor. xv, 7. He was at Jerusalem, and was considered as a pillar of the church, when St. Paul first came thither after his conversion, Gal. i, 19, A. D. 37. In the council of Jerusalem, held in the year 51, St. James gave his vote last; and the result of the council was principally formed from what St. James said, who, though he observed the ceremonies of the law, and was careful that others should observe them, was of opinion, that such a yoke was not to be imposed on the faithful converted from among the Heathens, Acts xv, 13, &c.

James the less was a person of great prudence and discretion, and was highly esteemed by the Apostles and other Christians. Such, indeed, was his general reputation for piety and virtue, that, as we learn, from Origen, Eusebius, and Jerom, Josephus thought, and declared it to be the common opinion, that the sufferings of the Jews, and the destruction of their city and temple, were owing to the anger of God, excited by the murder of James. This must be considered as a strong and remarkable testimony to the character of this Apostle, as it is given by a person who did not believe that Jesus was the Christ. The passages of Josephus, referred to by those fathers upon this subject, are not found in his works now extant.

James, General Epistle of. Clement of Rome and Hermas allude to this epistle; and it is quoted by Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerom, Chrysostom, Augustine, and many other fathers. But though the antiquity of this epistle had been always undisputed, some few formerly doubted its

right to be admitted into the canon. Eusebius says, that in his time it was generally, though not universally, received as canonical; and publicly read in most, but not in all, churches; and Estius affirms, that after the fourth century, no church or ecclesiastical writer is found who ever doubted its authenticity; but that, on the contrary, it is included in all subsequent catalogues of canonical Scripture, whether published by councils, churches, or individuals. It has, indeed, been the uniform tradition of the church, that this epistle was written by James the Just; but it was not universally admitted till after the fourth century, that James the Just was the same person as James the less, one of the twelve Apostles; that point being ascertained, the canonical authority of this epistle was no longer doubted. It is evident that this epistle could not have been written by James the elder, for he was beheaded by Herod Agrippa in the year 44, and the errors and vices reproved in this epistle show it to be of a much later date; and the destruction of Jerusalem is also here spoken of as being very near at hand, James v, 8, 9. It has always been considered as a circumstance very much in favour of this epistle, that it is found in the Syriac version, which was made as early as the end of the first century, and for the particular use of converted Jews,--the very description of persons to whom it was originally addressed. Hence we infer, that it was from the first acknowledged by those for whose instruction it was intended; and "I think," says Dr. Doddridge, "it can hardly be doubted but they were better judges of the question of its authenticity than the Gentiles, to whom it was not written; among whom, therefore, it was not likely to be propagated so early; and who at first might be prejudiced against it, because it was inscribed to the Jews."

The immediate design of this epistle was to animate the Jewish Christians to support with fortitude and patience any sufferings to which they might be exposed, and to enforce the genuine doctrine and practice of the Gospel, in opposition to the errors and vices which then prevailed among them. St. James begins by showing the benefits of trials and afflictions, and by assuring the Jewish Christians that God would listen to their sincere prayers for assistance and support; he reminds them of their being the distinguished objects of divine favour, and exhorts them to practical religion; to a just and impartial regard for the poor, and to a uniform obedience to all the commands of God, without any distinction or exception; he shows the inefficacy of faith without works, that is, unless followed by moral duties; he inculcates the necessity of a strict government of the tongue, and cautions them against censoriousness, strife, malevolence, pride, indulgence of their sensual passions, and rash judgment; he denounces threats against those who make an improper use of riches; he intimates the approaching destruction of Jerusalem; and concludes with exhortations to patience, devotion, and a solicitous concern



for the salvation of others. This epistle is written with great perspicuity and energy, and it contains an excellent summary of those practical duties and moral virtues which are required of Christians. Although the author wrote to the Jews dispersed throughout the world, yet the state of his native land passed more immediately before his eyes. Its final overthrow was approaching; and oppressions, factions, and violent scenes troubled all ranks, and involved some professing Christians in suffering, others in guilt.

JANNES and JAMBRES, or, as Pliny calls them, Jamne and Jotape, two magicians, who resisted Moses in Egypt, 2 Tim. iii, 8. He speaks, likewise, of the faction or sect of magicians, of which, he says, Moses, Jannes, and Jocabel, or Jopata, were heads. By this last word he meant probably the patriarch Joseph, whom the Egyptians considered as one of their most celebrated sages. The Mussulmans have several particulars to the same purpose. The paraphrast Jonathan says they were the sons of Balaam, who accompanied him to Balak, king of Moab. They are called by several names in several translations; by the Septuagint, φαρμακοὶ, poisoners, and ἐπαοιδοὶ, enchanters; 502by Sulpitius Severus, Chaldæans, that is, astrologers; by others, sapientes and malefici, wise men, that is, so esteemed among the Egyptians, philosophers, and witches. Artapanus tells us, that Pharaoh sent for magicians from Upper Egypt to oppose Moses. Ambrosiaster, or Hilary, the deacon, says they were brothers. He cites a book entitled “Jannes and Mambres,” which is likewise quoted by Origen, and ranked as apocryphal by Pope Gelasius. Some of the Hebrews call them Janes and Jambres; others, Jochana and Mamré, or Jonas and Jombros. Jerom translates their names Johannes and Mambres; and there is a tradition, they say, in the Talmud, that Juhanni and Mamré, chief of Pharaoh’s physicians, said to Moses, “Thou bringest straw into Egypt where abundance of corn grew;” that is, to bring your magical arts hither is to as much purpose as to bring water to the Nile. Some say their names are the same as John and Ambrose. Some will have it that they fled away with their father; others, that they were drowned in the Red Sea with the Egyptians; others, that they were killed by Phinehas in the war against the Midianites. Numenius, cited by Aristobulus, says that Jannes and Jambres were sacred scribes of the Egyptians, who excelled in magic at the time when the Jews were driven out of Egypt. See Plagues of Egypt.

JANSENISTS, a denomination of Roman Catholics in France, which was formed in the year 1640. They follow the opinions of Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, from whose writings the following propositions are said to have been extracted:--1. That there are divine precepts which good men, notwithstanding their desire to observe them, are, nevertheless, absolutely unable to obey; nor has God given them that measure of grace which is essentially necessary to render them capable of such obedience. 2. That no

person, in this corrupt state of nature, can resist the influence of divine grace, when it operates upon the mind. 3. That, in order to render human actions meritorious, it is not requisite that they be exempt from necessity; but that they be free from constraint. 4. That the Semi-Pelagians err greatly, in maintaining that the human will is endowed with the power of either receiving or resisting the aids and influences of preventing grace. 5. That whoever affirms that Jesus Christ made expiation, by his sufferings and death, for the sins of all mankind, is a Semi-Pelagian. Of these propositions, Pope Innocent X. condemned the first four as heretical, and the last as rash and impious. But he did this without asserting that these were the doctrines of Jansenius, or even naming him; which did not satisfy his adversaries, nor silence him. The next pope, however, Alexander VII. was more particular, and determined the said propositions to be the doctrines of Jansenius; which excited no small trouble in the Gallican church.

This denomination was also distinguished from many of the Roman Catholics, by their maintaining that the Holy Scriptures and public liturgies should be given to the people in their mother tongue; and they consider it as a matter of importance to inculcate upon all Christians, that true piety does not consist in the performance of external devotions, but in inward holiness and divine love.

As to Jansenius, it must be confessed that he was more diligent in the search of truth, than courageous in its defence. It is said that he read through the whole of St. Augustine's works ten, and some parts thirty, times. From these he made a number of excerpts, [extracts,] which he collected in his book called "Augustinus." This he had not the courage to publish; but it was printed after his death, and from it his enemies, the Jesuits, extracted the propositions above named; but the correctness and fidelity of their extracts may be justly questioned. Jansenius himself, undoubtedly, held the opinions of Calvin on unconditional election, though he seems to have been reserved in avowing them.

The Jansenists of Port Royal may be denominated the evangelical party of the Catholic church: among their number were the famous Father Quesnel, Pierre Nicole, Pascal, De Sacy, Duguet, and Arnauld; the last of whom is styled by Boileau, "the most learned mortal that ever lived." They consecrated all their great powers to the service of the cross; and for their attachment to the grand article of the Protestant reformation,--justification by faith, with other capital doctrines, they suffered the loss of all things. The Jesuits, their implacable enemies, never ceased until they prevailed upon their sovereign, Louis XIV. to destroy the abbey of Port Royal, and banish its inhabitants. It must be confessed, however, that all the Jansenists

were not like the eminent men whom we have just mentioned; and even these were tinged with enthusiasm and superstition. Some of them even pretended to work miracles, by which their cause was greatly injured.

JAPHETH, the son of Noah, who is commonly named the third in order of Noah's sons, was born in the five hundredth year of that patriarch, Genesis v, 32; but Moses, Genesis x, 21, says expressly he was the oldest of Noah's sons, according to our translation, and those of the Septuagint and Symmachus. Abraham was named the first of Terah's sons, "not from primogeniture, but from preëminence," as the father of the faithful, and the illustrious ancestor of the Israelites, and of the Jews, whose "seed was Christ," according to the flesh; with whose history the Old Testament properly commences: "Now these are the generations of Terah," &c, Gen. xi, 27; all the preceding parts of Genesis being only introductory to this. By the same analogy, Shem, the second son of Noah, is placed first of his three sons, Gen. v, 32, and Japheth, "the eldest," last. Compare Gen. x, 21; xi, 20. Thus Isaac is put before Ishmael, though fourteen years younger, 1 Chron. i, 28. And Solomon, the eldest, is reckoned the last of Bathsheba's children, 1 Chron. iii, 5.

Japheth signifies enlargement; and how wonderfully did Providence enlarge the boundaries of Japheth! His posterity diverged eastward and westward; from the original settlement in Armenia, through the whole extent of Asia, north of the great range of Taurus, distinguished by the general names of Tartary and Siberia, as far as the Eastern Ocean: and in process of time, by an easy passage across Behring's straits, the entire continent of America; and they spread in the opposite direction, throughout the whole of Europe, to the Atlantic Ocean; thus literally encompassing the earth, within the precincts of the northern temperate zone. While the enterprising and warlike genius of this hardy hunter race frequently led them to encroach on the settlements, and to dwell in "the tents of Shem," whose pastoral occupations rendered them more inactive, peaceable, and unwarlike; as when the Scythians invaded Media, and overran western Asia southwards, as far as Egypt, in the days of Cyaxares; and when the Greeks, and afterward the Romans, subdued the Assyrians, Medes, and Persians, in the east, and the Scythians and Jews in the south, as foretold by the Assyrian Prophet Balaam:

"And ships shall come from the coast of Chittim,  
And shall afflict the Assyrians, and afflict the Hebrews;  
But he [the invader] shall perish himself at last."  
Numb. xxiv, 24.

And by Moses: "And the Lord shall bring thee [the Jews] into Egypt [or bondage] again with ships," &c, Deut. xxviii, 28. And by Daniel: "For the

ships of Chittim shall come against him” [Antiochus, king of Syria,] Dan. xi, 30.

In these passages Chittim denotes the southern coasts of Europe, bordering on the Mediterranean Sea, called the “isles of the Gentiles,” Gen. x, 5. And, in later times, the Tartars in the east have repeatedly invaded and subdued the Hindoos and Chinese; while the warlike and enterprising genius of the British isles has spread their colonies, their arms, their arts, and their language, and, in some measure, their religion, from the rising to the setting sun.

The sons of Japheth were Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras. The Scripture says, that they peopled the isles of the Gentiles, and settled in different countries, each according to his language, family, and people, Genesis x, 5. It is supposed that Gomer peopled Galatia, and that from him the Cimmerians, or Cimbrians, and also the Phrygians, derived their origin; that Magog was the father of the Scythians, and Tartars, or Tatars; that Madai was the progenitor of the Medes, though some make him the founder of a people in Macedonia, called Macdi; that from Javan sprung the Ionians and Greeks; that Tubal was the father of the Iberians, and that at least a part of Spain was peopled by him and his descendants; that Meshech was the founder of the Cappadocians, from whom proceeded the Muscovites, or Russians; and that from Tiras the Thracians derived their origin. Japheth was known, by profane authors, under the name of Japetus. The poets make him father of heaven and earth. The Greeks believed that Japheth was the father of their race, and acknowledged nothing more ancient than him.

JAR, the Hebrew month which answers to our April. It consisted but of twenty-nine days.

JASPER, יִשְׁפָּר, Exod. xxviii, 20; xxxix, 13; and Ezek. xxviii, 13; ἵασπις, Rev. iv, 3, and xxi, 11, 18, 19. The Greek and Latin name, jaspis, as well as the English jasper, is plainly derived from the Hebrew, and leaves little room to doubt what species of gem is meant by the original word. The jasper is usually defined, a hard stone, of a bright, beautiful, green colour; sometimes clouded with white, and spotted with red or yellow.

JAVAN, or ION, (for the Hebrew word, differently pointed, forms both names,) was the fourth son of Japheth, and the father of all those nations which were included under the name of Grecians, or Ionians, as they were invariably called in the east. Javan had four sons, by whom the different portions of Greece Proper were peopled: Elisha, Tharsis, Chittim, and Dodanim. Elisha, Eliza, or Ellas, as it is written in the Chaldee, and from

whom the Greeks took the name of *Ἕλληνας*, settled in the Peloponnesus; where, in the Elysian fields and the river Ilissus, his name is still preserved. Tharsis settled in Achaia; Chittim, in Macedonia; and Dodanim, in Thessaly and Epirus; where the city of Dodona gives ample proof of the origin of its name. But the Greeks did not remain pure Javanim. It appears from history that, at a very early age, they were invaded and subjugated by the Pelasgi, a Cuthite race from the east, and by colonies of Phenicians and Egyptians from the south: so that the Greeks, so famous in history, were a compound of all these people. The aboriginal Greeks were called Jaones, or Jonim; from which similarity of sound, the Jonim and the Javanim, although belonging to two essentially different families, have been confounded together. Javan is the name used in the Old Testament for Greece and the Greeks. See Division of the Earth.

JEALOUSY, Waters of. See Adultery.

JEBUS, the son of Canaan, Gen. x, 16, and father of the people of Palestine called Jebusites. Their dwelling was in Jerusalem and round about, in the mountains. This people were very warlike, and held Jerusalem till David's time, Josh. xv, 65; 2 Sam. v, 6, &c.

JEDUTHUN, a Levite of Merari's family, and one of the four great masters of music belonging to the temple, 1 Chron. xvi, 38, 41, 42; xv, 17; Psalm lxxxix, title. He is the same as Ethan. Some of the Psalms are said to have been composed by him; such as the eighty-ninth, thirty-ninth, sixty-second, seventy-seventh; all of which go under his name. Some believe, that David, having composed these Psalms, gave them to Jeduthun and his company to sing; and that this is the reason of their going by this name. But there are some Psalms which have the name of Jeduthun, that seem to have been composed either 504 during the captivity, or after it; and consequently the name of Jeduthun prefixed to them, can signify nothing else, but that some of his descendants, and of Jeduthun's class, composed them long after the death of the famous Jeduthun, one of their ancestors.

JEHOAHAZ, otherwise SHALLUM, the son of Josiah, king of Judah, Jer. xxii, 11. Josiah having been wounded mortally by Necho, king of Egypt, and dying of his wounds at Megiddo, Jehoahaz was made king in his room, though he was not Josiah's eldest son, 2 Kings xxiii, 30, 31, 32. He was in all probability thought fitter than any of his brethren to make head against the king of Egypt. He was twenty-three years old when he began to reign, and he reigned about three months only in Jerusalem, in the year of the world 3395. King Necho, at his return from the expedition against Carchemish, provoked at the people of Judah for having placed this prince upon the throne without his consent, sent for him to Riblah, in Syria,

divested him of the kingdom, loaded him with chains, and sent him into Egypt, where he died, Jer. xxii, 11, 12. Jehoiakim, or Eliakim his brother, was made king in his room.

JEHOIACHIN, otherwise called Coniah, Jer. xxii, 24, and Jeconiah, 1 Chron. iii, 17, the son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, and grandson of Josiah. He ascended the throne, and reigned only three months. It seems he was born about the time of the first Babylonish captivity, A. M. 3398, when Jehoiakim, or Eliakim, his father, was carried to Babylon. Jehoiakim returned from Babylon, and reigned till A. M. 3405, when he was killed by the Chaldeans, in the eleventh year of his reign; and was succeeded by this Jehoiachin, who reigned alone three months and ten days; but he reigned about ten years in conjunction with his father. Thus 2 Kings xxiv, 8, is reconciled with 2 Chron. xxxvi, 9. In the former of these passages, he is said to have been eighteen when he began to reign, and in Chronicles only eight; that is, he was only eight when he began to reign with his father, and eighteen when he began to reign alone. He was a bad man, and did evil in the sight of the Lord, Jer. xxii, 24. The time of his death is uncertain; and the words of the Prophet Jeremiah, xxii, 30, are not to be taken in the strictest sense; since he was the father of Salathiel and others, 1 Chron. iii, 17, 18; Matt. i, 12.

JEHOIAKIM, or ELIAKIM, the brother and successor of Jehoahaz, king of Judah, was advanced to the throne by Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, A. M. 3395, 2 Kings xxiii, 34. He reigned eleven years in Jerusalem, and did evil in the sight of the Lord. When Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, this prince was also taken and put to death, and his body thrown into the common sewer, according to the prediction of Jeremiah, xxii, 18, 19.

JEHOSHAPHAT, king of Judah, son of Asa, king of Judah, and Azabah, daughter of Shilhi, ascended the throne at the age of thirty-five, and reigned twenty-five years. He had the advantage over Baasha, king of Israel; and he placed good garrisons in the cities of Judah and of Ephraim, which had been conquered by his father. God was with him, because he was faithful. He demolished the high places and groves. In the third year of his reign he sent some of his officers, with priests and Levites, through all the parts of Judah, with the book of the law, to instruct the people. God blessed the zeal of this prince, who was feared by all his neighbours. The Philistines and Arabians were tributaries to him. He built several houses in Judah in the form of towers, and fortified several cities. He generally kept an army of eleven hundred thousand men, without reckoning the troops in his strong holds. This number seems prodigious for so small a state as that of Judah; but, probably, these troops were only an enrolled militia.

The Scripture reproaches Jehoshaphat for his alliance with Ahab, king of Israel, 1 Kings xx; 2 Chronicles xviii. Some time after, he went to visit Ahab in Samaria; and Ahab invited him to march with him against Ramoth-Gilead. Jehoshaphat consented, but first asked for an opinion from a prophet of the Lord. Afterward, he went into the battle in his robe, and the enemy supposed him to be Ahab; but he crying out, they discovered their mistake, and Jehoshaphat returned in peace to Jerusalem. The Prophet Jehu reprov'd him for assisting Ahab, 2 Chron. xix, 1, 2, 3, &c. Jehoshaphat repaired this fault by the good regulations, and the good order, which he established in his dominions, both as to civil and religious affairs, by appointing honest and able judges, by regulating the discipline of the priests and Levites, and by enjoining them to perform their duty with punctuality. After this, in the year 3108, the Moabites, Ammonites, and other nations of Arabia Petræa, declared war against Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xx, 1, 2, 3, &c. They advanced to Hazaron-Tamar, otherwise Engedi. Jehoshaphat went with his people to the temple, and put up prayers to God. Jahaziel, the son of Zechariah, by the Spirit of the Lord, encouraged the king, and promised that the next day he should obtain a victory without fighting. Accordingly, these people being assembled the next day against Judah, quarrell'd, and killed one another; and Jehoshaphat and his army had only to gather their spoils. This prince continued to walk in the ways of the Lord; yet he did not destroy the high places, and the hearts of the people were not entirely directed to the God of their fathers. Jehoshaphat died after a reign of twenty-five years, and was buried in the royal sepulchre; and his son, Jehoram reigned in his stead.

2. Jehoshaphat, Valley of. This valley is a deep and narrow glen, which runs from north to south, between the Mount of Olives and Mount Moriah; the brook Cedron flowing through the middle of it, which is dry the greatest part of the year, but has a current of 505a red colour, after storms, or in rainy seasons. The Prophet Joel, iii, 2, 12, says, "The Lord will gather all nations in the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there." Abenezra is of opinion, that this valley is the place where King Jehoshaphat obtained a signal victory over the Moabites, Ammonites, and Meonians of Arabia Petræa, 2 Chron. xx, 1, &c, toward the Dead Sea, beyond the wilderness of Tekoah, which after that event was called the valley of blessing, verse 26. Others think it lies between the walls of Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives. Cyril, of Alexandria, on Joel iii, says that this valley is but a few furlongs distant from Jerusalem. Lastly, some maintain that the ancient Hebrews had named no particular place the valley of Jehoshaphat; but that Joel intended generally the place where God would judge the nations, and will appear at the last judgment in the brightness of his majesty. Jehoshaphat, in Hebrew, signifies "the judgment of God." It is

very probable that the valley of Jehoshaphat, that is, of God's judgment, is symbolical, as well as the valley of slaughter, in the same chapter. From this passage, however, the Jews and many Christians have been of opinion, that the last judgment will be solemnized in the valley of Jehoshaphat.

JEHOVAH, יהוה the proper and incommunicable name of the Divine Essence. That this divine name, Jehovah, was well known to the Heathens, there can be no doubt. Sanchoniathon writes Jebo; Diodorus, the Sicilian, Macrobius, St. Clemens Alexandrinus, St. Jerom, and Origen, pronounce Jao; Epiphanius, Theodoret, and the Samaritans, Jabe, Javé. We likewise find in the ancients, Jahoh, Javo, Javu, Jaod. The Moors call their god Jaba, whom some believe to be the same as Jehovah. The Latins, in all probability, took their Javis, or Jovis Pater, from Jehovah.

The Jews, after their captivity in Babylon, out of an excessive and superstitious respect for this name, left off to pronounce it, and thus lost the true pronounciation. The Septuagint generally renders it Κύριος, "the Lord." Origen, St. Jerom, and Eusebius, testify that in their time the Jews left the name of Jehovah written in their copies in Samaritan characters, instead of writing it in the common Chaldee or Hebrew characters; which shows their veneration for this holy name: and the fear they were under, lest strangers, who were not unacquainted with the Chaldee letters and language, should discover and misapply it. The Jews call this name of God the Tetragrammaton, or the name with four letters. It would be waste of time and patience to repeat all that has been said on this incommunicable name: it may not be amiss, however, to remind the reader, 1. That although it signifies the state of being, yet it forms no verb. 2. It never assumes a plural form. 3. It does not admit an article, or take an affix. 4. Neither is it placed in a state of construction with other words; though other words may be in construction with it. It seems to be a compound of יה, the essence, and הוה, existing; that is, always existing; whence the word eternal appears to express its import; or, as it is well rendered, "He who is, and who was, and who is to come," Rev. i, 4; xi, 17; that is, eternal, as the schoolmen speak, both a parte ante, and a parte post. Compare John viii, 58. It is usually marked by an abbreviation, ך, in Jewish books, where it must be alluded to. It is also abbreviated in the term יה, Jah, which, the reader will observe, enters into the formation of many Hebrew appellations. See Jah.

JEHU, the son of Jehoshaphat, and grandson of Nimshi, captain of the troops of Joram the king of Israel, was appointed by God to reign over Israel, and to avenge the sins committed by the house of Ahab, 1 Kings xix, 16. The Prophet Elisha received a commission to anoint him; but the order does not appear to have been executed until more than twenty years afterward, and then it was done by one of the sons of the prophets, 2 Kings



ix, 1–3. Jehu was then at the siege of Ramoth-Gilead, commanding the army of Joram, the king of Israel, when a young prophet appeared, who took him aside from the officers of the army, in the midst of whom he was sitting, and, when alone in a chamber, poured oil on his head, and said to him, “Thus saith the Lord, I have anointed thee king over Israel; thou shalt smite the house of Ahab, and avenge the blood of the prophets which hath been shed by Jezebel. For the whole house of Ahab shall perish, and I will make it as that of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, and that of Baasha, the son of Ahijah. Jezebel shall be eaten by the dogs in the fields of Jezreel, and there shall be none to bury her,” 2 Kings ix, 1–10. No sooner had the prophet delivered his message, than, to avoid being known, he instantly withdrew; and Jehu, returning to the company of his brother officers, was by them interrogated respecting what had taken place. He informed them that a prophet had been sent from God to anoint him to the kingly office; on which they all rose up, and each taking his cloak, they made a kind of throne for Jehu, and then sounding the trumpets, cried out, “Jehu is king.” Joram, who at that time reigned over the kingdom of Israel, was then at Jezreel in a state of indisposition, having been wounded at the siege of Ramoth-Gilead. Jehu, intending to surprise him, immediately gave orders that no one should be permitted to depart out of the city of Ramoth, and himself set off for Jezreel. As he approached that city, a centinel gave notice that he saw a troop coming in great haste; on which Joram despatched an officer to discover who it was; but Jehu, without giving the latter any answer, ordered him to follow in his rear. Joram sent a second, and Jehu laid upon him the same command. Finding that neither of them returned, Joram himself, accompanied by Ahaziah, king of Judah, proceeded in his chariot toward Jehu, whom they met in the field of Naboth the Jezreelite. Joram inquired, “Is it peace, Jehu?” To which the latter replied, “How can there be 506peace so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel, and her witchcrafts, are so many?” Joram instantly took the alarm, and, turning to Ahaziah, said, “We are betrayed.” At the same time Jehu drew his bow, and smote Joram between his shoulders, so that the arrow pierced his heart, and he died in his chariot. Jehu then gave orders that his body should be cast out into the field of Naboth the Jezreelite, thus fulfilling the prediction of the Prophet Elijah, 2 Kings ix, 11–26.

Jehu next proceeded to Jezreel, where Jezebel herself at that time resided. As he rode through the streets of the city, Jezebel, who was standing at her window and looking at him, exclaimed, “Can he who has killed his master hope for peace?” Jehu, lifting up his head and seeing her, commanded her servants instantly to throw her out at the window; which they did, and she was immediately trampled to death under the horses’ feet as they traversed the city. To complete her destiny, and fulfil the threatenings of Elijah, the dogs came and devoured her corpse; so that when Jehu sent to have her

buried, her bones only were found, 2 Kings ix, 27–37. After this, Jehu sent to inform the inhabitants of Samaria, who had the bringing up of Ahab's seventy children, that they might select which of them they thought proper to place upon the throne of Israel. But overwhelmed with fear, they replied that they were Jehu's servants, and would in all things obey him. He then commanded them to put to death all the king's children, and send their heads to him; which was accordingly done on the following day. Jehu also caused to be put to death all Ahab's relatives and friends, the officers of his court, and the priests whom he had entertained at Jezreel, 2 Kings x, 1–11. After this, Jehu proceeded to Samaria, and on his way thither met the friends of Ahaziah, king of Judah, who were going to Jezreel to salute the children of Ahab's family, with the death of whom they were as yet unacquainted. They were forty-two in number; but Jehu gave orders to have them apprehended and put to death. Soon after this, he met with Jonathan, the son of Rechab; and taking him up into his chariot, "Come with me," said he, "and see my zeal for the Lord." And when he was come to Samaria he extirpated every remaining branch of Ahab's family, without sparing an individual. Then convening the people of Samaria, he said, "Ahab paid some honours to Baal, but I will pay him greater. Send now and gather together all the ministers, priests, and prophets of Baal." When they were all assembled in Baal's temple, Jehu commanded to give each of them a particular habit, to distinguish them; at the same time directing that no stranger should mingle with them; and then ordered his people to put them all to the sword, not sparing one of them; the image of Baal was also pulled down, broken to pieces, and burned, the temple itself destroyed, and the place where it stood reduced to a dunghill, 2 Kings x, 12–28.

Such were the sanguinary exploits of Jehu toward the idolatrous house of Ahab; but he acted agreeably to divine direction, and the Lord in these instances so far approved his conduct, as to promise him that his children should sit upon the throne of Israel to the fourth generation. Yet, though Jehu had been the instrument in the hand of God for taking vengeance on the profane house of Ahab, we find him accused in Scripture of not entirely forsaking the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin in worshipping the golden calves, 2 Kings x, 29, 31. It appears also that, in executing the divine indignation on the wicked house of Ahab, he was actuated more by the spirit of ambition and animosity than the fear of God, or a regard to the purity of his worship. And thus it is that God, in the course of his providence, makes use of tyrants and wicked men, as his instruments to execute his righteous judgments in the earth. After a reign of eight-and-twenty years over Israel, Jehu died, and was succeeded by his son, Jehoahaz; but his reign was embittered by the war which Hazael, king of Syria, long waged against him, 2 Kings x, 32–36. His four descendants,

who succeeded him in the throne, were Jehoahaz, Joash, Jeroboam II. and Zechariah.

JEPHTHAH, one of the judges of Israel, was the son of Gilead by a concubine, Judges xi, 1, 2. His father having several other children by his lawful wife, they conspired to expel Jephthah from among them, insisting that he who was the son of a strange woman should have no part of the inheritance with them. Like Ishmael, therefore, he withdrew, and took up his residence beyond Jordan, in the land of Tob, where he appears to have become the chief of a banditti, or marauding party, who probably lived by plunder, Judges xi, 3. In process of time, a war broke out between the Ammonites and the children of Israel who inhabited the country beyond Jordan; and the latter, finding their want of an intrepid and skilful leader, applied to Jephthah to take the command of them. He at first reproached them with the injustice they had done him, in banishing him from his father's house; but he at length yielded to their importunity, on an agreement that, should he be successful in the war against the Ammonites, the Israelites should acknowledge him for their chief, Judges xi, 4–11.

As soon as Jephthah was invested with the command of the Israelites he sent a deputation to the Ammonites, demanding to know on what principle the latter had taken up arms against them. They answered that it was to recover the territory which the former had taken from them on their first coming out of Egypt. Jephthah replied that they had made no conquests in that quarter but from the Amorites; adding, "If you think you have a right to all that Chemosh, your god, hath given you, why should not we possess all that the Lord our God hath conferred on us by right of conquest?" Jephthah's reasoning availed nothing with the Ammonites; and as the latter persisted in waging war, the former collected his troops together and put himself at their head. The Spirit of the Lord is said to have now come upon Jephthah; by which we are here to understand, that the Lord endowed him with a spirit of valour and fortitude, adequate to the exigence of the situation in which he was placed, animating him with courage for the battle, and especially inspired him with unshaken confidence in the God of the armies of Israel, Judges xi, 17; Heb. xi, 32; 1 Sam. xi, 6; Num. xxiv, 2. Jephthah at this time made a vow to the Lord that if he delivered the Ammonites into his hand, whatever came forth out of the doors of his house to meet him when he returned should be the Lord's; it is also added in our English version, "and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering," Judges xi, 31. The battle terminated auspiciously for Jephthah; the Ammonites were defeated, and the Israelites ravaged their country. But on returning toward his own house, his daughter, an only child, came out to meet her father with timbrels and dances, accompanied by a chorus of virgins, to celebrate his victory. On seeing her, Jephthah rent his clothes, and said, "Alas, my

daughter! thou hast brought me very low; for I have opened my mouth to the Lord, and cannot go back.” His daughter intimated her readiness to accede to any vow he might have made in which she was personally interested; only claiming a respite of two months, during which she might go up to the mountains and bewail her virginity with her companions. Jephthah yielded to this request, and at the end of two months, according to the opinion of many, her father offered her up in sacrifice, as a burnt-offering to the Lord, Judges xi, 34–39. It is, however, scarcely necessary to mention, that almost from the days of Jephthah to the present time, it has been a subject of warm contest among the critics and commentators, whether the judge of Israel really sacrificed his daughter, or only devoted her to a state of celibacy. Among those who contend for the former opinion, may be particularly mentioned the very learned Professor Michaëlis, who insists most peremptorily that the words, “did with her as he had vowed,” cannot mean any thing else but that her father put her to death, and burned her body as a burnt-offering. On this point, however, the remarks of Dr. Hales are of great weight:--When Jephthah went forth to battle against the Ammonites “he vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, If thou wilt surely give the children of Ammon into my hand, then it shall be, that whatsoever cometh out of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall either be the Lord’s, or I will offer it up [for] a burnt-offering,” Judges xi, 30, 31. According to this rendering of the two conjunctions, ו, in the last clause, either, or, which is justified by the Hebrew idiom, the paucity of connecting particles in that language making it necessary that this conjunction should often be understood disjunctively, the vow consisted of two parts, 1. That what person soever met him should be the Lord’s, or be dedicated to his service. 2. That what beast soever met him, if clean, should be offered up for a burnt-offering unto the Lord. This rendering, and this interpretation, is warranted by the Levitical law about vows. The נדר, or vow in general, included either persons, beasts, or things, dedicated to the Lord for pious uses; which, if it was a simple vow, was redeemable at certain prices, if the person repented of his vow, and wished to commute it for money, according to the age and sex of the person, Lev. xxvii, 1–8. This was a wise regulation to remedy rash vows. But if the vow was accompanied with חרם, devotement, it was irredeemable, as in the following cases: “Notwithstanding, no devotement which a man shall devote unto the Lord, [either] of man, or of beast, or of land of his own property, shall be sold or redeemed. Every thing devoted is most holy unto the Lord,” Lev. xxvii, 28. Here the three vavs in the original should necessarily be rendered disjunctively, or, as the last actually is in our public translation, because there are three distinct subjects of devotement, to be applied to distinct uses; the man, to be dedicated to the service of the Lord, as Samuel by his mother, Hannah, 1 Sam. i, 11; the cattle, if clean, such as oxen, sheep, goats, turtle doves, or pigeons, to be sacrificed; and if unclean,

as camels, horses, asses, to be employed for carrying burdens in the service of the tabernacle or temple; and the lands, to be sacred property. This law, therefore, expressly applied, in its first branch, to Jephthah's case, who had devoted his daughter to the Lord, or opened his mouth unto the Lord, and therefore could not go back; as he declared in his grief at seeing his daughter, and his only child, coming to meet him with timbrels and dances. She was, therefore, necessarily devoted, but with her own consent, to perpetual virginity, in the service of the tabernacle, Judges xi, 36, 37. And such service was customary; for in the division of the spoils taken in the first Midianite war, of the whole number of captive virgins, "the Lord's tribute was thirty-two persons," Num. xxxi, 35–40. This instance appears to be decisive of the nature of her devotement. Her father's extreme grief on this occasion, and her requisition of a respite of two months to bewail her virginity, are both perfectly natural: having no other issue, he could only look forward to the extinction of his name or family; and a state of celibacy, which is reproachful among women every where, was peculiarly so among the Israelites; and was therefore no ordinary sacrifice on her part, who, though she generously gave up, could not but regret the loss of becoming "a mother in Israel." And he did with her according to his vow which he had vowed, and she knew no man," or remained a virgin all her life, Judges xi, 34–49. There was also another case of devotement which was irredeemable, and follows the former: "No one devoted, who shall be devoted of man, shall be redeemed, but shall surely be put to death," Levit. xxvii, 29. This case differs materially from the former: 1. It is confined to persons devoted, omitting beasts and lands. 2. It does not relate to private property, as in the foregoing. 3. The subject of it was to be utterly destroyed, instead of being "most holy unto the Lord." This law, therefore, related to aliens or public enemies devoted to destruction, either by God, by the people, or by the magistrate. Of all these we have instances in the Scriptures: 1. The Amalekites and Canaanites were devoted by God himself. Saul, therefore, was guilty of a breach of this law for sparing Agag, the king of the Amalekites, as Samuel reproached him, 1 Sam. xv, 23: and "Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord," not as a sacrifice, according to Voltaire, but as a criminal, "whose sword had made many women childless." By this law the Midianite women, who had been spared in battle, were slain, Num. xxxi, 14–17. 2. In Mount Hor, when the Israelites were attacked by Arad, king of the southern Canaanites, who took some of them prisoners, they vowed a vow unto the Lord, that they would utterly destroy these Canaanites, and their cities, if the Lord should deliver them into their hand; which the Lord ratified. Whence the place was called Hhormah, because the vow was accompanied by cherem, or devotement to destruction, Num. xxi, 1–3. And the vow was accomplished, Judges i, 17. 3. In the Philistine war, Saul adjured the people, and cursed any one that should taste food until the evening. His own son, Jonathan, inadvertently

ate a honey comb, not knowing of his father's oath, for which Saul sentenced him to die. But the people interposed, and rescued him, for his public services; thus assuming the power of dispensing, in their collective capacity, with an unreasonable oath, 1 Sam. xiv, 24–45. This latter case, therefore, is utterly irrelative to Jephthah's vow, which did not regard a foreign enemy, or a domestic transgressor, devoted to destruction, but, on the contrary, was a vow of thanksgiving, and therefore properly came under the former case. And that Jephthah could not possibly have sacrificed his daughter, according to the vulgar opinion, founded on incorrect translation, may appear from the following considerations: 1. The sacrifice of children to Moloch was an abomination to the Lord, of which in numberless passages, he expresses his detestation; and it was prohibited by an express law, under pain of death, as "a defilement of God's sanctuary, and a profanation of his holy name," Levit. xx, 2, 3. Such a sacrifice, therefore, unto the Lord himself, must be a still higher abomination. And there is no precedent of any such under the law, in the Old Testament. 2. The case of Isaac before the law, is irrelevant; for Isaac was not sacrificed; and it was only proposed for a trial of Abraham's faith. 3. No father, merely by his own authority, could put an offending, much less an innocent, child to death, upon any account, without the sentence of the magistrates, Deut. xxi, 18–21, and the consent of the people, as in Jonathan's case. 4. The Mischna, or traditional law of the Jews, is pointedly against it: "If a Jew should devote his son or daughter, his man or maid servant, who are Hebrews, the devotement would be void; because no man can devote what is not his own, or of whose life he has not the absolute disposal."

These arguments appear to be decisive against the sacrifice; and that Jephthah could not even have devoted his daughter to celibacy against her will, is evident from the history, and from the high estimation in which she was always held by the daughters of Israel, for her filial duty, and her hapless fate, which they celebrated by a regular anniversary commemoration four days in the year, Judges xi, 40. We may, however, remark, that, if it could be more clearly established that Jephthah actually immolated his daughter, there is not the least evidence that his conduct was sanctioned by God. Jephthah was manifestly a superstitious and ill-instructed man, and, like Samson, an instrument of God's power, rather than an example of his grace.

**JEREMIAH.** The Prophet Jeremiah was of the sacerdotal race, being, as he records himself, one of the priests that dwelt at Anathoth, in the land of Benjamin, a city appropriated out of that tribe to the use of the priests, the sons of Aaron, Joshua xxi, 18, and situate, as we learn from St. Jerom, about three miles north of Jerusalem. Some have supposed his father to have been that Hilkah, the high priest, by whom the book of the law was

found in the temple in the reign of Josiah: but for this there is no better ground than his having borne the same name, which was no uncommon one among the Jews; whereas, had he been in reality the high priest, he would doubtless have been mentioned by that distinguishing title, and not put upon a level with priests of an ordinary and inferior class. Jeremiah appears to have been very young when he was called to the exercise of the prophetic office, from which he modestly endeavoured to excuse himself by pleading his youth and incapacity; but being overruled by the divine authority, he set himself to discharge the duties of his function with unremitting diligence and fidelity during a period of at least forty-two years, reckoned from the thirteenth year of Josiah's reign. In the course of his ministry he met with great difficulties and opposition from his countrymen of all degrees, whose persecution and ill usage sometimes wrought so far upon his mind, as to draw from him expressions, in the bitterness of his soul, which many have thought hard to reconcile with his religious principles; but which, when duly considered, may be found to demand our pity for his unremitting sufferings, rather than our censure for any want of piety and reverence toward God. He was, in truth, a man of unblemished piety and conscientious integrity; a warm lover of his country, whose misery he pathetically deplores; and so affectionately attached to his countrymen, notwithstanding their injurious treatment of him, that he chose rather to abide with them, and undergo all hardships in their company, than separately to enjoy a state of ease and plenty, which the favour of the king of Babylon would have secured to him. At length, after the destruction of Jerusalem, being carried with the remnant of the Jews into Egypt, whither they had resolved to retire, though contrary to his advice, upon the murder of Gedaliah, whom the Chaldeans had left governor in Judea, he there continued warmly to remonstrate against their idolatrous practices, foretelling the consequences that would inevitably follow. But his freedom and zeal are said to have cost him his life; for the Jews at Tahpanhes, according to tradition, took such offence at him that they stoned him to death. This account of the manner of his end, though not absolutely certain, is at least very probable, considering the temper and disposition of the parties concerned. Their wickedness, however, did not long pass without its reward; for, in a few years after, they were miserably destroyed by the Babylonian armies which invaded Egypt according to the prophet's prediction, Jer. xlv, 27, 28.

The idolatrous apostasy, and other criminal enormities of the people of Judah, and the severe judgments which God was prepared to inflict upon them, but not without a distant prospect of future restoration and deliverance, are the principal subject matters of the prophecies of Jeremiah; excepting only the forty-fifth chapter, which relates personally to Baruch, and the six succeeding chapters, which respect the fortunes of some

particular Heathen nations. It is observable, however, that though many of these prophecies have their particular dates annexed to them, and other dates may be tolerably well conjectured from certain internal marks and circumstances, there appears much disorder in the arrangement, not easy to be accounted for on any principle of regular design, but probably the result of some accident or other, which has disturbed the original order. The best arrangement of the chapters appears to be according to the list which will be subjoined; the different reigns in which the prophecies were delivered were most probably as follows: The first twelve chapters seem to contain all the prophecies delivered in the reign of the good King Josiah. During the short reign of Shallum, or Jehoahaz, his second son, who succeeded him, Jeremiah does not appear to have had any revelation. Jehoiakim, the eldest son of Josiah, succeeded. The prophecies of this reign are continued on from the thirteenth to the twentieth chapter inclusively; to which we must add the twenty-second, twenty-third, twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, thirty-fifth, and thirty-sixth chapters, together with the forty-fifth, forty-sixth, forty-seventh, and most probably the forty-eighth, and as far as the thirty-fourth verse of the forty-ninth chapter. Jeconiah, the son of Jehoiakim, succeeded. We read of no prophecy that Jeremiah actually delivered in this king's reign; but the fate of Jeconiah, his being carried into captivity, and continuing an exile till the time of his death, were foretold early in his father's reign, as may be particularly seen in the twenty-second chapter. The last king of Judah was Zedekiah, the youngest son of Josiah. The prophecies delivered in his reign are contained in the twenty-first and twenty-fourth chapters, the twenty-seventh to the thirty-fourth, and the thirty-seventh to the thirty-ninth inclusively, together with the last six verses of the forty-ninth chapter, and the fiftieth and fifty-first chapters concerning the fall of Babylon. The siege of Jerusalem, in the reign of Zedekiah, and the capture of the city, are circumstantially related in the fifty-second chapter; and a particular account of the subsequent transactions is given in the fortieth to the forty-fourth inclusively. The arrangement of the chapters, alluded to above, is here subjoined: i-xx, xxii, xxiii, xxv, xxvi, xxxv, xxxvi, xlv, xxiv, xxix-xxxi, xxvii, xxviii, xxxi, xxxiv, xxxvii, xxxii, xxxiii, xxxviii, xxxix, from the fifteenth to the eighteenth verse, xxxix, from the first to the fourteenth verse, xl-xliv, xlvi, and so on.

The prophecies of Jeremiah, of which the circumstantial accomplishment is often specified in the Old and New Testament, are of a very distinguished and illustrious character. He foretold the fate of Zedekiah, Jer. xxxiv, 2-5; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 11-21; 2 Kings xxv, 5; Jer. lii, 11; the Babylonish captivity, the precise time of its duration, and the return of the Jews. He describes the destruction of Babylon, and the downfall of many nations, Jer. xxv, 12; ix, 26; xxv, 19-25; xlii, 10-18; xlvi, and the following chapters, in predictions, of which the gradual and successive completion kept up the confidence of



the Jews for the accomplishment of those prophecies, which he delivered relative to the Messiah and his period, Jer. xxiii, 5, 6; xxx, 9; xxxi, 15; xxxii, 14–18; xxxiii, 9–26. He foreshowed the miraculous conception of Christ, Jer. xxxi, 22, the virtue of his atonement, the spiritual character of his covenant, and the inward efficacy of his laws, Jer. xxxi, 31–36; xxxiii, 8. Jeremiah, contemplating those calamities which impended over his country, represented, in the most descriptive terms, and under the most impressive images, the destruction that the invading enemy should produce. He bewailed, in pathetic expostulation, the shameless adulteries which had provoked the Almighty, after long forbearance, to threaten Judah with inevitable punishment, at the time that false prophets deluded the nation with the promises of “assured peace,” and when the people, in impious contempt of “the Lord’s word,” defied its accomplishment. Jeremiah intermingles with his prophecies some historical relations relative to his own conduct, and to the completion of those predictions which he had delivered. The reputation of Jeremiah had spread among foreign nations, and his prophecies were deservedly celebrated in other countries. Many Heathen writers also have undesignedly borne testimony to the truth and accuracy of his prophetic and historical descriptions.

As to the style of Jeremiah, says Bishop Lowth, this prophet is by no means wanting either in elegance or sublimity, although, generally speaking, inferior to Isaiah in both. 510His thoughts, indeed, are somewhat less elevated, and he is commonly more large and diffuse in his sentences; but the reason of this may be, that he is mostly taken up with the gentler passions of grief and pity, for the expression of which he has a peculiar talent. This is most evident in the Lamentations, where those passions altogether predominate; but it is often visible also in his prophecies, in the former part of the book more especially, which is principally poetical; the middle parts are chiefly historical; but the last part, consisting of six chapters, is entirely poetical, and contains several oracles distinctly marked, in which this prophet falls very little short of the lofty style of Isaiah. But of the whole book of Jeremiah it is hardly the one half which I look upon as poetical.

Jeremiah survived to behold the sad accomplishment of all his darkest predictions. He witnessed all the horrors of the famine, and, when that had done its work, the triumph of the enemy. He saw the strong holds of the city cast down, the palace of Solomon, the temple of God, with all its courts, its roofs of cedar and of gold, levelled to the earth, or committed to the flames; the sacred vessels, the ark of the covenant itself, with the cherubim, pillaged by profane hands. What were the feelings of a patriotic and religious Jew at this tremendous crisis, he has left on record in his unrivalled elegies. Never did city suffer a more miserable fate, never was

ruined city lamented in language so exquisitely pathetic. Jerusalem is, as it were, personified, and bewailed with the passionate sorrow of private and domestic attachment; while the more general pictures of the famine, the common misery of every rank, and age, and sex, all the desolation, the carnage, the violation, the dragging away into captivity, the remembrance of former glories, of the gorgeous ceremonies and the glad festivals, the awful sense of the divine wrath heightening the present calamities, are successively drawn with all the life and reality of an eye-witness. They combine the truth of history with the deepest pathos of poetry.

JERICHO was a city of Benjamin, about seven leagues from Jerusalem, and two from the Jordan, Joshua xviii, 21. Moses calls it the city of palm trees, Deut. xxxiv, 3, because of palm trees growing in the plain of Jericho. Josephus says, that in the territory of this city were not only many palm trees, but also the balsam tree. The valley of Jericho was watered by a rivulet which had been formerly salt and bitter, but was sweetened by the Prophet Elisha, 2 Kings ii, 19. Jericho was the first city in Canaan taken by Joshua, ii, 1, 2, &c. He sent thither spies, who were received by Rahab, lodged in her house, and preserved from the king of Jericho. Joshua received orders to besiege Jericho, soon after his passage over Jordan, Joshua vi, 1–3, &c. God commanded the Hebrews to march round the city once a day for seven days together. The soldiers marched first, probably out of the reach of the enemies' arrows, and after them the priests, the ark, &c. On the seventh day, they marched seven times round the city; and at the seventh, while the trumpets were sounding, and all the people shouting, the walls fell down. The rabbins say, that the first day was our Sunday, and the seventh the Sabbath day. During the first six days, the people continued in profound silence; but on the seventh Joshua commanded them to shout. Accordingly they all exerted their voices, and the walls being overthrown, they entered the city, every man in the place opposite to him. Jericho being devoted by God, they set fire to the city, and consecrated all the gold, silver, and brass. Then Joshua said, "Cursed be the man before the Lord who shall rebuild Jericho." About five hundred and thirty years after this, Hiel, of Bethel, undertook to rebuild it; but he lost his eldest son, Abiram, at laying the foundations, and his youngest son, Segub, when he hung up the gates. However, we are not to imagine that there was no city of Jericho till the time of Hiel. There was a city of palm trees, probably the same as Jericho, under the Judges, Judges iii, 13. David's ambassadors, who had been insulted by the Ammonites, resided at Jericho till their beards were grown, 2 Sam. x, 4. There was, therefore, a city of Jericho which stood in the neighbourhood of the original Jericho. These two places are distinguished by Josephus. After Hiel of Bethel had rebuilt old Jericho, no one scrupled to dwell there. Our Saviour wrought miracles at Jericho.

According to Pococke, the mountains to which the absurd name of Quarantania has been arbitrarily given, are the highest in all Judea; and he is probably correct; they form part of a chain extending from Scythopolis into Idumea. The fountain of Elisha he states to be a soft water, rather warm; he found in it some small shell fish of the turbinated kind. Close by the ruined aqueduct are the remains of a fine paved way, with a fallen column, supposed to be a Roman milestone. The hills nearest to Jerusalem consist, according to Hasselquist, of a very hard limestone; and different sorts of plants are found on them, in particular the myrtle, the carob tree, and the turpentine tree; but farther toward Jericho they are bare and barren, the hard limestone giving way to a looser kind, sometimes white and sometimes grayish, with interjacent layers of a reddish micaceous stone, saxum purum micaceum. The vales, though now bare and uncultivated, and full of pebbles, contain good red mould, which would amply reward the husbandman's toil. Nothing can be more savage than the present aspect of these wild and gloomy solitudes, through which runs the very road where is laid the scene of that exquisite parable, the good Samaritan, and from that time to the present, it has been the haunt of the most desperate bandits, being one of the most dangerous in Palestine. Sometimes the track leads along the edges of cliffs and precipices, which threaten destruction on the slightest false step; at other times it winds through craggy passes, overshadowed by projecting 511 or perpendicular rocks. At one place the road has been cut through the very apex of a hill, the rocks overhanging it on either side. Here, in 1820, an English traveller, Sir Frederick Henniker, was attacked by the Arabs with fire-arms, who stripped him naked, and left him severely wounded: "It was past mid-day, and burning hot," says Sir Frederick; "I bled profusely; and two vultures, whose business it is to consume corpses, were hovering over me. I should scarcely have had strength to resist, had they chosen to attack me."

The modern village of Jericho is described by Mr. Buckingham as a settlement of about fifty dwellings, all very mean in their appearance, and fenced in front with thorny bushes, while a barrier of the same kind, the most effectual that could be raised against mounted Arabs, encircles the town. A fine brook flows by it, which empties itself into the Jordan; the nearest point of that river is about three miles distant. The grounds in the immediate vicinity of the village, being fertilized by this stream, bear crops of dourra, Indian corn, rice, and onions. The population is entirely Mohammedan, and is governed by a sheikh: their habits are those of Bedouins, and robbery and plunder form their chief and most gainful occupation. The whole of the road from Jerusalem to the Jordan, is held to be the most dangerous in Palestine; and indeed, in this portion of it, the very aspect of the scenery is sufficient, on the one hand, to tempt to robbery and murder, and, on the other, to occasion a dread of it in those who pass

that way. One must be amid these wild and gloomy solitudes, surrounded by an armed band, and feel the impatience of the traveller who rushes on to catch a new view at every pass and turn; one must be alarmed at the very tramp of the horses' hoofs rebounding through the caverned rocks, and at the savage shouts of the footmen, scarcely less loud than the echoing thunder produced by the discharge of their pieces in the valleys; one must witness all this upon the spot, before the full force and beauty of the admirable story of the good Samaritan can be perceived. Here, pillage, wounds, and death would be accompanied with double terror, from the frightful aspect of every thing around. Here, the unfeeling act of passing by a fellow creature in distress, as the priest and Levite are said to have done, strikes one with horror, as an act almost more than inhuman. And here, too, the compassion of the good Samaritan is doubly virtuous, from the purity of the motive which must have led to it, in a spot where no eyes were fixed on him to draw forth the performance of any duty, and from the bravery which was necessary to admit of a man's exposing himself, by such delay, to the risk of a similar fate to that from which he was endeavouring to rescue his fellow creature.

JEROBOAM, the son of Nebat and Zeruah, was born at Zereda, in the tribe of Ephraim, 1 Kings xi, 26. He is the subject of frequent mention in Scripture, as having been the cause of the ten tribes revolting from the dominion of Rehoboam, and also of his having "made Israel to sin," by instituting the idolatrous worship of the golden calves at Dan and Bethel, 1 Kings xii, 26–33. He seems to have been a bold, unprincipled, and enterprising man, with much of the address of a deep politician about him; qualities which probably pointed him out to King Solomon as a proper person to be entrusted with the obnoxious commission of levying certain taxes throughout the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. On a certain day, as Jeroboam was going out of Jerusalem into the country, having a new cloak wrapped about his shoulders, the Prophet Ahijah met him in a field where they were alone, and seizing the cloak of Jeroboam, he cut it into twelve pieces, and then addressing him, said, "Take ten of them to thyself; for thus saith the Lord, I will divide and rend the kingdom of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee. If, therefore, thou obeyest my word and walkest in my ways as David my servant has done, I will be with thee, and will establish thy house for ever, and put thee in possession of the kingdom of Israel," 1 Kings xi, 14–39. Whether it were that the promises thus made by Ahijah prompted Jeroboam to aim at taking their accomplishment into his own hands, and, with a view to that, began to solicit the subjects of Solomon to revolt; or whether the bare information of what had passed between the prophet and Jeroboam, excited his fear and jealousy, it appears evident that the aged monarch took the alarm, and attempted to apprehend Jeroboam, who, getting notice of what was intended him, made a

precipitate retreat into Egypt, where he remained till the death of Solomon. He then returned, and found that Rehoboam, who had succeeded his father Solomon in the throne of David, had already excited the disgust of ten of the tribes by some arbitrary proceedings, in consequence of which they had withdrawn their allegiance from the new monarch. These tribes no sooner heard of his return than they invited him to appear among them in a general assembly, in which they elected him to be king over Israel. Jeroboam fixed his residence at Shechem, and there fortified himself; he also rebuilt Penuel, a city beyond Jordan, putting it into a state of defence, in order to keep the tribes quiet which were on that side Jordan, 1 Kings xii, 1–25.

But Jeroboam soon forgot the duty which he owed to God, who had given him the kingdom; and thought of nothing but how to maintain himself in the possession of it, though he discarded the worship of the true God. The first suggestion of his unbelieving heart was, that if the tribes over whom he reigned were to go up to Jerusalem to sacrifice and keep the annual festivals, they would be under continual temptations to return to the house of David. To counteract this, he caused two golden calves to be made as objects of religious worship, one of which he placed at Dan, and the other at Bethel, the two extremities of his dominions; and caused a proclamation to be made throughout all his territories, that in future none of his subjects should go up to Jerusalem to worship; and, directing them to the two calves which had been recently erected, he cried out, “Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of Egypt!” He also caused idolatrous temples to be built, and priests to be ordained of the lowest of the people, who were neither of the family of Aaron nor of the tribe of Levi, 1 Kings xii, 26–33. Having appointed a solemn public festival to be observed on the fifteenth day of the eighth month, in order to dedicate his new altar and consecrate his golden calves, he assembled the people at Bethel, and himself went up to the altar for the purpose of offering incense and sacrifices. At that instant a prophet, who had come, divinely directed, from Judah to Bethel, accosted Jeroboam, and said, “O altar, altar, thus saith the Lord, A child shall be born to the house of David, Josiah by name; and upon thee shall he sacrifice the priests of the high places who now burn incense upon thee: he shall burn men’s bones upon thee.” To confirm the truth of this threatening, the prophet also added a sign, namely, that the altar should immediately be rent asunder, and the ashes and every thing upon it poured upon the earth. Jeroboam, incensed at this interference of the prophet, stretched out his hand and commanded him to be seized; but the hand which he had stretched out was instantly paralyzed, and he was unable to draw it back again. The altar, too, was broken, and the ashes upon it fell to the ground according to the prediction of the prophet. Jeroboam now solicited his prayers that his hand might be restored to him. The man of God interposed his supplication to Heaven, and the king’s hand was

restored to him sound as before. Jeroboam then entreated him that he would accompany him to his own house, and accept a reward; but he answered, "Though thou shouldst give me the half of thine house, I would not go with thee, nor will I taste any thing in this place, for the Lord hath expressly forbidden me to do so," 1 Kings xiii, 1–10. But notwithstanding this manifest indication of the displeasure of Heaven, it failed of recovering Jeroboam from his impious procedure. He continued to encourage his subjects in idolatry, by appointing priests of the high places, and engaging them in such worship as was contrary to the divine law. This was the sin of Jeroboam's family, and it was the cause of its utter extirpation. Some time after his accession to the throne of Israel, his favourite son Abijah fell sick, and, to relieve his parental solicitude, Jeroboam instructed his wife to disguise herself, and in that state to go and consult the Prophet Ahijah concerning his recovery. This was the same prophet who had foretold to Jeroboam that he should be king of Israel. He was now blind through old age; but the prophet was warned of her approach, and, before she entered his threshold, he called her by name, told her that her son should die, and then, in appalling terms, denounced the impending ruin of Jeroboam's whole family, which shortly after came to pass. After a reign of two-and-twenty years, Jeroboam died, and Nadab, his son, succeeded to the crown, 1 Kings xiii, 33, 34; xiv, 1–20.

2. Jeroboam, the second of that name, was the son of Jehoash, king of Israel. He succeeded to his father's royal dignity, A. M. 3179, and reigned forty-one years. Though much addicted to the idolatrous practices of the son of Nebat, yet the Lord was pleased so far to prosper his reign, that by his means, according to the predictions of the Prophet Jonah, the kingdom of the ten tribes was restored from a state of great decay, into which it had fallen, and was even raised to a pitch of extraordinary splendour. The Prophets Amos and Hosea, as well as Jonah, lived during this reign.

JERUSALEM, formerly called Jebus, or Salem, Joshua xviii, 28; Heb. vii, 2, the capital of Judea, situated partly in the tribe of Benjamin, and partly in that of Judah. It was not completely reduced by the Israelites till the reign of David, 2 Sam. v, 6–9. As Jerusalem was the centre of the true worship, Psalm cxxii, 4, and the place where God did in a peculiar manner dwell, first in the tabernacle, 2 Sam. vi, 7, 12; 1 Chron. xv, 1; xvi, 1; Psalm cxxxii, 13; cxxxv, 2, and afterward in the temple, 1 Kings vi, 13; so it is used figuratively to denote the church, or the celestial society, to which all that believe, both Jews and Gentiles, are come, and in which they are initiated, Gal. iv, 26; Heb. xii, 22; Rev. iii, 12; xxi, 2, 10. Jerusalem was situated in a stony and barren soil, and was about sixty furlongs in length, according to Strabo. The territory and places adjacent were well watered, having the fountains of Gihon and Siloam, and the brook Kidron, at the

foot of its walls; and, beside these, there were the waters of Ethan, which Pilate had conveyed through aqueducts into the city. The ancient city of Jerusalem, or Jebus, which David took from the Jebusites, was not very large. It was seated upon a mountain southward of the temple. The opposite mountain, situated to the north, is Sion, where David built a new city, which he called the city of David, wherein was the royal palace, and the temple of the Lord. The temple was built upon Mount Moriah, which was one of the little hills belonging to Mount Sion.

Through the reigns of David and Solomon, Jerusalem was the metropolis of the whole Jewish kingdom, and continued to increase in wealth and splendour. It was resorted to at the festivals by the whole population of the country; and the power and commercial spirit of Solomon, improving the advantages acquired by his father David, centred in it most of the eastern trade, both by sea, through the ports of Elath and Ezion-Geber, and over land, by the way of Tadmor or Palmyra. Or, at least, though Jerusalem might not have been made a depot of merchandise, the quantity of precious metals flowing into it by direct importation, and by duties imposed on goods passing to the ports of the Mediterranean, and in other directions, was unbounded. Some idea of the prodigious wealth of Jerusalem at this time may be formed by stating, that the quantity of gold left by David for the use of the temple amounted to £21,600,000 sterling, beside £3,150,000 in silver; and Solomon obtained £3,240,000 in gold by one voyage to Ophir, while silver was so abundant, "that it was not any thing accounted of." These were the days of Jerusalem's glory. Universal peace, unmeasured wealth, the wisdom and clemency of the prince, and the worship of the true God, marked Jerusalem, above every city, as enjoying the presence and the especial favour of the Almighty. But these days were not to last long: intestine divisions and foreign wars, wicked and tyrannical princes, and, last of all, the crime most offensive to Heaven, and the one least to be expected among so favoured a people, led to a series of calamities, through the long period of nine hundred years, with which no other city or nation can furnish a parallel. After the death of Solomon, ten of the twelve tribes revolted from his successor Rehoboam, and, under Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, established a separate kingdom: so that Jerusalem, no longer the capital of the whole empire, and its temple frequented only by the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, must have experienced a mournful declension. Four years after this, the city and temple were taken and plundered by Shishak, king of Egypt, 1 Kings xiv, 26, 27; 2 Chron. xii, 2-9. One hundred and forty-five years after, under Amaziah, they sustained the same fate from Joash, king of Israel, 2 Kings xiv; 2 Chron. xxv. One hundred and sixty years from this period, the city was again taken, by Esarhaddon, king of Assyria; and Manasseh, the king, carried a prisoner to Babylon, 2 Chron. xxxiii. Within the space of sixty-

six years more it was taken by Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, whom Josiah, king of Judah, had opposed in his expedition to Carchemish; and who, in consequence, was killed at the battle of Megiddo, and his son Eliakim placed on the throne in his stead by Necho, who changed his name to Jehoiakim, and imposed a heavy tribute upon him, having sent his elder brother, Jehoahaz, who had been proclaimed king at Jerusalem, a prisoner to Egypt, where he died, 2 Kings xxiii; 2 Chron. xxxv. Jerusalem was three times besieged and taken by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, within a very few years. The first, in the reign of the last mentioned king, Jehoiakim, who was sent a prisoner to Babylon, and the vessels of the temple transported to the same city, 2 Chron. xxxvi. The second, in that of his son Jehoiachin; when all the treasures of the palace and the temple, and the remainder of the vessels of the latter which had been hidden or spared in the first capture, were carried away or destroyed, and the best of the inhabitants, with the king, led into captivity, 2 Kings xxiv; 2 Chron. xxxvi. And the third, in the reign of Zedekiah, the successor of Jehoiachin; in whose ninth year the most formidable siege which this ill fated city ever sustained, except that of Titus, was commenced. It continued two years; during a great part of which the inhabitants suffered all the horrors of famine: when, on the ninth day of the fourth month, in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, which answers to July in the year B. C. 588, the garrison, with the king, endeavoured to make their escape from the city, but were pursued and defeated by the Chaldeans in the plains of Jericho; Zedekiah taken prisoner; his sons killed before his face at Riblah, whither he was taken to the king of Babylon; and he himself, after his eyes were put out, was bound with fetters of brass, and carried prisoner to Babylon, where he died: thus fulfilling the prophecy of Ezekiel, which declared that he should be carried to Babylon, but should not see the place, though he should die there, Ezekiel xii, 13. In the following month, the Chaldean army, under their general, Nebuzaradan, entered the city, took away every thing that was valuable, and then burned and utterly destroyed it, with its temple and walls, and left the whole razed to the ground. The entire population of the city and country, with the exception of a few husbandmen, were then carried captive to Babylon.

During seventy years, the city and temple lay in ruins: when those Jews who chose to take immediate advantage of the proclamation of Cyrus, under the conduct of Zerubbabel, returned to Jerusalem, and began to build the temple; all the vessels of gold and silver belonging to which, that had been taken away by Nebuchadnezzar, being restored by Cyrus. Their work, however, did not proceed far without opposition; for in the reign of Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, who in Scripture is called Ahasuerus, the Samaritans presented a petition to that monarch to put a stop to the building, Ezra iv, 6. Cambyses appears to have been too busily engaged in



his Egyptian expedition to pay any attention to this malicious request. His successor, Smerdis, the Magian, however, who in Scripture is called Artaxerxes, to whom a similar petition was sent, representing the Jews as a factious and dangerous people, listened to it, and, in the true spirit of a usurper, issued a decree putting a stop to the farther building of the temple, Ezra iv, 7, &c; which, in consequence, remained in an unfinished state till the second year, according to the Jewish, and third, according to the Babylonian and Persian account, of Darius Hystaspes, who is called simply Darius in Scripture. To him also a representation hostile to the Jews was made by their inveterate enemies, the Samaritans; but this noble prince refused to listen to it, and having searched the rolls of the kingdom, and found in the palace at Acmetha the decree of Cyrus, issued a similar one, which reached Jerusalem in the subsequent year, and even ordered these very Samaritans to assist the Jews in their work; so that it was completed in the sixth year of the same reign, Ezra iv, 24; v; vi, 1–15. But the city and walls remained in a ruinous condition until the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, the Artaxerxes Longimanus of profane history; by whom Nehemiah was sent to Jerusalem, with a power granted to him to rebuild them. Accordingly, under the direction of this zealous servant of God, the walls were speedily raised, but not without the accustomed opposition on the part of the Samaritans; who, despairing of the success of an application to the court of Persia, openly attacked the Jews with arms. But the building, notwithstanding, went steadily on; the men working with an implement of work in one hand, and a weapon of war in the other; and the wall, with incredible labour, was finished in fifty-two days, in the year B. C. 445; after which, the city itself was gradually rebuilt, Neh. ii, iv, vi. From this time Jerusalem remained attached to the Persian empire, but under the local jurisdiction of the high priests, until the subversion of that empire by Alexander, fourteen years after. See Alexander.

At the death of Alexander, and the partition of his empire by his generals, Jerusalem, with Judea, fell to the kings of Syria. But in the frequent wars which followed between the kings of Syria and those of Egypt, called by Daniel, the kings of the north and south, it belonged sometimes to one and sometimes to the other,--an unsettled and unhappy state, highly favourable to disorder and corruption,--the high priesthood was openly sold to the highest bidder; and numbers of the Jews deserted their religion for the idolatries of the Greeks. At length, in the year B. C. 170, Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, enraged at hearing that the Jews had rejoiced at a false report of his death, plundered Jerusalem, and killed eighty thousand men. Not more than two years afterward, this cruel tyrant, who had seized every opportunity to exercise his barbarity on the Jews, sent Apollonius with an army to Jerusalem; who pulled down the walls, grievously oppressed the people, and built a citadel on a rock adjoining the temple,

which commanded that building, and had the effect of completely overawing the seditious. Having thus reduced this unfortunate city into entire submission, and rendered resistance useless, the next step of Antiochus was to abolish the Jewish religion altogether, by publishing an edict which commanded all the people of his dominions to conform to the religion of the Greeks: in consequence of which, the service of the temple ceased, and a statue of Jupiter Olympus was set up on the altar. But this extremity of ignominy and oppression led, as might have been expected, to rebellion; and those Jews who still held their insulted religion in reverence, fled to the mountains, with Mattathias and Judas Maccabeus; the latter of whom, after the death of Mattathias, who with his followers and successors, are known by the name of Maccabees, waged successful war with the Syrians; defeated Apollonius, Nicanor, and Lysias, generals of Antiochus; obtained possession of Jerusalem, purified the temple, and restored the service, after three years' defilement by the Gentile idolatries.

From this time, during several succeeding Maccabean rulers, who were at once high priests and sovereigns of the Jews, but without the title of king, Jerusalem was able to preserve itself from Syrian violence. It was, however, twice besieged, first by Antiochus Eupator, in the year 163, and afterward by Antiochus Sidetes, in the year B. C. 134. But the Jews had caused themselves to be sufficiently respected to obtain conditions of peace on both occasions, and to save their city; till, at length, Hyrcanus, in the year 130 B. C., shook off the Syrian yoke, and reigned, after this event, twenty-one years in independence and prosperity. His successor, Judas, made an important change in the Jewish government, by taking the title of king, which dignity was enjoyed by his successors forty-seven years, when a dispute having arisen between Hyrcanus II. and his brother Aristobulus, and the latter having overcome the former, and made himself king, was, in his turn, conquered by the Romans under Pompey, by whom the city and temple were taken, Aristobulus made prisoner, and Hyrcanus created high priest and prince of the Jews, but without the title of king. By this event Judea was reduced to the condition of a Roman province, in the year 63 B. C. Nor did Jerusalem long after enjoy the dignity of a metropolis, that honour being transferred to Cæsarea. Julius Cæsar, having defeated Pompey, continued Hyrcanus in the high priesthood, but bestowed the government of Judea upon Antipater, an Idumæan by birth, but a Jewish proselyte, and father of Herod the Great. For the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, see Jews.

Jerusalem lay in ruins about forty-seven years, when the Emperor Ælius Adrian began to build it anew, and erected a Heathen temple, which he dedicated to Jupiter Capitolinus. The city was finished in the twentieth year of his reign, and called, after its founder, Ælia, or Ælia Capitolina, from

the Heathen deity who presided over it. In this state Jerusalem continued, under the name of Ælia, and inhabited more by Christians and Pagans than by Jews, till the time of the Emperor Constantine, styled the Great; who, about the year 323, having made Christianity the religion of the empire, began to improve it, adorned it with many new edifices and churches, and restored its ancient name. About thirty-five years afterward, Julian, named the Apostate, not from any love he bore the Jews, but out of hatred to the Christians, whose faith he had abjured, and with the avowed design of defeating the prophecies, which had declared that the temple should not be rebuilt, wrote to the Jews, inviting them to their city, and promising to restore their temple and nation. He accordingly employed great numbers of workmen to clear the foundations; but balls of fire bursting from the earth, soon put a stop to their proceeding. This miraculous interposition of Providence is attested by many credible witnesses and historians; and, in particular, by Ammianus Marcellinus, a Heathen, and friend of Julian; Zemus David, a Jew; Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Ambrose Ruffinus, Theodoret, Sozomen, and Socrates, who wrote his account within fifty years after the transaction, and while many eye-witnesses of it were still living. So stubborn, indeed, is the proof of this miracle, that even Gibbon, who strives to invalidate it, is obliged to acknowledge the general fact.

Jerusalem continued in nearly the same condition till the beginning of the seventh century, when it was taken and plundered by the celebrated Chosroes, king of Persia, by whom many thousands of the Christian inhabitants were killed, or sold for slaves. The Persians, however, did not hold it long, as they were soon after entirely defeated by the Emperor Heraclius, who rescued Jerusalem, and restored it, not to the unhappy Jews, who were forbidden to come within three miles of it, but to the Christians. A worse calamity was, however, speedily to befall this ill fated city. The Mohammedan imposture arose about this time; and the fanatics who had adopted its creed carried their arms and their religion with unprecedented rapidity over the greater part of the east. The Caliph Omar, the third from Mohammed, invested the city, which, after once more suffering the horrors of a protracted siege, surrendered on terms of capitulation in the year 637; and has ever since, with the exception of the short period that it was occupied by the crusaders, been trodden under foot by the followers of the false prophet.

2. The accounts of modern Jerusalem by travellers are very numerous. Mr. Conder, in his "Palestine," has abridged them with judgment; and we give the following extract: The approach to Jerusalem from Jaffa is not the direction in which to see the city to the best effect. Dr. E. D. Clarke entered it by the Damascus gate: and he describes the view of Jerusalem, when first

descried from the summit of a hill, at about an hour's distance, as most impressive. He confesses, at the same time, that there is no other point of view in which it is seen to so much advantage. In the celebrated prospect from the Mount of Olives, the city lies too low, is too near the eye, and has too much the character of a bird's eye view, with the formality of a topographical plan. "We had not been prepared," says this lively traveller, "for the grandeur of the spectacle which the city alone exhibited. Instead of a wretched and ruined town, by some described as the desolated remnant of Jerusalem, we beheld, as it were, a flourishing and stately metropolis, presenting a magnificent assemblage of domes, towers, palaces, churches, and monasteries; all of which, glittering in the sun's rays, shone with inconceivable splendour. As we drew nearer, our whole attention was engrossed by its noble and interesting appearance. The lofty hills surrounding it give the city itself an appearance of elevation less than it really has." Dr. Clarke was fortunate in catching this first view of Jerusalem under the illusion of a brilliant evening sunshine; but his description is decidedly overcharged. M. Chateaubriand, Mr. Buckingham, Mr. Brown, Mr. Jolliffe, Sir F. Henniker, and almost every other modern traveller, confirm the representation of Dr. Richardson. Mr. Buckingham says, "The appearance of this celebrated city, independent of the feelings and recollections which the approach to it cannot fail to awaken, was greatly inferior to my expectations, and had certainly nothing of grandeur or beauty, of stateliness or magnificence, about it. It appeared like a walled town of the third or fourth class, having neither towers, nor domes, nor minarets within it, in sufficient numbers to give even a character to its impressions on the beholder; but showing chiefly large flat-roofed buildings of the most unornamented kind, seated amid rugged hills, on a stony and forbidding soil, with scarcely a picturesque object in the whole compass of the surrounding view." Chateaubriand's description is very striking and graphical. After citing the language of the Prophet Jeremiah, in his lamentations on the desolation of the ancient city, as accurately portraying its present state, Lam. i, 1-6; ii, 1-9, 15, he thus proceeds: "When seen from the Mount of Olives, on the other side of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, Jerusalem presents an inclined plane, descending from west to east. An embattled wall, fortified with towers, and a Gothic castle, encompasses the city all round; excluding, however, part of Mount Zion, which it formerly enclosed. In the western quarter, and in the centre of the city, the houses stand very close; but, in the eastern part, along the brook Kedron, you perceive vacant spaces; among the rest, that which surrounds the mosque erected on the ruins of the temple, and the nearly deserted spot where once stood the castle of Antonia and the second palace of Herod. The houses of Jerusalem are heavy square masses, very low, without chimneys or windows: they have flat terraces or domes on the top, and look like prisons or sepulchres. The whole would appear to the eye one

uninterrupted level, did not the steeples of the churches, the minarets of the mosques, the summits of a few cypresses, and the clumps of nopals, break the uniformity of the plan. On beholding these stone buildings, encompassed by a stony country, you are ready to inquire if they are not the confused monuments of a cemetery in the midst of a desert. Enter the city, but nothing will you there find to make amends for the dulness of its exterior. You lose yourself among narrow, unpaved streets, here going up hill, there down, from the inequality of the ground; and you walk among clouds of dust or loose stones. Canvas stretched from house to house increases the gloom of this labyrinth. Bazaars, roofed over, and fraught with infection, completely exclude the light from the desolate city. A few paltry shops expose nothing but wretchedness to view; and even these are frequently shut, from apprehension of the passage of a *cadi*. Not a creature is to be seen in the streets, not a creature at the gates, except now and then a peasant gliding through the gloom, concealing under his garments the fruits of his labour, lest he should be robbed of his hard earnings by the rapacious soldier. Aside, in a corner, the Arab butcher is slaughtering some animal, suspended by the legs from a wall in ruins: from his haggard and ferocious look, and his bloody hands, you would suppose that he had been cutting the throat of a fellow creature, rather than killing a lamb. The only noise heard from time to time in the city is the galloping of the steed of the desert: it is the janissary who brings the head of the Bedouin, or who returns from plundering the unhappy Fella. Amid this extraordinary desolation, you must pause a moment to contemplate two circumstances still more extraordinary. Among the ruins of Jerusalem, two classes of independent people find in their religion sufficient fortitude to enable them to surmount such complicated horrors and wretchedness. Here reside communities of Christian monks, whom nothing can compel to forsake the tomb of Christ; neither plunder, nor personal ill treatment, nor menaces of death itself. Night and day they chant their hymns around the holy sepulchre. Driven by the cudgel and the sabre, women, children, flocks, and herds, seek refuge in the cloisters of these recluses. What prevents the armed oppressor from pursuing his prey, and overthrowing such feeble ramparts? The charity of the monks: they deprive themselves of the last resources of life to ransom their suppliants. Cast your eyes between the temple and Mount Zion; behold another petty tribe cut off from the rest of the inhabitants of this city. The particular objects of every species of degradation, these people bow their heads without murmuring; they endure every kind of insult without demanding justice; they sink beneath repeated blows without sighing; if their head be required, they present it to the scimitar. On the death of any member of this proscribed community, his companion goes at night, and inters him by stealth in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, in the shadow of Solomon's temple. Enter the abodes of these people, you will find them, amid the most abject wretchedness, instructing

their children to read a mysterious book, which they in their turn will teach their offspring to read. What they did five thousand years ago, these people still continue to do. Seventeen times have they witnessed the destruction of Jerusalem, yet nothing can discourage them, nothing can prevent them from turning their faces toward Sion. To see the Jews scattered over the whole world, according to the word of God, must doubtless excite surprise. But to be struck with supernatural astonishment, you must view them at Jerusalem; you must behold these rightful masters of Judea living as slaves and strangers in their own country; you must behold them expecting, under all oppressions, a king who is to deliver them. Crushed by the cross that condemns them, skulking near the temple, of which not one stone is left upon another, they continue in their deplorable infatuation. The Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, are swept from the earth; and a petty tribe, whose origin preceded that of those great nations, still exists unmixed among the ruins of its native land." To the same effect are the remarks of Dr. Richardson: "In passing up to the synagogue, I was particularly struck with the mean and wretched appearance of the houses on both sides of the streets, as well as with the poverty of their inhabitants. The sight of a poor Jew in Jerusalem has in it something peculiarly affecting. The heart of this wonderful people, in whatever clime they roam, still turns to it as the city of their promised rest. They take pleasure in her ruins, and would kiss the very dust for her sake. Jerusalem is the centre around which the exiled sons of Judah build, in imagination, the mansions of their future greatness. In whatever part of the world he may live, the heart's desire of a Jew is to be buried in Jerusalem. Thither they return from Spain and Portugal, from Egypt and Barbary, and other countries among which they have been scattered: and when, after all their longings, and all their struggles up the steeps of life, we see them poor, and blind, and naked, in the streets of their once happy Zion, he must have a cold heart that can remain untouched by their sufferings, without uttering a prayer that God would have mercy on the darkness of Judah; and that the Day Star of Bethlehem might arise in their hearts."

"Jerusalem," remarks Sir Frederick Henniker, "is called, even by Mohammedans, the Blessed City (El Gootz, El Koudes.) The streets of it are narrow and deserted, the houses dirty and ragged, the shops few and forsaken; and throughout the whole there is not one symptom of either commerce, comfort, or happiness. The best view of it is from the Mount of Olives: it commands the exact shape and nearly every particular; namely, the church of the holy sepulchre, the Armenian convent, the mosque of Omar, St. Stephen's gate, the round-topped houses, and the barren vacancies of the city. Without the walls are a Turkish burial ground, the tomb of David, a small grove near the tombs of the kings, and all the rest is a surface of rock, on which are a few numbered trees. The mosque of

Omar is the St. Peter's of Turkey, and the respective saints are held respectively by their own faithful in equal veneration. The building itself has a light pagoda appearance; the garden in which it stands occupies a considerable part of the city, and, contrasted with the surrounding desert, is beautiful. The burial place of the Jews is over the valley of Kedron, and the fees for breaking the soil afford a considerable revenue to the governor. The burial place of the Turks is under the walls, near St. Stephen's gate. From the opposite side of the valley, I was witness to the ceremony of parading a corpse round the mosque of Omar, and then bringing it forth for burial. I hastened to the grave, but was soon driven away: as far as my on dit tells me, it would have been worth seeing. The grave is strown with red earth, supposed to be of the Ager Damascenus of which Adam was made; by the side of the corpse is placed a stick, and the priest tells him that the devil will tempt him to become a Christian, but that he must make good use of his stick; that his trial will last three days, and that he will then find himself in a mansion of glory," &c.

The Jerusalem of sacred history is, in fact, no more. Not a vestige remains of the capital of David and Solomon; not a monument of Jewish times is standing. The very course of the walls is changed, and the boundaries of the ancient city are become doubtful. The monks pretend to show the sites of the sacred places; but neither Calvary, nor the holy sepulchre, much less the Dolorous Way, the house of Caiaphas, &c, have the slightest pretensions to even a probable identity with the real places to which the tradition refers. Dr. E. D. Clarke has the merit of being the first modern traveller who ventured to speak of the preposterous legends and clumsy forgeries of the priests with the contempt which they merit. "To men interested in tracing, within its walls, antiquities referred to by the documents of sacred history, no spectacle," remarks the learned traveller, "can be more mortifying than the city in its present state. The mistaken piety of the early Christians, in attempting to preserve, has either confused or annihilated the memorials it was anxious to render conspicuous. Viewing the havoc thus made, it may now be regretted that the Holy Land was ever rescued from the dominion of Saracens, who were far less barbarous than their conquerors. The absurdity, for example, of hewing the rocks of Judea into shrines and chapels, and of disguising the face of nature with painted domes and gilded marble coverings, by way of commemorating the scenes of our Saviour's life and death, is so evident and so lamentable, that even Sandys, with all his credulity, could not avoid a happy application of the reproof conveyed by the Roman satirist against a similar violation of the Egerian fountain." Dr. Richardson remarks, "It is a tantalizing circumstance for the traveller who wishes to recognise in his walks the site of particular buildings, or the scenes of memorable events, that the greater part of the objects mentioned in the description both of the

inspired and the Jewish historian, are entirely removed, and razed from their foundation, without leaving a single trace or name behind to point out where they stood. Not an ancient tower, or gate, or wall, or hardly even a stone, remains. The foundations are not only broken up, but every fragment of which they were composed is swept away, and the spectator looks upon the bare rock with hardly a sprinkling of earth to point out her gardens of pleasure, or groves of idolatrous devotion. And when we consider the palaces, and towers, and walls about Jerusalem, and that the stones of which some of them were constructed were thirty feet long, fifteen feet broad, and seven and a half feet thick, we are not more astonished at the strength, and skill, and perseverance, by which they were constructed, than shocked by the relentless and brutal hostility by which they were shattered and overthrown, and utterly removed from our sight. A few gardens still remain on the sloping base of Mount Zion, watered from the pool of Siloam; the gardens of Gethsemane are still in a sort of ruined cultivation; the fences are broken down, and the olive trees decaying, as if the hand that dressed and fed them were withdrawn; the Mount of Olives still retains a languishing verdure, and nourishes a few of those trees from which it derives its name; but all round about Jerusalem the general aspect is blighted and barren; the grass is withered; the bare rock looks through the scanty sward; and the grain itself, like the staring progeny of famine, seems in doubt whether to come to maturity, or die in the ear. The vine that was brought from Egypt is cut off from the midst of the land; the vineyards are wasted; the hedges are taken away; and the graves of the ancient dead are open and tenantless.”

3. On the accomplishment of prophecy in the condition in which this celebrated city has lain for ages, Keith well remarks:--It formed the theme of prophecy from the death bed of Jacob; and, as the seat of the government of the children of Judah, the sceptre departed not from it till the Messiah appeared, on the expiration of seventeen hundred years after the death of the patriarch, and till the period of its desolation, prophesied of by Daniel, had arrived. It was to be trodden down of the Gentiles, till the time of the Gentiles should be fulfilled. The time of the Gentiles is not yet fulfilled, and Jerusalem is still trodden down of the Gentiles. The Jews have often attempted to recover it: no distance of space or of time can separate it from their affections: they perform their devotions with their faces toward it, as if it were the object of their worship as well as of their love; and, although their desire to return be so strong, indelible, and innate, that every Jew, in every generation, counts himself an exile, yet they have never been able to rebuild their temple, nor to recover Jerusalem from the hands of the Gentiles. But greater power than that of a proscribed and exiled race has been added to their own, in attempting to frustrate the counsel that professed to be of God. Julian, the emperor of the Romans, not only



permitted but invited the Jews to rebuild Jerusalem and their temple; and promised to reestablish them in their paternal city. By that single act, more than by all his writings, he might have destroyed the credibility of the Gospel, and restored his beloved but deserted Paganism. The zeal of the Jews was equal to his own; and the work was begun by laying again the foundations of the temple. It was never accomplished, and the prophecy stands fulfilled. But even if the attempt of Julian had never been made, the truth of the prophecy itself is unassailable. The Jews have never been reinstated in Judea. Jerusalem has ever been trodden down of the Gentiles. The edict of Adrian was renewed by the successors of Julian; and no Jews could approach unto Jerusalem but by bribery or by stealth. It was a spot unlawful for them to touch. In the crusades, all the power of Europe was employed to rescue Jerusalem from the Heathens, but equally in vain. It has been trodden down for nearly eighteen centuries by its successive masters; by Romans, Grecians, Persians, Saracens, Mamelukes, Turks, Christians, and again by the worst of rulers, the Arabs and the Turks. And could any thing be more improbable to have happened, or more impossible to have been foreseen by man, than that any people should be banished from their own capital and country, and remain expelled and expatriated for nearly eighteen hundred years? Did the same fate ever befall any nation, though no prophecy existed respecting it? Is there any doctrine in Scripture so hard to be believed as was this single fact at the period of its prediction? And even with the example of the Jews before us, is it likely, or is it credible, or who can foretell, that the present inhabitants of any country upon earth shall be banished into all nations, retain their distinctive character, meet with an unparalleled fate, continue a people, without a government and without a country, and remain for an indefinite period, exceeding seventeen hundred years, till the fulfilment of a prescribed event which has yet to be accomplished? Must not the knowledge of such truths be derived from that prescience alone which scans alike the will and the ways of mortals, the actions of future nations, and the history of the latest generations?

JESHURUN, a name given to the collective political body of Israelites. Some derive the word from ישר, just or righteous, and so make it to signify a righteous people. Montanus renders it *rectitudo*, and so does the Samaritan version. But it seems a considerable objection against this sense, that Israel is called Jeshurun at the very time that they are upbraided with their sins and their rebellion: "Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked," &c, Deut. xxxii, 15. It is replied, Jeshurun is the diminutive of ישר, (for *nomen auctum in fine est nomen diminutivum*,) and so imports, that though, in general and on the whole, they were a righteous people, yet they were not without great faults. Perhaps Cocceius has given as probable an interpretation as any. He derives the word from שור, which signifies to see,

behold, or discover; from whence, in the future tense, plural, comes ישורו, which, with the addition of nun paragogicum, makes Jeshurun; that is, “the people who had the vision of God.” This makes the name of Jeshurun to be properly applied to Israel, not only when Moses is called their king, but when they are upbraided with their rebellion against God; since the peculiar manifestation which God had made of himself to them was a great aggravation of their ingratitude and rebellion.

JESSE. See David and Ruth.

JESUITS, or the society of Jesus, one of the most celebrated monastic orders of the Romish church, was founded in the year 1540, by Ignatius Loyola, Forsaking the military for the ecclesiastical profession, he engaged himself in the wildest and most extravagant adventures, as the knight of the blessed virgin. After performing a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and pursuing a multitude of visionary schemes, he returned to prosecute his theological studies in the universities of Spain, when he was about thirty-three years of age. He next went to Paris, where he collected a small number of associates; and, prompted by his fanatical spirit, or the love of distinction, began to conceive the establishment of a new religious order. He produced a plan of its constitution and laws, which he affirmed to have been suggested by the immediate inspiration of Heaven, and applied to the Roman pontiff, Paul III. for the sanction of his authority to confirm the institution. At a time when the papal authority had received so severe a shock from the progress of the Reformation, and was still exposed to the most powerful attacks in every quarter, this was an offer too tempting to be resisted. The reigning pontiff, though naturally cautious, and though scarcely capable, without the spirit of prophecy, of foreseeing all the advantages to be derived from the services of this nascent order, yet clearly perceiving the benefit of multiplying the number of his devoted servants, instantly confirmed by his bull the institution of the Jesuits, granted the most ample privileges to the members of the society, and appointed Loyola to be the first general of the order.

2. The simple and primary object of the society, says a writer in the Edinburgh Encyclopædia, was to establish a spiritual dominion over the minds of men, of which the pope should appear as the ostensible head, while the real power should reside with themselves. To accomplish this object, the whole constitution and policy of the order were singularly adapted, and exhibited various peculiarities which distinguished it from all other monastic orders. The immediate design of every other religious society was to separate its members from the world; that of the Jesuits, to render them masters of the world. The inmate of the convent devoted himself to work out his own salvation by extraordinary acts of devotion

and self-denial; the follower of Loyola considered himself as plunging into all the bustle of secular affairs, to maintain the interests of the Romish church. The monk was a retired devotee of heaven; the Jesuit a chosen soldier of the pope. That the members of the new order might have full leisure for this active service, they were exempted from the usual functions of other monks. They were not required to spend their time in the long ceremonial offices and numberless mummeries of the Romish worship. They attended no processions, and practised no austerities. They neither chanted nor prayed. "They cannot sing," said their enemies; "for birds of prey never do." They were sent forth to watch every transaction of the world which might appear to affect the interests of religion, and were especially enjoined to study the dispositions and cultivate the friendship of persons in the higher ranks. Nothing could be imagined more open and liberal than the external aspect of the institution, yet nothing could be more strict and secret than its internal organization. Loyola, influenced, perhaps, by the notions of implicit obedience which he had derived from his military profession, resolved that the government of the Jesuits should be absolutely monarchical. A general, chosen for life by deputies from the several provinces, possessed supreme and independent power, extending to every person, and applying to every case. Every member of the order, the instant that he entered its pale, surrendered all freedom of thought and action; and every personal feeling was superseded by the interests of that body to which he had attached himself. He went wherever he was ordered; he performed whatever he was commanded; he suffered whatever he was enjoined; he became a mere passive instrument incapable of resistance. The gradation of ranks was only a gradation in slavery; and so perfect a despotism over a large body of men, dispersed over the face of the earth, was never before realized.

The maxims of policy adopted by this celebrated society were, like its constitution, remarkable for their union of laxity and rigour. Nothing could divert them from their original object; and no means were ever scrupled which promised to aid its accomplishment. They were in no degree shackled by prejudice, superstition, or real religion. Expediency, in its most simple and licentious form, was the basis of their morals, and their principles and practices were uniformly accommodated to the circumstances in which they were placed; and even their bigotry, obdurate as it was, never appears to have interfered with their interests. The paramount and characteristic principle of the order, from which none of its members ever swerved, was simply this, that its interests were to be promoted by all possible means, at all possible expense. In order to acquire more easily an ascendancy over persons of rank and power, they propagated a system of the most relaxed morality, which accommodated itself to the passions of men, justified their vices, tolerated their

imperfections, and authorized almost every action which the most audacious or crafty politician would wish to perpetrate. To persons of stricter principles they studied to recommend themselves by the purity of their lives, and sometimes by the austerity of their doctrines. While sufficiently compliant in the treatment of immoral practices, they were generally rigidly severe in exacting a strict orthodoxy in opinions. "They are a sort of people," said the Abbé Boileau, "who lengthen the creed and shorten the decalogue." They adopted the same spirit of accommodation in their missionary undertakings; and their Christianity, chameleonlike, readily assumed the colour of every religion where it happened to be introduced. They freely permitted their converts to retain a full proportion of the old superstitions, and suppressed, without hesitation, any point in the new faith which was likely to bear hard on their prejudices or propensities. They proceeded to still greater lengths; and, beside suppressing the truths of revelation, devised the most absurd falsehoods, to be used for attracting disciples, or even to be taught as parts of Christianity. One of them in India produced a pedigree to prove his own descent from Brama; and another in America assured a native chief that Christ had been a valiant and victorious warrior, who, in the space of three years, had scalped an incredible number of men, women, and children. It was, in fact, their own authority, not the authority of true religion, which they wished to establish; and Christianity was generally as little known, when they quitted the foreign scenes of their labours as when they entered them.

These detestable objects and principles, however, were long an impenetrable secret: and the professed intention of the new order was to promote, with unequalled and unfettered zeal, the salvation of mankind. Its progress, nevertheless, was at first remarkably slow. Charles V., who is supposed, with his usual sagacity, to have discerned its dangerous tendency, rather checked than encouraged its advancement; and the universities of France resisted its introduction into that kingdom. Thus, roused by obstacles, and obliged to find resources within themselves, the Jesuits brought all their talents and devices into action. They applied themselves to every useful function and curious art; and neither neglected nor despised any mode, however humble, of gaining employment or reputation. The satirist's description of the Greeks in Rome has been aptly chosen to describe their indefatigable and universal industry:--

Grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes,  
Augur, schœnobates, medicus, magus; omnia novit  
Græculus.

Juvenal, lib. iii, 76.

"A Protean tribe, one knows not what to call,  
Which shifts to every form, and shines in all:

Grammarians, painters, augurs, rhetoricians,  
Rope-dancers, conjurors, fiddlers, and physicians,--  
All trades his own, your hungry Greekling counts.”  
Gifford.

They laboured with the greatest assiduity to qualify themselves as the instructors of youth; and succeeded, at length, in supplanting their opponents in every Catholic kingdom. They aimed, in the next place, to become the spiritual directors of the higher ranks; and soon established themselves in most of the courts which were attached to the papal faith, not only as the confessors, but frequently also as the guides and ministers, of superstitious princes. The governors of the society pursuing one uniform system with unwearied perseverance, became entirely successful; and, in the space of half a century, had in a wonderful degree extended the reputation, the number, and influence of the order. When Loyola, in 1540, petitioned the pope to authorize the institution of the Jesuits, he had only ten disciples; but in 1608 the number amounted to 10,581. Before the expiration of the sixteenth century they had obtained the chief direction of the education of youth in every Catholic country in Europe, and had become the confessors of almost all its noblest monarchs. In spite of their vow of poverty, their wealth increased with their power; and they soon rivalled, in the extent and value of their possessions, the most opulent monastic fraternities. About the beginning of the seventeenth century, they obtained from the court of Madrid the grant of the large and fertile province of Paraguay, which stretches across the southern continent of America, from the mountains of Potosi to the banks of the river La Plata; and, after every deduction which can reasonably be made from their own accounts of their establishment, enough will remain to excite the astonishment and applause of mankind. They found the inhabitants in the first stage of society, ignorant of the arts of life, and unacquainted with the first principles of subordination. They applied themselves to instruct and civilize these savage tribes. They commenced their labours by collecting about fifty families of wandering Indians, whom they converted and settled in a small township. They taught them to build houses, to cultivate the ground, and to rear tame animals; trained them to arts and manufactures, and brought them to relish the blessings of security and order. By a wise and humane policy, they gradually attracted new subjects and converts; till at last they formed a powerful and well organized state of three hundred thousand families.

Though the power of the Jesuits had become so extensive, and though their interests generally prospered during a period of more than two centuries, their progress was by no means uninterrupted; and, by their own misconduct, they soon excited the most formidable counteractions. Scarcely had they effected their establishment in France, in defiance of the

parliaments and universities, when their existence was endangered by the fanaticism of their own members. John Chastel, one of their pupils, made an attempt upon the life of Henry IV.; and Father Guiscard, another of the order, was convicted of composing writings favourable to regicide. The parliaments seized the moment of their disgrace, and procured their banishment from every part of the kingdom, except the provinces of Bourdeaux and Toulouse. From these rallying points, they speedily extended their intrigues in every quarter, and in a few years obtained their re-establishment. Even Henry, either dreading their power, or pleased with the exculpation of his licentious habits, which he found in their flexible system of morality, became their patron, and selected one of their number as his confessor. They were favoured by Louis XIII. and his minister Richelieu, on account of their literary exertions; but it was in the succeeding reign of Louis XIV. that they reached the summit of their prosperity. The Fathers La Chaise and Le Teltier were successively confessors to the king; and did not fail to employ their influence for the interest of their order: but the latter carried on his projects with so blind and fiery a zeal, that one of the Jesuits is reported to have said of him, "He drives at such a rate, that he will overturn us all." The Jansenists were peculiarly the objects of his machinations, and he rested not till he had accomplished the destruction of their celebrated college and convent at Port Royal. Before the fall, however, of this honoured seminary, a shaft from its bow had reached the heart of its proud oppressor. The "Provincial Letters of Pascal" had been published, in which the quibbling morality and unintelligible metaphysics of the Jesuits were exposed in a strain of inimitable humour, and a style of unrivalled elegance. The impression which they produced was wide and deep, and gradually sapped the foundation of public opinion, on which the power of the order had hitherto rested. Under the regency of the duke of Orleans, the Jesuits, and all theological personages and principles were disregarded with atheistical superciliousness; but under Louis XV. they partly recovered their influence at court, which, even under Cardinal Fleury, they retained in a considerable degree. But they soon revived the odium of the public by their intolerant treatment of the Jansenists, and probably accelerated their ruin by refusing, from political rather than religious scruples, to undertake the spiritual guidance of Madame de la Pampadour, as well as by imprudently attacking the authors of the "Encyclopédie." Voltaire directed against them all the powers of his ridicule, and finished the piece which Pascal had sketched. Their power was brought to a very low ebb, when the war of 1756 broke out, which occasioned the famous law-suit that led to their final overthrow.

In the mean time the king of Portugal was assassinated; and Carvalho, the minister, who detested the Jesuits, found means to load them with the odium of the crime. Malagrida, and a few more of these fathers, were

charged with advising and absolving the assassins; and, having been found guilty, were condemned to the stake. The rest were banished with every brand of infamy, and were treated with the most iniquitous cruelty. They were persecuted without discrimination, robbed of their property without pity, and embarked for Italy without previous preparation; so that, no provision having been made for their reception, they were literally left to perish with hunger in their vessels. These incidents prepared the way for a similar catastrophe in France. In March, 1762, the French court received intelligence of the capture of Martinico by the British; and, dreading a storm of public indignation, resolved to divert the exasperated feelings of the nation, by yielding the Jesuits to their impending fate. On the sixth of August, 1762, their institute was condemned by the parliament, as contrary to the laws of the state, to the obedience due to the sovereign, and to the welfare of the kingdom. The order was dissolved, and their effects alienated. But in certain quarters, where the provincial parliaments had not decided against them, Jesuits still subsisted; and a royal edict was afterward promulgated, which formally abolished the society in France, but permitted its members to reside within the kingdom under certain restrictions.

In Spain, where they conceived their establishment to be perfectly secure, they experienced an overthrow equally complete, and much more unexpected. The necessary measures were concerted under the direction of De Choiseul, by the Marquis D'Ossun, the French ambassador at Madrid, with Charles III., king of Spain, and his prime minister, the Count D'Aranda. The execution of their purposes was as sudden as their plans had been secret. At midnight, March 31st, 1767, large bodies of military surrounded the six colleges of the Jesuits in Madrid, forced the gates, secured the bells, collected the fathers in the refectory, and read to them the king's order for their instant transportation. They were immediately put into carriages previously placed at proper stations; and were on their way to Carthagená before the inhabitants of the city had any intelligence of the transaction. Three days afterward, the same measures were adopted with regard to every other college of the order in the kingdom; and, ships having been provided at the different sea ports, they were all embarked for the ecclesiastical states in Italy. All their property was confiscated, and a small pension assigned to each individual as long as he should reside in a place appointed, and satisfy the Spanish court as to his peaceable demeanour. All correspondence with the Jesuits was prohibited, and the strictest silence on the subject of their expulsion was enjoined under penalties of high treason. A similar seizure and deportation took place in the Indies, and an immense property was acquired by the government. Many crimes and plots were laid to the charge of the order; but whatever may have been their demerit, the punishment was too

summary to admit of justification; and many innocent individuals were subjected to sufferings beyond the deserts even of the guilty. Pope Clement III. prohibited their landing in his dominions; and, after enduring extreme miseries in crowded transports, the survivors, to the number of two thousand three hundred, were put ashore on Corsica. The example of the king of Spain was immediately followed by Ferdinand VI. of Naples, and soon after by the prince of Parma. They had been expelled from England in 1604; from Venice in 1606; and from Portugal in 1759, upon the charge of having instigated the families of Tavora and D'Aveiro to assassinate King Joseph I. Frederick the Great, of Prussia, was the only monarch who showed a disposition to afford them protection; but in 1773 the order was entirely suppressed by Pope Clement XIV., who is supposed to have fallen a victim to their vengeance. In 1801 the society was restored in Russia by the Emperor Paul; and in 1804, by King Ferdinand, in Sardinia. In August, 1814, a bull was issued by Pope Pius VII., restoring the order to all their former privileges, and calling upon all Catholic princes to afford them protection and encouragement. This act of their revival is expressed in all the solemnity of papal authority; and even affirmed to be above the recall or revision of any judge, with whatever power he may be clothed; but to every enlightened mind it cannot fail to appear as a measure altogether incapable of justification, from any thing either in the history of Jesuitism, or in the character of the present times.

3. It would be in vain to deny that many considerable advantages were derived by mankind from the labours of the Jesuits. Their ardour in the study of ancient literature, and their labours in the instruction of youth, greatly contributed to the progress of polite learning. They have produced a greater number of ingenious authors than all the other religious fraternities taken together; and though there never was known among their order one person who could be said to possess an enlarged philosophical mind, they can boast of many eminent masters in the separate branches of science, many distinguished mathematicians, antiquarians, critics, and even some orators of high reputation. They were in general, also, as individuals, superior in decency, and even purity of manners, to any other class of regular clergy in the church of Rome. But all these benefits by no means counterbalanced the pernicious effects of their influence and intrigues on the best interests of society.

The essential principles of the institution, namely, that their order is to be maintained at the expense of the society at large, and that the end sanctifies the means, are utterly incompatible with the welfare of any community of men. Their system of lax and pliant morality, justifying every vice, and authorizing every atrocity, has left deep and lasting ravages on the face of the moral world. Their zeal to extend the jurisdiction of the court of Rome



over every civil government, gave currency to tenets respecting the duty of opposing princes who were hostile to the Catholic faith, which shook the basis of all political allegiance, and loosened the obligations of every human law. Their indefatigable industry, and countless artifices in resisting the progress of reformed religion, perpetuated the most pernicious errors of Popery, and postponed the triumph of tolerant and Christian principles. Whence, then, it may well be asked, whence the recent restoration? What long latent proof has been discovered of the excellence, or even the expedience, of such an institution? The sentence of their abolition was passed by the senates, and monarchs, and statesmen, and divines, of all religions, and of almost every civilized country in the world. Almost every land has been stained and torn by their crimes; and almost every land bears on its public records the most solemn protests against their existence.

JESUS CHRIST, the Son of God, the Messiah, and Saviour of the world, the first and principal object of the prophecies, prefigured and promised in the Old Testament, expected and desired by the patriarchs; the hope of the Gentiles; the glory, salvation, and consolation of Christians. The name Jesus, or, as the Hebrews pronounce it, יהושוע, Jehoshua, or Joshua, Ἰησοῦς, signifies, he who shall save. No one ever bore this name with so much justice, nor so perfectly fulfilled the signification of it, as Jesus Christ, who saves even from sin and hell, and hath merited heaven for us by the price of his blood. It is not necessary here to narrate the history of our Saviour's life, which can no where be read with advantage except in the writings of the four evangelists; but there are several general views which require to be noticed under this article.

1. Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ or Messiah promised under the Old Testament. That he professed himself to be that Messiah to whom all the prophets gave witness, and who was, in fact, at the time of his appearing, expected by the Jews; and that he was received under that character by his disciples, and by all Christians ever since, is certain. And if the Old Testament Scriptures afford sufficiently definite marks by which the long announced Christ should be infallibly known at his advent, and these presignations are found realized in our Lord, then is the truth of his pretensions established. From the books of the Old Testament we learn that the Messiah was to authenticate his claim by miracles; and in those predictions respecting him, so many circumstances are recorded, that they could meet only in one person; and so, if they are accomplished in him, they leave no room for doubt, as far as the evidence of prophecy is deemed conclusive. As to MIRACLES, we refer to that article; here only observing, that if the miraculous works wrought by Christ were really done, they prove his mission, because, from their nature, and having been wrought to confirm his claim to be the Messiah, they necessarily imply a divine

attestation. With respect to PROPHECY, the principles under which its evidence must be regarded as conclusive will be given under that head; and here therefore it will only be necessary to show the completion of the prophecies of the sacred books of the Jews relative to the Messiah in one person, and that person the founder of the Christian religion.

The time of the Messiah's appearance in the world, as predicted in the Old Testament, is defined, says Keith, by a number of concurring circumstances, which fix it to the very date of the advent of Christ. The last blessing of Jacob to his sons, when he commanded them to gather themselves together that he might tell them what should befall them in the last days, contains this prediction concerning Judah: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be," Gen. xlix, 10. The date fixed by this prophecy for the coming of Shiloh, or the Saviour, was not to exceed the time during which the descendants of Judah were to continue a united people, while a king should reign among them, while they should be governed by their own laws, and while their judges should be from among their brethren. The prophecy of Malachi adds another standard for measuring the time: "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall come suddenly to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts," Mal. iii, 1. No words can be more expressive of the coming of the promised Messiah; and they as clearly imply his appearance in the second temple before it should be destroyed. In regard to the advent of the Messiah before the destruction of the second temple, the words of Haggai are remarkably explicit: "The desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of Hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, and in this place will I give peace," Hag. ii, 7. The Saviour was thus to appear, according to the prophecies of the Old Testament, during the time of the continuance of the kingdom of Judah, previous to the demolition of the temple, and immediately subsequent to the next prophet. But the time is rendered yet more definite. In the prophecies of Daniel, the kingdom of the Messiah is not only foretold as commencing in the time of the fourth monarchy, or Roman empire, but the express number of years that were to precede his coming are plainly intimated: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks," Dan. ix, 24, 25. Computation by weeks of years

was common among the Jews, and every seventh was the sabbatical year; seventy weeks, thus amounted to four hundred and ninety years. In these words the prophet marks the very time, and uses the very name of Messiah, the Prince; so entirely is all ambiguity done away. The plainest inference may be drawn from these prophecies. All of them, while, in every respect, they presuppose the most perfect knowledge of futurity; while they were unquestionably delivered and publicly known for ages previous to the time to which they referred; and while they refer to different contingent and unconnected events, utterly undeterminable and inconceivable by all human sagacity; accord in perfect unison to a single precise period where all their different lines terminate at once,--the very fulness of time when Jesus appeared. A king then reigned over the Jews in their own land; they were governed by their own laws; and the council of their nation exercised its authority and power. Before that period, the other tribes were extinct or dispersed among the nations. Judah alone remained, and the last sceptre in Israel had not then departed from it. Every stone of the temple was then unmoved; it was the admiration of the Romans, and might have stood for ages. But in a short space, all these concurring testimonies to the time of the advent of the Messiah passed away. During the very year, the twelfth of his age, in which Christ first publicly appeared in the temple, Archelaus the king was dethroned and banished; Coponius was appointed procurator; and the kingdom of Judea, the last remnant of the greatness of Israel, was debased into a part of the province of Syria. The sceptre was smitten from the tribe of Judah; the crown fell from their heads; their glory departed; and, soon after the death of Christ, of their temple one stone was not left upon another; their commonwealth itself became as complete a ruin, and was broken in pieces; and they have ever since been scattered throughout the world, a name but not a nation. After the lapse of nearly four hundred years posterior to the time of Malachi, another prophet appeared who was the herald of the Messiah. And the testimony of Josephus confirms the account given in Scripture of John the Baptist. Every mark that denoted the time of the coming of the Messiah was erased soon after the crucifixion of Christ, and could never afterward be renewed. And with respect to the prophecies of Daniel, it is remarkable, at this remote period, how little discrepancy of opinion has existed among the most learned men, as to the space from the time of the passing out of the edict to rebuild Jerusalem, after the Babylonish captivity, to the commencement of the Christian era, and the subsequent events foretold in the prophecy.

The predictions contained in the Old Testament respecting both the family out of which the Messiah was to arise, and the place of his birth, are almost as circumstantial, and are equally applicable to Christ, as those which refer to the time of his appearance. He was to be an Israelite, of the tribe of

Judah, of the family of David, and of the town of Bethlehem. That all these predictions were fulfilled in Jesus Christ; that he was of that country, tribe, and family, of the house and lineage of David, and born in Bethlehem, we have the fullest evidence in the testimony of all the evangelists; in two distinct accounts of the genealogies, by natural and legal succession, which, according to the custom of the Jews, were carefully preserved; in the acquiescence of the enemies of Christ in the truth of the fact, against which there is not a single surmise in history; and in the appeal made by some of the earliest Christian writers to the unquestionable testimony of the records of the census, taken at the very time of our Saviour's birth by order of Cæsar. Here, indeed, it is impossible not to be struck with the exact fulfilment of prophecies which are apparently contradictory and irreconcilable, and with the manner in which they were providentially accomplished. The spot of Christ's nativity was distant from the place of the abode of his parents, and the region in which he began his ministry was remote from the place of his birth; and another prophecy respecting him was in this manner verified: "In the land of Zebulun and Naphtali, by the way of the sea beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations, the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined," Isaiah ix, 1, 2; Matt. iv, 16. Thus, the time at which the predicted Messiah was to appear; the nation, the tribe, and the family from which he was to be descended; and the place of his birth,--no populous city, but of itself an inconsiderable place,--were all clearly foretold; and as clearly refer to Jesus Christ; and all meet their completion in him.

But the facts of his life, and the features of his character, are also drawn with a precision that cannot be misunderstood. The obscurity, the meanness, and the poverty of his external condition are thus represented: "He shall grow up before the Lord like a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form or comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. Thus saith the Lord to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship," Isaiah liii, 2; xlix, 7. That such was the condition in which Christ appeared, the whole history of his life abundantly testifies. And the Jews, looking in the pride of their hearts for an earthly king, disregarded these prophecies concerning him, were deceived by their traditions, and found only a stone of stumbling, where, if they had searched their Scriptures aright, they would have discovered an evidence of the Messiah. "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not this the son of Mary? said they and they were offended at him." His riding in humble triumph into Jerusalem; his being betrayed for thirty pieces of silver, and scourged, and buffeted, and spit upon; the piercing of his hands and of his feet; the last offered draught of vinegar and gall; the

parting of his raiment, and casting lots upon his vesture; the manner of his death and of his burial, and his rising again without seeing corruption, were all expressly predicted, and all these predictions were literally fulfilled, Zech. ix, 9; xi, 12; Isaiah l, 6; Psalm xxii, 16; lxix, 21; xxii, 18; Isaiah liii, 9; Psalm xvi, 10. If all these prophecies admit of any application to the events of the life of any individual, it can only be to that of the Author of Christianity. And what other religion can produce a single fact which was actually foretold of its founder?

The death of Christ was as unparalleled as his life; and the prophecies are as minutely descriptive of his sufferings as of his virtues. Not only did the paschal lamb, which was to be killed every year in all the families of Israel, which was to be taken out of the flock, to be without blemish, to be eaten with bitter herbs, to have its blood sprinkled, and to be kept whole that not a bone of it should be broken; not only did the offering up of Isaac, and the lifting up of the brazen serpent in the wilderness, by looking upon which the people were healed, and many ritual observances of the Jews, prefigure the manner of Christ's death, and the sacrifice which was to be made for sin; but many express declarations abound in the prophecies, 524that Christ was indeed to suffer. But Isaiah, who describes, with eloquence worthy of a prophet, the glories of the kingdom that was to come, characterizes, with the accuracy of a historian, the humiliation, the trials, and the agonies which were to precede the triumphs of the Redeemer of a world; and the history of Christ forms, to the very letter, the commentary and the completion of his every prediction. In a single passage, Isaiah lii, 13, &c; liii, the connection of which is uninterrupted, its antiquity indisputable, and its application obvious, the sufferings of the servant of God (who under that same denomination, is previously described as he who was to be the light of the Gentiles, the salvation of God to the ends of the earth, and the elect of God in whom his soul delighted, Isa. xiii, 10; xlix, 6) are so minutely foretold, that no illustration is requisite to show that they testify of Jesus. The whole of this prophecy thus refers to the Messiah. It describes both his debasement and his dignity; his rejection by the Jews; his humility, his affliction, and his agony; his magnanimity and his charity; how his words were disbelieved; how his state was lowly; how his sorrow was severe; how he opened not his mouth but to make intercession for the transgressors. In diametrical opposition to every dispensation of Providence which is registered in the records of the Jews, it represents spotless innocence suffering by the appointment of Heaven; death as the issue of perfect obedience; God's righteous servant as forsaken of him; and one who was perfectly immaculate bearing the chastisement of many guilty; sprinkling many nations from their iniquity, by virtue of his sacrifice; justifying many by his knowledge; and dividing a portion with the great and the spoil with the strong, because he hath poured out his soul

in death. This prophecy, therefore, simply as a prediction prior to the event, renders the very unbelief of the Jews an evidence against them, converts the scandal of the cross into an argument in favour of Christianity, and presents us with an epitome of the truth, a miniature of the Gospel in some of its most striking features. The simple exposition of it sufficed at once for the conversion of the eunuch of Ethiopia. To these prophecies may, in fact, be added all those which relate to his spiritual kingdom, or the circumstances of the promulgation, the opposition, and the triumphs of his religion; the accomplishment of which equally proves the divine mission of its Author, and points him out as that great personage with whom they stand inseparably connected.

2. But if Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, in that character his Deity also is necessarily involved, because the Messiah is surrounded with attributes of divinity in the Old Testament; and our Lord himself as certainly lays claim to those attributes as to the office of “the Christ.” Without referring here to the Scriptural doctrine of a Trinity of divine Persons in the unity of the Godhead, (see Trinity,) it is sufficient now to show that both in the Old and New Testament Scriptures, the Messiah is contemplated as a divine Person. In the very first promise of redemption, his superiority to that great and malignant spirit who destroyed the innocence of man, and blighted the fair creation of God, is unquestionably implied; while the Angel of the Divine Presence, the Angel of the Covenant, who appears so prominent in the patriarchal times, and the early periods of Jewish history, and was understood by the early Jews as the future Messiah, is seen at once as a being distinct from Jehovah and yet Jehovah himself; bearing that incommunicable name; and performing acts, and possessing qualities of unquestionable divinity. As the “Redeemer” of Job, he is the object of his trust and hope, and is said to be then a “living Redeemer;” to see whom at the last was to “see God.” As “Shiloh,” in the prophecy of Jacob, he is represented as having an indefinitely extensive reign over “the people” gathered to him; and in all subsequent predictions respecting this reign of Christ, it is represented so vast, so perfect, so influential upon the very thoughts, purposes, and affections of men, that no mere creature can be reasonably supposed capable of exercising it. Of the second Psalm, so manifestly appropriated to the Messiah, it has been justly said, that the high titles and honours ascribed in this Psalm to the extraordinary person who is the chief subject of it, far transcend any thing that is ascribed in Scripture to any mere creature. But if the Psalm be inquired into more narrowly, and compared with parallel prophecies; if it be duly considered, that not only is the extraordinary person here spoken of called, “the Son of God,” but that title is so ascribed to him as to imply, that it belongs to him in a manner that is absolutely singular, and peculiar to himself, seeing he is said to be begotten of God, verse 7, and is called, by way of eminence, “the Son,”

verse 12; that the danger of provoking him to anger is spoken of in so very different a manner from what the Scripture uses in speaking of the anger of any mere creature, "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little;" that when the kings and judges of the earth are commanded to serve God with fear, they are at the same time commanded to kiss the Son, which in those times and places was frequently an expression of adoration; and, particularly, that, whereas other Scriptures contain awful and just threatenings against those who trust in any mere man, the Psalmist nevertheless expressly calls them blessed who trust in the Son here spoken of;--all these things taken together make up a character of unequivocal divinity: and, on the other hand, when it is said, that God would set this his Son as his King on his holy hill of Zion, verse 6, this, and various other expressions in this Psalm, contain characters of that subordination which is appropriate to that divine Person who was to be incarnate, and engage in a work assigned to him by the Father. The former part of the forty-fifth Psalm is by the inspired authority of St. Paul applied to the Christ, who is addressed in these lofty words, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." In the same manner Psalm cii, 25-29, is applied to Christ by the same authority, and there he is represented as the Creator of all things, changing his creations as a vesture, and yet himself continuing the same unchanged being amidst all the mutations of the universe. In Psalm cx, David says, "Jehovah said unto my Lord, (Adonai,) Sit thou upon my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." And in Isaiah vi, the same Adonai is seen by the prophet "seated upon a throne, high and lifted up," receiving the adoration of seraphs, and bearing the title, "Jehovah, Lord of Hosts," of which passage St. John makes a direct application to Christ. Isaiah predicts his birth of a virgin, under the title of "Immanuel, God with us." The same prophet gives to this wonderful child the style of "the Mighty God," the Everlasting Father," and the "Prince of Peace;" so that, as Dr. Pye Smith justly observes, "if there be any dependence on words, the Messiah is here drawn in the opposite characters of humanity and Deity,--the nativity and frailty of a mortal child, and the incommunicable attributes of the omnipresent and eternal God." Twice is he called by Jeremiah, "Jehovah our righteousness." Daniel terms him the "Ancient of Days," or "The Immortal;" and Micah declares, in a passage which the council of the Jews, assembled by Herod, applied to the Messiah, that he who was to be born in Bethlehem was "even he whose comings forth are from eternity, from the days of the everlasting period." Thus the prophetic testimony describes him, as entitled to the appellation of "Wonderful," since he should be, in a sense peculiar to himself, the Son of God, Psalm ii, 7; Isaiah ix, 6; as existing and acting during the patriarchal and the Jewish ages, and even from eternity, Psalm xl, 7-9; Micah v, 2; as the guardian and protector of his people, Isaiah xl, 9-11; as the proper

object of the various affections of piety, of devotional confidence for obtaining the most important blessings, and of religious homage from angels and men, Psalm ii, 12; xcvi, 7; and, finally, declares him to be the eternal and immutable Being, the Creator, God, the Mighty God, Adonai, Elohim, Jehovah.

In perfect accordance with these views, does our Saviour speak of himself. He asserts his preëxistence, as having “come down from heaven;” and as existing “before Abraham;” and as being “in heaven” while yet before the eyes of his disciples on earth. In the same peculiar manner does he apply the term “Son of God” to himself, and that with so manifest an intention to assume it in the sense of divinity, that the Jews attempted on that account to stone him as a blasphemer. The whole force of the argument by which he silenced the Pharisees when he asked how the Messiah, who was to be the Son of David, could be David’s Lord, in reference to the passage in the Psalms before quoted, arose out of the doctrine of the Messiah’s divinity; and when he claims that all men should honour him as they honour the Father, and asserts that as the Father hath life in himself, so he has given to the Son to have life in himself, that he “quickeneth whom he will,” that “where two or three meet in his name he is in the midst of them,” and would be with his disciples “to the end of the world;” who does not see that the Jews concluded right, when they said that he made himself “equal with God,”--an impression which he took no pains to remove, although his own moral character bound him to do so, had he not intended to confirm that conclusion. So numerous are the passages in which divine titles, acts, and qualities, are ascribed to Christ, in the apostolical epistles, and so unbroken is the stream of testimony from the apostolic age, that the Deity of their Saviour was the undoubted and universal faith of his inspired followers, and of those who immediately succeeded them, that it is not necessary to quote proofs. The whole argument is this: If the Old Testament Scriptures represent the Messiah as a divine Person; the proofs which demonstrate Jesus to be the Messiah, demonstrate him also by farther and necessary consequence to be divine. Yet, though there is a union of natures in Christ, there is no mixture or confusion of their properties: his humanity is not changed into his Deity, nor his Deity absorbed by his humanity; but the two natures are distinct in one Person. How this union exists, is above our comprehension; and, indeed, if we cannot explain how our bodies and souls are united, it is not to be supposed that we can comprehend the mystery of “God manifest in the flesh.” So truly does Christ bear the name given to him in prophecy,--“Wonderful.”

3. The doctrine of the Deity of Christ derives farther confirmation from the consideration, that in no sound sense can the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments be interpreted so as to make their very different and often



apparently contradictory statements respecting him harmonize. How, for instance, is it that he is arrayed in the attributes of divinity, and yet is capable of being raised to a kingdom and glory?--that he is addressed, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," and yet that it should follow "God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows?"--that he should be God, and yet, by a human birth, "God with us?"--that he should, say, "I and my Father are one," and, "My Father is greater than I?"--that he is supreme, and yet a servant?--that he is equal and yet subordinate?--that he, a man, should require and receive worship and trust?--that he should be greater than angels, and yet "made lower than the angels?"--that he should be "made flesh," and yet be the Creator of all things?--that he should raise himself from the dead, and yet be raised by the power of the Father? These and many other declarations respecting him, all accord with the orthodox view of his person; and are intelligible so far as they state the facts respecting 526him; but are wholly beyond the power of interpretation into any rational meaning on any theory which denies to him a real humanity on the one hand, or a real and personal divinity on the other. So powerfully, in fact, has this been felt, that, in order to evade the force of the testimony of Scripture, the most licentious criticisms have been resorted to by the deniers of his divinity; such as would not certainly have been tolerated by scholars in the case of an attempt to interpret any other ancient writing.

4. Being, therefore, not only "a teacher sent from God," but the divine Son of God himself, it might be truly said by his wondering hearers, "Never man spake like this man." On our Lord's character as a teacher, therefore, many striking and just remarks have been made by different writers, not excepting some infidels themselves, who, in this respect, have been carried into admiration by the overwhelming force of evidence. This article, however, shall not be indebted to a desecrated source for an estimate of the character of his teaching, and shall rather be concluded with the following admirable remarks of a Christian prelate:--

"When our Lord is considered as a teacher, we find him delivering the justest and most sublime truths with respect to the divine nature, the duties of mankind, and a future state of existence; agreeable in every particular to reason, and to the wisest maxims of the wisest philosophers; without any mixture of that alloy which so often debased their most perfect production; and excellently adapted to mankind in general, by suggesting circumstances and particular images on the most awful and interesting subjects. We find him filling, and, as it were, overpowering our minds with the grandest ideas of his own nature; representing himself as appointed by his Father to be our Instructor, our Redeemer, our Judge, and our King; and showing that he lived and died for the most benevolent and important

purposes conceivable. He does not labour to support the greatest and most magnificent of all characters; but it is perfectly easy and natural to him. He makes no display of the high and heavenly truths which he utters; but speaks of them with a graceful and wonderful simplicity and majesty. Supernatural truths are as familiar to his mind, as the common affairs of life are to other men. He revives the moral law, carries it to perfection, and enforces it by peculiar and animating motives: but he enjoins nothing new beside praying in his name, mutual love among his disciples, as such, and the observance of two simple and significant positive laws which serve to promote the practice of the moral law. All his precepts, when rightly explained, are reasonable in themselves and useful in their tendency: and their compass is very great, considering that he was an occasional teacher, and not a systematical one. If from the matter of his instructions we pass on to the manner in which they were delivered, we find our Lord usually speaking as an authoritative teacher; though occasionally limiting his precepts, and sometimes assigning the reasons of them. He presupposes the original law of God, and addresses men as rational creatures. From the grandeur of his mind, and the magnitude of his subjects, he is often sublime; and the beauties interspersed throughout his discourses are equally natural and striking. He is remarkable for an easy and graceful manner of introducing the best lessons from incidental objects and occasions. The human heart is naked and open to him; and he addresses the thoughts of men, as others do the emotions of their countenance or their bodily actions. Difficult situations, and sudden questions of the most artful and ensnaring kind, serve only to display his superior wisdom, and to confound and astonish all his adversaries. Instead of showing his boundless knowledge on every occasion, he checks and restrains it, and prefers utility to the glare of ostentation. He teaches directly and obliquely, plainly and covertly, as wisdom points out occasions. He knows the inmost character, every prejudice and every feeling of his hearers; and, accordingly, uses parables to conceal or to enforce his lessons: and he powerfully impresses them by the significant language of actions. He gives proofs of his mission from above, by his knowledge of the heart, by a chain of prophecies, and by a variety of mighty works.

“He sets an example of the most perfect piety to God, and of the most extensive benevolence and the most tender compassion to men. He does not merely exhibit a life of strict justice, but of overflowing benignity. His temperance has not the dark shades of austerity; his meekness does not degenerate into apathy. His humility is signal, amidst a splendour of qualities more than human. His fortitude is eminent and exemplary, in enduring the most formidable external evils and the sharpest actual sufferings: his patience is invincible; his resignation entire and absolute. Truth and sincerity shine throughout his whole conduct. Though of

heavenly descent, he shows obedience and affection to his earthly parents. He approves, loves, and attaches himself to amiable qualities in the human race. He respects authority, religious and civil; and he evidences his regard for his country by promoting its most essential good in a painful ministry dedicated to its service, by deploring its calamities, and by laying down his life for its benefit. Every one of his eminent virtues is regulated by consummate prudence; and he both wins the love of his friends, and extorts the approbation and wonder of his enemies. Never was a character at the same time so commanding and natural, so resplendent and pleasing, so amiable and venerable. There is a peculiar contrast in it between an awful greatness, dignity, and majesty, and the most conciliating loveliness, tenderness, and softness. He now converses with prophets, lawgivers, and angels; and the next instant he meekly endures the dulness of his disciples, and the blasphemies and rage of the multitude. 527He now calls himself greater than Solomon, one who can command legions of angels, the Giver of life to whomsoever he pleaseth, the Son of God who shall sit on his glorious throne to judge the world. At other times we find him embracing young children, not lifting up his voice in the streets, not breaking the bruised reed, nor quenching the smoking flax; calling his disciples, not servants, but friends and brethren, and comforting them with an exuberant and parental affection. Let us pause an instant, and fill our minds with the idea of one who knew all things heavenly and earthly, searched and laid open the inmost recesses of the heart, rectified every prejudice, and removed every mistake, of a moral and religious kind, by a word exercised a sovereignty over all nature, penetrated the hidden events of futurity, gave promises of admission into a happy immortality, had the keys of life and death, claimed a union with the Father; and yet was pious, mild, gentle, humble, affable, social, benevolent, friendly, affectionate. Such a character is fairer than the morning star. Each separate virtue is made stronger by opposition and contrast; and the union of so many virtues forms a brightness which fitly represents the glory of that God 'who inhabiteth light inaccessible.' Such a character must have been a real one. There is something so extraordinary, so perfect, and so godlike in it, that it could not have been thus supported throughout by the utmost stretch of human art, much less by men confessedly unlearned and obscure." We may add, that such a character must also have been divine. His virtues are human in their class and kind, so that he was our "example;" but they were sustained and heightened by that divinity which was impersonated in him, and from which they derived their intense and full perfection.

5. A great deal has been written concerning the form, beauty, and stature of Jesus Christ. Some have asserted, that he was in person the noblest of all the sons of men. Others have maintained, that there was no beauty nor any graces in his outward appearance. The fathers have not expressed

themselves on this matter in a uniform manner. St. Jerom believes that the lustre and majesty which shone about our Saviour's face were capable of winning all hearts: it was this that drew the generality of his Apostles with so much ease to him; it was this majesty which struck those down who came to seize him in the olive garden. St. Bernard and St. Chrysostom contend in like manner for the beauty of Jesus Christ's person; but the most ancient fathers have acknowledged, that he was not at all handsome. *Homo indecorus et passibilis*, says Irenæus. Celsus objected to the Christians, that Jesus Christ, as a man, was little, and ill made, which Origen acknowledged in his answer to have been written of him. Clemens Alexandrinus owns, in several places, that the person of Jesus Christ was not beautiful, as does also Cyril of Alexandria. Tertullian says plainly, *vultu et aspectu inglorius*; that his outward form had nothing that could attract consideration and respect. St. Austin confesses, that Jesus Christ, as a man, was without beauty and the advantage of person; and the generality of the ancients, as Eusebius, Basil, Theodoret, Ambrose, Isidore, &c, explain the passage in the Psalms, "Thou art fairer than the children of men," as relating to the beauty of Jesus Christ according to his divinity. This difference in opinion shows that no certain tradition was handed down on this subject. The truth probably is, that all which was majestic and attractive in the person of our Lord, was in the expression of the countenance, the full influence of which was displayed chiefly in his confidential intercourse with his disciples; while his general appearance presented no striking peculiarity to the common observer.

JEWS, the appropriate denomination of the descendants of Judah, which soon included under it the Benjamites, who joined themselves to the tribe of Judah, on the revolt of the other ten tribes from the house of David. After the Babylonish captivity, when many individuals of these ten tribes returned with the men of Judah and Benjamin to rebuild Jerusalem, the term Jews included them also, or rather was then extended to all the descendants of Israel who retained the Jewish religion, whether they belonged to the two or to the ten tribes, whether they returned into Judea or not. Hence, not only all the Israelites of future times have been called Jews, but all the descendants of Jacob, from the earliest times, are frequently so called by us at present, and we speak even of their original dispensation as the Jewish dispensation. The history of this singular people is recorded in the sacred books of the Old Testament; and in place of epitomizing the accounts of the sacred writers, it will be more useful to fill up the chasm between the close of the historical books there contained, and the coming of our Lord.

When the kingdom of Judah had been seventy years in captivity, and the period of their affliction was completed, Cyrus, (B. C. 536,) under whom

were united the kingdoms of Persia, Media, and Babylon, issued a decree, permitting all the Jews to return to their own land, and to rebuild their temple at Jerusalem. This decree had been expressly foretold by the Prophet Isaiah, who spoke of Cyrus by name, above a hundred years before his birth, as the deliverer of God's chosen people from their predicted captivity. Though the decree issued by Cyrus was general, a part only of the nation took advantage of it. The number of persons who returned at this time was forty-two thousand three hundred and sixty, and seven thousand three hundred and thirty-seven servants. They were conducted by Zerubbabel and Joshua. Zerubbabel, frequently called in Scripture Shashbazzar, was the grandson of Jeconias, and consequently descended from David. He was called "the prince of Judah," and was appointed their governor by Cyrus, and with his permission carried back a part of the gold and silver vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple of Jerusalem. The rest of the treasures of the temple were carried thither afterward by Ezra. Joshua was the son of Josedec, the high priest, and grandson of Seraiah, who was high priest when the temple was destroyed. Darius, the successor of Cyrus, confirmed this decree, and favoured the re-establishment of the people. But it was in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, called in Scripture Ahasuerus, that Ezra obtained his commission, and was made governor of the Jews in their own land, which government he held thirteen years: then Nehemiah was appointed with fresh powers, probably through the interest of Queen Esther; and Ezra applied himself solely to correcting the canon of the Scriptures, and restoring and providing for the continuance of the worship of God in its original purity. The first care of the Jews, after their arrival in Judea, was to build an altar for burnt-offerings to God: they then collected materials for rebuilding the temple; and all necessary preparations being made, in the beginning of the second year after their return under Zerubbabel, they began to build it upon the old foundations. The Samaritans, affirming that they worshipped the God of Israel, offered to assist the Jews; but their assistance being refused, they did all in their power to impede the work; and hence originated that enmity which ever after subsisted between the Jews and Samaritans. The temple, after a variety of obstructions and delays, was finished and dedicated, in the seventh year of King Darius, B. C. 515, and twenty years after it was begun. Though this second temple, or, as it is sometimes called, the temple of Zerubbabel, who was at that time governor of the Jews, was of the same size and dimensions as the first, or Solomon's temple, yet it was very inferior to it in splendour and magnificence; and the ark of the covenant, the Shechinah, the holy fire upon the altar, the Urim and Thummim, and the spirit of prophecy, were all wanting to this temple of the remnant of the people. At the feast of the dedication, offerings were made for the twelve tribes of Israel, which seems to indicate that some of all the tribes returned from captivity; but by

far the greater number were of the tribe of Judah, and therefore from this period the Israelites were generally called Judæi or Jews, and their country Judea. Many, at their own desire, remained in those provinces where they had been placed by the kings of Assyria and Babylon. The settlement of the people, “after their old estate,” according to the word of the Lord, together with the arrangement of all civil and ecclesiastical matters, and the building of the walls of Jerusalem, were completed by Ezra and Nehemiah. But we soon after find Malachi, the last of the prophets under the Old Testament, reproving both priests and people very severely, not for idolatry, but for their scandalous lives and gross corruptions.

The Scriptural history ends at this period, B. C. 430; and we must have recourse to uninspired writings, principally to the books of the Maccabees, and to Josephus, for the remaining particulars of the Jewish history, to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Judea continued subject to the kings of Persia about two hundred years; but it does not appear that it had a separate governor after Nehemiah. From his time it was included in the jurisdiction of the governor of Syria, and under him the high priest had the chief authority. When Alexander the Great was preparing to besiege Tyre, he sent to Jaddua, the high priest at Jerusalem, to supply him with that quantity of provisions which he was accustomed to send to Persia. Jaddua refused, upon the ground of his oath of fidelity to the king of Persia. This refusal irritated Alexander; and when he had taken Tyre, he marched toward Jerusalem to revenge himself upon the Jews. Jaddua had notice of his approach, and, by the direction of God, went out of the city to meet him, dressed in his pontifical robes, and attended by the Levites in white garments. Alexander, visibly struck with this solemn appearance, immediately laid aside his hostile intentions, advanced toward the high priest, embraced him, and paid adoration to the name of God, which was inscribed upon the frontlet of his mitre: he afterward went into the city with the high priest, and offered sacrifices in the temple to the God of the Jews. This sudden change in the disposition of Alexander excited no small astonishment among his followers; and when his favourite Parmenio inquired of him the cause, he answered, that it was occasioned by the recollection of a remarkable dream he had in Macedonia, in which a person, dressed precisely like the Jewish high priest, had encouraged him to undertake the conquest of Persia, and had promised him success: he therefore adored the name of that God by whose direction he believed he acted, and showed kindness to his people. It is also said, that while he was at Jerusalem the prophecies of Daniel were pointed out to him, which foretold that “the king of Grecia” should conquer Persia, Dan. viii, 21. Before he left Jerusalem he granted the Jews the same free enjoyment of their laws and their religion, and exemption from tribute every sabbatical year, which they had been allowed by the kings of Persia; and when he

built Alexandria, he placed a great number of Jews there, and granted them many favours and immunities. Whether any Jews settled in Europe so early as while the nation was subject to the Macedonian empire, is not known; but it is believed that they began to Hellenize about this time. The Greek tongue became more common among them, and Grecian manners and opinions were soon introduced. See Alexander.

At the death of Alexander, (B. C. 323,) in the division of his empire among his generals, Judea fell to the share of Laomedon. But Ptolemy Soter, son of Lagus, king of Egypt, soon after made himself master of it by a stratagem: he entered Jerusalem on a Sabbath day, under pretence of offering sacrifice, and took possession of the city without resistance from the Jews, who did not on this occasion dare to transgress their law by fighting on a Sabbath day. Ptolemy carried many thousands captive into Egypt, both Jews and Samaritans, and settled them there: he afterward treated them with kindness, on account of their acknowledged fidelity to their engagements, particularly in their conduct toward Darius, king of Persia; and he granted them equal privileges with the Macedonians themselves at Alexandria. Ptolemy Philadelphus is said to have given the Jews who were captives in Egypt their liberty, to the number of a hundred and twenty thousand. He commanded the Jewish Scriptures to be translated into the Greek language, which translation is called the Septuagint. (See Alexandria.) After the Jewish nation had been tributary to the kings of Egypt for about a hundred years, it became subject to the kings of Syria. They divided the land, which now began to be called Palestine, into five provinces, three of which were on the west side of the Jordan, namely, Galilee, Samaria, and Judea, and two on the east side, namely, Trachonitis and Peræa; but they suffered them to be governed by their own laws, under the high priest and council of the nation. Seleucus Nicanor gave them the right of citizens in the cities which he built in Asia Minor and Cælo-Syria, and even in Antioch, his capital, with privileges, which they continued to enjoy under the Romans. Antiochus the Great granted considerable favours and immunities to the city of Jerusalem; and, to secure Lydia and Phrygia, he established colonies of Jews in those provinces. In the series of wars which took place between the kings of Syria and Egypt, Judea, being situated between those two countries, was, in a greater or less degree, affected by all the revolutions which they experienced, and was frequently the scene of bloody and destructive battles. The evils to which the Jews were exposed from these foreign powers were considerably aggravated by the corruption and misconduct of their own high priests, and other persons of distinction among them. To this corruption and misconduct, and to the increasing wickedness of the people, their sufferings ought indeed to be attributed, according to the express declarations of God by the mouth of his prophets. It is certain that about this time a considerable part of the

nation was become much attached to Grecian manners and customs, though they continued perfectly free from the sin of idolatry. Near Jerusalem places were appropriated to gymnastic exercises; and the people were led by Jason, who had obtained the high priesthood from Antiochus Epiphanes by the most dishonourable means, to neglect the temple worship, and the observance of the law, in a far greater degree than at any period since their return from the captivity. It pleased God to punish them for this defection, by the hand of the very person whom they particularly sought to please. Antiochus Epiphanes, irritated at having been prevented by the Jews from entering the holy place when he visited the temple, soon after made a popular commotion the pretence for the exercise of tyranny: he took the city, (B. C. 170,) plundered the temple, and slew or enslaved great numbers of the inhabitants, with every circumstance of profanation and of cruelty which can be conceived. For three years and a half, the time predicted by Daniel, the daily sacrifice was taken away, the temple defiled and partly destroyed, the observance of the law prohibited under the most severe penalties, every copy burned which the agents of the tyrant could procure, and the people required to sacrifice to idols, under pain of the most agonizing death. Numerous as were the apostates, (for the previous corruption of manners had but ill prepared the nation for such a trial,) a remnant continued faithful; and the complicated miseries which the people endured under this cruel yoke excited a general impatience. At length the moment of deliverance arrived. Mattathias, a priest, (B. C. 167,) eminent for his piety and resolution, and the father of five sons, equally zealous for their religion, encouraged the people by his example and exhortations, "to stand up for the law;" and having soon collected an army of six thousand men, he eagerly undertook to free Judea from the oppression and persecution of the Syrians, and to restore the worship of the God of Israel; but being very old when he engaged in this important and arduous work, he did not live to see its completion. At his death, his son, Judas Maccabæus, succeeded to the command of the army; and having defeated the Syrians in several engagements, he drove them out of Judea, and established his own authority in the country. His first care was to repair and purify the temple for the restoration of divine worship; and, to preserve the memory of this event, the Jews ordained a feast of eight days, called the feast of the dedication, to be yearly observed. Judas Maccabæus was slain in battle, and his brother Jonathan succeeded him in the government. He was also made high priest, and from that time the Maccabæan princes continued to be high priests. Judas Maccabæus and his brothers were so successful, by their valour and conduct, in asserting the liberty of their country, that in a few years they not only recovered its independence, but regained almost all the possessions of the twelve tribes, destroying at the same time the temple on Mount Gerizim, in Samaria. But they and their successors were almost always engaged in wars, in which, though



generally victorious, they were sometimes defeated, and their country for a short time oppressed. Aristobulus was the first of the Maccabees who assumed the name of king. About forty-two years after, a contest arising between the two brothers, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, the sons of Alexander Jaddæus, relative to the succession of the crown, both parties applied to the Romans for their support and assistance. Scæurus, the Roman general, suffered himself to be bribed by Aristobulus, and placed him on the throne. Not long after, Pompey returned from the east into Syria, and both the 530 brothers applied to him for his protection, and pleaded their cause before him, (B. C. 63.) Pompey considered this as a favourable opportunity for reducing Palestine under the power of the Romans, to which the neighbouring nations had already submitted; and therefore, without deciding the points in dispute between the two brothers, he marched his army into Judea, and, after some pretended negotiation with Aristobulus and his party, besieged and took possession of Jerusalem. He appointed Hyrcanus high priest, but would not allow him to take the title of king: he gave him, however, the specious name of prince, with very limited authority. Pompey did not take away the holy utensils or treasures of the temple, but he made Judea subject and tributary to the Romans; and Crassus, about nine years after, plundered the temple of every thing valuable belonging to it. Julius Cæsar confirmed Hyrcanus in the pontificate, and granted fresh privileges to the Jews; but about four years after the death of Julius Cæsar, Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, with the assistance of the Parthians, while the empire of Rome was in an unsettled state, deposed his uncle Hyrcanus, (B. C. 41,) seized the government, and assumed the title of king.

Herod, by birth an Idumean, but of the Jewish religion, whose father, Antipater, as well as himself, had enjoyed considerable posts of honour and trust under Hyrcanus, immediately set out for Rome, and prevailed upon the senate, through the interest of Antony and Augustus, to appoint him king of Judea. Armed with this authority, he returned, and began hostilities against Antigonus. About three years after, he took Jerusalem, and put an end to the government of the Maccabees or Asmonæans, after it had lasted nearly a hundred and thirty years. Antigonus was sent prisoner to Rome, and was there put to death by Antony. Herod married Mariamne, who lived to be the only representative of the Asmonæan family, and afterward caused her to be publicly executed from motives of unfounded jealousy. Herod considerably enlarged the kingdom of Judea, but it continued tributary to the Romans; he greatly depressed the civil power of the high priesthood, and changed it from being hereditary and for life to an office granted and held at the pleasure of the monarch; and this sacred office was now often given to those who paid the highest price for it, without any regard to merit: he was an inexorable, cruel tyrant to his people, and even

to his children, three of whom he put to death; a slave to his passions, and indifferent by what means he gratified his ambition; but to preserve the Jews in subjection, and to erect a lasting monument to his own name, he repaired the temple of Jerusalem at a vast expense, and added greatly to its magnificence.

At this time there was a confident expectation of the Messiah among the Jews; and indeed, a general idea prevailed among the Heathen, also, that some extraordinary conqueror or deliverer would soon appear in Judea. In the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Herod, while Augustus was emperor of Rome, the Saviour of mankind was born of the virgin Mary, of the lineage of David, in the city of Bethlehem of Judea, according to the word of prophecy. Herod, misled by the opinion, which was then common among the Jews, that the Messiah was to appear as the temporal prince, and judging from the inquiries of the wise men of the east, that the child was actually born, sent to Bethlehem, and ordered that all the children of two years old and under should be put to death, with the hope of destroying one whom he considered as the rival of himself, or at least of his family. He was soon after smitten with a most loathsome and tormenting disease, and died, a signal example of divine justice, about a year and a quarter after the birth of our Saviour, and in the thirty-seventh year of his reign, computing from the time he was declared king by the Romans. See Herod.

Herod made his will not long before his death, but left the final disposal of his dominions to Augustus. The emperor ratified this will in all its material points, and suffered the countries over which Herod had reigned to be divided among his three sons. Archelaus succeeded to the largest share, namely, to Judea Propria, Samaria, and Idumea. Herod Antipas, called Herod the Tetrarch, who afterward beheaded John the Baptist, succeeded to Galilee and Peræa; and Philip, to Trachonitis, and to the neighbouring region of Iturea. The sons of Herod the Great were not suffered to take the title of king: they were only called ethnarchs or tetrarchs. Beside the countries already mentioned, Abilene, which had belonged to Herod during the latter part of his life, and of which Lysanias is mentioned in Luke iii, 1, as tetrarch, and some cities were given to Salome, the sister of Herod the Great, (A. D. 7.) Archelaus acted with great cruelty and injustice; and in the tenth year of his government, upon a regular complaint being made against him by the Jews, Augustus banished him to Vienne, in Gaul, where he died.

After the banishment of Archelaus, Augustus sent Publius Sulpitius Quirinus, who, according to the Greek way of writing that name, is by St. Luke called Cyrenius, president of Syria, to reduce the countries over which Archelaus had reigned, to the form of a Roman province; and

appointed Coponius, a Roman of the equestrian order, to be governor, under the title of procurator of Judea, but subordinate to the president of Syria. The power of life and death was now taken out of the hands of the Jews, and taxes were from this time paid immediately to the Roman emperor. Justice was administered in the name and by the laws of Rome; though in what concerned their religion, their own laws, and the power of the high priest, and sanhedrim, or great council, were continued to them; and they were allowed to examine witnesses, and exercise an inferior jurisdiction in other causes, subject to the control of the Romans, to whom their tetrarchs or kings were also subject; and it may be remarked that, at this very period of time, our Saviour, who was now in the twelfth year of his age, being at Jerusalem with Joseph and Mary upon occasion of the passover, appeared first in the temple in his prophetic office, and in the business of his Father, on which he was sent, sitting among the doctors of the temple, and declaring the truth of God to them. After Coponius, Ambivius, Annus Rufus, Valerius Gratus, and Pontius Pilate, were successively procurators; and this was the species of government to which Judea and Samaria were subject during the ministry of our Saviour. Herod Antipas was still tetrarch of Galilee, and it was he to whom our Saviour was sent by Pontius Pilate. Lardner is of opinion that there was no procurator in Judea after Pontius Pilate, who was removed A. D. 36, but that it was governed for a few years by the presidents of Syria, who occasionally sent officers into Judea. Philip continued tetrarch of Trachonitis thirty-seven years, and died in the twentieth year of the reign of Tiberius. Caligula gave his tetrarchy to Agrippa, the grandson of Herod the Great, with the title of king; and afterward he added the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas, whom he deposed and banished after he had been tetrarch forty-three years. The Emperor Claudius gave him Judea, Samaria, the southern parts of Idumea, and Abilene; and thus at last the dominions of Herod Agrippa became nearly the same as those of his grandfather, Herod the Great. It was this Agrippa, called also Herod Agrippa, and by St. Luke Herod only, who put to death James, the brother of John, and imprisoned Peter. He died in the seventh year of his reign, and left a son called also Agrippa, then seventeen years old; and Claudius, thinking him too young to govern his father's extensive dominions, made Cuspius Fadus governor of Judea. Fadus was soon succeeded by Tiberius, and he was followed by Alexander Cumanus, Felix, and Festus; but Claudius afterward gave Trachonitis and Abilene to Agrippa, and Nero added a part of Galilee and some other cities. It was this younger Agrippa, who was also called king, before whom Paul pleaded at Cæsarea, which was at that time the place of residence of the governor of Judea. Several of the Roman governors severely oppressed and persecuted the Jews; and at length, in the reign of Nero, and in the government of Florus, who had treated them with greater cruelty than any of his predecessors, they openly revolted from the

Romans. Then began the Jewish war, which was terminated, after an obstinate defence and unparalleled sufferings on the part of the Jews, by the total destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, by the overthrow of their civil and religious polity, and the reduction of the people to a state of the most abject slavery; for though, in the reign of Adrian, numbers of them collected together, in different parts of Judea, it is to be observed, they were then considered and treated as rebellious slaves; and these commotions were made a pretence for the general slaughter of those who were taken, and tended to complete the work of their dispersion into all countries under heaven. Since that time the Jews have no where subsisted as a nation.

2. Jews, Modern. The Jews divide the books of the Old Testament into three classes: the law, the prophets, and the hagiographa, or holy writings. They have counted not only the large and small sections, the verses and the words, but even the letters in some of the books; and they have likewise reckoned which is the middle letter of the Pentateuch, which is the middle clause of each book, and how often each letter of the alphabet occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures. Beside the Scriptures, the Jews pay great attention to the Targums, or Chaldee paraphrases of them. It seems probable that these were written either during the Babylonish captivity, or immediately afterward, when the Jews had forgotten their own language, and acquired the Chaldee of the Targums, at present received by the Jews. The most ancient are that of Onkelos on the law, and that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the prophets: the former is supposed to be of greater antiquity than the latter, and it approaches, in simplicity and purity of style, to the Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra. The Targum on the prophets is believed to have been written before the birth of Christ; and, though inferior in respect of style to the Targum of Onkelos, is much superior to any other Targum.

The Jews also regard with great veneration, what is called the Talmud. This work consists of two parts: the Mishna, which signifies a second law; and the Gemara, which means either a supplement or a commentary. The Jews suppose that God first dictated the text of the law to Moses, which he commanded to be put in writing, and which exists in the Pentateuch, and then gave him an explication of every thing comprehended in it, which he ordered to be committed to memory. Hence the former is called the written, and the latter the oral, law. These two laws were recited by Moses to Aaron four times, to his sons three times, to the seventy elders twice, and to the rest of the people once: after this, the repetition was renewed by Aaron, his two sons, and the seventy elders. The last month of Moses's life was spent, according to the Jews, in repeating and explaining the law to the people, and especially to Joshua, his successor. A prophet might suspend any law, or authorize the violation of any precept, except those against idolatry. If

there was any difference of opinion respecting the meaning of any law or precept, it was determined by the majority. When Joshua died, all the interpretations he had received from Moses, as well as those made in his time, were transmitted to the elders: they conveyed them to the prophets, and by one prophet they were delivered to another. This law was only oral till the days of Rabbi Jehuda, who, perceiving that the students of the law were gradually decreasing, and that the Jews were dispersed over the face of the earth, collected all the traditions, arranged them under distinct heads, and formed them into a methodical code of traditional law; thus the Mishna was formed. It is written in a concise style, chiefly in the form of aphorisms, which admit of a variety of interpretations. On this account, a Gemara or commentary was written by a president of a school in Palestine, which, together with the Mishna, forms the Jerusalem Talmud. The Jews in Chaldea, however, not being satisfied with this Gemara, one of their rabbies compiled another; which, together with the Mishna, forms the Babylonian Talmud.

One of the principal branches of modern Judaism is the cabala, the study of which is regarded as the sublimest of all sciences. By the cabala, the Jews mean those mystical interpretations of the Scripture, and metaphysical speculations concerning the Deity, angels, &c, which they regard as having been handed down by a secret tradition from the earliest ages. In the eleventh century, the famous Rabbi Maimonides drew up a summary of the doctrines of Judaism, which every Jew is required to believe, on pain of excommunication in this world, and condemnation in the next. This summary consists of thirteen articles, which he calls foundations or roots of the faith. The articles are as follows: 1. That God is the Creator and active Supporter of all things. 2. That God is one, and eternally unchangeable. 3. That God is incorporeal, and cannot have any material properties. 4. That God must eternally exist. 5. That God alone is to be worshipped. 6. That whatever is taught by the prophets is true. 7. That Moses is the head and father of all contemporary doctors, and of all those who lived before or shall live after him. 8. That the law was given by Moses. 9. That the law shall always exist, and never be altered. 10. That God knows all the thoughts and actions of men. 11. That God will reward the observance, and punish the breach, of the laws. 12. That the Messiah is to come, though he tarry a long time. 13. That there shall be a resurrection of the dead, when God shall think fit.

The Jewish religion is, perhaps, more a religion of minute and trifling rites and ceremonies than even the Catholic religion. The minutest circumstances in dressing and undressing, washing and wiping the face and hands, and other necessary actions of common and daily life, are enjoined by the rabbies to be performed exactly according to the prescribed

regulations. Their prayers also are numerous, and some of them relate to the most trifling circumstances. Those esteemed the most solemn and important are called Shemoneh Esreh, or the eighteen prayers, though they actually consist of nineteen, the last having been added against heretics and apostates. They are enjoined to be said by all Jews above the age of thirteen, wherever they may be, three times a day. The members of the synagogue are required to repeat at least a hundred benedictions every day. A son who survives his father is enjoined to attend the nocturnal service in the synagogue every evening for a year, and to repeat the Kodesh, in order that his father may be delivered from hell. This service may be suspended by any person going up to the desk and closing the book. This is not unfrequently done in case of quarrels; and the prayers cannot be renewed till a reconciliation takes place.

Nothing is to be undertaken on Friday which cannot be finished before the evening. In the afternoon they wash and clean themselves, trim their hair, and pare their nails. Every Jew, of whatever rank, must assist in the preparation for the Sabbath. Two loaves, baked on the Friday, are set on a table. This is done in memory of the manna, of which a double portion fell on the sixth day of the week. The table remains spread all the Sabbath. Before the sun is set the candles are to be lighted; one, at least, with seven wicks, in allusion to the number of days in a week, is to be lighted in each house. The Talmudical directions respecting the wicks and oil form part of the Sabbath evening service; they are most ridiculously and childishly minute. The lesson appointed for the Sabbath is divided into seven parts, and read to seven persons at the altar. The first called up to hear it is a descendant of Aaron, the second of Levi, the third an Israelite of any tribe; the same order is then repeated: the seventh may be of any tribe. The portion read from the law is followed by a portion from the prophets. There are three services; morning, afternoon, and evening.

Of the festivals of the Jews we can mention only a few, and those merely in a cursory manner. The principal are those of the new moon, of the passover, of pentecost, of the new year, the fast of atonement, and the feast of tabernacles. That the festival of the new moon might be celebrated as nearly as possible on the day of the moon's conjunction with the sun, most of the months contain alternately twenty-nine and thirty days; and the feast of the new moon is held on the first, or on the first and second days of the month. The women are not allowed to work: the men may. Good eating and drinking particularly distinguish this festival. The feast of the passover commences on the fifteenth day of the month Nisan, and continues among Jews who live in or near Jerusalem seven days, and elsewhere eight days. The Sabbath preceding is called the great Sabbath, and is kept with most scrupulous strictness. The mode and materials for making the unleavened

cakes for the passover are most minutely described by the rabbies, as well as all the ceremonies of this feast. It is customary for every Jew to honour it by an exhibition of the most sumptuous furniture he can afford. The table for the feast is covered with a clean linen cloth, on which are placed several dishes: on one is the shank bone of a shoulder of lamb or kid, and an egg; on another, three cakes, wrapped in two napkins; on a third, some lettuce, parsley, celery, or other herbs: these are their bitter herbs. Near the salad is a cruet of vinegar, and some salt and water. There is also a dish representing the bricks which their forefathers were required to make in Egypt: this is composed of apples, almonds, nuts, and figs, formed into a paste, dressed in wine and cinnamon. The first two 533days, and the last two, are kept with particular solemnity and strictness. Contracts of marriage may be made, but no marriage is to be solemnized during this festival. The feast of pentecost, on the sixth day of the month Sivan, continues two days, and is kept with the same strictness as the first two days of the passover. It is a received opinion of the Jews, that the world was created on the day of their new year; and they therefore celebrate the festival of the new year by a discontinuance of all labour, and by repeated services in the synagogue. The fast of atonement is on the tenth day of Tisri: the first ten days of the month are called days of penitence during which the Jews believe that God examines the actions of mankind; but he defers passing sentence till the tenth. On the eve of the fast, a ceremony, evidently designed as a substitute for their ancient sacrifices, is performed. This consists in killing a cock with great formality. The cocks must on no account be red: white is the preferable colour. Before the fast begins, they endeavour to settle all their disputes. In the afternoon they make a hearty meal, to prepare for the fast, which is of the most rigid kind. The feast of tabernacles commences on the fifteenth of Tisri, and is kept nine days. Every Jew who has a court or garden is required to erect a tabernacle on this occasion; respecting the materials and erection of which the rabbies have given special directions. The eighth and ninth are high days, particularly the last, which is called the day of the rejoicing of the land.

Such are the opinions, traditions, rites, and ceremonies of the great majority of the modern Jews; but, beside these, there is a small sect denominated Caraites, that is, textualists,--persons attached to the text of the Scriptures. They reside chiefly in the Crimea, Lithuania, and Persia; and at Damascus, Constantinople, and Cairo: their whole number is very inconsiderable. They agree with other Jews in denying the advent of the Messiah. The principal difference between them consists in their adherence to the letter of the Scripture, and in the rejection of all paraphrases and interpretations of the rabbies. They also differ from the rabbies in various particulars respecting the feasts of the passover, pentecost, and tabernacles. They observe the Sabbath with far greater strictness. They extend the

degrees of affinity within which marriage is prohibited; but they are more strict in matters of divorce.

3. Jews, Calamities of the. All history cannot furnish us with a parallel to the calamities and miseries of the Jews: rapine and murder, famine and pestilence within, fire and sword, and all the terrors of war without. Our Saviour wept at the foresight of these calamities; and it is almost impossible for persons of any humanity to read the account without being affected. The predictions concerning them were remarkable, and the calamities that came upon them were the greatest the world ever saw. See Deut. xxviii, xxix; Matt. xxiv. Now, what heinous sin was it that could be the cause of such heavy judgments? Can any other be assigned than that which the Scripture assigns? "They both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and persecuted the Apostles," 1 Thess. ii, 15; and so filled up their sins, and wrath came upon them to the utmost. It is hardly possible to consider the nature and extent of their sufferings, and not conclude their own imprecation to be singularly fulfilled upon them: "His blood be on us, and on our children," Matt. xxvii, 25. At Cæsarea twenty thousand of the Jews were killed by the Syrians in their mutual broils. At Damascus, ten thousand unarmed Jews were killed; and at Bethshan, the Heathen inhabitants caused their Jewish neighbours to assist them against their brethren, and then murdered thirteen thousand of these inhabitants. At Alexandria, the Jews murdered multitudes of the Heathens, and were murdered, in their turn, to about sixty thousand. The Romans, under Vespasian, invaded the country, and took the cities of Galilee, Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum, &c, where Christ had been especially rejected, and murdered numbers of the inhabitants. At Jerusalem the scene was most wretched of all. At the passover, when there might have been two or three millions of people in the city, the Romans surrounded it with troops, trenches, and walls, that none might escape. The three different factions within murdered one another. Titus did all in his power to persuade them to an advantageous surrender, but they scorned every proposal. The multitudes of unburied carcasses corrupted the air, and produced a pestilence. The people fed on one another; and even ladies, it is said, boiled their suckling infants, and ate them. After a siege of six months, the city was taken. They murdered almost every Jew they met with. Titus was bent to save the temple, but could not: six thousand Jews who had taken shelter in it were all burned or murdered. The outcries of the Jews, when they saw it, were most dreadful: the whole city, except three towers, and a small part of the wall, was razed to the ground, and the foundations of the temple and other places were ploughed up. Soon after the forts of Herodian and Machæron were taken, the garrison of Massada murdered themselves rather than surrender. At Jerusalem alone, it is said, one million one hundred thousand perished by sword, famine, and pestilence. In other



places, we hear of two hundred and fifty thousand that were cut off, beside vast numbers sent into Egypt, to labour as slaves. About fifty years after, the Jews murdered about five hundred thousand of the Roman subjects, for which they were severely punished by Trajan. About A. D. 130, one Barcocaba pretended that he was the Messiah, and raised a Jewish army of two hundred thousand, who murdered all the Heathens and Christians that came in their way; but he was defeated by Adrian's forces. In this war, it is said, about six hundred thousand Jews were slain, or perished by famine and pestilence. Adrian built a city on Mount Calvary, and erected a marble statue of a swine over the gate that led to Bethlehem. No Jew was allowed to enter the city, or to look to it at a distance, under pain of death. In A. D. 360, the Jews, encouraged by Julian, Constantine's nephew, and now emperor, wishing to give Jesus the lie, began to rebuild their city and temple; but a terrible earthquake, and flames of fire issuing from the earth, killed the workmen, and scattered their materials. And after the death of Julian, the edict of Adrian being revived against them, and Roman guards prohibiting their approach, till the seventh century they durst not so much as creep over the rubbish to bewail the destruction of the city, without bribing the guards. In the third, fourth, and fifth centuries they were many of them furiously harassed and murdered. In the sixth century, twenty thousand of them were slain, and as many taken and sold for slaves. They were severely punished, A. D. 602, for their horrible massacre of the Christians at Antioch. In Spain, A. D. 700, they were ordered to be enslaved. In the eighth and ninth centuries they were greatly derided and abused; in some places they were made to wear leathern girdles, and ride without stirrups upon asses and mules. In France and Spain they were much insulted. In the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, their miseries rather increased; and they were greatly persecuted in Egypt. Beside what they suffered in the east by the Turkish and sacred war, it is shocking to think what multitudes of them the eight crusades murdered in Germany, Hungary, Lesser Asia, and elsewhere. In France multitudes were burned. In England, A. D. 1020, they were banished; and at the coronation of Richard I. the mob fell upon them, and murdered a great many of them. About one thousand five hundred of them were burned in the palace in the city of York, which they themselves set fire to, after killing their wives and children. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, their condition was no better. In Egypt, Canaan, and Syria, the crusaders still harassed them. Provoked with their mad running after pretended Messiahs, Califf Nasser scarce left any of them alive in his dominions of Mesopotamia. In Persia, the Tartars murdered them in multitudes. In Spain, Ferdinand persecuted them furiously. About 1349, the terrible massacre of them at Toledo forced many of them to murder themselves, or change their religion. About 1253, many were murdered in, and others banished from, France, but in 1275, recalled. The crusades of the fanatic shepherds, A. D. 1320 and 1330, who

wasted the south of France, massacred them; beside fifteen thousand of them that were murdered on another occasion. They were finally banished from France, A. D. 1358; since which, few of them have entered that country. King Edward expelled them from England, A. D. 1291, to the number of a hundred and sixty thousand. In the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, their misery continued. In Persia they have been terribly used; from 1663 to 1666, the murder of them was so universal, that but a few escaped to Turkey. In Portugal and Spain they have been miserably treated. About 1492, six or eight hundred thousand of them were banished from Spain. Some were drowned in their passage to Africa; some perished by hard usage; and many of their carcasses lay in the fields till wild beasts devoured them. In Germany, they have endured many hardships. They have been banished from Bohemia, Bavaria, Cologne, Nuremberg, Augsburg, and Vienna; they have been terribly massacred in Moravia, and plundered in Bonn and Bamberg. Except in Portugal and Spain, their present condition is generally tolerable.

4. Jews, Preservation of the. The preservation of the Jews, says Basnage, in the midst of the miseries which they have undergone during one thousand eight hundred years, is the greatest prodigy that can be imagined. As most religions depend on temporal prosperity, they triumph under the protection of a conqueror; they languish and sink with sinking monarchies. Paganism, which once covered the earth, is, in the civilized world, extinct. The Christian church was considerably diminished by the persecutions to which it was exposed; nor was it easy to repair the wastes made in it by those acts of violence. But here we behold a people hated and persecuted for one thousand eight hundred years, and yet sustaining itself, and widely extended. Kings have often employed the severity of edicts and the hand of executioners to ruin it. The seditious multitudes, by murders and massacres, have committed outrages against it still more violent and tragical. Princes and people, Pagans, Mohammedans, Christians, disagreeing in so many things, have united in the design of exterminating it, and have not been able to succeed. The bush of Moses, surrounded with flames, ever burns, and is not consumed. The Jews have been expelled, in different times, from every part of the world, which hath only served to spread them in all regions. From age to age they have been exposed to misery and persecution; yet still they subsist, in spite of the ignominy and the hatred which hath pursued them in all places, while the greatest monarchies are fallen, and nothing remains of them beside the name. The judgments which God hath exercised upon this people are terrible, extending to the men, the religion, and the very land in which they dwelt. The ceremonies essential to their religion can no more be observed: the ritual law, which cast a splendour on the national worship, and struck the Pagans so much that they sent their presents and their victims to Jerusalem,

is absolutely fallen; for they have no temple, no altar, no sacrifices. Their land itself seems to lie under a never-ceasing curse. Pagans, Christians, Mohammedans, in a word, almost all nations have, by turns, seized and held Jerusalem. To the Jews only hath God refused the possession of this small tract of ground, so supremely necessary for them, since, as Jews, they ought to worship on Mount Zion. In all this there is no exaggeration: 535we are only pointing out known facts; and far from having the least design to raise an odium against the nation from its miseries, we conclude that it ought to be looked upon as one of those prodigies which we admire without comprehending; since, in spite of evils so durable, and a patience so long exercised, it is preserved by a particular providence. The Jew ought to be weary of expecting a Messiah, who so unkindly disappoints his vain hopes; and the Christian ought to have his attention and his regard excited toward men whom God preserves, for so great a length of time under calamities which would have been the total ruin of any other people. The whole is a standing proof of the truth of the word of God; as it so signally, and beyond all contradiction, fulfils, even to particulars wonderfully minute, its ancient and numerous predictions.

The long protracted existence of the Jews as a separate people, is not only a standing evidence of the truth of the Bible, but is of that kind which defies hesitation, imitation, or parallel. Were this people totally extinct, some might affect to say, that they never had existed; or, that if they had existed, they never practised such rites as were imputed to them; or, that they were not a numerous people, but merely a small tribe of ignorant and unsettled Arabs. The care with which the Jews preserve their sacred books, and the conformity of those preserved in the east with those of the west, as lately attested, is a satisfactory argument in favour of the genuineness of both; and farther, the dispersion of the nation has proved the security of these documents; as it has not been in the power of any one enemy, however potent, to destroy the entire series, or to consign the whole to oblivion.

JEZEBEL, daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Zidonians, and wife of Ahab, king of Israel, 1 Kings xvi, 31. This princess introduced into the kingdom of Samaria the public worship of Baal, Astarte, and other Phenician deities, which the Lord had expressly forbidden; and with this impious worship, a general prevalence of those abominations which had formerly incensed God against the Canaanites, to their utter extirpation. Jezebel was so zealous, that she fed at her own table four hundred prophets belonging to the goddess Astarte; and her husband Ahab, in like manner, kept four hundred of Baal's prophets, as ministers of his false gods. The name of Jezebel is used proverbially, Rev. ii, 20. See Jehu.

JEZREEL, a royal city of the kings of Israel, who sometimes resided here as well as at Samaria. Ahab, in particular, is known to have made this his residence; near to whose palace was the vineyard of the unfortunate Naboth. The name of Jezreel was by the Greeks moulded into that of Esdraela; which is described by Eusebius and Jerom, in the fourth century, as a considerable town. In like manner, the valley of Jezreel obtained the name of the valley or plain of Esdraelon; which is still described as very fertile, and much frequented by the Arabs for its fine pasturage. This is the largest, and at the same time the most fertile, plain in the land of Canaan; and is called, by way of eminence, the Great Plain. It may be estimated at thirty miles in length, and twenty in breadth. The river Kishon flows through it. See Esdraelon.

JOAB was the son of Zeruah, David's sister, and brother to Abishai and Asahel. He was one of the most valiant soldiers and greatest generals in David's time; but he was also cruel, revengeful, and imperious. He performed great services for David, to whose interests he was always firm, and was commander-in-chief of his troops, when David was king of Judah only. His history is related in the second book of Samuel and the first book of Kings. See David, Abner, and Amasa.

JOANNA, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, was one of those women who, having been cured by our Saviour, followed him as disciples, and ministered to his necessities, Luke viii, 3.

JOASH, son of Ahaziah, king of Judah. When the impious Athaliah undertook to extinguish the race of the kings of Judah, that she might seize the crown herself, she ordered all the princes, her grandchildren, to be murdered. But Jehosheba, the sister of Ahaziah, and wife to the High Priest Jehoiada, rescued young Joash, then a child, from the cruelty of Athaliah, and lodged him in the temple with his nurse. Here he abode six years. In the seventh year Jehoiada procured him to be acknowledged king, and so well concerted his plan, that young Joash was placed on the throne, and saluted king in the temple, before the queen was informed of it. She was killed without the temple, 2 Kings xi, 1, &c. Joash received the diadem, together with the book of the law, from the hands of Jehoiada, the high priest, who, in the young king's name, made a covenant between the Lord, the king, and the people, for their future fidelity to God. He also obliged the people to take an oath of fidelity to the king. Joash was only seven years old when he began to reign, and he reigned forty years at Jerusalem. His mother's name was Zibiah of Beersheba. He governed with justice and piety, so long as he was guided by the High Priest Jehoiada. Yet he did not abolish the high places.

Jehoiada, during the king's minority, had issued orders for collecting voluntary offerings to the holy place, with the design of repairing the temple; but his orders were ill executed till the twentieth year of Joash. Then this prince directed chests to be placed at the entrance of the temple, and an account to be given him of what money was received from them, that it might be faithfully employed in repairing the house of God. Jehoiada dying at the age of a hundred and thirty years, Joash was misled by the evil counsel of his courtiers, who had before been restrained by the high priest's authority. They began to forsake the temple of the Lord, and to worship idols, and groves consecrated to idols. Then the Spirit of the Lord coming upon the High Priest Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, he reproved the people; but they who heard him stoned him, according to orders from their king. It was not long before God inflicted on Joash the just punishment of his ingratitude to Jehoiada, whose son he had so lately murdered. Hazael, king of Syria, besieged Gath, which belonged to Judah; and having taken it he marched against Jerusalem. Joash, to redeem himself from the difficulties of a siege, and from the danger of being plundered, took what money he could find in the temple, which had been consecrated by Ahaziah his father, Jehoram his grandfather, and himself, and gave the whole to Hazael. It is believed by some, that the next year the Syrian army marched again into Judah; but Hazael was not there in person. The Syrians made great havoc, defeated the troops of Joash, entered Jerusalem, slew the princes of Judah, and sent a great booty to the king of Syria at Damascus. They treated Joash himself with great ignominy, and left him extremely ill. His servants then revolted against him, and killed him in his bed, by which the blood of Zechariah the high priest was avenged. He was buried in Jerusalem, but not in the royal sepulchre. Amaziah his son succeeded him.

JOB, a patriarch celebrated for his patience, and the constancy of his piety and virtue. That Job was a real, and not a fictitious, character, may be inferred from the manner in which he is mentioned in the Scriptures. Thus, the Prophet Ezekiel speaks of him: "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God," Ezek. xiv, 14. Now since Noah and Daniel were unquestionably real characters, we must conclude the same of Job. "Behold," says the Apostle James, "we count them happy which endure: ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord, that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy," James v, 11. It is scarcely to be believed that a divinely inspired Apostle would refer to an imaginary character as an example of patience, or in proof of the mercy of God. But, beside the authority of the inspired writers, we have the strongest internal evidence, from the book itself, that Job was a real person; for it expressly specifies the names of persons, places, facts, and other circumstances usually related in true histories. Thus, we have the name,

country, piety, wealth, &c, of Job described, Job i; the names, number, and acts of his children are mentioned; the conduct of his wife is recorded as a fact, ii; his friends, their names, countries, and discourses with him in his afflictions are minutely delineated, Job ii, 11, &c. Farther: no reasonable doubt can be entertained respecting the real existence of Job, when we consider that it is proved by the concurrent testimony of all eastern tradition: he is mentioned by the author of the book of Tobit, who lived during the Assyrian captivity; he is also repeatedly mentioned by Arabian writers as a real character. The whole of his history, with many fabulous additions, was known among the Syrians and Chaldeans; and many of the noblest families among the Arabs are distinguished by his name, and boast of being descended from him.

Since, then, says Horne, the book of Job contains the history of a real character, the next point is the age in which he lived, a question concerning which there is as great a diversity of opinion, as upon any other subject connected with this venerable monument of sacred antiquity. One thing, however, is generally admitted with respect to the age of the book of Job, namely, its remote antiquity. Even those who contend for the later production of the book of Job are compelled to acquiesce in this particular. Grotius thinks the events of the history are such as cannot be placed later than the sojourning of the Israelites in the wilderness. Bishop Warburton, in like manner, admits them to bear the marks of high antiquity; and Michaëlis confesses the manners to be perfectly Abrahamic, that is, such as were common to all the seed of Abraham, Israelites, Ishmaelites, and Idumeans. The following are the principal circumstances from which the age of Job may be collected and ascertained:--1. The Usserian or Bible chronology dates the trial of Job about the year 1520 before the Christian era, twenty-nine years before the departure of the Israelites from Egypt; and that the book was composed before that event, is evident from its total silence respecting the miracles which accompanied the exode; such as the passage of the Red Sea, the destruction of the Egyptians, the manna in the desert, &c; all of which happened in the vicinity of Job's country, and were so apposite in the debate concerning the ways of Providence that some notice could not but have been taken of them, if they had been coeval with the poem of Job. 2. That it was composed before Abraham's migration to Canaan, may also be inferred from its silence respecting the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the other cities of the plain, which were still nearer to Idumea, where the scene is laid. 3. The length of Job's life places him in the patriarchal times. He survived his trial one hundred and forty years, Job xlii, 16, and was probably not younger at that time; for we read that his seven sons were all grown up, and had been settled in their own houses for a considerable time, Job i, 4, 5. He speaks of the sins of his youth, Job xiii, 26, and of the prosperity of his youth; and yet Eliphaz

addresses him as a novice: "With us are both the gray-headed and very aged men, much elder than thy father," Job xv, 10. 4. That he did not live at an earlier period, may be collected from an incidental observation of Bildad, who refers Job to their forefathers for instruction in wisdom:--

"Inquire, I pray thee, of the former age,  
And prepare thyself to the search of their fathers:"  
assigning as a reason the comparative shortness of human life, and consequent ignorance of the present generation:--

537"For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing;  
Because our days upon earth are a shadow."  
Job viii, 8, 9.

But the fathers of the former age, or grandfathers of the present, were the contemporaries of Peleg and Joktan, in the fifth generation after the deluge; and they might easily have learned wisdom from the fountain head by conversing with Shem, or perhaps with Noah himself; whereas, in the seventh generation, the standard of human life was reduced to about two hundred years, which was a shadow compared with the longevity of Noah and his sons. 5. The general air of antiquity which pervades the manners recorded in the poem, is a farther evidence of its remote date. The manners and customs, indeed, critically correspond with that early period. Thus, Job speaks of the most ancient kind of writing, by sculpture, Job xix, 24; his riches also are reckoned by his cattle, Job xlii, 12. Farther: Job acted as high priest in his family, according to the patriarchal usage, Gen. viii, 20; for the institution of an established priesthood does not appear to have taken place any where until the time of Abraham. Melchizedec, king of Salem, was a priest of the primitive order, Gen. xiv, 18; such also was Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, in the vicinity of Idumea, Exod. xviii, 12. The first regular priesthood was probably instituted in Egypt, where Joseph was married to the daughter of the priest of On, Gen. xli, 45. 6. The slavish homage of prostration to princes and great men, which prevailed in Egypt, Persia, and the east in general, and which still subsists there, was unknown in Arabia at that time. Though Job was one of the greatest men of all the east, we do not find any such adoration paid to him by his contemporaries, in the zenith of his prosperity, among the marks of respect so minutely described in the twenty-ninth chapter: "When the young men saw him, they hid themselves," (rather, shrunk back, through respect or rustic bashfulness,) "the aged arose and stood up" in his presence, (more correctly, ranged themselves about him,) "the princes refrained from talking, and laid their hand upon their mouth; the nobles held their peace," and were all attention while he spoke. All this was highly respectful, indeed, but still it was manly, and showed no cringing or servile adulation. With this description correspond the manners and conduct of the genuine

Arabs of the present day, a majestic race, who were never conquered, and who have retained their primitive customs, features, and character, with scarcely any alteration. 7. The allusion made by Job to that species of idolatry alone, which by general consent is admitted to have been the most ancient, namely, Zabianism, or the worship of the sun and moon, and also to the exertion of the judicial authority against it, Job xxxi, 26–28, is an additional and most complete proof of the high antiquity of the poem, as well as a decisive mark of the patriarchal age. 8. A farther evidence of the remote antiquity of this book is the language of Job and his friends; who, being all Idumeans, or at least Arabians of the adjacent country, yet conversed in Hebrew. This carries us up to an age so early as that in which all the posterity of Abraham, Israelites, Idumeans, and Arabians, yet continued to speak one common language, and had not branched into different dialects.

The country in which the scene of this poem is laid, is stated, Job i, 1, to be the land of Uz, which by some geographers has been placed in Sandy, and by others in Stony, Arabia. Bochart strenuously advocated the former opinion, in which he has been powerfully supported by Spanheim, Calmet, Carpzov, Heidegger, and some later writers; Michaëlis and Ilgen place the scene in the valley of Damascus; but Bishops Lowth and Magee, Dr. Hales, Dr. Good, and some later critics and philologers, have shown that the scene is laid in Idumea. In effect, nothing is clearer than that the history of an inhabitant of Idumea is the subject of the poem which bears the name of Job, and that all the persons introduced into it were Idumeans, dwelling in Idumea, in other words, Edomite Arabs. These characters are, Job himself, of the land of Uz; Eliphaz, of Teman, a district of as much repute as Uz, and which, it appears from the joint testimony of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Amos, and Obadiah, Jer. xlix, 7, 20; Ezek. xxv, 13; Amos i, 11, 12; Obadiah 8, 9, formed a principal part of Idumea; Bildad, of Shuah, who is always mentioned in conjunction with Sheba and Dedan, the first of whom was probably named after one of the brothers of Joktan or Kahtan, and the two last from two of his sons, all of them being uniformly placed in the vicinity of Idumea, Gen. xxv, 2, 3; Jer. xlix, 8; Zophar of Naama, a city importing pleasantness, which is also stated by Joshua, xv, 21, 41, to have been situated in Idumea, and to have lain in a southern direction toward its coast, on the shores of the Red Sea; and Elihu, of Buz, which, as the name of a place, occurs only once in Sacred Writ, Jer. xxv, 23, but is there mentioned in conjunction with Teman and Dedan; and hence necessarily, like them, a border city upon Uz or Idumea. Allowing this chorography to be correct, (and such, upon a fair review of facts, we may conclude it to be,) there is no difficulty in conceiving that hordes of nomadic Chaldeans as well as Sabeans, a people addicted to rapine, and roving about at immense distances for the sake of plunder, should have occasionally infested the



defenceless country of Idumea, and roved from the Euphrates even to Egypt.

The different parts of the book of Job are so closely connected together, that they cannot be detached from each other. The exordium prepares the reader for what follows, supplies us with the necessary notices concerning Job and his friends, unfolds the scope, and places the calamities full in our view as an object of attention. The epilogue, or conclusion, again, has reference to the exordium, and relates the happy termination of Job's trials; the dialogues which intervene flow in regular order. Now, if any of these parts were to be taken away, the poem would be extremely defective. Without the prologue the reader would be utterly ignorant who Job was, who were his friends, and the cause of his being so grievously afflicted. Without the discourse of Elihu, Job xxxii-xxxvii, there would be a sudden and abrupt transition from the last words of Job to the address of God, for which Elihu's discourse prepares the reader. And without the epilogue, or conclusion, we should remain in ignorance of the subsequent condition of Job. Hence it is evident, that the poem is the composition of a single author; but who that was, is a question concerning which the learned are very much divided in their sentiments. Elihu, Job, Moses, Solomon, Isaiah, an anonymous writer in the reign of Manasseh, Ezekiel, and Ezra, have all been contended for. The arguments already adduced respecting the age of Job, prove that it could not be either of the latter persons. Dr. Lightfoot, from an erroneous version of Job xxxii, 16, 17, has conjectured that it is the production of Elihu; but the correct rendering of that passage refutes this notion. Ilgen ascribes it probably to a descendant of Elihu. Another and more generally received opinion attributes this book to Moses; this conjecture is founded on some apparent striking coincidences of sentiment, as well as from some marks of later date which are supposed to be discoverable in it. But, independently of the characters of antiquity already referred to, and which place the book of Job very many centuries before the time of Moses, the total absence of even the slightest allusion to the manners, customs, ceremonies, or history of the Israelites, is a direct evidence that the great legislator of the Hebrews was not, and could not have been, the author. To which may be added, that the style of Job, as Bishop Lowth has remarked, is materially different from the poetical style of Moses; for it is much more compact, concise, or condensed, more accurate in the poetical conformation of the sentences; as may be observed also in the prophecies of Balaam the Mesopotamian, a foreigner, indeed, with respect to the Israelites, but not unacquainted either with their language, or with the worship of the true God. Upon the whole, then, we have sufficient ground to conclude that this book was not the production of Moses, but of some earlier age. Bishop Lowth favours the opinion of Schultens, Peters, and others, which is adopted by Bishop Tomline and Dr.

Hales, who suppose Job himself, or some contemporary, to have been the author of this poem; and there seems to be no good reason for supposing that it was not written by Job himself. It appears, indeed, highly probable that Job was the writer of his own story, of whose inspiration we have the clearest evidence in the forty-second chapter of this book, in which he thus addresses the Almighty: "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee." It is plain that in this passage some privilege is intended which he never had enjoyed before, and which he calls the sight of God.

The book of Job contains the history of Job, a man equally distinguished for purity and uprightness of character, and for honours, wealth, and domestic felicity, whom God permitted, for the trial of his faith, to be suddenly deprived of all his numerous blessings, and to be at once plunged into the deepest affliction, and most accumulated distress. It gives an account of his eminent piety, patience, and resignation under the pressure of these severe calamities, and of his subsequent elevation to a degree of prosperity and happiness, still greater than that which he had before enjoyed. How long the sufferings of Job continued, we are not informed; but it is said, that after God turned his captivity, and blessed him a second time, he lived one hundred and forty years, Job xlii, 16. Its style is in many parts peculiarly sublime; and it is not only adorned with poetical embellishments, but most learned men consider it as written in metre. Through the whole work we discover religious instruction shining forth amidst the venerable simplicity of ancient manners. It every where abounds with the noblest sentiments of piety, uttered with the spirit of inspired conviction. It is a work unrivalled for the magnificence of its language, and for the beautiful and sublime images which it presents. In the wonderful speech of the Deity, Job xxxviii, xxxix, every line delineates his attributes, every sentence opens a picture of some grand object in creation, characterized by its most striking features. Add to this, that its prophetic parts reflect much light on the economy of God's moral government; and every admirer of sacred antiquity, every inquirer after religious instruction, will seriously rejoice that the enraptured sentence of Job, xix, 23, is realized to a more effectual and unforeseen accomplishment; that while the memorable records of antiquity have mouldered from the rock, the prophetic assurance and sentiments of Job are graven in Scriptures that no time shall alter, no changes shall efface.

JOEL, the second of the twelve lesser prophets. It is impossible to ascertain the age in which he lived, but it seems most probable that he was contemporary with Hosea. No particulars of his life or death are certainly known. His prophecies are confined to the kingdom of Judah. He inveighs against the sins and impieties of the people, and threatens them with divine

vengeance; he exhorts to repentance, fasting, and prayer; and promises the favour of God to those who should be obedient. The principal predictions contained in this book are the Chaldean invasion, under the figurative representation of locusts; the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; the blessings of the Gospel dispensation; the conversion and restoration of the Jews to their own land; the overthrow of the enemies of God; and the glorious state of the Christian church in the end of the world. The style of Joel is perspicuous and elegant, and his descriptions are remarkably animated and poetical.

JOHN THE BAPTIST, the forerunner of the Messiah, was the son of Zechariah and Elizabeth, and was born about six months before our Saviour. His birth was foretold by an angel, sent purposely to deliver this joyful message, when his mother Elizabeth was barren, and both his parents far advanced in years. The same divine messenger foretold that he should be great in the sight of the Lord; that he should be filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb; that he should prepare the way of the Lord by turning many of the Jews to the knowledge of God; and that he should be the greatest of all the prophets, Luke i, 5–15. Of the early part of the Baptist's life we have but little information. It is only observed that "he grew and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel," Luke i, 80. Though consecrated from the womb to the ministerial office, John did not enter upon it in the heat of youth, but after several years spent in solitude and a course of self-denial.

The prophetic descriptions of the Baptist in the Old Testament are various and striking. That by Isaiah is: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a high way for our God," Isaiah xl, 3. Malachi has the following prediction: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. And he shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse," Mal. iv, 5. That this was meant of the Baptist, we have the testimony of our Lord himself, who declared, "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John. And if ye will receive it, this is Elias who was to come," Matt. xi, 14. The appearance and manners of the Baptist, when he first came out into the world, excited general attention. His clothing was of camel's hair, bound round him with a leathern girdle, and his food consisted of locusts and wild honey, Matt. iii, 4. The message which he declared was authoritative: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" and the impression produced by his faithful reproofs and admonitions was powerful and extensive, and in a great number of instances lasting. Most of the first followers of our Lord appear to have been awakened to seriousness and religious inquiry by John's ministry. His

character was so eminent, that many of the Jews thought him to be the Messiah; but he plainly declared that he was not that honoured person. Nevertheless, he was at first unacquainted with the person of Jesus Christ; only the Holy Ghost had told him that he on whom he should see the Holy Spirit descend and rest was the Messiah. When Jesus Christ presented himself to receive baptism from him, this sign was vouchsafed; and from that time he bore his testimony to Jesus, as the Christ.

Herod Antipas, having married his brother Philip's wife while Philip was still living, occasioned great scandal. John the Baptist, with his usual liberty and vigour, reproved Herod to his face; and told him that it was not lawful for him to have his brother's wife, while his brother was yet alive. Herod, incensed at this freedom, ordered him into custody, in the castle of Machærus; and he was ultimately put to death. (See Antipas.) Thus fell this honoured prophet, a martyr to ministerial faithfulness. Other prophets testified of Christ; he pointed to him as already come. Others saw him afar off; he beheld the advancing glories of his ministry eclipsing his own, and rejoiced to "decrease" while his Master "increased." His ministry stands as a type of the true character of evangelical repentance: it goes before Christ and prepares his way; it is humbling, but not despairing; for it points to "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world."

The Jews had such an opinion of this prophet's sanctity, that they ascribed the overthrow of Herod's army, which he had sent against his father-in-law, Aretas, to the just judgment of God for putting John the Baptist to death. The death of John the Baptist happened, as is believed, about the end of the thirty-first year of the vulgar era, or in the beginning of the thirty-second.

The baptism of John was much more perfect than that of the Jews, but less perfect than that of Jesus Christ. "It was," says St. Chrysostom, "as it were, a bridge, which, from the baptism of the Jews, made a way to that of our Saviour, and was more exalted than the first, but inferior to the second." That of St. John promised what that of Jesus Christ executed. Notwithstanding St. John did not enjoin his disciples to continue the baptism of repentance, which was of his institution, after his death, because, after the manifestation of the Messiah, and the establishment of the Holy Ghost, it became of no use; yet there were many of his followers who still administered it, and several years after the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, did not so much as know that there was any other baptism than that of John. Of this number was Apollos, a learned and zealous man, who was of Alexandria, and came to Ephesus twenty years after the resurrection of our Saviour, Acts xviii, 25. And when St. Paul came after Apollos to the same city, there were still many Ephesians who had received

no other baptism, and were not yet informed that the Holy Ghost was received by baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, Acts xix, 1. The Jews are said by the Apostle Paul to have been “baptized unto Moses,” at the time when they followed him through the Red Sea, as the servant of God sent to be their leader. Those who went out to John “were baptized unto John’s baptism;” that is, into the expectation of the person whom John announced, and into repentance of those sins which John condemned. Christians are “baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,” because in this expression is implied that whole system of truth which the disciples of Christ believe; into the name of the Father, the one true and living God whom Christians profess to serve; of the Son, that divine person revealed in the New Testament 540whom the Father sent to be the Saviour of the world; of the Holy Ghost, the divine person also revealed there as the Comforter, the Sanctifier, and the Guide of Christians.

John the Evangelist was a native of Bethsaida, in Galilee, son of Zebedee and Salome, by profession a fisherman. Some have thought that he was a disciple of John the Baptist before he attended Jesus Christ. He was brother to James the greater. It is believed that St. John was the youngest of the Apostles. Tillemont is of opinion that he was twenty-five or twenty-six years of age when he began to follow Jesus. Our Saviour had a particular friendship for him; and he describes himself by the name of “that disciple whom Jesus loved.” St. John was one of the four Apostles to whom our Lord delivered his predictions relative to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the approaching calamities of the Jewish nation, Mark xiii, 3. St. Peter, St. James, and St. John were chosen to accompany our Saviour on several occasions, when the other Apostles were not permitted to be present. When Christ restored the daughter of Jairus to life, Mark v, 37; Luke viii, 51; when he was transfigured on the mount, Matt. xvii, 1, 2; Mark ix, 2; Luke ix, 28; and when he endured his agony in the garden, Matt. xxvi, 36, 37; Mark xiv, 32, 33; St. Peter, St. James, and St. John were his only attendants. That St. John was treated by Christ with greater familiarity than the other Apostles, is evident from St. Peter desiring him to ask Christ who should betray him, when he himself did not dare to propose the question, John xiii, 24. He seems to have been the only Apostle present at the crucifixion, and to him Jesus, just as he was expiring upon the cross, gave the strongest proof of his confidence and regard, by consigning to him the care of his mother, John xix, 26, 27. As St. John had been witness to the death of our Saviour, by seeing the blood and water issue from his side, which a soldier had pierced, John xix, 34, 35, so he was one of the first made acquainted with his resurrection. Without any hesitation, he believed this great event, though “as yet he knew not the Scripture, that Christ was to rise from the dead,” John xx, 9. He was also one of those to whom our Saviour appeared at the sea of Galilee; and he was afterward, with the other ten Apostles, a

witness of his ascension into heaven, Mark xvi, 19; Luke xxiv, 51. St. John continued to preach the Gospel for some time at Jerusalem: he was imprisoned by the sanhedrim, first with Peter only, Acts iv, 1, &c, and afterward with the other Apostles, Acts v, 17, 18. Some time after this second release, he and St. Peter were sent by the other Apostles to the Samaritans, whom Philip the deacon had converted to the Gospel, that through them they might receive the Holy Ghost, Acts viii, 14, 15. St. John informs us, in his Revelations, that he was banished to Patmos, an island in the Ægean Sea, Rev. i, 9.

This banishment of the Apostle to the isle of Patmos is mentioned by many of the early ecclesiastical writers; all of whom, except Epiphanius in the fourth century, agree in attributing it to Domitian. Epiphanius says that John was banished by command of Claudius; but this deserves the less credit, because there was no persecution of the Christians in the time of that emperor, and his edicts against the Jews did not extend to the provinces. Sir Isaac Newton was of opinion that John was banished to Patmos in the time of Nero; but even the authority of this great man is not of sufficient weight against the unanimous voice of antiquity. Dr. Lardner has examined and answered his arguments with equal candour and learning. It is not known at what time John went into Asia Minor. Lardner thought that it was about the year 66. It is certain that he lived in Asia Minor the latter part of his life, and principally at Ephesus. He planted churches at Smyrna, Pergamos, and many other places; and by his activity and success in propagating the Gospel, he is supposed to have incurred the displeasure of Domitian, who banished him to Patmos at the end of his reign. He himself tells us that he “was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ;” and Irenæus, speaking of the vision which he had there, says, “It is not very long ago that it was seen, being but a little before our time, at the latter end of Domitian’s reign.” On the succession of Nerva to the empire in the year 96, John returned to Ephesus, where he died at an advanced age, in the third year of Trajan’s reign, A. D. 100. An opinion has prevailed, that he was, by order of Domitian, thrown into a caldron of boiling oil at Rome, and came out unhurt; but this account rests almost entirely on the authority of Tertullian, and seems to deserve little credit.

2. The genuineness of St. John’s Gospel has always been unanimously admitted by the Christian church. It is universally agreed that St. John published his Gospel in Asia; and that, when he wrote it, he had seen the other three Gospels. It is, therefore, not only valuable in itself, but also a tacit confirmation of the other three; with none of which it disagrees in any material point. The time of its publication is placed by some rather before, and by others considerably after, the destruction of Jerusalem. If we accede

to the opinion of those who contend for the year 97, this late date, exclusive of the authorities which support it, seems favoured by the contents and design of the Gospel itself. The immediate design of St. John in writing his Gospel, as we are assured by Irenæus, Jerom, and others, was to refute the Cerinthians, Ebionites, and other heretics, whose tenets, though they branched out into a variety of subjects, all originated from erroneous opinions concerning the person of Christ, and the creation of the world. These points had been scarcely touched upon by the other evangelists; though they had faithfully recorded all the leading facts of our Saviour's life, and his admirable precepts for the regulation of our conduct. St. John, therefore, undertook, perhaps at the request of the true believers in Asia, to write what Clement of Alexandria called a spiritual Gospel; and, accordingly, we find in it more of doctrine, and less of historical narrative, than in any of the others. It is also to be remembered, that this book, which contains so much additional information relative to the doctrines of Christianity, and which may be considered as a standard of faith for all ages, was written by that Apostle who is known to have enjoyed, in a greater degree than the rest, the affection and confidence of the divine Author of our religion; and to whom was given a special revelation concerning the state of the Christian church in all succeeding generations.

We have three epistles by this Apostle. Some critics have thought that all these epistles were written during St. John's exile in Patmos; the first, to the Ephesian church; the others to individuals; and that they were sent along with the Gospel, which the Apostle is supposed also to have written in Patmos. Thus Hug observes, in his "Introduction:" If St. John sent his Gospel to the continent, an epistle to the community was requisite, commending and dedicating it to them. Other evangelists, who deposited their works in the place of their residence, personally superintended them, and delivered them personally; consequently they did not require a written document to accompany them. An epistle was therefore requisite, and, as we have abundantly proved the first of John's epistles to be inseparable from the Gospel, its contents demonstrate it to be an accompanying writing, and a dedication of the Gospel. It went consequently to Ephesus. We can particularly corroborate this by the following observation: John, in the Apocalypse, has individually distinguished each of the Christian communities, which lay the nearest within his circle and his superintendence, by criteria, taken from their faults or their virtues. The church at Ephesus he there describes by the following traits: It was thronged with men who arrogated to themselves the ministry and apostolical authority, and were impostors, *ψευδεις*. But in particular he feelingly reproaches it because its "first love was cooled," *τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρῶτην ἀφῆκας*. The circumstance of impostors and false teachers happens in more churches. But decreasing love is an exclusive criterion

and failing, which the Apostle reprimands in no other community. According to his judgment, want of love was the characteristic fault of the Ephesians: but this epistle is from beginning to the end occupied with admonitions to love, with recommendations of its value, with corrections of those who are guilty of this fault, 1 John ii, 5, 9–11, 15; iii, 1, 11, 12, 14–18, 23; iv, 7–10, 12, 16–21; v, 1–3. Must not we therefore declare, if we compare the opinion of the Apostle respecting the Ephesians with this epistle, that, from its peculiar tenor, it is not so strikingly adapted to any community in the first instance as to this?

The second epistle is directed to a female, who is not named, but only designated by the honourable mention, ἐκλεκτῆ κυρία, “the elect lady.” The two chief positions, which are discussed in the first epistle, constitute the contents of this brief address. He again alludes to the words of our Saviour, “A new commandment,” &c, as in 1 John ii, 7, and recommends love, which is manifested by observance of the commandments. After this he warns her against false teachers, who deny that Jesus entered into the world as the Christ, or Messiah, and forbids an intercourse with them. At the end, he hopes soon to see her himself, and complains of the want of writing materials. The whole is a short syllabus of the first epistle, or it is the first in a renewed form. The words also are the same. It is still full of the former epistle: nor are they separated from each other as to time. The female appears before his mind in the circumstances and dangers of the society, in instructing and admonishing which he had just been employed. If we may judge from local circumstances, she also lived at Ephesus. But as for the author, his residence was in none of the Ionian or Asiatic cities, where the want of writing materials is not conceivable: he was still therefore in the place of his exile. The other circumstances noticed in it, are probably the following: The sons of the ἐκλεκτῆ κυρία had visited John, 2 John 4. The sister of this matron wishing to show to him an equal respect and sympathy in his fate, sent her sons likewise to visit the Apostle. While the latter were with the Apostle, there was an opportunity of sending to the continent, 2 John 13, namely, of despatching the two epistles and the Gospel.

The third epistle is written to Caius. The author consoles himself with the hope, as in the former epistle, of soon coming himself, 3 John 14. He still experiences the same want of writing materials, 3 John 13. Consequently, he was still living in the same miserable place: also, if we may judge from his hopes, the time was not very different. The residence of Caius is determined by the following criteria: The most general of them is the danger of being misled by false teachers, 3 John 3, 4. That which leads us nearer to the point, is the circumstance of John sometimes sending messages thither, and receiving accounts from thence, 3 John 5–8, that he



supposes his opinions to be so well known and acknowledged in this society, that he could appeal to them, as judges respecting them, 3 John 12, and that, finally, he had many particular friends among them, 3 John 15. The whole of this is applicable to a considerable place, where the Apostle had resided for a long time; and in the second epoch of his life, it is particularly applicable to Ephesus. He had lately written to the community, of which Caius was a member, ἔγραψα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, “I wrote to the church,” 3 John 9. If this is to be referred to the first epistle, (for we are not aware of any other to a community,) then certainly Ephesus is the place to which the third epistle was also directed, and was the place where Caius resided. From hence, the rest contains its own explanation. John had sent his first epistle thither; it was the accompanying writing to the Gospel, and with it he also sent the Gospel. Who was better qualified to promulgate the Gospel among the believers than Caius, especially if it was to be published at Ephesus?

The above view is ingenious, and in its leading parts satisfactory; but the argument from the Apostle’s supposed want of “writing materials” is founded upon a very forced construction of the texts. There seems, however, no reason to doubt of the close connection, in point of time, between the epistles and the Gospel; and, that being remembered, the train of thought in the mind of the Apostle sufficiently explains the peculiar character of the latter.

JONAH, son of Amittai, the fifth of the minor prophets, was born at Gath-hepher, in Galilee. He is generally considered as the most ancient of the prophets, and is supposed to have lived B. C. 840. The book of Jonah is chiefly narrative. He relates that he was commanded by God to go to Nineveh, and preach against the inhabitants of that capital of the Assyrian empire; that, through fear of executing this commission, he set sail for Tarshish; and that, in his voyage thither, a tempest arising, he was cast by the mariners into the sea, and swallowed by a large fish; that, while he was in the belly of this fish, he prayed to God, and was, after three days and three nights, delivered out of it alive; that he then received a second command to go and preach against Nineveh, which he obeyed; that, upon his threatening the destruction of the city within forty days, the king and people proclaimed a fast, and repented of their sins; and that, upon this repentance, God suspended the sentence which he had ordered to be pronounced in his name. Upon their repentance, God deferred the execution of his judgment till the increase of their iniquities made them ripe for destruction, about a hundred and fifty years afterward. The last chapter gives an account of the murmuring of Jonah at this instance of divine mercy, and of the gentle and condescending manner in which it pleased God to reprove the prophet for his unjust complaint. The style of

Jonah is simple and perspicuous; and his prayer, in the second chapter, is strongly descriptive of the feelings of a pious mind under a severe trial of faith. Our Saviour mentions Jonah in the Gospel, Matt. xii, 41; Luke xi, 32. See Nineveh and Gourd.

JONATHAN, the son of Saul, a prince of an excellent disposition, and in all varieties of fortune a sincere and steady friend to David. Jonathan gave signal proofs of courage and conduct upon all occasions that offered, during the wars between his father and the Philistines. The death of Jonathan was lamented by David, in one of the noblest and most pathetic odes ever uttered by genius consecrated by pious friendship. See 1 Sam. xiii, 16, &c; xiv, 1, 2, &c.

JOPPA, called also Japho in the Old Testament, which is still preserved in its modern name of Jaffa or Yafah, a sea port of Palestine, situated on an eminence in a sandy soil, about seventy miles north-west of Jerusalem. Joppa was anciently the port to Jerusalem. Here all the materials sent from Tyre for the building of Solomon's temple were brought and landed: it was, indeed, the only port in Judea, though rocky and dangerous. It possesses still, in times of peace, a considerable commerce with the places in its vicinity; and is well inhabited, chiefly by Arabs. This was the place of landing of the western pilgrims; and here the promised pardons commenced. Here St. Peter raised Dorcas from the dead, and resided many days in the house of one Simon, a tanner, Acts ix, 36–43; and it was from this place that the Prophet Jonah embarked for Tarshish.

JORAM, the son and successor of Ahab, king of Israel. See Jehu

JORDAN, the largest and most celebrated stream in Palestine. It is much larger, according to Dr. Shaw, than all the brooks and streams of the Holy Land united together; and, excepting the Nile, is by far the most considerable river either of the coast of Syria or of Barbary. He computed it to be about thirty yards broad, and found it nine feet deep at the brink. This river, which divides the country into two unequal parts, has been commonly said to issue from two fountains, or to be formed by the junction of two rivulets, the Jor and the Dan; but the assertion seems to be totally destitute of any solid foundation. The Jewish historian, Josephus, on the contrary, places its source at Phiala, a fountain which rises about fifteen miles from Cæsarea Philippi, a little on the right hand, and not much out of the way to Trachonitis. It is called Phiala, or the Vial, from its round figure; its water is always of the same depth, the bason being brimful, without either shrinking or overflowing. From Phiala to Panion, which was long considered as the real source of the Jordan, the river flows underground. The secret of its subterraneous course was first discovered by

Philip, the tetrarch of Trachonitis, who cast straws into the fountain of Phiala, which came out again at Panion. Leaving the cave of Panion, it crosses the bogs and fens of the lake Semichonitis; and after a course of fifteen miles, passes under the city of Julias, the ancient Bethsaida; then expands into a beautiful sheet of water, named the lake of Gennesareth; and, after flowing a long way through the desert, empties itself into the lake Asphaltites, or the Dead Sea. As the cave Panion lies at the foot of Mount Lebanon, in the northern extremity of Canaan, and the lake Asphaltites extends to the southern extremity, the river Jordan pursues its course through the whole extent of the country from north to south. It is evident, also, from the history of Josephus, that a wilderness or desert of considerable extent stretched along the river Jordan in the times of the New Testament; which was undoubtedly the wilderness mentioned by the evangelists, where John the Baptist came preaching and baptizing. The Jordan has a considerable depth of water. Chateaubriand makes it six or seven feet deep close at the shore, and about fifty paces in breadth a considerable distance from its entrance into the Dead Sea. According to the computation of Volney, it is hardly sixty paces wide at the mouth; but the author of "Letters from Palestine" states, that the stream when it enters the lake Asphaltites, is deep and rapid, rolling a considerable volume of waters; the width appears from two to three hundred feet, and the current is so violent, that a Greek servant belonging to the author, who attempted to cross it, though strong, active, and an excellent swimmer, found the undertaking impracticable. It may be said to have two banks, of which the inner marks the ordinary height of the stream; and the outer, its ancient elevation during the rainy season, or the melting of the snows on the summits of Lebanon. In the days of Joshua, and, it is probable, for many ages after his time, the harvest was one of the seasons when the Jordan overflowed his banks. This fact is distinctly recorded by the sacred historian: "And as they that bare the ark were come unto Jordan, and the feet of the priests that bare the ark were dipped in the brim of the water; for Jordan overfloweth all his banks all the time of harvest," Joshua iii, 15. This happens in the first month of the Jewish year, which corresponds with March, 1 Chronicles xii, 15. But in modern times, whether the rapidity of the current has worn the channel deeper than formerly, or whether its waters have taken some other direction, the river seems to have forgotten his ancient greatness. When Maundrell visited Jordan on the thirtieth of March, the proper time for these inundations, he could discern no sign or probability of such overflowing; nay, so far was it from overflowing, that it ran, says our author, at least two yards below the brink of its channel. After having descended the outer bank, he went about a furlong upon the level strand, before he came to the immediate bank of the river. This inner bank was so thickly covered with bushes and trees, among which he observed the tamarisk, the willow, and the oleander, that he could see no

water till he had made his way through them. In this entangled thicket, so conveniently planted near the cooling stream, and remote from the habitations of men, several kinds of wild beasts were accustomed to repose, till the swelling of the river drove them from their retreats. This circumstance gave occasion to that beautiful allusion of the prophet: "He shall come up like a lion, from the swelling of Jordan, against the habitation of the strong," Jer. xlix, 19. The figure is highly poetical and striking. It is not easy to present a more terrible image to the mind, than a lion roused from his den by the roar of the swelling river, and chafed and irritated by its rapid and successive encroachments on his chosen haunts, till, forced to quit his last retreat, he ascends to the higher grounds and the open country, and turns the fierceness of his rage against the helpless sheep cots, or the unsuspecting villages. A destroyer equally fierce, and cruel, and irresistible, the devoted Edomites were to find in Nebuchadnezzar and his armies.

The water of the river at the time of Maundrell's visit was very turbid, and too rapid to allow a swimmer to stem its course. Its breadth might be about twenty yards; and in depth, it far exceeded his height. The rapidity and depth of the river, which are admitted by every traveller, although the volume of water seems now to be much diminished, illustrate those parts of Scripture which mention the fords and passages of Jordan. It no longer, indeed, rolls down into the Salt Sea so majestic a stream as in the days of Joshua; yet its ordinary depth is still about ten or twelve feet, so that it cannot even at present be passed but at certain places. Of this well known circumstance, the men of Gilead took advantage in the civil war, which they were compelled to wage with their brethren: "The Gileadites took the passages of Jordan before the Ephraimites:--then they took him, and slew him at the passages of Jordan," Judg. xii, 6. The people of Israel, under the command of Ehud availed themselves of the same advantage in the war with Moab: "And they went down after him, and took the fords of Jordan toward Moab, and suffered not a man to pass over," Judg. iii, 28. But although the state of this river in modern times completely justifies the incidental remarks of the sacred writers, it is evident that Maundrell was disconcerted by the shallowness of the stream, at the time of the year when he expected to see it overflowing all its banks; and his embarrassment seems to have increased when he contemplated the double margin within which it flowed. This difficulty, which has perhaps occurred to some others, may be explained by a remark which Dr. Pococke has made on the river Euphrates: The bed of the Euphrates, says that writer, was measured by some English gentlemen at Beer, and found to be six hundred and thirty yards broad; but the river only two hundred and fourteen yards over; then they thought it to be nine or ten feet deep in the middle; and were informed that it sometimes rises twelve feet perpendicularly. He observed that it had

an inner and outer bank; but says, it rarely overflows the inner bank; that when it does, they sow water mellons and other fruits of that kind, as soon as the water retires, and have a great produce. From this passage, Mr. Harmer argues: "Might not the overflowings of the Jordan be like those of the Euphrates, not annual, but much more rare?" The difficulty, therefore, will be completely removed, by supposing, that it does not, like the Nile, overflow every year, as some authors, by mistake, had supposed, but, like the Euphrates, only in some particular years; but when it does it is in the time of harvest. If it did not in ancient times annually overflow its banks, the majesty of God in dividing its waters to make way for Joshua and the armies of Israel, was certainly the more striking to the Canaanites; who, when they looked upon themselves as defended in an extraordinary manner by the casual swelling of the river, its breadth and rapidity being both so extremely increased, yet, found it in these circumstances part asunder, and leave a way on dry land for the people of Jehovah. The common receptacle into which the Jordan empties his waters, is the lake Asphaltites, from whence they are continually drained off by evaporation. Some writers, unable to find a discharge for the large body of water which is continually rushing into the lake, have been inclined to suspect it had some communication with the Mediterranean; but, beside that we know of no such gulf, it has been demonstrated by accurate calculations, that evaporation is more than sufficient to carry off the waters of the river. It is, in fact, very considerable, and frequently becomes sensible to the eye, by the fogs with which the lake is covered at the rising of the sun, and which are afterward dispersed by the heat.

JOSEPH, son of Jacob and Rachel, and brother to Benjamin, Gen. xxx, 22, 24. The history of Joseph is so fully and consecutively given by Moses, that it is not necessary to abridge so familiar an account. In place of this, the following beautiful argument by Mr. Blunt for the veracity of the account drawn from the identity of Joseph's character, will be read with pleasure:--I have already found an argument for the veracity of Moses in the identity of Jacob's character, I now find another in the identity of that of Joseph. There is one quality, as it has been often observed, though with a different view from mine, which runs like a thread through his whole history, his affection for his father. Israel loved him, we read, more than all his children; he was the child of his age; his mother died while he was yet young, and a double care of him consequently devolved upon his surviving parent. He made him a coat of many colours; he kept him at home when his other sons were sent to feed the flocks. When the bloody garment was brought in, Jacob in his affection for him,--that same affection which, on a subsequent occasion, when it was told him that after all Joseph was alive, made him as slow to believe the good tidings as he was now quick to apprehend the sad; in this his affection for him, I say, Jacob at once

concluded the worst, and “he rent his clothes and put sackcloth upon his loins, and mourned for his son many days, and all his daughters rose up to comfort him; but he refused to be comforted, and he said, For I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning.”

Now, what were the feelings in Joseph which responded to these? When the sons of Jacob went down to Egypt, and Joseph knew them, though they knew not him; for they, it may be remarked, were of an age not to be greatly changed by the lapse of years, and were still sustaining the character in which Joseph had always seen them; while he himself had meanwhile grown out of the stripling into the man, and from a shepherd boy was become the ruler of a kingdom; when his brethren thus came before him, his question was, “Is your father yet alive?” Gen. xliii, 7. They went down a second time, and again the question was, “Is your father well, the old man of whom ye spake, is he yet alive?” More he could not venture to ask, while he was yet in his disguise. By a stratagem he now detains Benjamin, leaving the others, if they would, to go their way. But Judah came near unto him, and entreated him for his brother, telling him how that he had been surety to his father to bring him back; how that his father was an old man, and that this was the child of his old age, and that he loved him; how it would come to pass that if he should not see the lad with him he would die, and his gray hairs be brought with sorrow to the grave; for “how shall I go to my father, and the lad be not with me, lest, peradventure, I see the evil that shall come on my father?” Here, without knowing it, he had struck the string that was the tenderest of all. Joseph’s firmness forsook him at this repeated mention of his father, and in terms so touching: he could not refrain himself any longer; and, causing every man to go out, he made himself known to his brethren. Then, even in the paroxysm which came on him, (for he wept aloud, so that the Egyptians heard,) still his first words uttered from the fulness of his heart were, “Doth my father yet live?” He now bids them hasten and bring the old man down, bearing to him tokens of his love and tidings of his glory. He goes to meet him; he presents himself unto him, and falls on his neck, and weeps on his neck a good while; he provides for him and his household out of the fat of the land; he sets him before Pharaoh. By and by he hears that he is sick, and hastens to visit him; he receives his blessing; watches his death bed; embalms his body; mourns for him threescore and ten days; and then carries him, as he had desired, into Canaan to bury him, taking with him, as an escort to do him honour, “all the elders of Israel, and all the servants of Pharaoh, and all his house, and the house of his brethren, chariots, and horsemen, a very great company.” How natural was it now for his brethren to think that the tie by which alone they could imagine Joseph to be held to them was dissolved, that any respect he might have felt or feigned for them must have been buried in the cave of Machpelah, and that he would now requite to

them the evil they had done! "And they sent a messenger unto Joseph, saying, Thy father did command before he died, saying, So shall ye say unto Joseph, Forgive, I pray thee now, the trespass of thy brethren, and their sin; for they did unto thee evil." And then they add of themselves, as if well aware of the surest road to their brother's heart, "Forgive, we pray thee, the trespass of the servants of the God of thy father." In every thing the father's name is still put foremost: it is his memory which they count upon as their shield and buckler.

It is not the singular beauty of these scenes, or the moral lesson they teach, excellent as it is, with which I am now concerned, but simply the perfect artless consistency which prevails through them all. It is not the constancy with which the son's strong affection for his father had lived through an interval of twenty years' absence, and, what is more, through the temptation of sudden promotion to the highest estate;--it is not the noble-minded frankness with which he still acknowledges his kindred, and makes a way for them, "shepherds" as they were, to the throne of Pharaoh himself;--it is not the simplicity and singleness of heart which allow him to give all the first-born of Egypt, men over whom he bore absolute rule, an opportunity of observing his own comparatively humble origin, by leading them in attendance upon his father's corpse to the valleys of Canaan and the modest cradle of his race;--it is not, in a word, the grace, but the identity, of Joseph's character, the light in which it is exhibited by himself, and the light in which it is regarded by his brethren, to which I now point as stamping it with marks of reality not to be gainsayed.

Some writers have considered Joseph as a type of Christ; and it requires not much ingenuity to find out some resemblances, as his being hated by his brethren, sold for money, plunged into deep affliction, and then raised to power and honour, &c; but as we have no intimation in any part of Scripture that Joseph was constituted a figure of our Lord, and that this was one design of recording his history at length, all such applications want authority, and cannot safely be indulged. The account seems rather to have been left for its moral uses, and that it should afford, by its inimitable simplicity and truth to nature, a point of irresistible internal evidence of the truth of the Mosaic narrative.

2. Joseph, the husband of Mary, and reputed father of Jesus, was the son of Jacob, and grandson of Matthan, Matt. i, 15, 16. The place of his stated residence was Nazareth, particularly after the time of his marriage. We learn from the evangelists that he followed the occupation of a carpenter, Matt. xiii, 55; and that he was a just man, or one of those pious Israelites who looked for the coming of the Messiah, Matt. i, 19. It is probable that Joseph died before Christ entered upon his public ministry; for upon any

other supposition we are at a loss to account for the reason why Mary, the mother of Jesus, is frequently mentioned in the evangelic narrative, while no allusion is made to Joseph; and, above all, why the dying Saviour should recommend his mother to the care of the beloved disciple John, if her husband had been then living, John xix, 25–27.

3. Joseph of Arimathea, a Jewish senator, and a believer in the divine mission of Jesus Christ, John xix, 38. St. Luke calls him a counsellor, and also informs us that he was a good and just man, who did not give his consent to the crucifixion of Christ, Luke xxiii, 50, 51. And though he was unable to restrain the sanhedrim from their wicked purposes, he went to Pilate by night, and solicited from him the body of Jesus. Having caused it to be taken down from the cross, he wrapped it in linen, and laid it in his own sepulchre, which, being a rich man, he appears to have recently purchased, and then closed the entrance with a stone cut purposely to fit it, Matt. xxvii, 57–60; John xix, 38–42.

JOSHUA, the son of Nun. He was of the tribe of Ephraim, and born A. M. 2460. He devoted himself to the service of Moses, and in Scripture he is commonly called the servant of Moses, Exodus xxiv, 13; xxxiii, 11; Deuteronomy i, 38, &c. His first name was Hosea, or Oshea; Hoseah signifying saviour; Jehoshua, the salvation of God, or he will save. The first opportunity which Joshua had to signalize his valour was in the war made by the divine command against the Amalekites, Exodus xvii, 9, 10. He defeated and routed their whole army. When Moses ascended Mount Sinai to receive the law of the Lord, and remained there forty days and forty nights without eating or drinking, Joshua remained with him, though, in all probability, not in the same place, nor with the same abstinence, Exod. xxiv, 13; xxxii, 17. Joshua was “filled with the spirit of wisdom,” qualifying him for the arduous and important station of governing Israel, to which he was called by the special command of God, Num. xxvii, 18–20; Deut. xxxi, 7, 14; xxxiv, 9; Joshua i, 5. His piety, courage, and disinterested integrity are conspicuous throughout his whole history; and, exclusive of the inspiration which enlightened his mind and writings, he derived divine information, sometimes by immediate revelation from God, Joshua iii, 7; v, 13–15; at others from the sanctuary, through the medium of Eleazar, the high priest, the son of Aaron, who, having on the breast plate, presented himself before the mercy seat on which the Shechinah, or visible symbol of the divine presence, rested, and there consulted Jehovah by the Urim and Thummim, to which an answer was returned by an audible voice.

Joshua succeeded Moses in the government of Israel about the year of the world 2553, and died at Timnath-serah in the hundred and tenth year of his



age, A. M. 2578. He was about the age of eighty-four when he received the divine command to pass over Jordan, and take possession of the promised land, Joshua i, 1, 2. Having accomplished that arduous enterprise, and settled the chosen tribes in the peaceable possession of their inheritance, he retired to Shechem, or, according to some Greek copies, to Shiloh; where he assembled the elders of Israel, the heads of families, the judges and other officers; and, presenting themselves before God, he recapitulated the conduct of Divine Providence toward them, from the days of Abraham to that moment; recounted the miraculous and gracious dispensations of God toward their fathers and themselves; reminded them of their present enviable lot, and concluded his solemn address with an exhortation in these emphatic words: "Now, therefore, fear the Lord, and serve him in sincerity and truth; and put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood, and in Egypt; and serve ye the Lord," Joshua xxiv.

546The book of Joshua continues the sacred history from the period of the death of Moses to that of the death of Joshua and of Eleazar; a space of about thirty years. It contains an account of the conquest and division of the land of Canaan, the renewal of the covenant with the Israelites, and the death of Joshua. There are two passages in this book which show that it was written by a person contemporary with the events it records. In the first verse of the fifth chapter, the author speaks of himself as being one of those who had passed into Canaan: "And it came to pass when all the kings of the Amorites, which were on the side of Jordan westward, and all the kings of the Canaanites, which were by the sea, heard that the Lord had dried up the waters of Jordan from before the children of Israel, until we were passed over, that their heart melted." And from the twenty-fifth verse of the following chapter, it appears that the book was written before the death of Rahab: "And Joshua saved Rahab the harlot alive, and her father's household, and all that she had; and she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day; because she hid the messengers which Joshua sent to spy out Jericho." Though there is not a perfect agreement among the learned concerning the author of this book, yet by far the most general opinion is, that it was written by Joshua himself; and, indeed, in the last chapter it is said that "Joshua wrote these words in the book of the law of God;" which expression seems to imply that he subjoined this history to that written by Moses. The last five verses, giving an account of the death of Joshua, were added by one of his successors; probably by Eleazar, Phinehas, or Samuel.

JOSIAH, king of Judah, deserves particular mention on account of his wisdom and piety, and some memorable events that occurred in the course of his reign. He succeeded to the throne, upon the assassination of his father Amon, at the age of eight years, B. C. 640; and at a period when idolatry and wickedness, encouraged by his father's profligate example, very

generally prevailed. Josiah, who manifested the influence of pious and virtuous principles at a very early age, began, in his sixteenth year, to project the reformation of the kingdom, and to adopt means for restoring the worship of the true God. At the age of twenty years he vigorously pursued the execution of the plans which he had meditated. He began with abolishing idolatry, first at Jerusalem, and then through different parts of the kingdom; destroying the altars which had been erected, and the idols which had been the objects of veneration and worship. He then proceeded, in his twenty-sixth year, to a complete restoration of the worship of God, and the regular service of the temple. While he was prosecuting this pious work, and repairing the temple, which had been long neglected, and which had sunk into a state of dilapidation, the book of the law, which had been concealed in the temple, was happily discovered. This was, probably, a copy of the the Pentateuch, which had been lodged there for security by some pious priest in the reign of Ahaz or Manasseh. Josiah, desirous of averting from himself and the kingdom threatened judgments, determined to adhere to the directions of the law, in the business of reformation which he had undertaken; and to observe the festivals enjoined by Moses, which had been shamefully neglected. With this view he assembled all the elders of the people in the temple at Jerusalem; and, having ascended the throne, read the book of the Mosaic law, and then entered into a solemn covenant to observe the statutes and ordinances which it enjoined. To this covenant the whole assembly testified their consent. The ark was restored to its proper place; the temple was purified; idolatrous utensils were removed, and those appropriate to the worship of God substituted in their room. After these preparations, the passover was observed with singular zeal and magnificence. This took place in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign: but, in pursuing his laudable plans of reformation, he was resisted by the inveterate habits of the Israelites; so that his zealous and persevering efforts were ineffectual. Their degeneracy was so invincible, that the almighty Sovereign was provoked to inflict upon them those calamities which were denounced by the Prophet Zephaniah. In the thirty-second year of Josiah's reign, Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, advanced with his army against Carchemish, a city situated on the river Euphrates. He was opposed by the king of Judah; so that a bloody battle ensued at Megiddo, in which Josiah received a mortal wound, which terminated in his death, after he had been conveyed to Jerusalem, in the thirty-ninth year of his reign, B.C. 609. His death was greatly lamented by all his subjects; and an elegy was written on the occasion by the Prophet Jeremiah, which is not now extant, 2 Kings xxii, xxiii; 2 Chronicles xxxiv, xxxv.

JUBAL, a son of Lamech, the inventor of musical instruments, Gen. iv, 21.

JUBILEE, among the Jews, denotes every fiftieth year; being that following the revolution of seven weeks of years; at which time all the slaves were made free, and all lands reverted to their ancient owners. The jubilees were not regarded after the Babylonish captivity. The political design of the law of the jubilee was to prevent the too great oppression of the poor, as well as their being liable to perpetual slavery. By this means the rich were prevented from accumulating lands for perpetuity, and a kind of equality was preserved through all the families of Israel. The distinction of tribes was also preserved, in respect both to their families and possessions; that they might be able, when there was occasion, on the jubilee year, to prove their right to the inheritance of their ancestors. Thus, also, it would be known with certainty of what tribe or family the Messiah sprung. It served, also, like the Olympiads of the Greeks, and the Lustra of the Romans, for the readier computation of time. The jubilee has also been supposed to be typical of the Gospel state and dispensation, described by Isaiah lxi, 1, 2, in 547reference to this period, as “the acceptable year of the Lord.”

The word jubilee, in a more modern sense, denotes a grand church solemnity or ceremony celebrated at Rome, in which the pope grants a plenary indulgence to all sinners; at least, to as many as visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome. The jubilee was first established by Boniface VII., in 1300, which was only to return every hundred years; but the first celebration brought in such store of wealth, that Clement VI., in 1343, reduced it to the period of fifty years. Urban VI., in 1389, appointed it to be held every thirty-five years, that being the age of our Saviour; and Paul II. and Sixtus IV., in 1475, brought it down to every twenty-five, that every person might have the benefit of it once in his life. Boniface IX. granted the privilege of holding jubilees to several princes and monasteries; for instance, to the monks of Canterbury, who had a jubilee every fifty years; when people flocked from all parts to visit the tomb of Thomas-a-Becket. Afterward, jubilees became more frequent: there is generally one at the inauguration of a new pope; and he grants them as often as the church or himself have occasion for them. To be entitled to the privileges of the jubilee, the bull enjoins fasting, alms, and prayers. It gives the priests a full power to absolve in all cases even those otherwise reserved to the pope; to make commutations of vows, &c; in which it differs from a plenary indulgence. During the time of jubilee, all other indulgences are suspended.

JUDAH, the son of Jacob and Leah, who was born in Mesopotamia, Genesis xxix, 35. It was he who advised his brethren to sell Joseph to the Ishmaelite merchants, rather than stain their hands with his blood, Gen. xxxvii, 26. There is little said of his life, and the little that is recorded does

not raise him high in our estimation. In the last prophetic blessing pronounced on him by his father Jacob, Gen. xlix, 8, 9, there is a promise of the regal power; and that it should not depart from his family before the coming of the Messiah. The whole southern part of Palestine fell to Judah's lot; but the tribes of Simeon and Dan possessed many cities which at first were given to Judah. This tribe was so numerous, that at the departure out of Egypt it contained seventy-four thousand six hundred men capable of bearing arms, Num. i, 26, 27. The crown passed from the tribe of Benjamin, of which Saul and his sons were, to that of Judah, which was David's tribe, and the tribe of the kings, his successors, until the Babylonish captivity.

JUDAISM, the religious doctrines and rites of the Jews, the descendants of Abraham. With Abraham Judaism may be said, in some sense, to have begun; but it was not till the promulgation of the law upon Mount Sinai, that the Jewish economy was established, and that to his posterity was committed a dispensation which was to distinguish them ever after from every other people on earth. The Mosaic dispensation consisted of three parts; the religious faith and worship of the Jews, their civil polity, and precepts for the regulation of their moral conduct. Their civil government, as well as their sacred polity, was of divine institution; and, on all important occasions, their public affairs were conducted by the Deity himself, or by persons bearing his commission. The laws of the Jews, religious and moral, civil, political, and ritual, that is, a complete system of pure Judaism, are contained in the books of the Old Testament, and chiefly in the five books of Moses. See Government of the Hebrews.

The religion of the ancestors of the Jews, before the time of Moses, consisted in the worship of the one living and true God, under whose immediate direction they were; in the hope of a Redeemer; in a firm reliance on his promises under all difficulties and dangers; and in a thankful acknowledgment for all his blessings and deliverances. In that early age, we read of altars, pillars, and monuments raised, and sacrifices offered to God. They used circumcision as a seal of the covenant which God had made with Abraham. As to the mode and circumstances of divine worship, they were much at liberty till the time of Moses; but that legislator, by the direction and appointment of God himself, prescribed an instituted form of religion, and regulated ceremonies, feasts, days, priests, and sacrifices, with the utmost exactness. The rites and observances of their religion under the law were numerous, and its sanctions severe. Notwithstanding God's prophets, and oracles, and ordinances, and the symbol of his presence, were among them, the Jews were ever very prone to idolatry, till the Babylonish furnace served to purify them from that corruption. After their seventy years' captivity, many among them gave too much place to the Greek idolatries, but as a nation they were never again guilty of the crime. Their

religious worship and character in our Saviour's time had become formal and superstitious; and such it still continues to be, in a greater or less degree, at the present day. Ancient Judaism, compared with all religions except the Christian, was distinguished for its superior purity and spirituality; and the whole Mosaic ritual was of a typical nature. See Jews.

JUDAIZING CHRISTIANS. Concerning the divine origin of the religion of Moses, there was among the Jews no diversity of sentiment, and they not unnaturally drew the conclusion, that, as it had proceeded from God, it must be of perpetual obligation. They were indeed fully aware, that another communication from heaven was to be made to mankind, and that this was to be announced by a messenger more distinguished than even the lawgiver whom they revered; but they had satisfied themselves, that the great design of the Messiah's mission would be to rescue them from the oppression of a foreign yoke, and to lay in Jerusalem the foundation of universal empire. For accomplishing these purposes, it was requisite that their Messiah should be invested with temporal power; and in this idea, which so many circumstances 548 in their history tended to endear to them, they were confirmed by those passages in the books of their prophets which described him as destined to sit on the throne of David, to sway a righteous sceptre, and to establish an everlasting kingdom. When, accordingly, Christ appeared in the humblest condition of life, and when, after the commencement of his ministry, he declared, that the hopes of empire which his countrymen had long cherished were fallacious, the predictions on which they had been rested suggesting, when combined with other predictions, a very different view of the designs of the Almighty, they were filled with indignation, and the greater part of them, although they saw the miracles which Jesus wrought, and heard those appeals to their own Scriptures which, however eager to do so, they found themselves unable to confute, rejected his pretensions on account of the meanness of his situation, and reprobated him as a deceiver of the people.

There was, however, a considerable number who could not adopt this conclusion, and who, satisfied that the mighty works which he performed fully established the reality of the divine commission to which he laid claim, relinquished their prejudices respecting a temporal sovereignty, and embraced his doctrine as the revealed will of God. But, notwithstanding this, they do not seem to have formed the most distant conception that there was any thing in that doctrine to set aside the system which had been transmitted to them by their fathers. They regarded the two dispensations as forming one whole; and believed that the rites which had distinguished from the rest of mankind those who belonged to the commonwealth of Israel, would in the same manner mark the disciples of the Messiah's kingdom. Agreeably to this, as they conceived, they saw that Jesus

conformed to their ceremonial institutions, he frequented the temple, he purified it from abuses by which it had been profaned, and they interpreted, in the sense most in harmony with their favourite notions, the declaration which he had publicly made, that he came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it. Even the apostles who had constantly attended him, who had listened not merely to his public discourses, but to the interpretation of them, which, in tender condescension to their weakness, he often in private gave, were so thoroughly established in this opinion that it required a peculiar revelation to be made to him before Peter would open the kingdom of God to a Gentile. It cannot, therefore, be matter of surprise that the sentiment prevailed among the whole of the Jews who had been converted to Christianity; or that even after it was opposed by the declaration of the Apostles as individuals, and by their solemn determination, when assembled to decide with respect to it, that the law was not binding upon Gentile converts, they should still have adhered to it, when from not having a written record of faith they might have imagined, either that the representation of the apostolic decision was erroneous, or that the sanction which it gave to their own adherence to their ceremonies virtually confirmed the doctrine which they felt such aversion to relinquish. They accordingly displayed much zeal in support of the Mosaical economy, represented the strict observance of what it required as essential for justification, and looked with a kind of abhorrence upon that large proportion of believers who paid to this no respect, and who even did not hesitate to condemn it as subversive of the fundamental principle of the Gospel dispensation. A great part of the epistles of St. Paul is directed against the Judaizing teachers who inculcated the original tenet of their brethren. The Apostle earnestly presses upon the churches, that by the works of the law we cannot be justified, that circumcision is of no avail, that by grace we are saved, and that Christ hath redeemed us by his blood. He, indeed, uniformly represents the idea which he opposed as inconsistent with Christianity, as an idea which could not be held without detracting from what our Saviour has done to accomplish our redemption. What effect his writings produced upon the Jewish believers, cannot be accurately ascertained; but it is quite certain that a very large proportion of them adhered to their ritual observances either as national, or as instrumental in obtaining the divine favour; and this survived the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem,--events which might have been expected to convince every one of the temporary nature of the Mosaical economy.

But after Adrian, by again directing the Roman arms against the Jews, blasted the hopes which had been fondly cherished, that their city would be rebuilt, and their temple opened with greater splendour than before, a vast number of them, either from being convinced by what they had seen, or from their eagerness to gain admission into the city which the emperor

had erected, but from which he had ordered that all who persisted in Judaism should be excluded, for the first time embraced the religion of Christ; and many, who had previously done so, abandoning the Jewish ritual, acquiesced fully in the representation of the faith given by St. Paul, choosing as their bishop a Gentile convert. There were, however, not a few who remained steadfast in their principles, who were now consequently separated from the great body of their believing countrymen, and who retained the appellation of Nazarenes, which had probably been given to the whole of the Jewish Christians. This remnant soon split into two parties. The one party, although they held that the law of Moses was obligatory upon the descendants of the house of Israel, did not extend it to those who had never been of the family of Abraham; they revered Jesus as being more than man, and in fact approached so near to the prevailing sentiments of the church, that, notwithstanding their peculiar sentiments in relation to the Mosaical law, they were not ranked by the earliest writers among heretics. The other party, who were called Ebionites, either from Ebion, the name, it is alleged, of 549 their leader, from their poverty, or from the low notions which they entertained of Christ, for all these reasons have been specified, showing sufficiently that the matter is really uncertain,--maintained the original tenet that their law was binding upon all men, and that without observing what it required it was impossible to be justified. As this was in direct opposition to the declarations of St. Paul, instead of submitting to apostolic authority they set it at defiance, rejecting his epistles, and branding him as an enemy to the truth. They disregarded even the Gospels which were received by the generality of Christians, and used a gospel of their own which they had so modelled as to support the tenets to which they were attached. One of these tenets, one which, indeed, naturally followed from their conceptions of the Gospel dispensation, was, that its author was merely a man raised solely by the commission with which he had been honoured above the rest of his fellow creatures.

JUDAS ISCARIOT, or, as he is usually called, the traitor, and betrayer of our Lord. "The treachery of Judas Iscariot," says Dr. Hales, "his remorse, and suicide, are occurrences altogether so strange and extraordinary, that the motives by which he was actuated require to be developed, as far as may be done, where the evangelists are, in a great measure, silent concerning them, from the circumstances of the history itself, and from the feelings of human nature. Judas, the leading trait in whose character was covetousness, was probably induced to follow Jesus at first with a view to the riches, honours, and other temporal advantages, which he, in common with the rest, expected the Messiah's friends would enjoy. The astonishing miracles he saw him perform left no room to doubt of the reality of his Master's pretensions, who had, indeed, himself in private actually accepted the title from his Apostles; and Judas must have been much disappointed

when Jesus repeatedly refused the proffered royalty from the people in Galilee, after the miracle of feeding the five thousand, and again after his public procession to Jerusalem. He might naturally have grown impatient under the delay, and dissatisfied also with Jesus for openly discouraging all ambitious views among his disciples; and, therefore, he might have devised the scheme of delivering him up to the sanhedrim, or great council of the nation, (composed of the chief priests, scribes, and elders,) in order to compel him to avow himself openly as the Messiah before them; and to work such miracles, or to give them the sign which they so often required, as would convince and induce them to elect him in due form, and by that means enable him to reward his followers. Even the rebukes of Jesus for his covetousness, and the detection of his treacherous scheme, although they unquestionably offended Judas, might only serve to stimulate him to the speedier execution of his plot, during the feast of the passover, while the great concourse of the Jews, from all parts assembled, might powerfully support the sanhedrim and their Messiah against the Romans. The success of this measure, though against his Master's will, would be likely to procure him pardon, and even to recommend him to favour afterward. Such might have been the plausible suggestions by which Satan tempted him to the commission of this crime. But when Judas, who attended the whole trial, saw that it turned out quite contrary to his expectations, that Jesus was capitally convicted by the council, as a false Christ and false prophet, notwithstanding he had openly avowed himself; and that he wrought no miracle, either for their conviction or for his own deliverance, as Judas well knew he could, even from the circumstance of healing Malchus, after he was apprehended; when he farther reflected, like Peter, on his Master's merciful forewarnings of his treachery, and mild and gentle rebuke at the commission of it; he was seized with remorse, and offered to return the paltry bribe of thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders instantly on the spot, saying, 'I sinned in delivering up innocent blood;' and expected that on this they would have desisted from the prosecution. But they were obstinate, and not only would not relent, but threw the whole load of guilt upon him, refusing to take their own share; for they said, 'What is that to us? see thou to that;' thus, according to the aphorism, loving the treason, but hating the traitor, after he had served their wicked turn. Stung to the quick at their refusal to take back the money, while they condemned himself, he went to the temple, cast down the whole sum in the treasury, or place for receiving the offerings of the people; and, after he had thus returned the wages of iniquity, he retired to some lonely place, not far, perhaps, from the scene of Peter's repentance; and, in the frenzy of despair, and at the instigation of the devil, hanged himself; crowning with suicide the murder of his Master and his friend; rejecting his compassionate Saviour, and plunging his own soul into perdition! In another place it is said that, 'falling headlong, he burst asunder, and all his bowels gushed



out,' Acts i, 18. Both these accounts might be true: he might first have hanged himself from some tree on the edge of a precipice; and, the rope or branch breaking, he might be dashed to pieces by the fall."

The above view of the case of Judas endeavours ingeniously to account for his conduct by supposing him influenced by the motive of compelling our Lord to declare himself, and assume the Messiahship in its earthly glory. It will, however, be recollected, that the only key which the evangelic narrative affords, is, Judas's covetousness; which passion was, in him, a growing one. It was this which destroyed whatever of honest intention he might at first have in following Jesus; and when fully under its influence he would be blinded by it to all but the glittering object of the reward of iniquity. In such a mind there could be no true faith, and no love; what wonder, then, when avarice was in him a ruling and unrestrained passion, that he should betray his Lord? Still it may be admitted that the knowledge which Judas had of our Lord's miraculous power, might lead him the more readily to put him into the hands of the chief priests. He might suppose that he would deliver himself out of their hands; and thus Judas attempted to play a double villany, against Christ and against his employers.

JUDE, Epistle of, a canonical book of the New Testament, written against the heretics, who, by their impious doctrines and disorderly lives, corrupted the faith and good morals of Christians. The author of this epistle, called Judas, and also Thaddeus and Lebbeus, was one of the twelve Apostles; he was the son of Alpheus, brother of James the less, and one of those who were called our Lord's brethren. We are not informed when, or how, he was called to be an Apostle; but it has been conjectured, that, before his vocation to the Apostleship, he was a husbandman, that he was married, and that he had children. The only account we have of him in particular, is that which occurs in John xiv, 21–23. It is not unreasonable to suppose that, after having received, in common with other Apostles, extraordinary gifts at the pentecost, he preached the Gospel for some time in several parts of the land of Israel, and wrought miracles in the name of Christ. And, as his life seems to have been prolonged, it is probable that he afterward left Judea, and went abroad preaching the Gospel to Jews and Gentiles in other countries. Some have said that he preached in Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia; and that he suffered martyrdom in the last mentioned country. But we have no account of his travels upon which we can rely; and it may be questioned whether he was a martyr.

In the early ages of Christianity, several rejected the Epistle of St. Jude, because the apocryphal books of Enoch, and the ascension of Moses, are quoted in it. Nevertheless, it is to be found in all the ancient catalogues of

the sacred writings; and Clement, of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen quote it as written by Jude, and reckon it among the books of sacred Scripture. In the time of Eusebius it was generally received. As to the objections that have been urged against its authority, Dr. Lardner suggests, that there is no necessity for supposing that St. Jude quoted a book called Enoch, or Enoch's prophecies; and even allowing that he did quote it, he gives it no authority; it was no canonical book of the Jews; and if such a book existed among the Jews, it was apocryphal, and yet there might be in it some right things. Instead of referring to a book called the "Assumption or Ascension of Christ," which probably was a forgery much later than his time, it is much more credible that St. Jude refers to the vision in Zech. iii, 1-3. It has been the opinion of several writers, and, among others, of Hammond and Benson, that St. Jude addressed his epistle to the Jewish Christians; but Dr. Lardner infers, from the words of the inscription of the epistle, verses 1, 3, that it was designed for the use of all in general who had embraced the Christian religion. The last mentioned author supposes that this epistle was written A. D. 64, 65, or 66.

JUDEA, a district of Asia Minor, which is described both by ancient and modern geographers under a great variety of names, and with great diversity of extent. In the most extensive application of the name, it comprehends the whole country possessed by the Jews, or people of Israel; and included, therefore, very different portions of territory at different periods of their history. Upon the conquest of the country by Joshua, it was divided into twelve portions, according to the number of the tribes of Israel; and a general view of their respective allotments (though the intermediate boundaries cannot be very precisely ascertained) may convey some idea of its extent at that period. The portion of the tribe of Judah comprised all the country between Edom, or Idumea, on the south, the Mediterranean on the west, the Salt Sea on the east, and an imaginary line on the north, from the northern extremity of the Salt Sea to the Mediterranean. The portion of Simeon was included within that of Judah, and formed the south-west corner of the country; comprehending the towns of Bersaba, Gerar, Rapha, Gaza, Ascalon, and Azotus. The portion of Benjamin was situated to the north of Judah, near the centre of the kingdom, bounded on the east by the river Jordan, and containing part of Jerusalem, Jericho, Bethel, Rama, &c. The portion of Dan lay to the north-west of Judah, between that of Benjamin and the Mediterranean, reaching as far north as the latter, and containing Accaron and Jamnia. The portion of Ephraim stretched along the northern limits of Dan and Benjamin, between the river Jordan on the east, and the Mediterranean sea on the west; containing Sichem, Joppa, Lydda, Gazara, &c. The portion of the half tribe of Manasseh was situated north of Ephraim, between the river Jordan and the Mediterranean, reaching as far north as Dora, at the foot of Mount Carmel. The portion of

Issachar stretched northward from Manasseh, and westward from Jordan, as far as Mount Tabor. The portion of Asher comprehended the maritime tract between Mount Carmel, as far as Sidon. The portion of Zebulon, bounded by Asher on the west, and Mount Tabor on the south, joined on the east the portion of Naphtali, which occupied the borders of the lake Gennesareth, or sea of Tiberias. The portion of Reuben lay to the eastward of the river Jordan, bounded on the south by the torrent of Arnon, and on the north by the river Jabok. The portion of Gad, also on the east of the Jordan, stretched from the Jabok toward the north, where it was bounded by the other half tribe of Manasseh, which occupied the country east of the lake Gennesareth, to the northern limits of the country. The whole of this extent between Cælo-Syria on the north, and Arabia Petraea on the south, the Mediterranean on the west, and Arabia Deserta on the east, may be considered as situated between  $31^{\circ} 10'$  and  $33^{\circ} 15'$  of north latitude, about a 551 hundred and forty miles in length, and nearly a hundred in breadth. Reckoning from Dan to Beersheba, which are often mentioned in sacred Scripture as including the more settled and permanent possessions of the Israelites, its length would not exceed a hundred and twenty miles. But, if estimated from its boundaries in the reigns of David and Solomon, and several succeeding princes, its extent must be enlarged more than threefold; including both the land of Palestine, or of the Philistines, on the south, and the country of Phenice on the north, with part of Syria to the north-east. All this extent was originally comprehended in the land of promise, Genesis xv, 18; Deut. xi, 24; and was actually possessed by David and Solomon, 1 Kings ix, 20; 2 Chron. viii, 7. It is described in numerous passages of the sacred writings, as all comprised in the Holy Land, from Hamath on the north, to the river of Egypt on the south; and from the Great or Mediterranean Sea on the west, to the deserts of Arabia on the east; a tract of country at least four hundred and sixty miles in length, and more than a hundred in breadth, Joshua xv, 2, &c; xix, 24, &c; 1 Chron. xiii, 5; 2 Chron. vii, 8; Ezekiel xlvii, 16, 20; Amos vi, 14.

After the death of Solomon, when the kingdom of the Hebrews had attained its greatest extent, it was divided, in consequence of a revolt of ten tribes, into two distinct sovereignties, named Israel and Judah; the former of which had its seat of government in Samaria, and the latter in Jerusalem. The territories of both were gradually curtailed and laid waste by the revolt of tributary princes, and the incursions of powerful neighbours; and both were at length completely overthrown; that of Israel, by the king of Assyria, about B. C. 720; and that of Judah, by Nebuchadnezzar, about a hundred and fourteen years later.

After a captivity of seventy years, the Jews, who had been the subjects of Judah, having received permission from Cyrus to return to their native

country, not only occupied the former territories of that kingdom, but extended themselves over great part of what had belonged to the ten tribes of the kingdom of Israel; and then, for the first time, gave the name of Judea to the whole country over which they had again established their dominion. The same name was given to that kingdom as possessed by Herod the Great under the Romans; but, in the enumeration of the provinces of the empire, it was recognised only by the name of Palestine. All traces of its ancient division among the twelve tribes were now abolished, and it was distributed into four provinces; namely, Judea Proper in the south, Galilee in the north, Samaria in the centre, and Peræa on the east of the river Jordan. Judea Proper, situated in  $31^{\circ} 40'$  north latitude, was bounded on the north by Samaria, on the west by the Mediterranean, on the east by the river Jordan, on the south by Arabia Petræa; and comprised the ancient settlements of Judah, Benjamin, Dan, and Simeon, with Philistia and Idumea. It is divided by Josephus into eleven toparchies, and by Pliny into ten; but these subdivisions are little noticed by ancient writers, and their boundaries are very imperfectly ascertained. The principal places in the north-east quarter of the province were Jerusalem, the capital, which was entirely destroyed in the reign of Hadrian, and replaced by a new city named Ælia, a little farther north, which is now the site of the modern Jerusalem; Jericho, the city of palm trees, about nineteen miles eastward of Jerusalem, and eight from the river Jordan; Phaselis, built by Herod in memory of his brother, fifteen miles north-west of Jericho; Archelais, built by Archelaus, ten miles north of Jericho; Gophna, fifteen miles north of Jerusalem, in the road to Sichem; Bethel, twelve miles north of Jerusalem, originally called Luz; Gilgal, about one mile and a half from Jericho; Engeddi, a hundred furlongs south south-east of Jericho, near the northern extremity of the Dead Sea; Masada, a strong fortress built by Judas Maccabeus, the last refuge of the Jews after the fall of Jerusalem; Ephraim, a small town westward of Jericho; Anathoth, a Levitical town, nearly four miles north of Jerusalem. In the south-east quarter of the province were situated Bethlehem, or Ephrath, about six miles south from the capital; Bethzur, now St. Philip, a strong place on the road to Hebron, ten miles south of Jerusalem; Ziph, a small town between Hebron and the Dead Sea; Zoar, at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, near the situation of Sodom; Hebron, formerly Kirjath-arba, a very ancient town in a hilly country, twenty-five miles south of the capital; Arad, about twenty-four miles southward from Hebron, and near the Ascensus Avrabim, or Scorpion Mountains, on the border of Arabia Petræa; and Thamar, on the southern limit of the province, near the south extremity of the Dead Sea. In the north-west quarter were Bethshemesh, or Heliopolis, a Levitical city, about ten miles west of the capital; Rama, six miles north from Jerusalem; Emmaus, a village eight miles north north-west from Jerusalem, afterward called Nicopolis, in consequence of a victory gained by Vespasian over the

revolted Jews; Bethoron, a populous Levitical city on the road to Lydda, a few miles north-west of Emmaus; Kirjath-jearim, on the road to Joppa, nine miles westward from the capital; Lydda, now Lod, and called by the Greeks Diospolis, about twelve miles east of Joppa; Ramla, supposed to be the same as Arimathea, about five miles south-west of Lydda; Joppa, a maritime town, now Jaffa, about twelve leagues north-west of Jerusalem; Jabne, a walled sea-port town between Joppa and Azotus; and Ekron, a town on the north boundary of the Philistines. In the south-west quarter of Judea were Gath, about twenty miles west from Jerusalem, near to which were the city of Eleutheropolis, a flourishing place in the second century; Makkedah, a strong place, eight miles north-east from 552Eleutheropolis; Bersabe, or Beersheba, about twenty-six miles south from Eleutheropolis; Gerar, between Beersheba and the sea coast; Azotus, or Ashdod, to the west of Eleutheropolis, within a few miles of the sea, and the seat of a bishop in the first ages of the Christian church; Ascalon, a considerable maritime town, above forty-three miles south-west of Jerusalem; Gaza, fifteen miles southward from Ascalon; and Raphia, between Gaza and Rhinocurura, remarkable for a great battle in its neighbourhood, in which Philopater, king of Egypt, defeated Antiochus, king of Syria.

Samaria, lying between Judea and Galilee, in  $32^{\circ} 15'$  north latitude, extended along the sea coast from Joppa to Dora, and along the river Jordan from the rivulet of Alexandrium to the southern extremity of the sea of Tiberias; comprehending the territory of the tribe of Ephraim, of the half tribe of Manasseh, and part of Issachar. Its principal cities were Samaria, the capital of the kingdom of Israel, north of Sichem, and equally distant from Jordan and the sea coast, afterward named Sebaste by Herod, in honour of Augustus; Jezrael, or Esdraelon, about four leagues north from Samaria; Sichem, or Sychar, called by the Romans Neapolis, eight miles south of Samaria, in a valley between the mountains Gerizim and Ebal; Bethsan, called by the Greek writers Scythopolis, about twenty miles north-east of Sichem; Cæsarea of Palestine, anciently called Turris Stratonis, greatly enlarged by Herod, and long the principal city of the province, about nineteen leagues north north-west from Jerusalem; Dora, now Tartura, nine miles north from Cæsarea, on the road to Tyre; Apollonia, now Arzuf, on the sea coast, twenty-two miles south of Cæsarea; and Hadadrimmon, afterward called Maximianopolis, about seventeen miles eastward of Cæsarea.

Galilæa, in  $33^{\circ}$  north latitude, bounded on the south by Samaria, on the west by the Mediterranean, on the north by Syria, on the east by the river Jordan and the lake Gennesareth, comprehended the possessions of Asher, Naphtali, and Zabulon, with part of the allotment of Issachar. The northern division of the province was thinly inhabited by Jews, and was sometimes

called Galilee of the Gentiles; but the southern portion was very populous. Its principal towns were Capernaum, at the northern extremity of the lake of Gennesareth; Bethsaida, a considerable village a few leagues south of Capernaum; Cinnereth, south of Bethsaida, rebuilt by Herod Antipas, and named Tiberias; Tarichæa, a considerable town at the efflux of the river Jordan from the sea of Tiberias, thirty stadia south from the town of Tiberias; Nazareth, two leagues north-west of Mount Tabor, and equally distant from the lake of Gennesareth and the sea coast; Arbela, six miles west of Nazareth; Sepphoris, or Dio-Cæsarea, now Sefouri, a large and well fortified town, about five leagues north north-west of Mount Tabor; Zabulon, a strong and populous place, sixty stadia south-east of Ptolemais; Acre, or Accon, seven miles north from the promontory of Carmel, afterward enlarged and called Ptolemais by Ptolemy I., of Egypt, and in the time of the crusades distinguished by the name of Acre, the last city possessed by the Christians in Syria, and was taken and destroyed by the Sultan Serapha, of Egypt, in 1291; Kedes, or Cydissus, a Levitical city at the foot of Mount Panium, twenty miles south-east of Tyre; Dan, originally Laish, on the north boundary of the Holy Land, about thirty miles south-east of Sidon; Paneas, near to Dan, or, according to some, only a different name for the same place, was repaired by Philip, son of Herod the Great, and by him named Cæsarea, in honour of Augustus, with the addition of Philippi, to distinguish it from the other town of the same name in Samaria; Jotapata, the strongest town in Galilee, about four leagues north north-east of Dio-Cæsarea; and Japha and Gischala, two other fortified places in the same district.

Peræa, though the name would denote any extent of country beyond Jordan, is more particularly applied to that district in 32° north latitude, which formerly composed the territories of Sihon, the Amorite, and Og, king of Bashan; extending from the river Arnon (which flows through an extensive plain into the Dead Sea) to the mount of Gilead, where the Jordan issues from the sea of Tiberias; and which fell to the lot of the tribes of Reuben and Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh. This province was about sixty miles from north to south, and forty from east to west. The principal places were Penuel, on the left of the Jabbok, which forms the northern border of the country; Succoth, on the banks of the Jordan, a little farther south; Bethabara, a little below Succoth, where was a place of passage over the river; Amathus, afterward named Assalt, a strong town below the influx of the torrent Jazer; Livias, between Mount Nebo and the northern extremity of the Dead Sea, a town which was so named by Herod, in honour of Livia, the wife of Augustus; Machærus, a citadel on a steep rock, south of Livias, near the upper end of the Dead Sea; Lasa, or Calle-rhoe, celebrated for its hot springs, between Machærus and the river Arnon; Herodium, a fort built by Herod a few miles farther inland, as a protection

against the Moabites; Aroer, a town of Moab, seven leagues east of the Dead Sea; Castra Amonensia, a Roman station, supposed to be the ancient Mephoath, seven leagues north-east of Aroer; Hesbon, or Esbus, the capital of Sihon, anciently famed for its fish pools, seven leagues east from the Jordan, three from Mount Nebo, and nearly in the centre of the province; Madaba, now El-Belkaa, three leagues south-east of Hesbon; Jazer, or Tira, a Levitical city on a small lake, five leagues north-east of Hesbon. To the south of Peræa lies a territory called Moabites, the capital of which was Rabbath-Moab, afterward named Areopolis; and to the south-west of which was Charac-Moab, 553 or Karak, a fortress on the summit of a hill, at the entrance of a deep valley.

To the north of Peræa were situated several districts, which, as forming part of the kingdom of Judea under Herod the Great, require to be briefly noticed in this account; and which do properly come under the general name of Peræa, as being situated on the eastward of the river Jordan. These were Galaadites, or Gileadites, in  $32^{\circ} 20'$  north latitude, now Zarca, east from Jordan, and north from the Jabbok; containing the cities of Ramoth-Gilead, Mahanaim, Jabesh-Gilead, at the foot of Mount Gilead. Batanæa, anciently Basan, now Bitinia, in  $32^{\circ} 25'$  north latitude, formerly celebrated for its oaks and pastures, was situated to the north of Galaadites, and contained the cities of Adrea, or Edrei, Astaroth, and Bathyra. Gaulonitis, a narrow strip of land between Batanæa and the shore of the sea of Tiberias, stretching northward to Mount Hermon, and containing Gamala, a strong town near the southern extremity of the sea of Tiberias; Argob, between this sea and Mount Hippos; Julias, supposed to be the same as Chorazin, and by others to be Bethsaida; and Seleuca, a fortified place on the east border of Lacus Samochonitis. Auranitis, or Ituræa, a mountainous and barren tract north of Batanæa, and bounded on the west by a branch of Mount Hermon, contained Bostra, or Bozra, about fifty miles east from the sea of Tiberias, bordering on Arabia Petræa, afterward enlarged by Trajan, and named Trajana Bostra; and Trachonitis, in  $33^{\circ} 15'$  north latitude, between Hermon and Antilibanus, eastward from the sources of Jordan, and containing Baalgad, Mispah, Paneas, or Cæsarea Philippi, and Ænos, nearly twenty-five miles east of Panæas, and as far south south-west of Damascus. There remains to be noticed the Decapolis, or confederation of ten cities in the last mentioned districts, which having been occupied during the Babylonish captivity by Heathen inhabitants, refused to adopt the Mosaic ritual after the restoration of the Jews, and found it necessary to unite their strength against the enterprises of the Asmonean princes. One of them, namely, Scythopolis, already described in the account of Samaria, was situated to the west of Jordan; but the other nine were all to the east of that river, namely, Gadara, or Kedar, a strong place on a hill, the capital of Peræa in the time of Josephus, about sixty stadia east from the sea of

Tiberias, and much frequented for its hot baths: Hippos, sometimes called Susitha, thirty stadia north-west of Gadara; Dium, or Dion, of which the situation is unknown, but conjectured by D’Anville to have been about seven leagues eastward from Pella, a considerable town supplied with copious fountains, on the river Jabbok, fourteen miles south-east of Gadara, and celebrated as the place to which the Christians retired, by divine admonition, before the destruction of Jerusalem; Canatha, south-east of Cæsarea, and between the Jordan and Mount Hermon; Garasa, afterward Jaras, three leagues north-east from the upper extremity of the sea of Tiberias, and much noted during the crusades; Rabbath-Ammon, the capital of the Ammonites, south-east of Ramoth, and near the source of the Jabbok, on the confines of Arabia, afterward called Philadelphia by Ptolemy Philadelphus, from whom it had received considerable improvements, of which the ruins are still visible; Abila, four leagues east from Gadara, in a fertile tract between the river Hieromax and Mount Gilead; and Capitolais, a town in Batanæa, five or six leagues east north-east of Gadara.

Judea, Wilderness of, a wild and desert country along the southern course of the river Jordan, east of Jerusalem; that which by St. Matthew is called the wilderness of Judea, being described by St. Luke as “all the country about Jordan;” from whence this wilderness extended southward along the western side of the Dead Sea. This is a stony and desolate region, of hopeless sterility, and most savage aspect; consisting almost entirely of disordered piles of rocks, and rocky mountains. This was the wilderness in which John first preached and baptized, and into which our Lord, after his own baptism, was led by the Spirit to be tempted, Matthew iv; Luke iv. Here, also, the mountain was situated which formed the scene of one of the most striking parts of this temptation. Maundrell describes this region as a most miserable, dry, and barren place; consisting of high rocky mountains, so torn and disordered, as if the earth had here suffered some great convulsion. Mr. Buckingham, who visited the same part in 1816, says, “As we proceeded to the northward, we had on our left a lofty peak of the range of hills which border the plain of the Jordan on the west, and ended in this direction the mountains of Judea. This peak is considered to be that to which Jesus was transported by the devil during his fast of forty days in the wilderness; ‘after which he was an hungered.’ Nothing can be more forbidding than the aspect of these hills; not a blade of verdure is to be seen over all their surface, and not the sound of any living being is to be heard throughout all their extent. They form, indeed, a most appropriate scene for that wilderness in which the Son of God is said to have dwelt with the wild beasts, ‘while the angels ministered unto him.’”



JUDGES is applied to certain eminent persons chosen by God himself to govern the Jews from the time of Joshua till the establishment of the kings. For the nature and duration of their office, and the powers with which they were invested, see Jews. The judges were not ordinary magistrates, but were appointed by God on extraordinary occasions; as to head the armies, to deliver the people from their enemies, &c. Salian has observed, that they not only presided in courts of justice, but were also at the head of the councils, the armies, and of every thing that concerned the government of the state; though they never assumed the title either of princes, governors, or the like.

Salian remarks seven points wherein they differed from kings: 1. They were not hereditary. 2. They had no absolute power of life and death, but only according to the laws, and dependently upon them. 3. They never undertook war at their own pleasure, but only when they were commanded by God, or called to it by the people. 4. They exacted no tribute. 5. They did not succeed each other immediately, but after the death of one there was frequently an interval of several years before a successor was appointed. 6. They did not use the ensigns of sovereignty, the sceptre or diadem. 7. They had no authority to make any laws, but were only to take care of the observance of those of Moses. Godwin, in his "Moses and Aaron," compares them to the Roman dictators, who were appointed only on extraordinary emergencies, as in case of war abroad, or conspiracies at home, and whose power, while they continued in office, was great, and even absolute. Thus the Hebrew judges seem to have been appointed only in cases of national trouble and danger. This was the case particularly with respect to Othniel, Ehud, and Gideon. The power of the judges, while in office, was very great; nor does it seem to have been limited to a certain time, like that of the Roman dictators, which continued for half a year; nevertheless, it is reasonable to suppose, that, when they had performed the business for which they were appointed, they retired to a private life. This Godwin infers from Gideon's refusing to take upon him the perpetual government of Israel, as being inconsistent with the theocracy.

Beside these superior judges, every city in the commonwealth had its elders, who formed a court of judicature, with a power of determining lesser matters in their respective districts. The rabbies say, there were three such elders or judges in each lesser city, and twenty-three in the greater. But Josephus, whose authority has greater weight, speaks of seven judges in each, without any such distinction of greater and less. Sigonius supposes that these elders and judges of cities were the original constitution settled in the wilderness by Moses, upon the advice given him by Jethro, Exod. xviii, 21, 22, and continued by divine appointment after the settlement in the land of Canaan; whereas others imagine that the Jethronian prefectures

were a peculiar constitution, suited to their condition while encamped in the wilderness, but laid aside after they came into Canaan. It is certain, however, that there was a court of judges and officers, appointed in every city, by the law of Moses, Deut. xvi, 18. How far, and in what respects, these judges differed from the elders of the city, it is not easy to ascertain; and whether they were the same or different persons. Perhaps the title elders may denote their seniority and dignity; and that of judges, the office they sustained. The lower courts of justice, in their several cities, were held in their gates, Deut. xvi, 15. Each tribe had its respective prince, whose office related chiefly, if not altogether, to military affairs. We read also of the princes of the congregation, who presided in judiciary matters. These are called elders, and were seventy in number, Num. xi, 16, 17, 24, 25. But it does not appear whether or not this consistory of seventy elders was a perpetual, or only a temporary, institution. Some have supposed that it was the same that afterward became famous under the appellation of sanhedrim; but others conceive the institution of the seventy elders to have been only temporary, for the assistance of Moses in the government, before the settlement in the land of Canaan; and that the sanhedrim was first set up in the time of the Maccabees. See Sanhedrim.

Judges, Book of, a canonical book of the Old Testament, containing the history of the Israelitish judges, of whom we have been speaking in the preceding article. The author is not known. It is probable the work did not come from any single hand, being rather a collection of several little histories, which at first were separate, but were afterward collected by Ezra or Samuel into a single volume; and, in all likelihood, were taken from the ancient journals, annals, or memoirs, composed by the several judges. The antiquity of this book is unquestionable, as it must have been written before the time of David, since the description, Judges i, 21, was no longer true of Jerusalem after he had taken possession of it, and had introduced a third class of inhabitants of the tribe of Judah. Eichorn acknowledges that it does not bear the marks of subsequent interpolation. Dr. Patrick is of opinion that the five last chapters are a distinct history, in which the author gives an account of several memorable transactions, which occurred in or about the time of the judges; whose history he would not interrupt by intermixing these matters with it, and therefore reserved them to be related by themselves in the second part, or appendix.

JUDGMENT, Day of, is that important period which shall terminate the present dispensation of grace toward the fallen race of Adam, put an end to time, and introduce the eternal destinies of men and angels, Acts xvi, 31; 1 Cor. xv, 24–26; 1 Thess. iv, 14–17; Matt. xxv, 31–46. It is in reference to this solemn period that the Apostle Peter says, “The heavens and the earth which now exist are by the word of God reserved in store unto fire, against

the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men,” 2 Peter iii, 7. Several eminent commentators understand this prophecy as a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem. In support of their interpretation, they appeal to the ancient Jewish prophecies, where, as they contend, the revolutions in the political state of empires and nations are foretold in the same forms of expression with those introduced in Peter’s prediction. The following are the prophecies to which they appeal:--Isaiah xxxiv, 4, where the destruction of Idumea is foretold under the figures of dissolving the host of heaven, and of rolling the heaven together as a scroll, and of the falling down of all their host as the leaf falleth off from the vine. Ezekiel xxxii, 7, where the 555destruction of Egypt is described by the figures of covering the heaven, and making the stars thereof dark; and of covering the sun with a cloud, and of hindering the moon from giving her light. In Joel ii, 10, the invasion of Judea by foreign armies is thus foretold: “The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble; the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining.” And in verses 30, 31, the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans is thus predicted: “I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.” God, threatening the Jews, is introduced saying, “In that day I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day,” Amos viii, 9. The overthrow of Judaism and Heathenism is thus foretold: “Yet once and I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea and the dry land,” Haggai ii, 6. Lastly: our Lord, in his prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, has the following expressions: “After the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken,” Matt. xxiv, 29.

Now it is remarkable that, in these prophecies, none of the prophets have spoken, as Peter has done, of the entire destruction of this mundane system, nor of the destruction of any part thereof. They mention only the rolling of the heavens together as a scroll, the obscuring of the light of the sun and of the moon, the shaking of the heavens and the earth, and the falling down of the stars: whereas Peter speaks of the utter destruction of all the parts of this mundane system by fire. This difference affords room for believing that the events foretold by the prophets are different in their nature from those foretold by the Apostle; and that they are to be figuratively understood, while those predicted by the Apostle are to be understood literally. To this conclusion, likewise, the phraseology of the prophets, compared with that of the Apostle, evidently leads: for the prophetic phraseology, literally interpreted, exhibits impossibilities; such as the rolling of the heavens together as a scroll; the turning of the moon into blood, and the falling down of the stars from heaven as the leaf of a tree.

Not so the apostolic phraseology: for the burning of the heavens, or atmosphere, and its passing away with a great noise; and the burning of the earth and the works thereon, together with the burning and melting of the elements, that is, the constituent parts of which this terraqueous globe is composed; are all things possible, and therefore may be literally understood; while the things mentioned by the prophets can only be taken figuratively. This, however, is not all. There are things in the Apostle's prophecy which show that he intended it to be taken literally. As, 1. He begins with an account of the perishing of the old world, to demonstrate against the scoffers the possibility of the perishing of the present heavens and earth. But that example would not have suited his purpose; unless, by the burning of the present heavens and earth, he had meant the destruction of the material fabric. Wherefore, the opposition stated in this prophecy between the perishing of the old world by water, and the perishing of the present world by fire, shows that the latter is to be as real a destruction of the material fabric as the former was. 2. The circumstance of the present heavens and earth being treasured up and kept, ever since the first deluge, from all after deluges, in order to their being destroyed by fire at the day of judgment, shows, we think, that the Apostle is speaking of a real, and not of a metaphorical, destruction of the heavens and earth. 3. This appears, likewise, from the Apostle's foretelling that, after the present heavens and earth are burned, new heavens and a new earth are to appear, in which the righteous are for ever to dwell. 4. The time fixed by the Apostle for the burning of the heavens and the earth, namely, the day of judgment and punishment of ungodly men, shows that the Apostle is speaking, not of the destruction of a single city or nation during the subsistence of the world, but of the earth itself, with all the wicked who have dwelt thereon. These circumstances persuade us that this prophecy, as well as the one recorded, 2 Thess. i, 9, is not to be interpreted metaphorically of the destruction of Jerusalem; but should be understood literally of the general judgment, and of the destruction of our mundane system.

But "it is appointed unto men once to die, and after death the judgment." These two events are inseparably linked together in the divine decree, and they reciprocally reflect importance on each other. Death is, indeed, the terror of our nature. Men may contrive to keep it from their thoughts, but they cannot think of it without fearful apprehensions of its consequences. It was justly to be dreaded by man in his state of innocence; and to the unrenewed man it ever was, and ever will be, a just object of abhorrence. The Gospel of Jesus Christ, which has brought life and immortality to light, is the only sovereign antidote against this universal evil. To the believer in Christ, its rough aspect is smoothed, and its terrors cease to be alarming. To him it is the messenger of peace; its sting is plucked out; its dark valley is the road to perfect bliss and life immortal. To him, "to live is Christ, and

to die is gain," Phil. i, 21. To die! speaking properly, he cannot die. He has already died in Christ, and with him: his "life is hid with Christ in God," Romans vi, 8; Col. iii, 3.

With this conquest of the fear of death is nearly allied another glorious privilege resulting from union with the Redeemer; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and "not be ashamed before him at his coming," 1 John ii, 28. Were death all that we have to dread, death might be braved. But after death there is a judgment; a judgment attended with 556 circumstances so tremendous as to shake the hearts of the boldest of the sons of nature. Then "men shall seek death, and shall not find it; and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them," Rev. ix, 6. Then shall come indeed an awful day; a day to which all that have preceded it are intended to be subservient; when the Lord shall appear in the united splendour of creating, of governing, and of judicial majesty, to finish his purposes respecting man and earth, and to pronounce the final, irreversible sentence, "It is done!" Rev. xxi, 6. Nothing of terror or magnificence hitherto beheld,--no glory of the rising sun after a night of darkness and of storm,--no convulsions of the earth,--no wide irruption of waters,--no flaming comet dragging its burning train over half the heaven, can convey to us an adequate conception of that day of terrible brightness and irresistible devastation. Creation then shall be uncreated. "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up," 2 Peter iii, 10. The Lord shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, 2 Thess. i, 7, 8, arrayed in all the glory of his Godhead, and attended by his mighty angels, Matt. xvi, 27; xxv, 31. All that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, John v, 28, 29. Earth and sea shall give up the dead which are in them. All that ever lived shall appear before him, Rev. xx, 12, 13. The judgment shall sit; and the books shall be opened, Dan. vii, 10. The eye of Omniscience detects every concealment by which they would screen from observation themselves, or their iniquity. The last reluctant sinner is finally separated from the congregation of the righteous, Psalm i, 5; and inflexible justice, so often disregarded, derided, and defied, gives forth their eternal doom! But to the saints this shall be a day of glory and honour. They shall be publicly acknowledged by God as his people; publicly justified from the slanders of the world; invested with immortal bodies; presented by Christ to the Father; and admitted into the highest felicity in the immediate presence of God for ever. These are the elevating, the transporting views, which made the Apostle Paul speak with so much desire and earnest expectation of the "day of Christ."

JUSTICE is in Scripture taken for that essential perfection in God, whereby he is infinitely righteous and just, both in himself and in all his proceedings

with his creatures, Psalm lxxxix, 14. 2. That political virtue which renders to every man his due; and is first, distributive, which concerns princes, magistrates, &c, Job xxix, 14; secondly, communicative, which concerns all persons in their dealings one with another, Gen. xviii, 19.

Justice, Administration of. According to the Mosaic law, there were to be judges in all the cities, whose duty it was likewise to exercise judicial authority in the neighbouring villages; but weighty causes and appeals went up to the supreme judge or ruler of the commonwealth, and, in case of a failure here, to the high priest, Deut. xvii, 8, 9. In the time of the monarchy, weighty causes and appeals went up, of course, to the king, who, in very difficult cases, seems to have consulted the high priest, as is customary at the present day among the Persians and Ottomans. The judicial establishment was reorganized after the captivity, and two classes of judges, the inferior and superior, were appointed, Ezra vii, 25. The more difficult cases, nevertheless, and appeals, were either brought before the ruler of the state, called *פֶּהַד*, or before the high priest; until, in the age of the Maccabees, a supreme, judicial tribunal was instituted, which is first mentioned under Hyrcanus II. This tribunal is not to be confounded with the seventy-two counsellors, who were appointed to assist Moses in the civil administration of the government, but who never filled the office of judges. See Sanhedrim.

Josephus states, that in every city there was a tribunal of seven judges, with two Levites as apparitors, and that it was a Mosaic institution. That there existed such an institution in his time, there is no reason to doubt, but he probably erred in referring its origin to so early a period as the days of Moses. (See Judges.) This tribunal, which decided causes of less moment, is denominated in the New Testament *κρίσις*, or the judgment, Matt. v, 22. The Talmudists mention a tribunal of twenty-three judges, and another of three judges; but Josephus is silent in respect to them. The courts of twenty-three judges were the same with the synagogue tribunals, mentioned in John xvi, 2; which merely tried questions of a religious nature, and sentenced to no other punishment than “forty stripes save one,” 2 Cor. xi, 24. The court of three judges was merely a session of referees, which was allowed to the Jews by the Roman laws; for the Talmudists themselves, in describing this court, go on to observe, that one judge was chosen by the accuser, another by the accused, and a third by the two parties conjunctly; which shows at once the nature of the tribunal.

The time at which courts were held, and causes were brought before them for trial, was in the morning, Jer. xxi, 12; Psalm ci, 8. According to the Talmudists, it was not lawful to try causes of a capital nature in the night; and it was equally unlawful to examine a cause, pass sentence, and put it

in execution on the same day. The last particular was very strenuously insisted on. It is worthy of remark, that all of these practices, which were observed in other trials, were neglected in the tumultuous trial of Jesus, Matt. xxvi, 57; John xviii, 13–18. The places for judicial trials were in very ancient times the gates of cities, which were well adapted to this purpose. (See Gates.) Originally, trials were every where very summary, excepting in Egypt; where the accuser committed the charge to writing, the accused replied in writing, the accuser repeated the charge, and the accused answered again, &c, Job xiv, 17. 557It was customary in Egypt for the judge to have the code of laws placed before him, a practice which still prevails in the east. Moses interdicted, in the most express and decided manner, gifts or bribes, which were intended to corrupt the judges, Exod. xxii, 20, 21; xxiii, 1–9; Lev. xix, 15; Deut. xxiv, 14, 15. Moses also, by legal precautions, prevented capital punishments, and corporal punishments which were not capital, from being extended, as was done in other nations, both to parents and their children, and thus involving the innocent and the guilty in that misery which was justly due only to the latter, Exod. xxiii, 7; Deut. xxiv, 16; Dan. vi, 24.

The ceremonies which were observed in conducting a judicial trial, were as follows: 1. The accuser and the accused both made their appearance before the judge or judges, Deut. xxv, 1, who sat with legs crossed upon the floor, which was furnished for their accommodation with carpet and cushions. A secretary was present, at least in more modern times, who wrote down the sentence, and, indeed, every thing in relation to the trial; for instance, the articles of agreement that might be entered into previous to the commencement of the judicial proceedings, Isaiah x, 1, 2; Jer. xxxii, 1–14. The Jews assert that there were two secretaries, the one being seated to the right of the judge, who wrote the sentence of not guilty, the other to the left, who wrote the sentence of condemnation, Matt. xxv, 33–46. That an apparitor or beadle was present, is apparent from other sources. 2. The accuser was denominated in Hebrew אָדוֹר, or the adversary, Zech. iii, 1–3; Psalm cix, 6. The judge or judges were seated, but both of the parties implicated stood up, the accuser standing to the right hand of the accused: the latter, at least after the captivity, when the cause was one of great consequence, appeared with hair dishevelled, and in a garment of mourning. 3. The witnesses were sworn, and, in capital cases, the parties concerned, 1 Sam. xiv, 37–40; Matt. xxvi, 63. In order to establish the charges alleged, two witnesses were necessary, and, including the accuser, three. The witnesses were examined separately, but the person accused had the liberty to be present when their testimony was given in, Num. xxxv, 30; Deut. xvii, 1–15; Matt. xxvi, 59. Proofs might be brought from other sources; for instance, from written contracts, or from papers in evidence of any thing purchased or sold, of which there were commonly taken two

copies, the one to be sealed, the other to be left open, as was customary in the time of Jerom, Jer. xxxii, 10–13. 4. The parties sometimes, as may be inferred from Prov. xviii, 18, made use of the lot in determining the points of difficulty between them, but not without a mutual agreement. The sacred lot of Urim and Thummim was anciently resorted to, in order to detect the guilty, Joshua vii, 14–24; 1 Sam. xiv; but the determination of a case of right or wrong in this way was not commanded by Moses. 5. The sentence, very soon after the completion of the examination, was pronounced; and the criminal, without any delay, even if the offence were a capital one, was hastened away to the place of punishment, Joshua vii, 22, &c; 1 Sam. xxii, 18; 1 Kings ii, 23.

A few additional remarks will cast some light upon some passages of Scripture: the station of the accused was in an eminent place in the court, that the people might see them, and hear what was alleged against them, and the proofs of it, together with the defence made by the criminals. This explains the reason of the remark by the Evangelist Matthew, concerning the posture of our Lord at his trial: “Jesus stood before the governor;” and that, in a mock trial, many ages before the birth of Christ, in which some attention was also paid to public forms, Naboth was set on high among the people, 1 Kings xxi, 9. The accusers and the witnesses also stood, unless they were allowed to sit by the indulgence of the judges, when they stated the accusation, or gave their testimony. To this custom of the accusers rising from their seats, when called by the court to read the indictment, our Lord alludes in his answer to the scribes and Pharisees, who expressed a wish to see him perform some miracle: “The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it,” Matt. xii, 42. According to this rule, which seems to have been invariably observed, the Jews who accused the Apostle Paul at the bar of Festus the Roman governor, “stood round about,” while they stated the crimes which they had to lay to his charge, Acts xxv, 7. They were compelled to stand as well as the prisoner, by the established usage of the courts of justice in the east. The Romans often put criminals to the question, or endeavoured to extort a confession from them by torture. Agreeably to this cruel and unjust custom, “the chief captain commanded Paul to be brought into the castle, and bade that he should be examined by scourging,” Acts xxii, 24. It was usual, especially among the Romans, when a man was charged with a capital crime, and during his arraignment, to let down his hair, suffer his beard to grow long, to wear filthy, ragged garments, and appear in a very dirty and sordid habit; on account of which they were called *sordidati*. When the person accused was brought into court to be tried, even his near relations, friends, and acquaintances, before the court voted, appeared with dishevelled hair, and clothed with garments foul and out of fashion, weeping, crying, and deprecating punishment. The accused sometimes



appeared before the judges clothed in black, and his head covered with dust. In allusion to this ancient custom, the Prophet Zechariah represents Joshua, the high priest, when he appeared before the Lord, and Satan stood at his right hand to accuse him, as clothed with filthy garments, Zech. iii, 3. After the cause was carefully examined, and all parties impartially heard, the public crier, by command of the presiding magistrate, 558 ordered the judges to bring in their verdict. The most ancient way of giving sentence, was by white and black sea shells, or pebbles. This custom has been mentioned by Ovid in these lines:--

Mos erat antiquis, niveis atrisque lapillis,  
His damnare reos, illis absolvere culpa.

“It was a custom among the ancients, to give their votes by white or black stones; with these they condemned the guilty, with those acquitted the innocent.” In allusion to this ancient custom, our Lord promises to give the spiritual conqueror “a white stone,” Rev. ii, 17; the white stone of absolution or approbation. When sentence of condemnation was pronounced, if the case was capital, the witnesses put their hands on the head of the criminal, and said, “Thy blood be upon thine own head.” To this custom the Jews alluded, when they cried out at the trial of Christ, “His blood be on us and on our children.” Then was the malefactor led to execution, and none were allowed openly to lament his misfortune. His hands were secured with cords, and his feet with fetters; a custom which furnished David with an affecting allusion, in his lamentation over the dust of Abner: “Thy hands were not bound, nor thy feet put in fetters,” 2 Sam. iii, 34; that is, he was put treacherously to death, without form of justice.

2. Executions in the east are often very prompt and arbitrary, when resulting from royal authority. In many cases the suspicion is no sooner entertained, or the cause of offence given, than the fatal order is issued; the messenger of death hurries to the unsuspecting victim, shows his warrant, and executes his orders that instant in silence and solitude. Instances of this kind are continually occurring in the Turkish and Persian histories. When the enemies of a great man among the Turks have gained influence enough over the prince to procure a warrant for his death, a *capidgi*, the name of the officer who executes these orders, is sent to him, who shows him the order he has received to carry back his head; the other takes the warrant of the grand signior, kisses it, puts it on his head in token of respect, and then, having performed his ablutions and said his prayers, freely resigns his life. The *capidgi*, having strangled him, cuts off his head, and brings it to Constantinople. The grand signior’s order is implicitly obeyed; the servants of the victim never attempt to hinder the executioner, although these *capidgis* come very often with few or no attendants. It appears from the writings of Chardin, that the nobility and *grandees* of Persia are put to death

in a manner equally silent, hasty, and unobstructed. Such executions were not uncommon among the Jews under the government of their kings. Solomon sent Benaiah as his capidgi, or executioner, to put Adonijah, a prince of his own family, to death; and Joab, the commander-in-chief of the forces in the reign of his father. A capidgi likewise beheaded John the Baptist in prison, and carried his head to the court of Herod. To such silent and hasty executioners the royal preacher seems to refer in that proverb, "The wrath of a king is as messengers of death; but a wise man will pacify it," Prov. xvi, 14: his displeasure exposes the unhappy offender to immediate death, and may fill the unsuspecting bosom with terror and dismay, like the appearance of a capidgi; but by wise and prudent conduct a man may sometimes escape the danger. From the dreadful promptitude with which Benaiah executed the commands of Solomon on Adonijah and Joab, it may be concluded that the executioner of the court was as little ceremonious, and the ancient Jews, under their kings, nearly as passive, as the Turks or Persians. The Prophet Elisha is the only person on the inspired record who ventured to resist the bloody mandate of the sovereign; the incident is recorded in these terms: "But Elisha sat in his house, and the elders sat with him; and the king sent a man from before him; but ere the messenger came to him, he said to the elders, See how this son of a murderer hath sent to take away mine head? Look ye, when the messenger cometh, shut the door and hold him fast at the door; is not the sound of his master's feet behind him?" 2 Kings vi, 32. But if such mandates had not been too common among the Jews, and in general submitted to without resistance, Jehoram had scarcely ventured to despatch a single messenger to take away the life of so eminent a person as Elisha.

Criminals were at other times executed in public; and then commonly without the city. To such executions without the gate, the Psalmist undoubtedly refers in this complaint: "The dead bodies of thy saints have they given to be meat unto the fowls of the heaven; the flesh of thy saints unto the beasts of the earth; their blood have they shed like water round about Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them," Psalm lxxix, 2, 3. The last clause admits of two senses: 1. There was no friend or relation left to bury them. 2. None were allowed to perform this last office. The despotism of eastern princes often proceeds to a degree of extravagance which is apt to fill the mind with astonishment and horror. It has been thought, from time immemorial, highly criminal to bury those who had lost their lives by the hand of an executioner, without permission. In Morocco, no person dares to bury the body of a malefactor without an order from the emperor; and Windus, who visited that country, speaking of a man who was sawn in two, informs us, that his body must have remained to be eaten by the dogs if the emperor had not pardoned him; an extravagant custom to pardon a man after he is dead; but unless he does so, no person dares bury the body.

To such a degree of savage barbarity it is probable the enemies of God's people carried their opposition, that no person dared to bury the dead bodies of their innocent victims.

In ancient times, persons of the highest rank and station were employed to execute the sentence of the law. They had not then, as we have at present, public executioners; 559but the prince laid his commands on any of his courtiers whom he chose, and probably selected the person for whom he had the greatest favour. Gideon commanded Jether, his eldest son, to execute his sentence on the kings of Midian; the king of Israel ordered the footmen who stood around him, and who were probably a chosen body of soldiers for the defence of his person, to put to death the priests of the Lord; and when they refused, Doeg, an Edomite, one of his principal officers. Long after the days of Saul, the reigning monarch commanded Benaiah, the chief captain of his armies, to perform that duty. Sometimes the chief magistrate executed the sentence of the law with his own hands; for when Jether shrunk from the duty which his father required, Gideon, at that time the supreme magistrate in Israel, did not hesitate to do it himself. In these times such a command would be reckoned equally barbarous and unbecoming; but the ideas which were entertained in those primitive ages of honour and propriety, were in many respects extremely different from ours. In Homer, the exasperated Ulysses commanded his son Telemachus to put to death the suitors of Penelope, which was immediately done. The custom of employing persons of high rank to execute the sentence of the law, is still retained in the principality of Senaar, where the public executioner is one of the principal nobility; and, by virtue of his office, resides in the royal palace.

JUSTIFICATION, in common language, signifies a vindication from any charge which affects the moral character; but in theology it is used for the acceptance of one, by God, who is, and confesses himself to be, guilty. To justify a sinner, says Mr. Bunting, in an able sermon on this important subject, is to account and consider him relatively righteous; and to deal with him as such, notwithstanding his past actual unrighteousness, by clearing, absolving, discharging, and releasing him from various penal evils, and especially from the wrath of God, and the liability to eternal death, which, by that past unrighteousness, he had deserved; and by accepting him as if just, and admitting him to the state, the privileges, and the rewards of righteousness. Hence it appears that justification, and the remission or forgiveness of sin, are substantially the same thing. These expressions relate to one and the same act of God, to one and the same privilege of his believing people. Accordingly, St. Paul clearly uses justification and forgiveness as synonymous terms, when he says, "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is

preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses,” Acts xiii, 38, 39. Also in the following passage: “To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin,” Rom. iv, 5–8. Here, the justification of the ungodly, the counting or imputation of righteousness, the forgiveness of iniquity, and the covering and non-imputation of sin, are phrases which have all, perhaps, their various shades of meaning, but which express the very same blessing under different views. But (1.) the justification of a sinner does not in the least degree alter or diminish the evil nature and desert of sin. For we know “it is God,” the holy God, “that justifieth.” And he can never regard sin, on any consideration, or under any circumstances, with less than perfect and infinite hatred. Sin, therefore, is not changed in its nature, so as to be made less “exceedingly sinful,” or less worthy of wrath, by the pardon of the sinner. The penalty is remitted, and the obligation to suffer that penalty is dissolved; but it is still naturally due, though graciously remitted. Hence appear the propriety and duty of continuing to confess and lament even pardoned sin with a lowly and contrite heart. Though released from its penal consequences by an act of divine clemency, we should still remember that the dust of self-abasement is our proper place before God, and should temper our exultation in his mercy by an humbling recollection of our natural liability to his wrath. “I will establish my covenant with thee, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord: that thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord God,” Ezek. xvi, 62, 63. (2.) The account which has been given of justification, if correct, sufficiently points out the error of many of the Roman Catholic divines, and of some mystic theologians, who seem to suppose that to be justified is to be, not reckoned righteous, but actually made righteous, by the infusion of a sanctifying influence, producing a positive and inherent conformity to the moral image of God. This notion confounds the two distinct though kindred blessings of justification and regeneration. The former, in its Scriptural sense, is an act of God, not in or upon man, but for him, and in his favour; an act which, abstractedly considered, to use the words of Dr. Barrow, “respects man only as its object, and translates him into another relative state. The inherent principle of righteousness is a consequent of this act of God; connected with it, but not formally of it.” (3.) The justification extends to all past sins; that is, to all guilt contracted previously to that time at which the act of justification takes place. In respect of this, it is, while it remains in force, a most full,

perfect, and entire absolution from wrath. "All manner of sin" is then forgiven. The pardon which is granted is a "justification," not merely from some things, from many things, from most things, but "from all things," Acts xiii, 39. God does not justify us, or pardon our innumerable offences, by degrees, but at once. As by the law of works he is cursed, who "continueth not in all things" which that law enjoined, so he who is truly absolved by the Gospel is cleared from all and every thing which before stood against him; and "there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Well may that Gospel which reveals and offers such a benefit be termed a "great salvation!" (4.) Another remark, which it may not be unnecessary to make, is, that justification, however effectual to our release from past guilt, does not terminate our state of probation. It is not irreversible, any more than eternal. As he who is now justified was once condemned, so he may in future come again into condemnation, by relapsing into sin and unbelief, although at present "accepted in the Beloved." Thus Adam, before transgression, was in a state of favour; but as he had not then fulfilled, to the end of his probation, the righteousness of that law under which he was placed, his ultimate and final acceptance was not absolutely certain. His privilege, as one accepted of God, might be forfeited, and was actually forfeited, by his subsequent sin. Now our own justification or pardon only places us, as to this point, in similar circumstances. Though ever so clearly and fully forgiven, we are yet on our trial for eternity, and should "look to ourselves, that we lose not the things which we have gained." That justification may for our sin be reversed, appears from our Lord's parable of the two debtors, in which one who had obtained the blessing of forgiveness is represented as incurring the forfeiture of it by the indulgence of an unforgiving spirit toward his fellow servant, Matt. xviii, 23–35. Let us therefore "watch and pray, that we enter not into temptation."

2. The immediate results of justification are (1.) The restoration of amity and intercourse between the pardoned sinner and the pardoning God. For, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God," and, consequently, unforbidden access to him. The matter and ground of God's controversy with us being then removed by his act of gracious absolution, we become the objects of his friendship. "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness; and he was" immediately "called the friend of God," Jas. ii, 23; and so are all those who are similarly justified. This reconciliation, however, does not extend to their instant and absolute deliverance from all those evils which transgression has entailed on man. They are still liable, for a season, to affliction and pain, to temporal suffering and mortality. These are portions of the original curse from which their justification does not as yet release them. But it entitles them to such supports under all remaining trouble, and to such promises of a sanctifying

influence with it, as will, if embraced, “turn the curse into a blessing.” Whom the Lord loveth, he may still chasten, and in very faithfulness afflict them. But these are acts of salutary discipline, rather than of vindictive displeasure. His friendship, not his righteous hostility, is the principle from which they all proceed; and the salvation, not the destruction, of the sufferer is the end to which they are all directed. (2.) Another immediate result of justification is the adoption of the persons justified into the family of God, and their consequent right to eternal life of body and soul. God condescends to become not only their Friend, but their Father; they are the objects not merely of his amicable regard, but of his paternal tenderness. And, admitted to the relation of children, they become entitled to the children’s inheritance; for, “if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together,” Rom. viii, 17. (3.) With these results of justification is inseparably connected another, of the utmost value and importance; namely, the habitual indwelling of the Holy Spirit. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith,” Gal. iii, 13, 14. “Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts,” Gal. iv, 6. With the remission of sins, St. Peter also connects, as an immediate result, as a distinct but yet a simultaneous blessing, “the gift of the Holy Ghost,” Acts ii, 38. And in the fifth verse of this chapter, the Holy Ghost is said to be given to those who are justified by faith. Of this indwelling the immediate effects are, (i.) Tranquillity of conscience. For he testifies and manifests to those in whom he dwells their free justification and gracious adoption. The spirit which such persons have received is “not the spirit of bondage to fear, but the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God,” Rom. viii, 15, 16. (ii.) Power over sin; a prevailing desire and ability to walk before God in holy obedience. No sooner is the Holy Spirit enthroned in the heart, than he begins to make all things new. In his genuine work, purity is always connected with consolation. Those to whom he witnesses their freedom from condemnation he also enables to “walk, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit,” Rom. viii, 1. (iii.) A joyous hope of heaven. Their title results from the fact of their adoption; their power to rejoice in hope, from the Spirit’s testimony of that fact. “We, through the Spirit, wait for the hope of righteousness by faith,” and “abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost,” Gal. v, 5; Rom. xv, 13.

3. To have a complete view of the method by which justification and all its consequent blessings are attained, we must consider the originating, the meritorious, and the instrumental cause of justification. (1.) The originating cause is the grace, the free, undeserved, and spontaneous love

of God toward fallen man. He remembered and pitied us in our low estate; for his mercy endureth for ever. "After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us. The grace of God bringeth salvation," Titus ii, 11; iii, 4, 5. We are "justified freely by his grace," Rom. iii, 24. But God is wise, and holy, and just, as well as merciful and gracious. And his wisdom determined, that, in order to reconcile the designs of his mercy toward sinners with the claims of his purity and justice, those designs should be accomplished only through the intervention of a divine Redeemer. We are justified "through our Lord Jesus Christ," Rom. i, 5. (2.) Our Lord Jesus Christ is the sole meritorious cause of our justification. All he did and all he suffered in his mediatorial character may be said to have contributed to this great purpose. For what he did, in obedience to the precepts of the law, and what he suffered, in satisfaction of its penalty, taken together, constitute that mediatorial righteousness, for the sake of which the Father is ever well pleased in him. Now, in this mediatorial righteousness all who are justified have a saving interest. It is not meant that it is personally imputed to them in its formal nature or distinct acts; for against any such imputation there lie insuperable objections both from reason and from Scripture. But the collective merit and moral effects of all which the Mediator did and suffered are so reckoned to our account when we are justified, that, for the sake of Christ and in consideration of his obedience unto death, we are released from guilt, and accepted of God. From this statement of the meritorious cause of justification, it appears that while our pardon is, in its origin, an act of the highest grace, it is also, in its mode, an act most perfectly consistent with God's essential righteousness, and demonstrative of his inviolable justice. It proceeds not on the principle of abolishing the law or its penalty; for that would have implied that the law was unduly rigorous, either in its precepts or in its sanctions. But it rests on the ground that the law has been magnified and vindicated, and that its penalty, or sufferings, which were fully equivalent to that penalty in a moral view, when the dignity of the sufferer is considered, have been sustained by our voluntary Substitute. Thus "grace reigns through righteousness," not at the expense of righteousness. "Now, the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," Romans iii, 21-26. (3.) As to the instrumental cause of justification, the merit of the blood of Jesus does not

operate necessarily so as to produce our pardon as an immediate and unavoidable effect, but through the instrumentality of faith. The faith by which we are justified is present faith, faith actually existing and exercised. We are not justified by to-morrow's faith foreseen; for that would lead to the Antinomian notion of justification from eternity, a notion which to mention is to confute. We are not justified by yesterday's faith recorded or remembered; for that would imply the opinion that justification is irreversible. The justification offered in the Scriptures is a justification upon believing, in which we are never savingly interested until we believe, and which continues in force only so long as we continue to believe. On all unbelievers the wrath of God abides. The atonement of Jesus was indeed accepted, as from him, at the time when it was offered; but it is not accepted, as for us, to our individual justification, until we individually believe, nor after we cease to believe. The OBJECT of justifying faith may be inferred from what has been before said, as to the originating and meritorious causes of justification. It has respect, in general, to all that Christ is set forth in the Gospel as doing or suffering, by the gracious appointment of the Father, in order to our redemption and pardon. But it has respect, in particular, to the atoning sacrifice of Christ, as exhibited by divine authority in the Scriptures, and as attested to be acceptable and sufficient by his resurrection from the dead, and by his mediatorial exaltation at the right hand of God. The acts or exercises of this faith seem to be three; or rather, that faith which is required in order to our justification is a complex act of the mind, which includes three distinct but concurrent exertions of its powers. It includes, (1.) The assent of the understanding to the truth of the testimony of God in the Gospel; and especially to that part of it which concerns the design and efficacy of the death of Jesus as a sacrifice for sin. (2.) The consent of the will and affections to this plan of salvation; such an approbation and choice of it as imply a renunciation of every other refuge, and a steady and decided preference of this. Unbelief is called a disallowing of the foundation laid in Zion; whereas faith includes a hearty allowance of it, and a thankful acquiescence in God's revealed method of forgiveness. (3.) From this assent of the enlightened understanding, and consent of the rectified will, to the evangelical testimony concerning Christ crucified, results the third thing, which is supposed to be implied in justifying faith; namely, actual trust in the Saviour, and personal apprehension of his merits. When, under the promised leading and influence of the Holy Ghost, the penitent, sinner thus confidently relies and individually lays hold on Christ, then the work of justifying faith is complete; then, and not till then, he is immediately justified. On the whole, it may be said that the faith to which the privilege of justification is annexed, is such a belief of the Gospel, by the power of the Spirit of God, as leads us to come to Christ, to receive Christ, to trust



in Christ, and to commit the keeping of our souls into his hands, in humble confidence of his ability and his willingness to save us.

The grand doctrine of the Reformation was that of justification by faith, and was therefore held by all the Lutheran and Reformed churches. The Papists assert that man's inherent righteousness is the meritorious cause of his justification; many Protestant divines have endeavoured to unite the two, and have held that men are justified by faith and good works; and others have equally departed from the opinions of the earliest reformers on the subject of justification, in representing it as resulting from the imputation of Christ's active and passive righteousness to those that believe, instead of confining the imputation to the moral consequence and effect of both. In other words, that which is reckoned to us in our justification for righteousness is our faith in Christ's merits, and that not because of any intrinsic value in faith; but only for the sake of those merits. In a mere moral sense man's sin or righteousness is imputed to him, when he is considered as actually the doer of sinful or of righteous acts. A man's sin or righteousness is imputed to him in its legal consequence, under a government of rewards and punishments; and then to impute sin or righteousness signifies, in a legal sense, to reckon and to account it, to acquit or condemn, and forthwith to punish, or to exempt from punishment. Thus Shimei entreats David, that he would "not impute folly to him," that is, that he would not punish his folly. In this sense, too, David speaks of the blessedness of the man whose "transgression is forgiven," and to whom the Lord "imputeth not sin," that is, whom he forgives, so that the legal consequence of his sin shall not fall upon him. This non-imputation of sin, to a sinner, is expressly called the "imputation of righteousness, without works;" the imputation of righteousness is, then, the non-punishment, or the pardon of sin; and if this passage be read in its connection, it will also be seen, that by "imputing" faith for righteousness, the Apostle means precisely the same thing: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness; even as David also describeth the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not sin." This quotation from David would have been nothing to the Apostle's purpose, unless he had understood the forgiveness of sins, and the imputation of righteousness, and the non-imputation of sin, to signify the same thing as "counting faith for righteousness," with only this difference, that the introduction of the term "faith" marks the manner in which the forgiveness of sin is obtained. To have faith imputed for righteousness, is nothing more than to be justified by faith, which is also called by St. Paul, "being made righteous," that is, being placed by an act of free forgiveness, through faith in Christ, in the condition of righteous

men, in this respect, that the penalty of the law does not lie against them, and that they are the acknowledged objects of the divine favour. See Faith.

KADESH-BARNEA, a station of the Israelites, to which they returned again after thirty-eight years, is said to be in the wilderness of Zin, Num. xiii, 21; xx, 1; Deut. xxxii, 51; but in the wilderness of Paran, Num. xii, 16. In the Itinerary it is simply called Rithmah, "the wilderness." Dr. Hales observes, that Wells, Shaw, the authors of the "Universal History," &c, have greatly perplexed and obscured the geography of this Itinerary, by supposing that there were two places of this name distinct from each other. They consider the latter of them as situated on the western side of Mount Hor, toward the land of Canaan, and thus confound it with that Kadesh in the land of the Philistines, where Abraham sojourned, Gen. xvi, 13; xx, 1. But that it lay on the east side of Mount Hor, is evident; for why should Moses send messengers from Kadesh to the king of Edom, requesting permission to pass through his territories in the way to Canaan, if they were already at the verge of Palestine, Num. xx, 14? This application, however, was necessary if his territories were situated between Canaan and the Israelites. The true situation of Kadesh is ascertained beyond a doubt, from its lying between Mount Hor and Ezion-Geber, on the Elanitic Gulf, Num. xxxiii, 35–37.

KADMONITES, ancient inhabitants of the land of Canaan, whose habitation was beyond Jordan, to the east of Phenicia, Gen. xv, 19. The Kadmonites were descended from Canaan, the son of Ham. It has been conjectured that the celebrated Cadmus, the founder of Thebes in Bœotia, was originally a Kadmonite; and that his wife, Hermione, was so named from Mount Hermon.

KEDAR. This name signifies black in the original; and hence Bochart concludes that it refers to a people or tribe of Arabs who were more than others burned by the sun; but none of the Arabs are black. The name is also supposed to refer to the black tents made of felt, which are still in use; and Cant. i, 5, is quoted in support of this usage of the word: "I am black, but comely as the tents of Kedar." But the Arabic root is by some said to signify power and dignity. Kedar was the second son of Ishmael, whose family probably became more numerous, or more warlike, than those of his brethren, and so took precedence of name. This latter supposition appears probable from the manner in which they are mentioned by Isaiah, xxi, 16, 17, who speaks of "the glory of Kedar," and "the archers and mighty men of Kedar." Their flocks are also spoken of by the same Prophet, Isaiah lx, 7, together with those of Nebaioth, whose tribe or family both shared and outlived the glory of Kedar.

KEDRON, a small brook which, rising near Jerusalem, runs through the valley on the east of the city, between it and the Mount of Olives. Descending into the valley from St. Stephen's 563 gate, the traveller comes to the bed of the brook Kedron, which is but a few paces over. This brook is stated by Pococke to have its rise a little way farther to the north, but its source does not appear to have been ascertained. Like the Ilissus, it is dry at least nine months in the year; its bed is narrow and deep, which indicates that it must formerly have been the channel for waters that have found some other and probably subterranean course. There is now no water in it, except after heavy rains. A bridge is thrown over it a little below the gate of St. Stephen; and they say, that when there is water, unless the torrent swells much, which very rarely occurs, it all runs under ground to the north of this bridge. The course of the brook is along the valley of Jehoshaphat, to the south-west corner of the city, and then turning to the south, it runs to the Dead Sea.

KENITES, people who dwelt westward of the Dead Sea, and extended themselves pretty far into Arabia Petræa; for Jethro, the priest of Midian, and father-in-law to Moses, was a Kenite, Judges i, 16; 1 Chron. ii, 55; 1 Sam. xv, 6. When Saul was sent to destroy the Amalekites, the Kenites, who had joined them, perhaps by compulsion, were ordered to depart from them, that they might not share in their fate; and the reason assigned was, that they "showed kindness to the children of Israel when they came up out of Egypt," 1 Sam. xv, 6. Which, according to the margin of our Bible, is to be understood of the father-in-law of Moses and his family. From the story of Jethro, who is expressly said to be a Midianite, they appear to have retained the worship of the true God among them; for which, and their kindness to the Israelites when passing their country, they were spared in the general destruction of the nations bordering on Canaan. Of these Kenites were the Rechabites, the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and the Suchathites, mentioned in 1 Chron. ii, 55, whose chief office was that of scribes. (See Rechabites.) Balaam, when invited by Balak, king of Moab, to curse Israel, stood upon a mountain, whence he addressed the Kenites, and said, "Strong is thy dwelling place, and thou puttest thy nest in a rock; nevertheless, the Kenite shall be wasted until Ashur shall carry thee away captive," Num. xxiv, 21, 22. The Kenites dwelt in mountains and rocks almost inaccessible. They were conquered and carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar. After Saul the Kenites are not mentioned; but they subsisted, being mingled among the Edomites and other nations of Arabia Petræa.

KENIZZITES, an ancient people of Canaan, whose land God promised to the descendants of Abraham, Gen. xv, 19. It is thought that this people dwelt in the mountains south of Judea.

KETURAH, the name of Abraham's second wife. Abraham married Keturah, when he was one hundred and forty years of age, and by her he had six sons, Zimram, Jokshan, Medan, Midian, Ishbak, and Shuah. Some chronologers, as Bishop Clayton, Hallet, &c, thinking it improbable that Abraham should marry again at such an advanced age, have dislocated the chronology of this period, by supposing that Abraham took Keturah as a concubine, in consequence of his wife Sarah's barrenness, even before he left Charran; and that Keturah's children were among the souls born to him and Lot during their residence in that country. But it seems evident from the whole tenor of the history, that Abraham was childless until the birth of Ishmael, Gen. xv, 2, 3; that he had no other son than Ishmael when he received the promise of Isaac, Gen. xvii, 18; and that Isaac and Ishmael jointly, as his eldest sons, celebrated his funeral, Gen. xxv, 9. His second marriage, at the age of one hundred and forty years, shows his faith in the divine promise, that he should be "a father of many nations;" for which purpose his constitution might be miraculously renewed, as Sarah's was. Beside, Abraham himself was born when his father Terah was one hundred and thirty years of age. Abraham settled the sons of Keturah in the east country of Arabia, near the residence of Ishmael.

KEY is frequently mentioned in Scripture, as well in a natural as in a figurative sense. The keys of the ancients were very different from ours; because their doors and trunks were closed generally with bands, and the key served only to loosen or fasten these bands in a certain manner. In a moral sense key has many significations: "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder: so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open," Isaiah xxii, 22,--he shall be grand master and principal officer of his prince's house. Christ promises to St. Peter, that he should first open the gate of his kingdom, both to Jew and Gentile, in making the first converts among them, Matt. xvi, 19. It is observable that no supremacy is here given to St. Peter; as the power of binding and loosing belonged equally to all the Apostles, Matt. xviii, 18. The term binding and loosing was customarily applied by the Jews to a decision respecting doctrines or rites, establishing which were lawful and which unlawful. (See Bind.) And it may also denote, to bind with sickness, and to loose by restoring to health. Jesus Christ says that he has the key of death and hell, Rev. i, 18; that is, it is in his power to bring to the grave, or to deliver from it; to appoint to life or to death.

KIBROTH HATAVAH, one of the encampments of the Israelites in the wilderness, Numbers xi, 34, 35.

KID, כִּיד, the young of the goat. Among the Hebrews the kid was reckoned a great delicacy; and appears to have been served for food in preference to the lamb. (See Goat.) It continues to be a choice dish in the neighbouring countries. "After drinking," says Salt, "café à la Sultane, as it is termed by French writers, hookahs were offered to us; and soon afterward, to my great surprise, dinner was announced. We accordingly retired with the dola of Aden to another apartment, 564 where a kid, broiled and cut into small pieces, with a quantity of pillaued rice, was served up to us, agreeably to the fashion of the country. No people in the world is more straitened than the Abyssinians with respect to the necessaries of life: a little juwarry bread, a small quantity of fish, an adequate supply of goat's and camel's milk, and a kid on very particular occasions, constitute the whole of their subsistence. As soon as we arrived at the village of Howakil, a very neat hut was prepared for me; and as the evening was far advanced, I consented to stay for the night. Nothing could exceed the kindness of these good people; a kid was killed, and a quantity of fresh milk was brought and presented in straw baskets made of the leaves of the doom tree, seared over with wax, a manufacture in which the natives of these islands particularly excel." The village of Engedi, situate in the neighbourhood of Jericho, derives its name from the Hebrew word עֵיִן, a fountain, and כִּיד, a kid. It is suggested by the situation among lofty rocks, which, overhanging the valleys, are very precipitous. A fountain of pure water rises near the summit, which the inhabitants called Engedi, "the fountain of the goat," because it is hardly accessible to any other creature.

KINGDOM, in Scripture, is a term of frequent occurrence, and variously applied. Thus we read of the kingdom of God, Psalm ciii, 19; Dan. iv, 3; or his universal empire and dominion over all creatures; in reference to which it is said, "Jehovah is a great God, and a great King above all gods," Psalm xcvi, 3. "His throne is established in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." Again: we frequently read in the evangelists of the kingdom of heaven; a phrase, says Dr. Campbell, in which there is a manifest allusion to the predictions in which the dispensation of the Messiah was revealed by the prophets in the Old Testament, particularly by Daniel, who mentions it as "a kingdom which the God of heaven would set up, and which should never be destroyed," Dan. ii, 44. The same prophet also speaks of it as a kingdom to be given, with glory and dominion over all people, nations, and languages, to one like unto the Son of man, Dan. vii, 13, 14. And the Prophet Micah, speaking of the same era, represents it as a time when Jehovah, having removed all the afflictions of his people, would reign over them in Mount Zion thenceforth even for ever, Micah iv, 6, 7. According to the prophecy of Daniel, this kingdom was to take place during the existence of the Roman empire, the last of the four great monarchies that had succeeded each other, Dan. ii, 44. And as it was set up by the God of

heaven, it is, in the New Testament, termed “the kingdom of God,” or “the kingdom of heaven.” It was typified by the Jewish theocracy, and declared to be at hand by John the Baptist, and by Christ and his Apostles also in the days of his flesh; but it did not come with power till Jesus rose from the dead and sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, Acts ii, 32–37. Then was he most solemnly inaugurated, and proclaimed King of the New Testament church, amidst adoring myriads of attendant angels, and “the spirits of just men made perfect.” Then were fulfilled the words of Jehovah by the Psalmist David, “I have set my King upon my holy hill of Zion,” Psalm ii, 6. This is that spiritual empire to which he himself referred when interrogated before Pontius Pilate, and in reference to which he said, “My kingdom is not of this world,” John xviii, 36, 37. His empire, indeed, extends to every creature; for all authority is committed into his hands, both in heaven and on earth,” and he is head over all things to the church;” but his kingdom primarily imports the Gospel church, which is the subject of his laws, the seat of his government, and the object of his care; and, being surrounded with powerful opposers, he is represented as ruling in the midst of his enemies. This kingdom is not of a worldly origin, or nature, nor has it this world for its end or object. It can neither be promoted nor defended by worldly power, influence, or carnal weapons, but by bearing witness unto the truth, or by the preaching of the Gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. Its real subjects are only those who are of the truth, and hear Christ’s voice; for none can enter it but such as are born from above, John iii, 3–5; nor can any be visible subjects of it, but such as appear to be regenerated, by a credible profession of faith and obedience. Its privileges and immunities are not of this world, but such as are spiritual and heavenly; they are all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ Jesus, Ephesians i, 3.

**KINGS.** This word does not always imply the same degree of power, nor the same degree of importance; nor does it imply the magnitude of the dominion or territory of these officers. In Scripture many persons are called kings, whom we should rather denominate chiefs or leaders; and many single towns, or, at most, together with their adjacent villages, are said to have had kings. Not aware of this lower sense of the word king, or unwilling to adopt it, many persons have been embarrassed by the following passage: Moses commanded us a law,—he was king in Jeshurun,” Deut. xxxiii, 4, 5, or king among the Israelites; that is, he was the principal among the assembly of the superiors of the Israelites. Some refer this to Jehovah. Moses was the chief, the leader, the guide of his people, fulfilling the duties of a king; but he was not king in the same sense as David or Solomon was afterward. This remark reconciles the following observation: These kings reigned in Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel,” Gen. xxxvi, 31; for Moses, though he was king in an

inferior sense, did not reign, in the stronger sense, over the children of Israel, their constitution not being monarchical under him. Beside, we find in Joshua, that almost every town in Canaan had its king; and we know that the territories of these towns must have been very inconsiderable, Joshua xii, 9–24. Adonizedek, himself no very powerful king, mentions seventy kings whom he had subdued and mutilated.

MAP OF  
JUDAH AND ISRAEL.  
Illustrating the  
BOOKS OF KINGS.

565Kings, Books of. The first book of Kings commences with an account of the death of David, and contains a period of a hundred and twenty-six years, to the death of Jehoshaphat; and the second book of Kings continues the history of the kings of Israel and Judah through a period of three hundred years, to the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. These two books formed only one in the Hebrew canon, and they were probably compiled by Ezra from the records which were regularly kept, both in Jerusalem and Samaria, of all public transactions. These records appear to have been made by the contemporary prophets, and frequently derived their names from the kings whose history they contained. They are mentioned in many parts of Scripture; thus 1 Kings xi, 41, we read of the book of the Acts of Solomon, which is supposed to have been written by Nathan, Ahijah, and Iddo, 2 Chron. ix, 29. We elsewhere read that Shemaiah the prophet, and Iddo the seer, wrote the Acts of Rehoboam, 2 Chron. xii, 15; that Jehu wrote the Acts of Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xx, 34; and Isaiah those of Uzziah and Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxvi, 22; xxxii, 32. We may therefore conclude, that from these public records, and other authentic documents, were composed the two books of Kings; and the uniformity of their style favours the opinion of their being put into their present shape by the same person.

KISHON. That ancient river, the river Kishon,” falls into the bay of Acre, and has its source in the hills to the east of the plain of Esdraelon, which it intersects. Being enlarged by several small streams, it passes between Mount Carmel and the hills to the north, and then falls into the sea at this point. In the condition we saw it, says Maundrell, its waters were low and inconsiderable; but in passing along the side of the plain, we discerned the tracts of many lesser torrents, falling down into it from the mountains, which must needs make it swell exceedingly upon sudden rains, as doubtless it actually did at the destruction of Sisera’s host.

KISS, a mode of salutation, and token of respect, which has been practised in all nations. It was also in ordinary use among the Jews; hence Judas in this way saluted his Master. But there was also the kiss of homage, as one of the ceremonies performed at the inauguration of the kings of Israel. The Jews called it the kiss of majesty. Psalm ii, 12, seems to be an allusion to this. St. Paul speaks frequently of the kiss of peace, which was in use among believers, and was given by them to one another as a token of charity and union, publicly in their religious assemblies, Heb. xiii, 24. Kissing the feet is in eastern countries expressive of exuberant gratitude or reverence.

KITE, קיט, Lev. xi, 14; Deut. xiv, 13; Job xxviii, 7. Bochart supposes this to be the bird which the Arabians call the ja-jao, from its note; and which the ancients named æsalon, the merlin," a bird celebrated for its sharp-sightedness. This faculty is referred to in Job xxviii, 7, where the word is rendered vulture." As a noun masculine plural, קיטין, in Isaiah xiii, 22; xxxiv, 14; and Jer. 1, 39, Bochart says that jackals are intended; but, by the several contexts, particularly the last, it may well mean a kind of unclean bird, and so be the same with that mentioned above.

KOHATH, the second son of Levi, and father of Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel, Gen. xlvi, 11; Exod. vi, 18. Kohath's family was appointed to carry the ark and sacred vessels of the tabernacle, while the Israelites marched through the wilderness, Num. iv, &c.

KORAH was the son of Izhar, of the race of Levi, and father of Asher, Elkanah, and Aliasaph, and head of the Korites, a celebrated family among the Levites. Korah, being dissatisfied with the rank he held among the sons of Levi, and envying the authority of Moses and Aaron, formed a party against them, in which he engaged Dathan, Abiram, and On, with two hundred and fifty of the principal Levites, Num. xvi, 1-3, &c. Korah, at the head of the rebels, went to Moses and Aaron, and complained that they alone arrogated to themselves all the authority over the people of the Lord. Moses falling with his face on the earth, answered them as follows: Tomorrow, in the morning, the Lord will discover who are his. Let every one of you take, therefore, his censer, and to-morrow he shall put incense into it, and offer it before the Lord; and he shall be acknowledged priest whom the Lord shall choose and approve." The next day, Korah, with two hundred and fifty of his faction, presenting themselves with their censers before the Lord, the glory of the Lord appeared visibly over the tabernacle, and a voice was heard to say, Separate yourselves from among this congregation, that I may consume them in a moment." Upon this, Moses and Aaron, falling with their faces to the ground, said, O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, shall one man sin, and wilt thou be wroth with all



the congregation?” And the Lord said unto Moses, Command all the people to depart from about the tents of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.” When, therefore, the people were retired, Moses said, If these men die the common death of all men, then the Lord hath not sent me; but if the earth open and swallow them up quick, ye shall know that they have blasphemed the Lord.” As soon as he had spoken, the earth opened from under their feet, and swallowed them up with what belonged to them. There was one thing which added to this surprising wonder, and which was, that when Korah was thus swallowed up in the earth, his sons were preserved from his misfortunes. We know not the exact year in which the death of Korah and his companions happened. The sons of Korah continued as before to serve in the tabernacle of the Lord. David appointed them their office in the temple, to guard the doors, and sing the praises of God. To them are ascribed several psalms, which are designated by the name of Korah; as the forty-second, forty-fourth to the forty-ninth, eighty-fourth to the eighty-seventh; in all, eleven psalms.

566LABAN, the son of Bethuel, grandson of Nahor, brother to Rebekah, and father of Rachel and Leah, Gen. xxviii, 2, &c. Of this man, the first thing we hear is his entertainment of Abraham’s servant when he came on his errand to Rebekah. Hospitality was the virtue of his age and country. In his case, however, it seems to have been no little stimulated by the sight of “the ear ring and the bracelets on his sister’s hands,” which the servant had already given her, Gen. xxiv, 30; so he speedily made room for the camels. He next is presented to us as beguiling that sister’s son, who had sought a shelter in his house, and whose circumstances placed him at his mercy, of fourteen years’ service, when he had covenanted with him for seven only; endeavouring to retain his labour when he would not pay him his labour’s worth, himself devouring the portion which he should have given to his daughters, counting them but as strangers, Gen. xxxi, 15. Compelled, at length, to pay Jacob wages, he changes them ten times, and, in the spirit of a crafty, griping worldling, makes him account for whatever of the flock was torn of beasts or stolen, whether by day or night. When Jacob flies from this iniquitous service with his family and cattle, Laban still pursues and persecutes him, intending, if his intentions had not been overruled by a mightier hand, to send him away empty, even after he had been making, for so long a period, so usurious a profit of him.

LACHISH, a city of Palestine, Joshua x, 23; xv, 39. Sennacherib besieged Lachish, but did not make himself master of it. From thence it was that he sent Rabshakeh against Jerusalem, 2 Kings xviii, 17; xix, 8; 2 Chron. xxxii, 9.

LAMAISM, the religion of the people of Thibet. The Delai Lama, Grand Lama," is at once the high priest, and the visible object of adoration, to this nation, to the hordes of wandering Tartars, and to the prodigious population of China. He resides at Patoli, a vast palace on a mountain near the banks of the Burampooter, about seven miles from Lahasse. The foot of the mountain is surrounded by twenty thousand lamas, or priests, in attendance on their sovereign pontiff, who is considered as the viceregent of the Deity on earth; and the remote Tartars are said to regard him absolutely as the Deity himself, and call him God, the everlasting Father of heaven. They believe him to be immortal, and endowed with all knowledge and virtue. Every year they come up from different parts to worship, and make rich offerings at his shrine. Even the emperor of China, who is a Mantchou Tartar, does not fail in acknowledgments to him in his religious capacity; and entertains in the palace of Pekin an inferior lama, deputed as his nuncio from Thibet. The grand lama is only to be seen in a secret place of his palace, amidst a great number of lamps, sitting cross-legged on a cushion, and decked all over with gold and precious stones; while, at a distance, the people prostrate themselves before him, it being not lawful for any so much as to kiss his feet. He returns not the least sign of respect, nor ever speaks, even to the greatest princes; but only lays his hand upon their heads, and they are fully persuaded that they thereby receive a full forgiveness of their sins. The Sunniasses, or Indian pilgrims, often visit Thibet as a holy place; and the lama entertains a body of two or three hundred in his pay. Beside his religious influence and authority, he is possessed of unlimited power throughout his dominions, which are very extensive. The inferior lamas, who form the most numerous as well as the most powerful body in the state, have the priesthood entirely in their hands, and, beside, fill up many monastic orders, which are held in great veneration among them. The whole country, like Italy, abounds with priests; and they entirely subsist on the rich presents sent them from the utmost extent of Tartary, from the empire of the great mogul, and from almost all parts of the Indies. The opinion of the orthodox among the Thibetians is, that when the grand lama seems to die, either of old age or infirmities, his soul, in fact, only quits a crazy habitation to enter another, younger and better; and is discovered again in the body of some child, by certain tokens, known only to the lamas, or priests, in which order he always appears. Almost all the nations of the east, except the Mohammedans, believe the metempsychosis, or transmigration of the soul, as the most important article of their faith; especially the inhabitants of Thibet and Ava, the Peguans, the Siamese, the greater part of the Chinese and Japanese, and the Monguls and Kalmucks. According to their doctrine, the soul no sooner leaves her old habitation than she enters a new one. The delai lama, therefore, or rather the god Foe or Fuh, residing in the delai lama, passes to his successor; and he being a god, to whom all things are known, the grand lama is therefore acquainted

with every thing which happened during his residence in his former bodies. This religion, which was early adopted in a large part of the globe, is said to have been of three thousand years' standing; and neither time, nor the influence of men, has had the power of shaking the authority of the grand lama. This theocracy, which extends as fully to temporal as to spiritual concerns, is professed all over Thibet and Mongalia; is almost universal in Greater and Less Bucharia, and several provinces of Tartary; has some followers in the kingdom of Cashmere, in India; and is the predominant religion of China.

It has been observed that the religion of Thibet is the counterpart of the Roman Catholic, since the inhabitants of that country use holy water, and a singing service. They also offer alms, prayers, and sacrifices for the dead. They have a vast number of convents filled with monks and friars, amounting to thirty thousand, and confessors chosen by their superiors. They use beads, wear the mitre, like the bishops; and their delai lama is nearly the same among them as the sovereign pontiff was formerly, in the zenith of his power, among 567the Roman Catholics. So complete is the resemblance, that, when one of the first Romish missionaries penetrated Thibet, he came to the conclusion that the devil had set up there an imitation of the rites of the Catholic church, in order the more effectually to destroy the souls of men. Captain Turner, speaking of the religion of Thibet, says, It seems to be the schismatical offspring of the religion of the Hindoos, deriving its origin from one of the followers of that faith, a disciple of Bouddhu, who first broached the doctrine which now prevails over the wide extent of Tartary. It is reported to have received its earliest admission in that part of Tibet, or Thibet, bordering upon India, which from hence became the seat of the sovereign lamas, to have traversed over Mantchieux Tartary, and to have been ultimately disseminated over China and Japan. Though it differs from the Hindoo in many of its outward forms, yet it still bears a very close affinity with the religion of Brumha in many important particulars. The principal idol in the temples of Tibet, or Thibet, is Muha-Moonee, the Booddhu of Bengal, who is worshipped under these and various other epithets, throughout the great extent of Tartary, and among all nations to the eastward of the Brumhapootru. In the wide-extended space over which this faith prevails, the same object of veneration is acknowledged under numerous titles: among others, he is styled Godumu, or Gotumu, in Assam and Ava, Shumunu in Siam, Amida Buth in Japan, Fohi in China," &c.

LAMBETH ARTICLES. See Predestination.

LAMECH, a descendant of Cain, the son of Mathusael, and father of Jabal, Jubal, Tubal-Cain, and Naamah, Gen. iv, 18–20, &c. He stands branded as

the father of polygamy, the first who dared to violate the sacred command, Gen. ii, 24; giving way to his unbridled passion, and thus overleaping the divine mould raised by the wisdom of our great Creator; which restraint is enforced by the laws of nature herself, who peoples the earth with an equal number of males and females, and thereby teaches foolish man that polygamy is incompatible with her wise regulations. He married Adah and Zillah: the former was the mother of Jabal and Jubal, and the latter of Tubal-Cain and Naamah, his sister.

2. Lamech, the son of Methuselah, and father of Noah. He lived a hundred fourscore and two years before the birth of Noah, Gen. v, 25, 31; after which he lived five hundred and ninety-five years longer: thus the whole term of his life was seven hundred and seventy-seven years.

LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH. This book was formerly annexed to his prophecies, though it now forms a separate book. Josephus, and several other learned men, have referred them to the death of Josiah; but the more common opinion is, that they were applicable only to some period subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. But though it be allowed that the Lamentations were primarily intended as a pathetic description of present calamities, yet while Jeremiah mourns the desolation of Judah and Jerusalem during the Babylonian captivity, he may be considered as prophetically painting the still greater miseries they were to suffer at some future time: this seems plainly indicated by his referring to the time when the punishment of their iniquity shall be accomplished, and they shall no more be carried into captivity, Lam. iv, 22. The Lamentations are written in metre, and consist of a number of plaintive effusions, composed after the manner of funeral dirges. They seem to have been originally written by their author as they arose in his mind, and to have been afterward joined together as one poem. There is no regular arrangement of the subject, or disposition of the parts: the same thought is frequently repeated with different imagery, or expressed in different words. There is, however, no wild incoherency, or abrupt transition; the whole appears to have been dictated by the feelings of real grief. Tenderness and sorrow form the general character of these elegies; and an attentive reader will find great beauty in many of the images, and great energy in some of the expressions. This book of Lamentations is divided into five chapters; in the first, second, and fourth, the prophet speaks in his own person, or by an elegant and interesting personification introduces the city of Jerusalem as lamenting her calamities, and confessing her sins; in the third chapter a single Jew, speaking in the name of a chorus of his countrymen, like the Coryphæus of the Greeks, describes the punishment inflicted upon him by God, but still acknowledges his mercy, and expresses some hope of

deliverance; and in the fifth chapter, the whole nation of the Jews pour forth their united complaints and supplications to almighty God.

Every chapter, with the exception of the third, contains twenty-two verses, corresponding in number with the letters of the Hebrew alphabet; and each verse commences with a different letter, the first with aleph, the second with beth, the third with gimel, &c. The third chapter, consisting of sixty-six verses, has three verses together beginning with the same letter, the following three with the next letter, &c. This peculiarity may be seen in Psalm cxix; the first eight verses in which commence with aleph, the next eight with beth, &c, till the whole alphabet has been consecutively taken. This mode of versification, which has some distant resemblance to the modern acrostic style, seems to have been employed by the Hebrews in some of their elegiac poetry, perhaps to assist the memory.

LAMP, *λαμπας*. There is frequent mention of lamps in Scripture, and the word is often used figuratively. The houses in the east were, from the remotest antiquity, lighted with lamps; and hence it is so common in Scripture to call every thing which enlightens the body or mind, which guides or refreshes, by the name of a lamp. These lamps were sustained by a large candlestick set upon the ground. The houses of Egypt, in modern times, are never without lights: they burn lamps all the night long, and in every occupied apartment. So requisite to the comfort of a family is this custom reckoned, or so imperious is the power which it exercises, that the poorest people would rather retrench part of their food than neglect it. As this custom no doubt prevailed in Egypt and the adjacent regions of Arabia and Palestine in former times, it imparts a beauty and force to some passages of Scripture which have been little observed. Thus, in the language of Jeremiah, to extinguish the light in an apartment is a convertible phrase for total destruction; and nothing can more properly and emphatically represent the total destruction of a city than the extinction of the lights: I will take from them the light of a candle, and this whole land shall be a desolation and an astonishment." Job describes the destruction of a family among the Arabs, and the desolation of their dwellings, in the very language of the prophet: How oft is the candle of the wicked put out, and how oft cometh their destruction upon them!" Job xxi, 17. Bildad expresses the same idea in the following beautiful passage: Yea, the light of the wicked shall be put out, and the spark of his fire shall not shine. The light shall be dark in his tabernacle, and his candle shall be put out with him," Job xviii, 5, 6. A burning lamp is, on the other hand, the chosen symbol of prosperity, a beautiful instance of which occurs in the complaint of Job: O that I were as in months past, as in the days when God preserved me; when his candle shined upon my head, and when by his light I walked through darkness," Job xxix, 2, 3. When the ten tribes were taken from

Rehoboam, and given to his rival, Jehovah promised to reserve one tribe, and assigns this reason: That David my servant may have a light always before me in Jerusalem," 1 Kings xi, 36. In many parts of the east, and in particular in the Indies, instead of torches and flambeaux, they carry a pot of oil in one hand, and a lamp full of oily rags in the other.

LANGUAGE, the faculty of human speech, concerning the origin of which there have been entertained different opinions among philosophers and learned men. The Mosaic history, which gives us an account of the formation and first occupations of man, represents him as being immediately capable of conversing with his Maker; of giving names to the various tribes and classes of animals; and of reasoning consecutively, and in perfectly appropriate terms, concerning his own situation, and the relation he stood in to the other creatures. As in man's first attempt at speech, according to this account, there appear no crudeness of conception, no barrenness of ideas, and no inexpressive or unappropriate terms, we must certainly infer, that God who made and endued him with corporeal and mental powers perfectly suited to his state and condition in life, endued him, also, not only with the faculty of speech, but with speech or language itself; which latter was as necessary to his comfort, and to the perfection and end of his being, as any other power or faculty which his Creator thought proper to bestow upon him.

Among the antediluvians there was but one language; and even now the indications that the various languages of the earth have had one common source are very convincing. Whether this primitive language was the same with any of the languages of which we have still any remains, has been a subject of much dispute. That the primitive language continued at least till the dispersion of mankind, consequent upon the building of Babel, there seems little reason to doubt. When, by an immediate interposition of divine power, the language of men was confounded, we are not informed to what extent this confusion of tongues prevailed. Under the article Confusion of Tongues some reasons are given to show that the primitive language was not lost at that event, but continued in the form of the Hebrew.

There are, however, other opinions on the oft disputed subject as to the primitive language. The Armenians allege, that as the ark rested in their country, Noah and his children must have remained there a considerable time, before the lower and marshy country of Chaldea could be fit to receive them; and it is therefore reasonable to suppose they left their language there, which was probably the very same that Adam spoke. Some have fancied the Greek the most ancient tongue, because of its extent and copiousness. The Teutonic, or that dialect of it which is spoken in the Lower Germany and Brabant, has found a strenuous patron in Geropius

Becanus, who endeavours to derive even the Hebrew itself from that tongue. The pretensions of the Chinese to this honour have been allowed by several Europeans. The patrons of this opinion endeavour to support it, partly, by the great antiquity of the Chinese, and their having preserved themselves so many ages from any considerable mixture or intercourse with other nations. It is a notion advanced by Dr. Allix, and maintained by Mr. Whiston, with his usual tenacity and fervour, that the Chinese are the posterity of Noah, by his children born after the flood; and that Fohi, the first king of China, was Noah. As for those which are called the oriental languages, they have each their partisans. The generality of eastern writers allow the preference to the Syriac, except the Jews, who assert the antiquity of the Hebrew with the greatest warmth; and with them several Christian writers agree, particularly Chrysostom, Austin, Origen, and Jerome, among the ancients; and among the moderns, Bochart, Heidegger, Selden, and Buxtorf. The Sanscrit has also put in its claims; and some have thought that the Pali bears the character of the highest antiquity. All these are however useless speculations. The only point worth contending for is, that language was conveyed at once to the first pair in sufficient degree for intellectual intercourse with each other, and devotional <sup>569</sup>intercourse with God; and that man was not left, as infidel writers have been pleased to say, to form it for himself out of rude and instinctive sounds. On this subject the remarks of Delaney are conclusive: "That God made man a sociable creature, does not need to be proved; and that when he made him such, he withheld nothing from him that was in any wise necessary for his well being in society, is a clear consequence from the wisdom and goodness of God; and if he withheld nothing any way necessary to his well being, much less would he withhold from him that which is the instrument of the greatest happiness a reasonable creature is capable of in this world. If the Lord God made 'Adam a help meet for him,' because 'it was not good for man to be alone,' can we imagine he would leave him unfurnished with the means to make that help useful and delightful to him? If it was not good for him to be alone, certainly neither was it good for him to have a companion to whom he could not readily communicate his thoughts, with whom he could neither ease his anxieties, nor divide or double his joys, by a kind, a friendly, a reasonable, a religious conversation; and how he could do this in any degree of perfection, or to any height of rational happiness, is utterly inconceivable without the use of speech.

"If it be said, that the human organs being admirably fitted for the formation of articulate sounds, these, with the help of reason, might in time lead men to the use of language. I own it imaginable that they might: but still, till that end were attained in perfection, which possibly might not be in a series of many generations, it must be owned that brutes were better dealt by, and could better attain all the ends of their creation. And if that be

absurd to be supposed, certainly the other is not less absurd to be believed. Nay, I think it justly doubtful, whether, without inspiration from God in this point, man could ever attain the true ends of his being; at least, if we may judge in this case, by the example of those nations who, being destitute of the advantages of a perfect language, are, in all probability, from the misfortune of that sole defect, sunk into the lowest condition of barbarism and brutality. And as to the perfection in which the human organs are framed and fitted for the formation of articulate sounds, this is clearly an argument for believing that God immediately blessed man with the use of speech, and gave him wherewithal to exert those organs to their proper ends; for this is surely as credible, as that when he gave him an appetite for food, and proper organs to eat and to digest it, he did not leave him to seek painfully for a necessary supply, (till his offence had made such a search his curse and punishment,) but placed him at once in the midst of abundant plenty. The consequence from all which is, that the perfection and felicity of man, and the wisdom and goodness of God, necessarily required that Adam should be supernaturally endowed with the knowledge and use of language. And therefore, as certain as it can be, that man was made perfect and happy, and that God is wise and good; so certain is it, that, when Adam and Eve were formed, they were immediately enabled by God to converse and communicate their thoughts, in all the perfection of language necessary to all the ends of their creation. And as this was the conduct most becoming the goodness of God, so we are assured from Moses, that it was that to which his infinite wisdom determined him; for we find that Adam gave names to all the creatures before Eve was formed; and, consequently, before necessity taught him the use of speech.”

It is true that many languages bear marks of being raised to their improved state from rude and imperfect elements, and that all are capable of being enriched and rendered more exact; and it is this which has given some colour to those theories which trace all language itself up from elemental sounds, as the necessities of men, their increasing knowledge, and their imagination led to the invention of new words and combinations. All this is, however, consistent with the Scripture fact, that language was taught at first by God to our first parents. The dispersion of mankind carried many tribes to great distances, and wars still farther scattered them, and often into wide regions where they were farther dispersed to live chiefly by the chase, by fishing, or at best but an imperfect agriculture. In various degrees we know they lost useful arts; and for the same reasons they would lose much of their original language; those terms being chiefly retained which their immediate necessities, and the common affairs of a gross life, kept in use. But when civilization again overtook these portions of mankind, and kingdoms and empires were founded among them, or they became integral parts of the old empires, then their intercourse with each other becoming



more rapid, and artificial, and intellectual, their language was put into a new process of improvement, and to the eye of the critic would exhibit the various stages of advancement; and in many it would be pushed beyond that perfection which it had when it first began to deteriorate. See Letters.

LANTERN. The word occurs, John xviii, 3: μετὰ φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων: with torches and lanterns:" but both terms appear to signify torches; the former of a ruder kind than the latter, being formed of split laths bound into bundles, throwing around a strong glare of light. They came thus furnished to apprehend our Lord, lest he should escape through the darkness of the night.

LAODICEA. There were several cities of this name, but the Scripture speaks only of that in Phrygia, upon the river Lycus, near Colosse. Its ancient name was Diospolis: it was afterward called Rhoas. Lastly, Antiochus, the son of Stratonice, rebuilt it, and called it Laodicea, from the name of his wife Laodice. It became the mother church of sixteen bishoprics. Its three theatres, and the immense circus, which was capable of containing 570upward of thirty thousand spectators, the spacious remains of which (with other ruins buried under ruins) are yet to be seen, give proof of the greatness of its ancient wealth and population; and indicate too strongly that in that city where Christians were rebuked, without exception, for their lukewarmness, there were multitudes who were lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God. The amphitheatre was built after the Apocalypse was written, and the warning of the Spirit had been given to the church of the Laodiceans to be zealous and repent. There are no sights of grandeur, nor scenes of temptation around it now. Its own tragedy may be briefly told. It was lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot; and therefore it was loathsome in the sight of God. And it has been blotted from the world. It is now as desolate as its inhabitants were destitute of the fear and love of God. It is, as described in his Travels by Dr. Smith, utterly desolated, and without any inhabitant except wolves, and jackals, and foxes." It can boast of no human inhabitants, except occasionally when wandering Turcomans pitch their tents in its spacious amphitheatre. The finest sculptured fragments are to be seen at a considerable depth, in excavations which have been made among the ruins. And Colonel Lake observes, There are few ancient cities more likely than Laodicea to preserve many curious remains of antiquity beneath the surface of the soil. Its opulence, and the earthquakes to which it was subject, render it probable that valuable works of art were often there buried beneath the ruins of the public and private edifices."

LAPWING, דוכיפת, Levit. xi, 19; Deut. xiv, 18. The bird intended by the Hebrew name in these places is undoubtedly the hoopoe; a very beautiful,

but most unclean and filthy, species of birds. The Septuagint renders it ἔποπα; and the Vulgate, upupa; which is the same with the Arabian interpreters. The Egyptian name of the bird is kukuphah; and the Syrian, kikuphah; which approach the Hebrew dukiphath. It may have its name from the noise or cry it makes, which is very remarkable, and may be heard a great way.

**LATITUDINARIANS**, a term applied to those divines who, in the seventeenth century, attempted to bring Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents, into one communion, by compromising the differences between them. The chief leaders of this party were the great Chillingworth and John Hales; to whom may be added More, Cudworth, Gale, Tillotson, and Whitchcot. They were zealously attached to the church of England, but did not look upon episcopacy as indispensable to the constitution of the Christian church. Hence they maintained that those who adopted other forms of government and worship, were not on that account to be excluded from the communion, or to forfeit the title of brethren. They reduced the fundamental doctrines of Christianity to a few points. By this way of proceeding, they endeavoured to show that neither the Episcopalians, who, generally speaking, were then Arminians, nor the Presbyterians and Independents, who as generally adopted the doctrines of Calvin, had any reason to oppose each other with such animosity and bitterness; since the subjects of their debates were matters non-essential to salvation, and might be variously explained and understood without prejudice to their eternal interests. This plan failing, through the violence of the bishops on one hand, (though sanctioned by the Lord Chancellor Clarendon,) and by the jealousy of the more rigid on the other, the name Latitudinarian became a term of reproach, as implying an indifferency to all religions, and has been generally so used ever since.

**LAVER**. Between the altar and the tabernacle, a little to the south, stood a circular laver, which, together with its base, was made of the brazen ornaments which the women had presented for the use of the tabernacle, and was thence called כּוּר נְחֹשֶׁת, Exodus xxx, 18; xl, 7. The priests, when about to perform their duties, washed their hands in this laver.

**LAW**, a rule of action; a precept or command, coming from a superior authority, which an inferior is bound to obey. The manner in which God governs rational creatures is by a law, as the rule of their obedience to him, and this is what we call God's moral government of the world. The term, however, is used in Scripture with considerable latitude of meaning; and to ascertain its precise import in any particular place, it is necessary to regard the scope and connection of the passage in which it occurs. Thus, for instance, sometimes it denotes the whole revealed will of God as

communicated to us in his word. In this sense it is generally used in the book of Psalms, i, 2; xix, 7; cxix; Isaiah viii, 20; xlii, 21. Sometimes it is taken for the Mosaic institution distinguished from the Gospel, John i, 17; Matt. xi, 13; xii, 5; Acts xxv, 8. Hence we frequently read of the law of Moses as expressive of the whole religion of the Jews, Heb. ix, 19; x, 28. Sometimes, in a more restricted sense, for the ritual or ceremonial observances of the Jewish religion. In this sense the Apostle speaks of the law of commandments contained in ordinances," Eph. ii, 15; Heb. x, 1; and which, being only a shadow of good things to come," Christ Jesus abolished by his death, and so in effect destroyed the ancient distinction between Jew and Gentile, Gal. iii, 17. Very frequently it is used to signify the decalogue, or ten precepts which were delivered to the Israelites from Mount Sinai. It is in this acceptation of the term that the Lord Jesus declares he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it," Matt. v, 17; and he explains its import as requiring perfect love to God and man, Luke x, 27. It is in reference to this view that St. Paul affirms, By the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified; for by the law is the knowledge of sin," Rom. iii, 20. The language of this law is, The soul that sinneth it shall die," and Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written," or required, in the book of the law, to do 571them," Gal. iii, 10. To deliver man from this penalty, Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being himself made a curse for us," Gal. iii, 13. The law, in this sense, was not given that men should obtain righteousness or justification by it, but to convince them of sin, to show them their need of a Saviour, to shut them up, as it were, from all hopes of salvation from that source, and to recommend the Gospel of divine grace to their acceptance, Gal. iii, 19–25. Again, the law often denotes the rule of good and evil, or of right and wrong, revealed by the Creator and inscribed on man's conscience, even at his creation, and consequently binding upon him by divine authority; and in this respect it is in substance the same with the decalogue. That such a law was connate with, and, as it were, implanted in, man, appears from its traces, which, like the ruins of some noble building, are still extant in every man. It is from those common notions, handed down by tradition, though often imperfect and perverted, that the Heathens themselves distinguished right from wrong, by which they were a law unto themselves, showing the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness," Rom. ii, 12–15, although they had no express revelation.

The term law, is, however, eminently given to the Mosaic law; on the principles and spirit of which, a few general remarks may be offered. The right consideration of this divine institute, says Dr. Graves, will surround it with a glory of truth and holiness, not only worthy of its claims, but which has continued to be the light of the world on theological and moral subjects, and often on great political principles, to this day. If we examine

the Jewish law, to discover the principle on which the whole system depends, the primary truth, to inculcate and illustrate which is its leading object, we find it to be that great basis of all religion, both natural and revealed, the self-existence, essential unity, perfections, and providence of the supreme Jehovah, the Creator of heaven and earth. The first line of the Mosaic writings inculcates this great truth: In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." When the lawgiver begins to recapitulate the statutes and judgments he had enjoined to his nation, it is with this declaration: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," Deut. vi, 4; or, as it might be more closely expressed, Jehovah our Elohim, or God, is one Jehovah. And at the commencement of that sublime hymn, delivered by Moses immediately before his death, in which this illustrious prophet sums up the doctrines he had taught, the wonders by which they had been confirmed, and the denunciations by which they were enforced, he declares this great tenet with the sublimity of eastern poetry, but at the same time with the precision of philosophic truth: Give ear," says he, O ye heavens, and I will speak: and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth. My doctrine shall drop rain: my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass," Deut. xxxii, 1, &c. What, is that doctrine so awful, that the whole universe is thus invoked to attend to it? so salutary as to be compared with the principle whose operation diffuses beauty and fertility over the vegetable world? Hear the answer: Because I will publish the name of Jehovah; ascribe ye greatness unto our God. He is the rock, his work is perfect: a God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is he."

This, then, is one great leading doctrine of the Jewish code. But the manner in which this doctrine is taught displays such wise accommodation to the capacity and character of the nation to whom it is addressed, as deserves to be carefully remarked. That character by which the supreme Being is most clearly distinguished from every other, however exalted; that character from which the acutest reasoners have endeavoured demonstratively to deduce, as from their source, all the divine attributes, is self-existence. Is it not then highly remarkable, that it is under this character the Divinity is described on his first manifestation to the Jewish lawgiver? The Deity at first reveals himself unto him as the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; and therefore the peculiar national and guardian God of the Jewish race. Moses, conscious of the degeneracy of the Israelites, their ignorance of, or their inattention to, the true God, and the difficulty and danger of any attempt to recall them to his exclusive worship, and to withdraw them from Egypt, seems to decline the task; but when absolutely commanded to undertake it, he said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto

them? And God said unto Moses, I am that I am: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I Am hath sent me unto you," Exod. iii, 13, 14. Here we observe, according to the constant method of the divine wisdom, when it condescends to the prejudices of men, how in the very instance of indulgence it corrects their superstition. The religion of names arose from an idolatrous polytheism; and the name given here directly opposes this error, and in the ignorance of that dark and corrupted period establishes that great truth, to which the most enlightened philosophy can add no new lustre, and on which all the most refined speculations on the divine nature ultimately rest, the self-existence, and, by consequence, the eternity and immutability, of the one great Jehovah.

But though the self-existence of the Deity was a fact too abstract to require its being frequently inculcated, his essential unity was a practical principle, the sure foundation on which to erect the structure of true religion, and form a barrier against the encroachments of idolatry: for this commenced not so frequently in denying the existence, or even the supremacy, of the one true God, as in associating with him for objects of adoration inferior intermediate beings, who were supposed to be 572 more directly employed in the administration of human affairs. To confute and resist this false principle was, therefore, one great object of the Jewish scheme. Hence the unity of God is inculcated with perpetual solicitude; it stands at the head of the system of moral law promulgated to the Jews from Sinai by the divine voice, heard by the assembled nation, and issuing from the divine glory, with every circumstance which could impress the deepest awe upon even the dullest minds: I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage; thou shalt have no other gods beside me," Exod. xx, 2, 3. And in the recapitulation of the divine laws in Deuteronomy, it is repeatedly enforced with the most solemn earnestness: Hear, O Israel, The Lord our God is one Lord," Deut. vi, 4. And again: Unto thee it was showed, that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God; there is none else beside him. Know, therefore, this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and in the earth beneath: there is none else," Deut. iv, 35, 39.

This self-existent, supreme and only God is moreover described as possessed of every perfection which can be ascribed to the Divinity: Ye shall be holy," says the Lord to the people of the Jews; for I the Lord your God am holy," Lev. xix, 2. Ascribe ye," says the legislator, greatness unto our God; he is the rock; his work is perfect; a God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is he," Deut. xxxii, 4. And in the hymn of thanksgiving on the miraculous escape of the Israelites at the Red Sea, this is its burden: Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like unto thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" Exod.

xv, 11. And when the Lord delivered to Moses the two tables of the moral law, he is described as descending in the cloud, and proclaiming the name of the Lord: And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty," Exod. xxxiv, 6, 7.

But to teach the self-existence, the unity, the wisdom, and the power of the Deity, nay, even his moral perfections of mercy, justice, and truth, would have been insufficient to arrest the attention, and command the obedience of a nation, the majority of which looked no farther than mere present objects, and at that early period cherished scarcely any hopes higher than those of a temporal kind,--if, in addition to all this, care had not been taken to represent the providence of God as not only directing the government of the universe by general laws, but also perpetually superintending the conduct and determining the fortune of every nation, of every family, nay, of every individual. It was the disbelief or the neglect of this great truth which gave spirit and energy, plausibility and attraction, to the whole system of idolatry. While men believed that the supreme God and Lord of all was too exalted in his dignity, too remote from this sublunary scene, to regard its vicissitudes with an attentive eye, and too constantly engaged in the contemplation of his own perfections, and the enjoyment of his own independent and all-perfect happiness, to interfere in the regulation of human affairs, they regarded with indifference that supreme Divinity who seemed to take no concern in their conduct, and not to interfere as to their happiness. However exalted and perfect such a Being might appear to abstract speculation, he was to the generality of mankind as if he did not exist; as their happiness or misery were not supposed to be influenced by his power, they referred not their conduct to his direction. If he delegated to inferior beings the regulation of this inferior world; if all its concerns were conducted by their immediate agency, and all its blessings or calamities distributed by their immediate determination; it seemed rational, and even necessary, to supplicate their favour and submit to their authority; and neither unwise nor unsafe to neglect that Being, who, though all-perfect and supreme, would, on this supposition appear, with respect to mankind, altogether inoperative. In truth, this fact of the perpetual providence of God extending even to the minutest events, is inseparably connected with every motive which is offered to sway the conduct of the Jews, and forcibly inculcated by every event of their history. This had been manifested in the appointment of the land of Canaan for the future settlement of the chosen people on the first covenant which God entered into with the Patriarch Abraham; in the prophecy, that for four hundred years they should be afflicted in Egypt, and afterward be thence delivered; in the increase of their nation, under circumstances of extreme oppression,

and their supernatural deliverance from that oppression. The same providence was displayed in the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea; the travels of the thousands of Israel through the wilderness, sustained by food from heaven; and in their subsequent settlement in the promised land by means entirely distinct from their own strength. Reliance on the same providence was the foundation of their civil government, the spirit and the principle of their constitution. On this only could they be commanded to keep the sabbatic year without tilling their land, or even gathering its spontaneous produce; confiding in the promise, that God would send his blessing on the sixth year, so that it should bring forth fruit for three years, Lev. xxv, 21. The same faith in Divine Providence alone could prevail on them to leave their properties and families exposed to the attack of their surrounding enemies; while all the males of the nation assembled at Jerusalem to celebrate the three great festivals, enjoined by divine command, with the assurance that no man should desire their land when they went up to appear before the Lord their God thrice in the year, Exodus xxxiv, 24. And, finally, it is most evident, that, contrary to all other lawgivers, the Jewish legislator renders his civil institutions entirely subordinate to his religious; and announces to his nation that their temporal adversity or prosperity would entirely depend, not on their observance of their political regulations; not on their preserving a military spirit, or acquiring commercial wealth, or strengthening themselves by powerful alliances; but on their continuing to worship the one true God according to the religious rites and ceremonies by him prescribed, and preserving their piety and morals untainted by the corruptions and vices which idolatry tended to introduce.

Such was the theology of the Jewish religion, at a period when the whole world was deeply infected with idolatry; when all knowledge of the one true God, all reverence for his sacred name, all reliance on his providence, all obedience to his laws, were nearly banished from the earth; when the severest chastisements had been tried in vain; when no hope of reformation appeared from the refinements of civilization or the researches of philosophy; for the most civilized and enlightened nations adopted with the greatest eagerness, and disseminated with the greatest activity, the absurdities, impieties, and pollutions of idolatry. Then was the Jewish law promulgated to a nation, who, to mere human judgment, might have appeared incapable of inventing or receiving such a high degree of intellectual and moral improvement; for they had been long enslaved to the Egyptians, the authors and supporters of the grossest idolatry; they had been weighed down by the severest bondage, perpetually harassed by the most incessant manual labours; for the Egyptians made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field," Exod. i, 14. At this time, and in this nation, was the Mosaic law

promulgated, teaching the great principles of true religion, the self-existence, the unity, the perfections, and the providence of the one great Jehovah; reprobating all false gods, all image worship, all the absurdities and profanations of idolatry. At this time, and in this nation, was a system of government framed, which had for its basis the reception of, and steady adherence to, this system of true religion; and establishing many regulations, which would be in the highest degree irrational, and could never hope to be received, except from a general and thorough reliance on the superintendence of Divine Providence, controlling the course of nature, and directing every event, so as to proportion the prosperity of the Hebrew people, according to their obedience to that law which they had received as divine.

It is an obvious, but it is not therefore a less important remark, that to the Jewish religion we owe that admirable summary of moral duty, contained in the ten commandments. All fair reasoners will admit that each of these must be understood to condemn, not merely the extreme crime which it expressly prohibits, but every inferior offence of the same kind, and every mode of conduct leading to such transgression; and, on the contrary, to enjoin opposite conduct, and the cultivation of opposite dispositions. Thus, the command, Thou shalt not kill," condemns not merely the single crime of deliberate murder, but every kind of violence, and every indulgence of passion and resentment, which tends either to excite such violence, or to produce that malignant disposition of mind, in which the guilt of murder principally consists: and similarly of the rest. In this extensive interpretation of the commandments, we are warranted, not merely by the deductions of reason, but by the letter of the law itself. For the addition of the last, Thou shalt not covet," proves clearly that in all, the dispositions of the heart, as much as the immediate outward act, is the object of the divine Legislator; and thus it forms a comment on the meaning, as well as a guard for the observance, of all the preceding commands. Interpreted in this natural and rational latitude, how comprehensive and important is this summary of moral duty! It inculcates the adoration of the one true God, who made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is;" who must, therefore, be infinite in power, and wisdom, and goodness; the object of exclusive adoration; of gratitude for every blessing we enjoy; of fear, for he is a jealous God; of hope, for he is merciful. It prohibits every species of idolatry; whether by associating false gods with the true, or worshipping the true by symbols and images. Commanding not to take the name of God in vain, it enjoins the observance of all outward respect for the divine authority, as well as the cultivation of inward sentiments and feelings suited to this outward reverence; and it establishes the obligation of oaths, and, by consequence, of all compacts and deliberate promises; a principle, without which the administration of laws would be impracticable, and the



bonds of society must be dissolved. By commanding to keep holy the Sabbath, as the memorial of the creation, it establishes the necessity of public worship, and of a stated and outward profession of the truths of religion, as well as of the cultivation of suitable feelings; and it enforces this by a motive which is equally applicable to all mankind, and which should have taught the Jew that he ought to consider all nations as equally creatures of that Jehovah whom he himself adored; equally subject to his government, and, if sincerely obedient, entitled to all the privileges his favour could bestow. It is also remarkable, that this commandment, requiring that the rest of the Sabbath should include the man-servant, and the maid-servant, and the stranger that was within their gates, nay, even their cattle, proved that the Creator of the universe extended his attention to all his creatures; that the humblest of mankind were the objects of his paternal love; that no accidental differences, which so often create alienation among different nations, would alienate any from the divine regard; and that even the brute creation shared the benevolence of their Creator, and ought to be treated by men with gentleness and humanity.

574When we proceed to the second table, comprehending more expressly our social duties, we find all the most important principles on which they depend clearly enforced. The commandment which enjoins, Honour thy father and mother," sanctions the principles, not merely of filial obedience, but of all those duties which arise from our domestic relations; and, while it requires not so much any one specific act, as the general disposition which should regulate our whole course of conduct in this instance, it impresses the important conviction, that the entire law proceeds from a Legislator able to search and judge the heart of man. The subsequent commands coincide with the clear dictates of reason, and prohibit crimes which human laws in general have prohibited as plainly destructive of social happiness. But it was of infinite importance to rest the prohibitions, Thou shalt not kill," Thou shalt not commit adultery," Thou shalt not steal," Thou shalt not bear false witness," not merely on the deductions of reason, but also on the weight of a divine authority. How often have false ideas of public good in some places, depraved passions in others, and the delusions of idolatry in still more, established a law of reputation contrary to the dictates of reason, and the real interests of society. In one country we see theft allowed, if perpetrated with address; in others, piracy and rapine honoured, if conducted with intrepidity. Sometimes we perceive adultery permitted, the most unnatural crimes committed without remorse or shame; nay, every species of impurity enjoined and consecrated as a part of divine worship. In others, we find revenge honoured as spirit, and death inflicted at its impulse with ferocious triumph. Again, we see every feeling of nature outraged, and parents exposing their helpless children to perish for deformity of body or weakness of mind; or, what is still more dreadful,

from mercenary or political views; and this inhuman practice familiarized by custom, and authorized by law. And, to close the horrid catalogue, we see false religions leading their deluded votaries to heap the altars of their idols with human victims; the master butchers his slave, the conqueror his captive; nay, dreadful to relate, the parent sacrifices his children, and, while they shriek amidst the tortures of the flames, or in the agonies of death, he drowns their cries by the clangour of cymbals and the yells of fanaticism. Yet these abominations, separate or combined, have disgraced ages and nations which we are accustomed to admire and celebrate as civilized and enlightened,--Babylon and Egypt, Phenicia and Carthage, Greece and Rome. Many of these crimes legislators have enjoined, or philosophers defended. What, indeed, could be hoped from legislators and philosophers, when we recollect the institutions of Lycurgus, especially as to purity of manners, and the regulations of Plato on the same subject, in his model of a perfect republic; when we consider the sensuality of the Epicureans, and immodesty of the Cynics; when we find suicide applauded by the Stoics, and the murderous combats of gladiators defended by Cicero, and exhibited by Trajan? Such variation and inconstancy in the rule and practice of moral duty, as established by the feeble or fluctuating authority of human opinion, demonstrates the utility of a clear divine interposition, to impress these important prohibitions; and it is difficult for any sagacity to calculate how far such an interposition was necessary, and what effect it may have produced by influencing human opinions and regulating human conduct, when we recollect that the Mosaic code was probably the first written law ever delivered to any nation; and that it must have been generally known in those eastern countries, from which the most ancient and celebrated legislators and sages derived the models of their laws and the principles of their philosophy.

But the Jewish religion promoted the interests of moral virtue, not merely by the positive injunctions of the decalogue; it also inculcated clearly and authoritatively the two great principles on which all piety and virtue depend, and which our blessed Lord recognised as the commandments on which hang the law and the prophets,--the principles of love to God and love to our neighbour. The love of God is every where enjoined in the Mosaic law, as the ruling disposition of the heart, from which all obedience should spring, and in which it ought to terminate. With what solemnity does the Jewish lawgiver impress it at the commencement of his recapitulation of the divine law: Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might," Deut. vi, 4, 5. And again: And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul?" Deut. x, 12. Nor is the love

of our neighbour less explicitly enforced: Thou shalt not," says the law, avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the Lord," Lev. xix, 18. The operation of this benevolence, thus solemnly required, was not to be confined to their own countrymen; it was to extend to the stranger, who, having renounced idolatry, was permitted to live among them, worshipping the true God, though without submitting to circumcision or the other ceremonial parts of the Mosaic law: If a stranger," says the law, sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord thy God," Lev. xix, 33, 34.

Thus, on a review of the topics we have discussed, it appears that the Jewish law promulgated the great principles of moral duty in the decalogue, with a solemnity suited to their high preëminence; that it enjoined love to God with the most unceasing solicitude, and love to our neighbour, as extensively and forcibly, as the peculiar design of the Jewish economy, and the peculiar character of the Jewish people, would permit; that it impressed the deepest conviction of God's requiring, not mere external observances, but heart-felt piety, well regulated desires, and active benevolence; that it taught sacrifice could not obtain pardon without repentance, or repentance without reformation and restitution; that it described circumcision itself, and, by consequence, every other legal rite, as designed to typify and inculcate internal holiness, which alone could render men acceptable to God; that it represented the love of God as designed to act as a practical principle, stimulating to the constant and sincere cultivation of purity, mercy, and truth; and that it enforced all these principles and precepts by sanctions the most likely to operate powerfully on minds unaccustomed to abstract speculations and remote views, even by temporal rewards and punishments; the assurance of which was confirmed from the immediate experience of similar rewards and punishments, dispensed to their enemies and to themselves by that supernatural Power which had delivered the Hebrew nation out of Egypt, conducted them through the wilderness, planted them in the land of Canaan, regulated their government, distributed their possessions, and to which alone they could look to obtain new blessings, or secure those already enjoyed. From all this we derive another presumptive argument for the divine authority of the Mosaic code; and it may be contended, that a moral system thus perfect, promulgated at so early a period, to such a people, and enforced by such sanctions as no human power could undertake to execute, strongly bespeaks a divine original.

2. The moral law is sometimes called the Mosaic law, because it was one great branch of those injunctions which, under divine authority, Moses enjoined upon the Israelites when they were gathered into a political community under the theocracy. But it existed previously as the law of all mankind; and it has been taken up into the Christian system, and there more fully illustrated. As the obligation of the moral law upon Christians has, however, been disputed by some perverters of the Christian faith, or held by others on loose and fallacious grounds, this subject ought to be clearly understood. It is, nevertheless, to be noticed, that the morals of the New Testament are not proposed to us in the form of a regular code. Even in the books of Moses, which have the legislative form to a great extent, not all the principles and duties which constituted the full character of godliness," under that dispensation, are made the subjects of formal injunction by particular precepts. They are partly infolded in general principles, or often take the form of injunction in an apparently incidental manner, or are matters of obvious inference. A preceding code of traditionary moral law is all along supposed in the writings of Moses and the prophets, as well as a consuetudinary ritual and a doctrinal theology, both transmitted from the patriarchs. This, too, is eminently the case with Christianity. It supposes that all who believed in Christ admitted the divine authority of the Old Testament; and it assumes the perpetual authority of its morals, as well as the truth of its fundamental theology. The constant allusions in the New Testament to the moral rules of the Jews and patriarchs, either expressly as precepts, or as the data of argument, sufficiently guard us against the notion, that what has not in so many words been re-enacted] by Christ and his Apostles is of no authority among Christians. In a great number of instances, however, the form of injunction is directly preceptive, so as to have all the explicitness and force of a regular code of law, and is, as much as a regular code could be, a declaration of the sovereign will of Christ, enforced by the sanctions of eternal life and death. This, however, is a point on which a few confirmatory observations may be usefully adduced. No part of the preceding dispensation, designated generally by the appellation of the law," is repealed in the New Testament, but what is obviously ceremonial, typical, and incapable of coëxisting with Christianity. Our Lord, in his discourse with the Samaritan woman, declares, that the hour of the abolition of the temple worship was come; the Apostle Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, teaches us that the Levitical services were but shadows, the substance and end of which is Christ; and the ancient visible church, as constituted upon the ground of natural descent from Abraham, was abolished by the establishment of a spiritual body of believers to take its place. No precepts of a purely political nature, that is, which respect the civil subjection of the Jews to their theocracy, are, therefore, of any force to us as laws, although they may have, in many cases, the greatest authority as principles. No ceremonial precepts can be binding, since they were

restrained to a period terminating with the death and resurrection of Christ; nor are even the patriarchal rites of circumcision and the passover obligatory upon Christians, since we have sufficient evidence that they were of an adumbrative character, and were laid aside by the first inspired teachers of Christianity.

With the moral precepts which abound in the Old Testament the case is very different, as sufficiently appears from the different, and even contrary, manner in which they are always spoken of by Christ and his Apostles. When our Lord, in his sermon on the mount, says, Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil;” that is, to confirm or establish it; the entire scope of his discourse shows that he is speaking exclusively of the moral precepts of the law,” eminently so called, and of the moral injunctions of the prophets founded upon them, and to which he thus gives an equal authority. And in so solemn a manner does he enforce this, that he adds, doubtless as foreseeing that attempts would be made by deceiving or deceived men 576 professing his religion, to lessen the authority of the moral law, Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven;” that is, as St. Chrysostom interprets, He shall be the farthest from attaining heaven and happiness, which imports that he shall not attain it at all.” In like manner St. Paul, after having strenuously maintained the doctrine of justification by faith alone, anticipates an objection by asking, Do we then make void the law through faith?” and subjoins, God forbid: yea, we establish the law;” meaning by the law,” as the context and his argument clearly show, the moral and not the ceremonial law.

After such declarations, it is worse than trifling for any to contend that, in order to establish the authority of the moral law of the Jews over Christians, it ought to have been formally reënacted. To this we may, however, farther reply, not only that many important moral principles and rules found in the Old Testament were never formally enacted among the Jews; were traditional from an earlier age; and received at different times the more indirect authority of inspired recognition; but, to put the matter in a stronger light, that all the leading moral precepts of the Jewish Scriptures are, in point of fact, proposed in the New Testament in a manner which has the full force of formal reënactment, as the laws of the Christian church. This argument, from the want of formal reënactment, will therefore have no weight. The summary of the law and the prophets, which is to love God with all our heart, and to serve him with all our strength, and to love our neighbour as ourselves, is unquestionably enjoined, and even reënacted by the Christian lawgiver. When our Lord is explicitly asked by one who came unto him and said, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may

have eternal life?" the answer given shows that the moral law contained in the decalogue is so in force under the Christian dispensation, that obedience to it is necessary to final salvation:--"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." And that nothing ceremonial is intended by this term, is manifest from what follows: He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal," &c. Matt. xix, 17–19. Here, also, we have all the force of a formal reënactment of the decalogue, a part of it being evidently put for the whole. Nor were it difficult to produce passages from the discourses of Christ and the writings of the Apostles, which enjoin all the precepts of this law taken separately, by their authority, as indispensable parts of Christian duty, and that, too, under their original sanctions of life and death; so that the two circumstances which form the true character of a law in its highest sense, divine authority and penal sanctions, are found as truly in the New Testament as in the Old. It will not, for instance, be contended, that the New Testament does not enjoin the acknowledgment and worship of one God alone; nor that it does not prohibit idolatry; nor that it does not level its maledictions against false and profane swearing; nor that the Apostle Paul does not use the very words of the fifth commandment preceptively, when he says, Honour thy father and mother, which is the first commandment with promise," Eph. vi, 2; nor that murder, adultery, theft, false witness, and covetousness are not all prohibited under pain of exclusion from the kingdom of God. Thus, then, we have the whole decalogue brought into the Christian code of morals, by a distinct injunction of its separate precepts, and by their recognition as of permanent and unchangeable obligation; the fourth commandment, respecting the Sabbath only, being so far excepted, that its injunction is not so expressly marked. This, however, is no exception in fact; for beside that its original place in the two tables sufficiently distinguishes it from all positive, ceremonial, and typical precepts, and gives it a moral character, in respect to its ends, which are, first, mercy to servants and cattle, and, second, the worship of almighty God, undisturbed by worldly interruptions and cares, it is necessarily included in that law" which our Lord declares he came not to destroy, or abrogate; in that law" which St. Paul declares to be established by faith," and among those commandments" which our Lord declares must be kept," if any one would enter into life." To this, also, the practice of the Apostles is to be added, who did not cease themselves from keeping one day in seven holy, nor teach others so to do; but gave to "the Lord's day" that eminence and sanctity in the Christian church which the seventh day had in the Jewish, by consecrating it to holy uses; an alteration not affecting the precept at all, except in an unessential circumstance, (if indeed in that,) and in which we may suppose them to have acted under divine suggestion.

Thus, then, we have the obligation of the whole decalogue as fully established in the New Testament as in the Old, as if it had been formally reënacted; and that no formal reënactment of it took place, is itself a presumptive proof that it was never regarded by the lawgiver as temporary, which the formality of republication might have supposed. It is important to remark, however, that, although the moral laws of the Mosaic dispensation pass into the Christian code, they stand there in other and higher circumstances; so that the New Testament is a more perfect dispensation of the knowledge of the moral will of God than the Old. In particular, (1.) They are more expressly extended to the heart, as by our Lord, in his sermon on the mount; who teaches us that the thought and inward purpose of any offence is a violation of the law prohibiting its external and visible commission. (2.) The principles on which they are founded are carried out in the New Testament into a greater variety of duties, which, by embracing more perfectly the social and civil relations of life, are of a more universal character. (3.) There is a much more enlarged injunction of positive and particular virtues, especially those which constitute the Christian temper. (4.) By all overt acts being inseparably connected with corresponding principles in the heart, in order to constitute acceptable obedience, which principles suppose the regeneration of the soul by the Holy Ghost. This moral renovation is, therefore, held out as necessary to our salvation, and promised as a part of the grace of our redemption by Christ. (5.) By being connected with promises of divine assistance, which is peculiar to a law connected with evangelical provisions. (6.) By their having a living illustration in the perfect and practical example of Christ. (7.) By the higher sanctions derived from the clearer revelation of a future state, and the more explicit promises of eternal life, and threatenings of eternal punishment. It follows from this, that we have in the Gospel the most complete and perfect revelation of moral law ever given to men; and a more exact manifestation of the brightness, perfection, and glory of that law, under which angels and our progenitors in paradise were placed, and which it is at once the delight and the interest of the most perfect and happy beings to obey.

LAZARUS, brother to Martha and Mary. He dwelt at Bethany with his sisters, near Jerusalem; and the Lord Jesus did him the honour sometimes of lodging at his house when he visited the city. See the account of his resurrection related at large in John xi, 5, &c.

LEAD, עפרת, Exod. xv, 10; Num. xxxi, 22; Job xix, 24; Jer. vi, 29; Ezek. xxii, 18; xxvii, 12; Zech. v, 7, 8; a mineral of a bluish white colour. It is the softest next to gold, but has no great tenacity, and is not in the least sonorous. It is mentioned with five other species of metal, Num. xxxi, 22;

and there is no doubt but that this is the meaning of the word; so the Septuagint render it throughout, μόλιθος or μόλιθος.

LEAVEN. The Hebrews were forbidden by the law to eat leavened bread, or a food with leaven in it, during the seven days of the passover, Exod. xii, 15–19; Lev. ii, 11. They were very careful in purifying their houses from all leaven before this feast began. God forbade either leaven or honey to be offered to him in his temple; that is, in cakes or in any baked meats. But on other occasions they might offer leavened bread or honey. St. Paul, 1 Cor. v, 7, 8, expresses his desire that the faithful should celebrate the Christian passover with unleavened bread; which, figuratively, signifies sincerity and truth. In this he teaches us two things; first, that the law which obliged the Jews to a literal observance of the passover is no longer in force; and, secondly, that by unleavened bread, truth and purity of heart were denoted. The same Apostle alludes to the ceremony used at the passover, when he says, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump;" that is, a small portion of leaven, in a quantity of bread or paste, corrupts the whole, and renders it unclean. Our Saviour, in the Gospel, Matthew xvi, 11, warns his Apostles to beware of the leaven of the Herodians and Pharisees; meaning their doctrines.

LEBANON, or LIBANUS, signifying white, from its snows,—the most elevated mountain or mountain chain in Syria, celebrated in all ages for its cedars; which, as is well known, furnished the wood for Solomon's temple. This mountain is the centre, or nucleus, of all the mountain ridges which, from the north, the south, and the east, converge toward this point; but it overtops them all. This configuration of the mountains, and the superiority of Lebanon, are particularly striking to the traveller approaching both from the Mediterranean on the west, and the desert on the east. On either side, he first discovers, at a great distance, a clouded ridge, stretching from north to south, as far as the eye can see; the central summits of which are capped with clouds, or tipped with snow. This is Lebanon, which is often referred to in Holy Writ for its streams, its timber, and its wines; and at the present day the seat of the only portion of freedom of which Syria can boast.

The altitude of Lebanon is so considerable, that it appears from the reports of travellers to have snow on its highest eminences all the year round. Volney says, that it thus remains toward the north-east, where it is sheltered from the sea winds and the rays of the sun. Maundrell found that part of the mountain which he crossed, and which in all probability was by no means the highest, covered with deep snow in the month of May. Dr. E. D. Clarke, in the month of July, saw some of the eastern summits of Lebanon, or Anti-Libanus, near Damascus, covered with snow, not lying in patches, as is common in the summer season with mountains which border on the



line of perpetual congelation, but do not quite reach it, but with that perfect white, smooth, and velvetlike appearance, which snow only exhibits when it is very deep,—a striking spectacle in such a climate, where the beholder, seeking protection from a burning sun, almost considers the firmament to be on fire. At the time this observation was made, the thermometer, in an elevated situation near the sea of Tiberias, stood at  $102\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$  in the shade. Sir Frederic Henniker passed over snow in July; and Ali Bey describes the same eastern ridge as covered with snow in September. Of the noble cedars which once adorned the upper parts of this mountain but few now remain, and those much decayed. Burckhardt, who crossed Mount Libanus in 1810, counted about thirty-six large ones, fifty of middle size, and about three hundred smaller and young ones: but more might exist in other parts of the mountain. The wine, especially that made about the convent of Canobin, still preserves its ancient celebrity; and is reported by travellers, more particularly by Rauwolff, Le Bruyn, and De la Roque, to be of the most exquisite kind for flavour and fragrance. The rains which fall in the lower regions of Lebanon, and the melting of the 578snow in the upper ones, furnish an abundance of perennial streams, which are alluded to by Solomon, Cant. iv, 15. On the declivities of the mountain grew the vines which furnished the rich and fragrant wine which Hosea celebrated, xiv, 7, and which may still be obtained by proper culture.

The cedar of Lebanon has, in all ages, been reckoned as an object of unrivalled grandeur and beauty in the vegetable kingdom. It is, accordingly, one of the natural images which frequently occur in the poetical style of the Hebrew prophets; and is appropriated to denote kings, princes, and potentates of the highest rank. Thus, the Prophet Isaiah, whose writings abound with metaphors and allegories of this kind, in denouncing the judgments of God upon the proud and arrogant, declares that the day of the Lord of Hosts shall be upon all the cedars of Lebanon that are high and lifted up, and upon all the oaks of Bashan,” Isaiah ii, 13. The king of Israel used the same figure in his reply to the challenge of the king of Judah: The thistle that was in Lebanon sent to the cedar that was in Lebanon, saying, Give thy daughter to my son to wife: and there passed by a wild beast that was in Lebanon, and trod down the thistle,” 2 Kings xiv, 9. The spiritual prosperity of the righteous man is compared by the Psalmist to the same noble plant: The righteous shall flourish as the palm tree; he shall grow as the cedar in Lebanon.” To break the cedars, and shake the enormous mass on which they grow, are the figures that David selects to express the awful majesty and power of Jehovah: The voice of the Lord is powerful; the voice of the Lord is full of majesty. The voice of the Lord breaketh the cedars: yea, the Lord breaketh the cedars of Lebanon. He maketh them also to skip like a calf; Lebanon and Sirion like a young

unicorn,” Psalm xxix, 4–6. This description of the divine majesty and power possesses a character of awful sublimity.

The stupendous size, the extensive range, and great elevation of Libanus; its towering summits capped with perpetual snow, or crowned with fragrant cedars; its olive plantations; its vineyards, producing the most delicious wines; its clear fountains, and cold-flowing brooks; its fertile vales, and odoriferous shrubberies,--combine to form in Scripture language, the glory of Lebanon.” But that glory, liable to change, has, by the unanimous consent of modern travellers, suffered a sensible decline. The extensive forests of cedar, which adorned and perfumed the summits and declivities of those mountains, have almost disappeared. Only a small number of these trees of God, planted by his almighty hand,” which, according to the usual import of the phrase, signally displayed the divine power, wisdom, and goodness, now remain. Their countless number in the days of Solomon, and their prodigious bulk, must be recollected, in order to feel the force of that sublime declaration of the prophet: Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt-offering,” Isaiah xl, 16. Though the trembling sinner were to make choice of Lebanon for the altar; were to cut down all its forests to form the pile; though the fragrance of this fuel, with all its odoriferous gums, were the incense; the wine of Lebanon pressed from all its vineyards, the libation; and all its beasts, the propitiatory sacrifice; all would prove insufficient to make atonement for the sins of men; would be regarded as nothing in the eyes of the supreme Judge for the expiation of even one transgression. The just and holy law of God requires a nobler altar, a costlier sacrifice, and a sweeter perfume,--the obedience and death of a divine Person to atone for our sins, and the incense of his continual intercession to secure our acceptance with the Father of mercies, and admission into the mansions of eternal rest. The conversion of the Gentile nations from the worship of idols and the bondage of corruption, to the service and enjoyment of the true God, is foretold in these beautiful and striking terms: The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them: and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon: they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God,” Isaiah xxxv, 4.

LEEK, קציר, in Numbers xi, 5, translated leek;” in 1 Kings xviii, 5; 2 Kings xix, 26; Job xl, 15; Psalm xxxvii, 2; xc, 5; ciii, 15; civ, 14; cxxix, 6; cxlvii, 8; Isaiah xxxv, 7; xxxvii, 27; xl, 6, it is rendered grass;” in Job viii, 12, herb;” in Prov. xxvii, 25; Isaiah xv, 6, hay;” and in Isaiah xxxiv, 13, a court.” It is much of the same nature with the onion. The kind called karrat by the Arabians, the *allium porrum* of Linnæus, Hasselquist says, must

certainly have been one of those desired by the children of Israel, as it has been cultivated and esteemed from the earliest times to the present in Egypt. The inhabitants are very fond of eating it raw, as sauce for their roasted meat; and the poor people eat it raw with their bread, especially for breakfast. There is reason, however, to doubt whether this plant is intended in Num. xi, 5, and so differently rendered every where else: it should rather intend such vegetables as grow promiscuously with grass. Ludolphus supposes that it may mean lettuce and sallads in general; and Maillet observes, that the succory and endive are eaten with great relish by the people in Egypt: some or all of these may be meant.

LEGION. The Roman legions were composed each of ten cohorts; a cohort, of fifty maniples; a maniple, of fifteen men; consequently, a full legion contained six thousand soldiers. Jesus cured one who called himself legion," as if possessed by a legion of devils, Mark v, 9. He also said to Peter, who drew his sword to defend him in the olive garden: Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, who shall presently give me 579 more than twelve legions of angels?" Matt. xxvi, 53.

LEMUEL. See Agur.

LENTIL, עדשים, Gen. xxv, 34; 2 Sam. xvii, 28; xxiii, 11; Ezek. iv, 9, a sort of pulse; in the Septuagint φακός, and Vulgate lens. The lentils of Egypt were very much esteemed among the ancients. St. Austin says, they grow abundantly in Egypt, are much used as a food there, and those of Alexandria are considered particularly valuable. Dr. Shaw says, beans, lentils, kidney beans, and garvancos are the chief of their pulse kind. Beans, when boiled and stewed with oil and garlic, are the principal food of persons of all distinctions. Lentils are dressed in the same manner as beans, dissolving easily into a mass, and making a pottage of a chocolate colour. This, we find, was the red pottage" which Esau, from thence called Edom, exchanged for his birthright.

LEOPARD, נמר, Cant. iv, 8; Isaiah xi, 6; Jer. v, 6; xiii, 23; Hosea xiii, 7; Hab. i, 8; Dan. vii, 6; ὄρδαλις, Rev. xiii, 2; Ecclus. xxviii, 23. There can be no doubt that the pard or leopard is the animal mentioned. Bochart shows that the name is similar in the Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic. The LXX uniformly render it by ὄρδαλις; and Jerom, pardus. Probably, these animals were numerous in Palestine; as we find places with a name intimating their having been the haunts of leopards: Nimrah, Num. xxxii, 3; Beth-Nimrah, Num. xxxii, 36; Joshua xiii, 27; and waters of Nimrim," Isa. xv, 6; Jer. xlvi, 34; and mountains of leopards," Cant. iv, 8. Nimrod might have his name from this animal: He was a mighty hunter before the Lord; wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the

Lord," Gen. x, 9. It is supposed, however, that his predations were not confined to the brute creation. Dr. Geddes remarks, that the word hunter" expresses too little. He was a freebooter, in the worst sense of the word; a lawless despot:

Proud Nimrod first the bloody chase began,  
A mighty hunter, and his prey was man.

Isaiah, describing the happy state of the reign of Messiah, says, The leopard shall lie down with the kid," Isaiah xi, 6. Even animals shall lose their fierceness and cruelty, and become gentle and tame. Jeremiah, v, 6, mentions the artful ambuscades of this animal; and in xiii, 23, alludes to his spots: Can a Cushite change his skin; or a leopard his spots? Then may ye prevail with them to do good who are habituated to do evil;" and Habakkuk, i, 8, refers to its alertness.

LEPROSY. See Diseases.

LETTERS, marks for the purpose of expressing sounds, used in writing. Few subjects have given rise to more discussion than the origin of alphabetic characters. If they are of human invention, they must be considered as one of the most admirable efforts of the ingenuity of man. So wonderful is the facility which they afford for recording human thought; so ingenious, and at the same time so simple, is the analysis which they furnish for the sounds of articulate speech, and for all the possible variety of words; that we might expect the author of this happy invention to have been immortalized by the grateful homage of succeeding ages, and his name delivered down to posterity with the ample honours it so justly merited. But the author and the era of this discovery, if such it be, are both lost in the darkness of remote antiquity. Even the nation to which the invention is due cannot now be ascertained. The Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Phenicians, the Persians, the Indians, have all laid claim to the honour of it; and each has named its inventor among the remote, and probably fabulous, personages that figure in the earlier ages of their history. In consequence of this uncertainty respecting the author of alphabetic writing, and the high value and extreme difficulty of the invention itself, many have been inclined to attribute this art to an immediate revelation from the Deity; contending that it was communicated with other invaluable gifts from above, in remote ages, to the descendants of Abraham, and probably to the Patriarch Moses, who was the author of the most ancient compositions in alphabetical writing that we at present possess. The arguments which are brought in support of the divine revelation of the alphabet, are chiefly these: 1. The high antiquity of the use of letters; the Hebrew characters having existed in a perfect state when Moses composed the Pentateuch, the most ancient writing now known to be extant. 2. The similarity between

the various alphabets of different nations, which, for the most part, are the same, in the order, power, and even form, of their letters with the Hebrew. 3. The complete want of alphabetic characters among those nations, which have been cut off from all communication with the ancient civilized world, as the aboriginal Americans; or that part of the human race which had no opportunity of borrowing the system of written characters revealed to the Hebrews, as China.

Had man been left to himself, the first and most natural way of making his thoughts visible to the eye would be by pictorial representations. The second step would, for convenience' sake, be to invent an abbreviated form of these pictures, sufficiently legible to call to mind the original picture in full, and yet so reduced and intermixed with a few easily remembered arbitrary characters, or symbols, as to be more extensively useful. The next and most difficult step would be the alphabet so formed as to express all the sounds of the language, by convenient combination. The Egyptian monuments show specimens of each; the hieroglyph, the mixed and abbreviated, and the alphabetical. The magnificent ruins of Persepolis, the capital of ancient Persia, exhibit also the pure pictorial style, and tablets of abbreviated emblems. The characters on the bricks dug up from the ruins of ancient Babylon have characters, which are supposed to be, not alphabetic, but abbreviated symbols, and therefore suppose the existence of the larger picture writing, whether the people 580 possessed a proper alphabet or not. All the savage tribes of America had their picture writings, and this style was carried to great perfection by the Mexicans. The latter had, likewise, abbreviated marks, which were used as symbols; and thus made an approach to letters, although they never reached this discovery. It is a curious fact, that in our day a Cherokee chief has actually invented an alphabet, and that in the process he commenced with a pictorial representation of animals which uttered sounds somewhat like those of his own tongue; which thought seems not to have entered into the picture writing of the ancients, whose delineations spoke wholly to the eye, and not at all to the ear. Finding this method imperfect and cumbersome, he at last hit upon the expedient of arbitrary characters, which he gradually reduced in number, and so perfected, that, with a few European improvements, books are now printed in them for the use of his nation. In China the language is a complete system of abbreviated pictures, emblems, or symbols; and there is no proper alphabet to this day.

These facts are urged as direct proofs or strong presumptions that all alphabetical characters have been preceded by picture or imitative characters; and that as the whole is within the compass of human ingenuity, the notion of a divine suggestion of letters, or of the important art of alphabetical writing, is bringing in the divine agency without necessity. But

the assumption that alphabets have in all cases been formed through this process, is wholly hypothetical. Certain it is that we can prove from the Scriptures that literal writing was in use at an earlier period than can be assigned to any picture writing whatever. Writing and reading were familiar to Moses and the Israelites when the law was given, and must have long previously existed among them, and, probably, among the Egyptians of the same age too; which is much earlier than any of those monuments bearing hieroglyphical characters reach. We have given sufficient reason to conclude that Job lived at an earlier period still, and as he expresses a wish that his words should be written in a book, and engraven on the rock, the knowledge of reading as well as writing must have been pretty general in his country, or the book and the inscription could not have been a testimony of his faith and hope to his countrymen, as he passionately desired it to be. Here, too, it is to be observed, that in the early Mosaic history we have not the least intimation of writing by pictures or symbols, nor any that the art of writing had been revealed from heaven in the days of Moses, preparatory to the giving of a written law and the introduction of inspired books for the religious instruction of the people. We must trace it up higher; though whether of divine revelation, or human invention, cannot certainly be determined. Its importance was assuredly worthy of the former; and if this was not done by particular revelation, doubtless we may reasonably and piously ascribe it to a divine suggestion.

It may, indeed, be asked, How then is it that in other nations we can so accurately trace the progress from the picture to the symbol, and thence on to the alphabet; as for instance in Egypt? We answer, that if this were allowed, still it might be, and probably was, a part of the divine procedure with reference to the preservation of the true religion, that the knowledge of letters should be early given to the Abrahamic family, or, at least, preserved among them, while many others of the more dispersed branches of the human race becoming barbarous, as stated under the article Language, might lose it; because picture writing was easily convertible to idolatrous purposes, and in reality was greatly encouraged from that source. The same care would be exerted to prevent pictorial representations of spiritual beings and things as the forming of images; and the race of true worshippers of God was never therefore placed under the necessity of thus expressing their thoughts by such delineations. But it is, in fact, far from being proved, that the hieroglyph, or picture writing, of Egypt for example, was more ancient among that people than alphabetic writing. One of the most recent writers on this side is the Marquis Spineto, in his Lectures on Egyptian Hieroglyphics." His theory is, in fact, that of Warburton; and he thinks that the recent discoveries as to the hieroglyphics of Egypt fully establish it. The opinion of this learned prelate was, that the primitive mode of writing among the Egyptians was by figurative delineations or

hieroglyphics; that this becoming too tedious and voluminous, by degrees they perfected another character, which he calls the running-hand of hieroglyphics, resembling the Chinese characters; which being at first formed only by the outlines of figures, became at length a kind of marks; and at last led to the compendious use of letters by an alphabet. His argument against the knowledge of letters by the immediate descendants of Noah is as follows: For, if the invention of the alphabet had preceded the dispersion, we should have found the use of it generally established among mankind, and hieroglyphics and picture writing entirely laid aside. But this is not the case. The Mexicans and the Peruvians, up to the fifteenth century, and, to this day, the Chinese, have no knowledge of the alphabet. They all, like the Egyptians, made use of hieroglyphics, more or less abridged, more or less symbolical, or, if you please, more or less arbitrary; but they had no knowledge of the alphabet. The invention of letters, therefore, must have happened after the dispersion, at a time when picture or hieroglyphical writing was generally used; it was thus imported into the respective countries, by the primitive inhabitants, as they separated themselves from the common society, carrying in their migrations those partly true and partly false notions of the Deity, and of the great event which had submerged the world; notions which, in fact, are to be found in the theology and ritual of all the nations in the universe, although more or less disfigured and altered.”

581 But as the running-hand hieroglyphics, spoken of by Warburton, were no more alphabetical than the hieroglyphics themselves, still we are left to make the inquiry, Who was the inventor of the Egyptian alphabet? This is supposed by the Marquis on the authority of a passage in Plato, to be a secretary of one of the kings of Egypt. This king is called Thamus; who forbade his ingenious secretary, Thouth, or Theuth, to make the invention public; lest the people should no longer pay attention to the hieroglyphics, which would then be soon forgotten. The secret, however, soon escaped; and as it diminished to a prodigious degree the difficulty of writing, it was generally adopted by the Egyptians, and from them passed into other nations. The first,” says the Marquis, who seem to have got a knowledge of this system, were the Phenicians; they imparted it to the Arabians, to the Jews, and carried it over to Greece. From that country it was exported to the several islands, carried to the continent, and reached the northern nations. The Chinese alone refused to adopt the valuable discovery; proud of the antiquity of their social establishment, believing themselves superior to the rest of mankind, they still adhered to their ancient mode of writing. This, as I have already observed, though originally the same with that used by the Egyptians, became, in process of time, materially different, being made up of arbitrary marks, which are for the most part ideographical. With the discovery of the alphabet, however, a very material change took place

in regard to hieroglyphics. Originally, as we have seen, they had been the common, nay, the sole mode of writing, employed by the nation at large, in all the transactions of life, and through the policy of King Thamus, the alphabetical letters were kept secret: but, as soon as this discovery became known, the contrary happened; alphabetical writing became common, and hieroglyphics mysterious, not because they were purposely hidden in mystery, but simply because they required greater application and greater trouble. They indeed still continued to be used in matters of religion, funerals, public monuments, and the like; but in all business, and common transactions, the alphabetical writing was employed. This was a necessary consequence of the general use of hieroglyphics in their primitive state; for although the Egyptians might, and, in fact, did, give the preference to the alphabet, yet they did not think it necessary to erase the old hieroglyphical characters from their temples, from their obelisks, from their tombs, and religious vases. The priests, therefore, still continued to study and preserve the knowledge of hieroglyphics; and these, partly by their showy nature, partly by the continuation of the old custom, continued still to be used in public monuments of a votive and funeral nature. To distinguish them, therefore, from the alphabetical letters newly invented, they obtained the name of sacred, on the score of their being employed only in matters of religion. The priests, however, who had already invented a new set of arbitrary marks, as a shorter way of hieroglyphical writing, which they employed exclusively in transactions which concerned their body and their pursuits, after the invention of the alphabet turned these marks into letters, and thus they formed another set of characters, or mode of writing, to which they gave the appellation of hieratic, as belonging exclusively to their order. In these characters they wrote all historical, political, and religious transactions. And as the common, or demotic letters were employed in all the common business of life, and hieroglyphics confined to public monuments, and funereal and votive ceremonies, the Egyptians became possessed of at least three different modes of writing, or sets of characters, which were hieroglyphic, demotic, and hieratic. Whether the priests had invented another set of characters, unknown to the people, and in which they concealed their doctrine and their knowledge, is a question which cannot be solved at present. The want of monuments disables us from saying any thing of a decisive nature on this subject. One thing alone we can suppose with certainty, that if such a mode of writing did ever exist, and for the purpose for which it is supposed to have existed, the knowledge of it must have been confined to the priests only, and the records so written concealed with the greatest care from the eye of the nation. If, therefore, such records exist, they must be sought for in the dwelling of the hierophant, in the most recondite places of the temples; perhaps in those subterraneous passages which now lie hidden under mountains of sand, and in which no one but the priests were ever permitted to enter.”



The whole of this account, we may however observe, is far from being satisfactory. Whether the early Egyptians wrote hieroglyphics at all, no monuments yet discovered are so ancient as to prove; since all such characters now known must have been written subsequently to the advancement of the kingdom into great power, and after considerable progress had been made in architecture and other arts. The passage, too, in Plato, on which the argument is made to depend, may just as well refer to the running-hand or abridged hieroglyphical signs, as to alphabetical writing; and the supposition, that the priests gave an alphabetical character to this kind of abridged pictorial writing after the discovery of the real alphabet, (and alphabetical Ackerblad and Dr. Young have proved it to be,) is quite hypothetic. We think it more probable that alphabetical writing is much older than the hieroglyphics; that the phonetic hieroglyphics were fanciful representations of the alphabetic characters, intermingled with those symbols which idolatry and the natural peculiarities of Egypt would suggest; that the whole was originally easy to be deciphered by those who knew letters at all; and that the leading motive of fixing them on public monuments in preference to literal inscriptions, was the taste of the day, which custom, antiquity, and superstition at length consecrated. We have thus an easy way of accounting for the alphabetical, though obscure, character of the hieroglyphic running-hand, or hieratic writing, so much used in manuscripts. As an abridged form of the hieroglyphical outline, it would at least be phonetic wherever the hieroglyphic was so; and where that was symbolical, it would naturally present greater difficulty in deciphering, which, in fact, has been proved to be the case, by modern students in the art. It is, indeed, acknowledged by those who advocate the priority of the hieroglyphic to the alphabetic signs, that the number of ideas which could thus be expressed is few; and this the Marquis Spineto considers as a presumptive proof of his theory. In these early ages, the position of mankind after the flood," he observes, was such as to preclude the possibility of supposing that they had many ideas and many wants; therefore we may reasonably conclude, that their language consisted of words only which were intended to express the things most necessary to life, and consequently contained a small number of words." We know, indeed, that it is the notion of many infidel writers, that the original race or races of mankind were a sort of savages; and that a state of society gradually increased the ideas, and enriched the language of those who at first were capable of uttering but a few simple articulate sounds; but that any person should talk in a similar strain, who professes to receive the Mosaic history, is absurd. The antediluvians had surely much knowledge. Many arts were invented before the flood; and the ark itself is a vast monument of mechanical skill. Arts, science, morals, legislation, theology, were all known before the flood; and were all transmitted from the old

world to the new, by Noah and his sons. These were not men of few ideas," nor was the pastoral mode of life incompatible with great moral knowledge, eloquence, and the highest and richest poetry, as we see in the book of Job. Men were not then, as many moderns have supposed, a race of babies, able only to ask for what they needed to eat and drink, or childishly to play with; and we may therefore rest assured that they had a language so copious, and enunciations of ideas so various in their respective tongues, that picture writing neither was nor could be adequate to their full expression. The true origin of hieroglyphic writing is still unexplained; and will, after all, probably, remain inexplicable: but it has little claim to be considered as the first mode of expressing the sounds of language. As for the Chinese language, it is evident that it cannot be urged in proof of alphabetical writing having in all cases passed through the process above mentioned; for to this day the Chinese have no alphabet. As a language it is indeed peculiar, as being wholly monosyllabic; and we must be better acquainted with the early circumstances of that people before we can account for either. See Writing.

LEVIATHAN, לְוִיָּתָן, Job iii, 8; xli, 1; Psalm lxxiv, 14; civ, 26; Isa. xxvii, 1. The old commentators concurred in regarding the whale as the animal here intended. Beza and Diodati were among the first to interpret it the crocodile: and Bochart has since supported this last rendering with a train of argument which has nearly overwhelmed all opposition, and brought almost every commentator over to his opinion. It is very certain that it could not be the whale, which does not inhabit the Mediterranean, much less the rivers that empty themselves into it; nor will the characteristics at all apply to the whale. The crocodile, on the contrary, is a natural inhabitant of the Nile, and other Asiatic and African rivers; of enormous voracity and strength, as well as fleetness in swimming; attacks mankind and the largest animals with most daring impetuosity; when taken by means of a powerful net, will often overturn the boats that surround it; has, proportionally, the largest mouth of all monsters whatever; moves both its jaws equally, the upper of which has not less than forty, and the lower than thirty-eight sharp, but strong and massy, teeth; and is furnished with a coat of mail, so scaly and callous as to resist the force of a musket ball in every part, except under the belly. Indeed, to this animal the general character of the leviathan seems so well to apply, that it is unnecessary to seek farther.

LEVITES. Under this name may be comprised all the descendants of Levi; but it principally denotes those who were employed in the lowest ministries of the temple, by which they were distinguished from the priests, who, being descended from Aaron, were likewise of the race of Levi by Kohath, but were employed in higher offices. The Levites were descendants of Levi, by Gershom, Kohath, and Merari, excepting the family of Aaron; for

the children of Moses had no part in the priesthood, and were only common Levites. God chose the Levites instead of the first-born of all Israel, for the service of his tabernacle and temple, Num. iii, 6, &c. They obeyed the priests in the ministrations of the temple, and brought to them wood, water, and other things necessary for the sacrifices. They sung and played on instruments, in the temple, &c; they studied the law, and were the ordinary judges of the country, but subordinate to the priests. God provided for the subsistence of the Levites, by giving them the tithe of corn, fruit, and cattle; but they paid to the priests the tenth of their tithes; and as the Levites possessed no estates in the land, the tithes which the priests received from them were looked on as the first-fruits which they were to offer to the Lord, Num. xviii, 21–24. God assigned them for their habitations forty-eight cities, with fields, pastures, and gardens, Num. xxxv. Of these thirteen were given to the priests, six of which were cities of refuge, Joshua xx, 7; xxi, 19, 20, &c. While the Levites were actually employed in the temple, they were subsisted out of the provisions in store there, and out of the daily offerings there made; and if any Levite quitted the place of his abode, to serve the temple, even out of the time of his half-yearly 583or weekly waiting, he was received there, kept and provided for, in like manner as his other brethren, who were regularly in waiting, Deut. xviii, 6–8. The consecration of Levites was without much ceremony. They wore no particular habit to distinguish them from the other Israelites, and God ordained nothing particularly for their mourning, 2 Chron. xxix, 34. The manner of their consecration may be seen in Num. viii, 5–7, &c.

Josephus says, that in the reign of Agrippa, king of the Jews, about A. D. 62, six years before the destruction of the temple by the Romans, the Levites desired permission from that prince to wear the linen tunic like the priests; and this was granted. This innovation was displeasing to the priests; and the Jewish historian remarks, that the ancient customs of the country were never forsaken with impunity. He adds, that Agrippa permitted likewise the families of the Levites, whose duty it was to guard the doors, and perform other troublesome offices, to learn to sing and play on instruments, that they might be qualified for the temple service as musicians. The Levites were divided into different classes: Gershonites, Kohathites, Merarites, and Aaronites or priests, Num. iii, &c. The Gershonites, whose number was seven thousand five hundred, were employed in the marches through the wilderness in carrying the veils and curtains of the tabernacle; the Kohathites, whose number was eight thousand six hundred, in carrying the ark and sacred vessels of the tabernacle; the Merarites, whose number was six thousand two hundred, in carrying the several pieces of the tabernacle which could not be placed upon the chariots; and the Aaronites were the priests who served the sanctuary. When the Hebrews encamped in the wilderness, the Levites

were placed around the tabernacle; Moses and Aaron at the east, Gershon at the west, Kohath at the south, and Merari at the north. Moses ordained that the Levites should not begin in the service of the tabernacle till they were five-and-twenty years of age, Num. viii, 24–26; or, as he says elsewhere, from thirty to fifty years old, Num. iv, 3. But David, finding that they were no longer employed in these grosser offices of transporting the vessels of the tabernacle, appointed them to enter on service at the temple at twenty years of age. The priests and Levites waited by turns, weekly, in the temple. They began their weeks on one Sabbath day, and on the Sabbath day in the following week went out of waiting, 1 Chronicles xxiii, 24; 2 Chron. xxi, 17; Ezra iii, 8. When an Israelite made a religious entertainment in the temple, God required that the Levites should be invited to it, Deut. xii, 18, 19.

LEVITICUS, a canonical book of Scripture, being the third book of the Pentateuch of Moses; thus called because it contains principally the laws and regulations relating to the Levites, priests, and sacrifices; for which reason the Hebrews call it the law of the priests, because it includes many ordinances concerning their services. See Pentateuch.

LIBATION. This word is used in sacrificial language, to express an affusion of liquors, poured upon victims to be sacrificed to the Lord. The quantity of wine for a libation was the fourth part of a hin, rather more than two pints. Libations among the Hebrews were poured on the victim after it was killed, and the several pieces of it were laid on the altar, ready to be consumed by the flames, Lev. vi, 20; viii, 25, 26; ix, 4; xvi, 12, 20. These libations consisted in offerings of bread, wine, and salt. The Greeks and Latins offered libations with the sacrifices, but they were poured on the victim's head while it was living. So Sinon, relating the manner in which he was to be sacrificed, says he was in the priest's hands ready to be slain, was loaded with bands and garlands; that they were preparing to pour upon him the libations of grain and salted meal:--

Jamque dies infanda aderat, mihi sacra parari,  
Et salsæ fruges, et circum tempora vittæ.  
Æneid ii, 130, 131.

[And now the horrible day being come, they began to prepare for me the sacred rites.]

The salted barley on my front was spread,  
The sacred fillets bound my destined head.”  
Pitt.

And Dido, beginning to sacrifice, pours wine between the horns of the victim:--

Ipsa tenens dextra pateram pulcherrima Dido,  
Candenti vaccæ media inter cornua fudit.  
Æneid iv.

The queen before the snowy heifer stands,  
Amid the shrines, a goblet in her hands;  
Between the horns she sheds the sacred wine,  
And pays due honours to the powers divine.”  
Pitt.

St. Paul describes himself, as it were, a victim about to be sacrificed, and that the accustomed libations of meal and wine were already, in a manner, poured upon him: For I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand,” 2 Tim. iv, 6. The same expressive sacrificial term occurs in Phil. ii, 17, where the Apostle represents the faith of the Philippians as a sacrifice, and his own blood as a libation poured forth to hallow and consecrate it: “Yea, and if I be offered, σπένδομαι, upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ, I joy and rejoice with you all.”

LIBERTINES. Mention is made of the synagogue of the Libertines, Acts vi, 9; concerning whom there are different opinions, two of which bid fairest for the truth. The first is that of Grotius and Vitringa, that they were Italian Jews or proselytes. The ancient Romans distinguished between libertus and libertinus. Libertus was one who had been a slave, and obtained his freedom; libertinus was the son of a libertus. But this distinction in after ages was not strictly observed; and libertinus also came to be used for one not born, but made free, in opposition to ingenuus, or one born free. Whether the libertini mentioned in this passage of the Acts were Gentiles, who had become proselytes to Judaism, or native Jews, who having been made slaves to the Romans were afterward set at liberty, and in remembrance of their captivity called themselves 584libertini, and formed a synagogue by themselves, is differently conjectured by the learned. It is probable the Jews of Cyrenia, Alexandria, &c, built synagogues at Jerusalem at their own charge, for the use of their brethren who came from those countries; as the Danes, Swedes, &c, build churches for the use of their own countrymen in London; and that the Italian Jews did the same; and because the greatest number of them were libertini, their synagogue was therefore called the synagogue of the Libertines. The other opinion, which is hinted by Œcumenius on the Acts, and mentioned by Dr. Lardner, as more lately advanced by Mr. Daniel Gerdes, professor of divinity in the university of Groningen, is this, that the Libertines are so called from a city or country called Libertus, or Libertina, in Africa, about Carthage. Suidas, in his Lexicon, on the word λιβερτινος, says it was ονομα εθνους, nomen gentis. [The name of a nation.] And the glossa interlinearis,

of which Nicolas de Lyra made great use in his notes, hath over the word *libertini, e regione*, denoting that they were so styled from a country. In the acts of the famous conference with the Donatists at Carthage, A. D. 411, there is mentioned one Victor, bishop of the church of Libertina: and in the acts of the Lateran council, which was held in 649, there is mention of *Januarius gratiâ Dei episcopus sanctæ ecclesiæ Libertinensis*; [Januarius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Libertina;] and therefore Fabricius, in his Geographical Index of Christian Bishoprics," has placed Libertina in what was called Africa Propria, or the proconsular province of Africa. Now, as all the other people of the several synagogues, mentioned in this passage of the Acts, are denominated from the places from whence they came, it is probable that the Libertines were so too; and as the Cyrenians and Alexandrians, who came from Africa, are placed next to the Libertines in that catalogue, it is probable they also belonged to the same country. So that, upon the whole, there is little reason to doubt of the Libertines being so called from the place from whence they came; and the order of the names in the catalogue might lead us to think, that they were farther off from Jerusalem than Alexandria and Cyrenia, which will carry us to the proconsular province in Africa about Carthage.

**LIBNAH**, a city in the southern part of the tribe of Judah, Joshua xv, 42, of which a cession was made to the priests for their habitation, and which was declared a city of refuge, 1 Chron. vi, 57.

**LIBYA**. The name, in its largest sense, was used by the Greeks to denote the whole of Africa. But Libya Proper, or the Libya of the New Testament, the country of the Lubims of the Old, was a large country lying along the Mediterranean, on the west of Egypt. It was called *Pentapolitana Regio* by Pliny, from its five chief cities, Berenice, Arsinoe, Ptolemais, Apollonia, and Cyrene; and *Libya Cyrenaica* by Ptolemy, from Cyrene its capital. Libya is supposed to have been first peopled by, and to have derived its name from, the Lehabim, or Lubim. These, its earlier inhabitants, appear in the times of the Old Testament, to have consisted of wandering tribes, who were sometimes in alliance with Egypt, and at others with the Ethiopians of Arabia; as they are said to have assisted both Shishak and Zerah in their expeditions into Judea, 2 Chron. xii, xiv, xvi. They were for a time sufficiently powerful to maintain a war with the Carthaginians, by whom they were in the end entirely overcome. Since that period, Libya, in common with the rest of the east, has successively passed into the hands of the Greeks, Romans, Saracens, and Turks. The city Cyrene, built by a Grecian colony, was the capital of this country, in which, and other parts, dwelt many Jews, who came up to Jerusalem at the feast of pentecost, together with those dispersed among other nations, and are called by St. Luke dwellers in the parts of Libya about Cyrene," Acts ii, 10.

LICE. Swarms of lice was the third plague with which God punished the Egyptians, Exod. viii, 16. The Hebrew word בְּנִיִּים, which the LXX render σκνίφες, some translate flies,” and think them the same as gnats. Origen says that the sciniphe is so small a fly, that it is scarcely perceptible to the eye, but that it occasions a sharp stinging pain. However, the original, according to the Syriac, and several good interpreters, signifies lice.”

But Josephus, the Jewish rabbins, and most of the modern translators render the Hebrew word at large lice; and Bochart and Bryant support this interpretation. The former argues that gnats could not be meant. 1. Because the creatures here mentioned sprang from the dust of the earth, and not from the waters. 2. Because they were both on men and cattle, which cannot be spoken of gnats. 3. Because their name comes from the radix בִּין, which signifies to make firm, fix, establish, which can never agree to gnats, flies, &c, which are ever changing their place, and are almost constantly on the wing. 4. Because כְּנֵה is the term by which the talmudists express the term louse, &c. To which may be added, that if they were winged and stinging insects, as Jerom, Origen, and others have supposed, the plague of flies is unduly anticipated; and the next miracle will be only a repetition of the former. Mr. Bryant, in illustrating the aptness of this miracle, has the following remarks: “The Egyptians affected great external purity, and were very nice both in their persons and clothing; bathing and making ablutions continually. Uncommon care was taken not to harbour any vermin. They were particularly solicitous on this head; thinking it would be a great profanation of the temple which they entered, if any animalcule of this sort were concealed in their garments.” The priests, says Herodotus, are shaved, both as to their heads and bodies, every third day, to prevent any louse, or any other detestable creature, being found upon them when they are performing their duty to the gods. The same is mentioned by another author, who adds, that all woollen was considered as foul, as from a perishable animal; but flax is the product of the immortal earth, affords a delicate and pure covering, and is not liable to harbour lice. We may hence see what an abhorrence the Egyptians showed toward this sort of vermin, and what care was taken by the priests to guard against them. The judgments, therefore, inflicted by the hands of Moses, were adapted to their prejudices. It was, consequently, not only most noisome to the people in general, but was no small odium to the most sacred order in Egypt, that they were overrun with these filthy and detestable vermin.

LIGHT, φῶς, is used in a physical sense, Matt. xvii, 2; Acts ix, 3; xii, 7; 2 Cor. iv, 6; for a fire giving light, Mark xiv, 54; Luke xxii, 56; for a torch, candle, or lamp, Acts xvi, 29; and for the material light of heaven, as the sun, moon, or stars, Psalm cxxxvi, 7; James i, 17. Figuratively taken, it

signifies a manifest or open state of things, Matt. x, 27; Luke xii, 3; also prosperity, truth, and joy.

God is said to dwell in light inaccessible, 1 Tim. vi, 16. This seems to contain a reference to the glory and splendour which shone in the holy of holies, where Jehovah appeared in the luminous cloud above the mercy seat, and which none but the high priest, and he only once a year, was permitted to approach unto, Lev. xvi, 2; Ezek. i, 22, 26, 28; but this was typical of the glory of the celestial world. It signifies, also, instruction, both by doctrine and example, Matt. v, 16; John v, 35; or persons considered as giving such light, Matt. v, 14; Rom. ii, 19. It is applied figuratively to Christ, the true Light, the Sun of Righteousness, who is that in the spiritual, which the material light is in the natural, world; who is the great Author, not only of illumination and knowledge, but of spiritual life, health, and joy to the souls of men.

The images of light and darkness, says Bishop Lowth, are commonly made use of in all languages to imply or denote prosperity and adversity, agreeably to the common sense and perception which all men have of the objects themselves. But the Hebrews employ those metaphors more frequently and with less variation than other people: indeed, they seldom refrain from them whenever the subject requires or will even admit of their introduction. These expressions, therefore, may be accounted among those forms of speech, which in the parabolic style are established and defined; since they exhibit the most noted and familiar images, and the application of them on this occasion is justified by an acknowledged analogy, and approved by constant and unvarying custom. In the use of images, so conspicuous and so familiar among the Hebrews, a degree of boldness is excusable. The Latins introduce them more sparingly, and therefore are more cautious in the application of them. But the Hebrews, upon a subject more sublime indeed, in itself, and illustrating it by an idea which was more habitual to them, more daringly exalt their strains, and give a loose rein to the spirit of poetry. They display, for instance, not the image of the spring, of Aurora, of the dreary night, but the sun and stars as rising with increased splendour in a new creation, or again involved in chaos and primeval darkness. Does the sacred bard promise to his people a renewal of the divine favour, and a recommencement of universal prosperity? In what magnificent colours does he depict it! Such, indeed, as no translation can illustrate, but such as none can obscure:--

The light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun,  
And the light of the sun shall be sevenfold.”

Isaiah xxx, 26.

But even this is not sufficient:--



No longer shalt thou have the sun for thy light by day;  
Nor by night shall the brightness of the moon enlighten thee:  
For Jehovah shall be to thee an everlasting light,  
And thy God shall be thy glory.  
Thy sun shall no more decline;  
Neither shall thy moon wane;  
For Jehovah shall be thine everlasting light;  
And the days of thy mourning shall cease.”  
Isaiah lx, 19, 20.

In another place he has admirably diversified the same sentiment:--

And the moon shall be confounded, and the sun shall be ashamed;  
For Jehovah, God of Hosts, shall reign  
On Mount Sion, and in Jerusalem:  
And before his ancients shall he be glorified.”  
Isaiah xxiv, 25.

On the other hand, denouncing ruin against the proud king of Egypt:--

And when I shall put thee out, I will cover the heavens,  
And the stars thereof will I make dark:  
I will involve the sun in a cloud,  
Nor shall the moon give out her light.  
All the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over thee,  
And I will set darkness upon thy land, saith the Lord Jehovah.”  
Ezekiel xxvii, 7, 8.

These expressions are bold and daring; but the imagery is well known, the use of it is common, the signification definite: they are therefore perspicuous, clear, and truly magnificent.

LIGN-ALOES. See Aloe.

LIGURE, לִשְׁמֹ, Exod. xxviii, 19; xxxix, 12, a precious stone of a deep red colour, with a considerable tinge of yellow. Theophrastus and Pliny describe it as resembling the carbuncle, of a brightness sparkling like fire.

LILY, 1 לִישָׁן Kings vii, 19, 22, 26; 2 Chron. iv, 5; Cant. ii, 2, 16; iv, 5; v, 13; vi, 2, 3; vii, 2; Hosea xiv, 5; κρίνον, Matt. vi, 28; Luke xii, 27; a well known sweet and beautiful flower, which furnished Solomon with a variety of charming images in his Song, and with graceful ornaments in the fabric and furniture of the temple. The title of some of the Psalms upon Shushan,” or Shoshanim,” Psalms xlv; lx; lxix; lxxx, probably means no more than that the music of these sacred compositions was to be regulated by that of some odes, which were known by those names or appellations. By the lily

586of the valley,” Cant. ii, 2, we are not to understand the humble flower, generally so called with us, the *lilium convallium*, but the noble flower which ornaments our gardens, and which in Palestine grows wild in the fields, and especially in the valleys. Pliny reckons the lily the next plant in excellency to the rose; and the gay Anacreon compares Venus to this flower. In the east, as with us, it is the emblem of purity and moral excellence. So the Persian poet, Sadi, compares an amiable youth to the white lily in a bed of narcissuses,” because he surpassed all the young shepherds in goodness. As, in Cant. v, 13, the lips are compared to the lily, Bishop Patrick supposes the lily here instanced to be the same which, on account of its deep red colour, is particularly called by Pliny *rubens lilium*, and which, he tells us, was much esteemed in Syria. Such may have been the lily mentioned in Matt. vi, 28–30; for the royal robes were purple: Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these:” so in Luke xii, 27. The scarcity of fuel in the east obliges the inhabitants to use, by turns, every kind of combustible matter. The withered stalks of herbs and flowers, the tendrils of the vine, the small branches of rosemary, and other plants, are all used in heating their ovens and bagnios. We can easily recognize this practice in that remark of our Lord, If God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?” Matt. vi, 30. The grass of the field, in this passage, evidently includes the lilies of which he had just been speaking, and, by consequence, herbs in general; and in this extensive sense the word *χόρτος* is not unfrequently taken. Those beautiful productions of nature, so richly arrayed, and so exquisitely perfumed, that the splendour even of Solomon is not to be compared to theirs, shall soon wither and decay, and be used as fuel. God has so adorned these flowers and plants of the field, which retain their beauty and vigour but for a few days, and are then applied to some of the meanest purposes of life: will he not much more take care of his servants who are so precious in his sight, and designed for such important services in the world? This passage is one of those of which Sir Thomas Browne says, The variously interspersed expressions from plants and flowers elegantly advantage the significancy of the text.”

Mr. Salt, in his *Voyage to Abyssinia*,” says, “At a few miles from Adowa, we discovered a new and beautiful species of amaryllis, which bore from ten to twelve spikes of bloom on each stem, as large as those of the belladonna, springing from one common receptacle. The general colour of the corolla was white, and every petal was marked with a single streak of bright purple down the middle. The flower was sweet scented, and its smell, though much more powerful, resembled that of the lily of the valley. This superb plant excited the admiration of the whole party; and it brought

immediately to my recollection the beautiful comparison used on a particular occasion by our Saviour: 'I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.'" And Sir James E. Smith observes, "It is natural to presume the divine Teacher, according to his usual custom, called the attention of his hearers to some object at hand; and as the fields of the Levant are overrun with the *amaryllis lutea*, whose golden lilaceous flowers in autumn afford one of the most brilliant and gorgeous objects in nature, the expression of 'Solomon in all his glory not being arrayed like one of these,' is peculiarly appropriate. I consider the feeling with which this was expressed as the highest honour ever done to the study of plants; and if my botanical conjecture be right, we learn a chronological fact respecting the season of the year when the sermon on the mount was delivered."

LIME, *שיד*, Deut. xxvii, 2, 4; Isaiah xxxiii, 12; Amos ii, 1; a soft friable substance, obtained by calcining or burning stones, shells, or the like. From Isa. xxxiii, 12, it appears that it was made in a kiln lighted with thorn bushes; and from Amos ii, 1, that bones were sometimes calcined for lime. The use of it was for plaster or cement, the first mention of which is in Deut. xxvii, where Moses directed the elders of the people, saying, Keep all the commandments which I command you this day. And it shall be on the day when you shall pass over Jordan unto the land which the Lord your God giveth you, that you shall set up great stones, and plaster them with plaster, and shall write upon them all the words of this law," &c. The book of the law, in order to render it the more sacred, was deposited beside the ark of the covenant. The guardians of the law, to whom was entrusted the duty of making faithful transcripts of it, were the priests. But Moses did not account even this precaution sufficient for the due preservation of his law in its original purity; for he commanded that it should beside be engraven on stones, and these stones kept on a mountain near Sichem, in order that a genuine exemplar of it might be transmitted even to the latest generations.

LION, *ארי*, or *ארה*, Genesis xlix, 9; Deut. xxxiii, 22; Psalm vii, 2; xxii, 13; Hosea xiii, 8; Micah v, 8; a large beast of prey, for his courage and strength called the king of beasts. This animal is produced in Africa, and the hottest parts of Asia. It is found in the greatest numbers in the scorched and desolate regions of the torrid zone, in the deserts of Zaara and Billdulgerid, and in all the interior parts of the vast continent of Africa. In these desert regions, from whence mankind are driven by the rigorous heat of the climate, this animal reigns sole master. His disposition seems to partake of the ardour of his native soil. Inflamed by the influence of a burning sun, his rage is tremendous, and his courage undaunted. Happily, indeed, the species is not numerous, and is said to be 587greatly diminished; for, if we

may credit the testimony of those who have traversed those vast deserts, the number of lions is not nearly so great as formerly. Mr. Shaw observes that the Romans carried more lions from Libya in one year for their public spectacles, than could be found in all that country at this time. The lion was also found in Palestine, and the neighbouring countries. The length of the largest lion is between eight and nine feet, the tail about four, and its height about four feet and a half. The female is about one-fourth part less, and without a mane. As the lion advances in years, his mane grows longer and thicker. The hair on the rest of the body is short and smooth, of a tawny colour, but whitish on the belly. Its roaring is loud and dreadful. When heard in the night it resembles distant thunder. Its cry of anger is much louder and shorter. The attachment of a lioness to her young is remarkably strong. For their support she is more ferocious than the lion himself; makes her incursions with greater boldness; destroys, without distinction, every animal that falls in her way, and carries it reeking to her cubs. She usually brings forth in the most retired and inaccessible places; and when afraid that her retreat should be discovered, endeavours to hide her track by brushing the ground with her tail. When much disturbed or alarmed, she will sometimes transport her young, which are usually three or four in number, from one place to another in her mouth; and, if obstructed in her course, will defend them to the last extremity. The habits of the lion and the lioness afford many spirited, and often sublime, metaphors to the sacred writers.

The lion has several names in Scripture, according to his different ages or character: 1. גור, a little lion, a lion's whelp, Deut. xxxiii, 22; Jer. li, 38; Ezek. xix, 2; Nahum ii, 13. 2. כפיר, a young lion that has done sucking the lioness, and, leaving the covert, begins to seek prey for himself. So Ezekiel xix, 2, 3: The lioness hath brought up one of her whelps; it became a chephir; it learned to catch the prey; it devoured men." See Psalm xci, 13; Prov. xix, 12. 3. ארי, a grown and vigorous lion, having whelps, eager in pursuit of prey for them, Nahum ii, 12; valiant, 2 Sam. xvii, 10; arrogantly opposing himself, Num. xxiii, 24. This is, indeed, the general name, and occurs frequently. 4. שחל, one in the full strength of his age; a black lion, Job iv, 10; x, 16; Psalm xci, 13; Prov. xxvi, 13; Hosea v, 14; xiii, 7. 5. ליש, a fierce or enraged lion, Job iv, 11; Prov. xxx, 30; Isaiah xxv, 6. A regard to these characteristics and distinctions is very important for illustrating the passages of Scripture where the animal is spoken of, and discovering the propriety of the allusions and metaphors which he so often furnishes to the Hebrew poets. The lion of the tribe of Judah, mentioned Rev. v, 5, is Jesus Christ, who sprung from the tribe of Judah, and overcame death, the world, and the devil. The lion from the swelling of Jordan, Jer. l, 44, is Nebuchadnezzar marching against Judea, with the strength and fierceness of a lion. Isaiah, describing the happy time of the Messiah, says, that then

the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling should lie down together; and that a little child should lead them; and that the lion should eat straw like the ox, Isaiah xi, 6, 7, which is hyperbolical, and signifies the peace and happiness which the church of Christ should enjoy. The lion hath roared, and who shall not fear?" Amos iii, 8. "The king's wrath is as the roaring of a lion. Who provoketh him to anger sinneth against his own soul," Prov. xix, 12; xx, 2; that is, he seeketh his own death. Solomon says, A living dog is better than a dead lion," Eccles. x, 4; showing that death renders those contemptible who otherwise are the greatest, most powerful, and most terrible.

Then went Samson down and, behold, a young lion roared against him, and the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and he rent him as he would have rent a kid, and he had nothing in his hand," Judges xiv, 5, 6. An instance in quite modern times of an unarmed man attempting to combat a lion is related by Poiret: "In a douar, or a camp of Bedouin Arabs, near La Calle, a French factory, a young lion had seized a cow. A young Moor threw himself upon the savage beast, to tear his booty from him, and as it were to stifle him in his arms, but he would not let go his prey. The father of the young man hastened to him, armed with a kind of hoe; and aiming at the lion, struck his son's hand, and cut off three of his fingers. It cost a great deal of trouble to rescue the prey from the lion. I saw this young man, who was attended by Mr. Gay, at that time surgeon to the hospital of La Calle." David, according to 1 Sam. xvii, 34, had, when a shepherd, once fought with a lion, and another time with a bear, and rescued their prey from them. Tellez relates, that an Abyssinian shepherd had once killed a lion of extraordinary size with only two poles. Behold, he shall come up like a lion from the swelling of Jordan against the habitation of the strong," Jer. xlix, 19. The comparison used by the prophet in these words will be perfectly understood by the account which Mr. Maundrell gives of the river Jordan: After having descended," says he, "the outermost bank of Jordan, you go about a furlong upon a level strand, before you come to the immediate bank of the river. This second bank is so beset with bushes and trees, such as tamarisks, willows, oleanders, &c, that you can see no water till you have made your way through them. In this thicket anciently, and the same is reported of it at this day, several sorts of wild beasts were wont to harbour themselves, whose being washed out of the covert by the overflowings of the river gave occasion to that allusion: 'He shall come up like a lion from the swelling of Jordan.'"

He shall be cast into the den of lions," Dan. vi, 7. In Morocco," says Höst, "the king has a lions' den, into which men, particularly Jews, are sometimes thrown; but the latter generally come off unhurt, because the keepers of these animals are Jews, who may safely be with them, with

a rod in the hand, if they only take care to go out backward, as the lion does not suffer any one to turn his back upon him. The other Jews do not let their brethren remain longer than a night among the lions, as they might otherwise become too hungry; but ransom them with money, which is, in fact, the king's object." In another place in the same work we find the following description of the construction of this lions' den: "At one end of the royal palace there is a place for ostriches and their young; and beyond the other end, toward the mountains, there is a large lions' den, which consists of a large square hole in the ground, with a partition, in the middle of which there is a door, which the Jews, who are obliged to maintain and keep them for nothing, are able to open and shut from above, and can thus entice the lions, by means of the food, from one division to the other, to clean the other in the mean time. It is all in the open air, and a person may look down over a wall, which is a yard and a quarter high."

LITANY, a solemn form of supplication to God. The word is derived from *λειτουργία*, supplication. At first the use of litanies was not fixed to any stated time; but they were employed only as exigencies required. They were observed in imitation of the Ninevites with ardent supplications and fastings, to avert the threatened judgments of fire, earthquake, inundations, or hostile invasions. The days on which they were used were called rogation days. Several of these days were appointed by the canons of different councils, till the seventeenth council of Toledo decreed that litanies should be used in every month. Thus, by degrees, these solemn supplications came to be used weekly, on Wednesdays and Fridays, the ancient stationary days in all churches. As to the form in which litanies are made, namely, in short petitions by the priest with responses by the people, St. Chrysostom derives the custom from the primitive ages, when the priest began and uttered by the Spirit some things fit to be prayed for, and the people joined the intercessions, saying, We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord." When the miraculous gift of the Spirit began to cease, they wrote down several of these forms, which were the original of our present litanies. St. Ambrose has left us one, which agrees in many particulars with that of our own church. About the year 400, litanies began to be used in processions, the people walking barefoot, and repeating them with great devotion. It is pretended that several countries were delivered from great calamities by this means. About the year 600, Gregory the Great, from all the litanies extant, composed the famous sevenfold litany, by which Rome, it is said, was delivered from a grievous mortality. This has served as a pattern to all the western churches since; and to it ours of the church of England comes nearer than that of the Romish missal, in which later popes have inserted the invocation of saints, which our Reformers properly expunged. These processional litanies having occasioned much scandal, it was decreed that in future the litanies should be used only within the walls

of the church. Before the last review of the Common Prayer, the litany was a distinct service by itself, and used some time after the morning prayer was ended. At present it forms one office with the morning service, being ordered to be read after the third collect for grace, instead of the intercessional prayers in the daily service.

LITURGY denotes all the ceremonies in general belonging to divine service. The word comes from the Greek, *λειτῦργία*, public service, or public ministry; formed of *λεῖτος*, public, and *ἔργον*, work. In a more restrained signification, liturgy is used among the Romanists to signify the mass; and among us, the common prayer. All who have written on liturgies agree that, in primitive days, divine service was exceedingly simple, clogged with very few ceremonies, and consisted of but a very small number of prayers; but, by degrees, they increased the number of ceremonies, and added new prayers, to render the office more awful and venerable to the people. At length, things were carried to such a pitch that a regulation became necessary; and it was found needful to put the service, and the manner of performing it, into writing; and this was what they called a liturgy. Liturgies have been different at different times and in different countries. We have the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, of St. Peter, the Armenian liturgy, Gallican liturgy, &c. The properties required in a public liturgy," says Paley, are these: it must be compendious; express just conceptions of the divine attributes; recite such wants as a congregation are likely to feel, and no other; and contain as few controverted propositions as possible." The liturgy of the church of England was composed A. D. 1547, and established in the second year of King Edward VI. In the fifth year of this prince, it was reviewed, because some things were contained in that liturgy which showed a compliance with the superstitions of those times; and exceptions were taken against it by learned men at home, and by Calvin abroad. Some alterations were made in it, which consisted in adding the general confession and absolution, and the communion service, to begin with the commandments. The use of oil in confirmation and extreme unction, was left out, and also prayers for souls departed, and what related to a belief of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. The liturgy, so reformed, was established by the acts of 5th and 6th of Edward VI., chap. 1. However, it was abolished by Queen Mary, who enacted that the service should stand as it was commonly used in the last year of King Henry VIII. That of Edward VI. was reestablished, with some few alterations, by Elizabeth. Some farther alterations were introduced, in consequence of the review of the Common Prayer Book, by order of King James, in the first year of his reign; particularly in the office of private baptism, in several rubrics, and other passages, with the 589 addition of five or six new prayers and thanksgivings, and all that part of the catechism which contains the doctrines of the sacraments. This Book of Common Prayer, so altered,

remained in force from the first year of King James to the fourteenth of Charles II. The last review of the liturgy was in the year 1661. It is an invidious cavil, says Dr. Nichols, that our liturgy was compiled out of popish books. Our reformers took nothing from them, but what was taken before from the oldest writers. We have many things out of the Greek liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom; more out of the litanies of Ambrose and Gregory; very much out of the ancient forms of the church dispersed in the works of the fathers, who wrote long before the Roman Breviary, and Canon of the Mass. Our Reformers added many prayers, and thanksgivings, and exhortations, to supply the defect.

LIZARD, לִטְאוֹה, Levit. xi, 30. All interpreters agree that the original word here signifies a sort of lizard. Bochart takes it for that kind which is of a reddish colour, lies close to the earth, and is of a venomous nature.

LOCUST, אַרְבֵּה. The word is probably derived from אַרְבֵּה, which signifies to multiply, to become numerous, &c; because of the immense swarms of these animals by which different countries, especially in the east, are infested. See this circumstance referred to, Judges vi, 5; vii, 12; Psalm cv, 34; Jer. xlv, 23; li, 14; Joel i, 4; Nahum iii, 15; Judith ii, 19, 20; where the most numerous armies are compared to the arbeh, or locust.

The locust, in entomology, belongs to a genus of insects known among naturalists by the name of grylli. The common great *σκινοφες* brown locust is about three inches in length, has two antennæ about an inch long, and two pairs of wings. The head and horns are brown; the mouth, and insides of the larger legs, bluish; the upper side of the body, and upper wings, brown; the former spotted with black, and the latter with dusky, spots. The back is defended by a shield of a greenish hue; the under wings are of a light brown hue, tintured with green, and nearly transparent. The general form and appearance of the insect is that of the grasshopper so well known in this country. These creatures are frequently mentioned in the Old Testament. They were employed as one of the plagues for the punishment of the Egyptians; and their visitation was threatened to the Israelites as a mark of the divine displeasure. Their numbers and destructive powers very aptly fit them for this purpose. When they take the field, they always follow a leader, whose motions they invariably observe. They often migrate from their native country, probably in quest of a greater supply of food. On these occasions they appear in such large flocks as to darken the air; forming many compact bodies or swarms, of several hundred yards square. These flights are very frequent in Barbary, and generally happen at the latter end of March or beginning of April, after the wind has blown from the south for some days. The month following, the young brood also make their appearance, generally following the track of the old ones. In whatever



country they settle, they devour all the vegetables, grain, and, in fine, all the produce of the earth; eating the very bark off the trees; thus destroying at once the hopes of the husbandman, and all the labours of agriculture: for though their voracity is great, yet they contaminate a much greater quantity than they devour; as their bite is poisonous to vegetables, and the marks of devastation may be traced for several succeeding seasons. There are various species of them, which consequently have different names; and some are more voracious and destructive than others, though all are most destructive and insatiable spoilers. Bochart enumerates ten different kinds which he thinks are mentioned in the Scripture.

Writers in natural history bear abundant testimony to the Scriptural account of these creatures. Dr. Shaw describes at large the numerous swarms and prodigious broods of those locusts which he saw in Barbary. Dr. Russel says, Of the noxious kinds of insects may well be reckoned the locusts, which sometimes arrive in such incredible multitudes, that it would appear fabulous to give a relation of them; destroying the whole of the verdure wherever they pass." Captain Woodroffe, who was for some time at Astrachan, a city near the Volga, sixty miles to the north-west of the Caspian Sea, in latitude 47°, assures us, that, from the latter end of July to the beginning of October, the country about that city is frequently infested with locusts, which fly in such prodigious numbers as to darken the air, and appear at a distance as a heavy cloud. As for the Mosaic permission to the Jews of eating the locusts, Lev. xi, 22, however strange it may appear to the mere English reader, yet nothing is more certain than that several nations, both of Asia and Africa, anciently used these insects for food; and that they are still eaten in the east to this day. Niebhur gives some account of the several species of locusts eaten by the Arabs, and of their different ways of dressing them for food. The Europeans," he adds, do not comprehend how the Arabs can eat locusts with pleasure; and those Arabs who have had no intercourse with the Christians will not believe, in their turn, that these latter reckon oysters, crabs, shrimps, cray-fish, &c, for dainties. These two facts, however, are equally certain." Locusts are often used figuratively by the prophets, for invading armies; and their swarms aptly represented the numbers, the desolating march of the vast military hordes and their predatory followers, which the ancient conquerors of the east poured down upon every country they attacked.

LOG, Lev. xiv, 12, a Hebrew measure for things liquid, containing five-sixths of a pint.

LOLLARDS, the supposed followers of Walter Lollard, or rather of Walter the Lollard, who, according to Dr. Mosheim, was a Dutchman of remarkable eloquence and piety, though tinctured with mysticism, and

who, for teaching sentiments contrary to the church of 590Rome, and nearly corresponding with those of Wickliffe, was burned alive at Cologne in 1322. But before this there existed, in different parts of Germany and Flanders, various societies of Cellites, to whom the term Lollards was applied, and who were protected by the magistrates and inhabitants, on account of their usefulness to the sick, and in burying the dead. They received the name Lollards, from the old German or Belgic word lullen, (Latin, lallo,) to sing with a low voice," to lull to sleep," (whence lullaby,) because when they carried to the grave, the bed of death, such as died of the plague, which at that period ravaged all Europe, they sung a dirge or hymn, probably, in a soft and mournful tone. These Lollards obtained many papal grants, by which their institution was confirmed, their persons exempted from the cognizance of the inquisitors, and subjected entirely to the jurisdiction of the bishops; and, at last, for their farther security, Charles, duke of Burgundy, in 1472, obtained a bull from Pope Sixtus IV., by which they were ranked among the religious orders, and delivered from the jurisdiction of their bishops; which privileges were yet more extended by Pope Julius II. in 1506.

In England the followers of Wickliffe were called Lollards by way of reproach, either on account of the humble offices of the original Lollards, (the Cellites,) or from the attachment of the Wickliffites to singing hymns. Their enemies probably meant to describe them as poor melancholy creatures, only fit to sing psalms at a funeral.

LOOKING GLASS. Moses states that the women who waited all night at the door of the tabernacle, cheerfully offered their looking glasses, to be employed in making a brazen laver for the purification of the priests, Exod. xxxviii, 8. These looking glasses were doubtless of brass, since the basin here mentioned, and the basis thereof, were made from them. The ancient looking glasses were mirrors, not made of glass as ours; but of brass, tin, silver, and a mixture of brass and silver, which last were the best and most valuable.

LORD'S DAY. See Sabbath.

LORD'S SUPPER, an ordinance instituted by our Saviour in commemoration of his death and sufferings. The institution of this sacrament is recorded by the first three evangelists, and by the Apostle Paul, whose words differ very little from those of his companion St. Luke; and the only difference between St. Matthew and St. Mark is, that the latter omits the words, for the remission of sins." There is so general an agreement among them all, that it will only be necessary to recite the words of one of them: Now, when the even was come, he sat down with the

twelve,” to eat the passover which had been prepared by his direction; and as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat: this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins,” Matt. xxvi, 20, 26–28. The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper being thus instituted, was adopted by all the early Christians, with very few exceptions; and no modern sect rejects it, except the Quakers and some mystics, who make the whole of religion to consist of contemplative love.

In the early times of the Gospel the celebration of the Lord’s Supper was both frequent and numerously attended. Voluntary absence was considered as a culpable neglect; and exclusion from it, by the sentence of the church, as a severe punishment. Every one brought an offering proportioned to his ability; these offerings were chiefly of bread and wine; and the priests appropriated as much as was necessary for the administration of the eucharist. The clergy had a part of what was left for their maintenance; and the rest furnished the repast called ἀγάπη, or love-feast, which immediately followed the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, and of which all the communicants, both rich and poor, partook. The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper greatly resembled the religious feasts to which the Jews were accustomed. At those feasts they partook of bread and wine in a serious and devout manner, after a solemn blessing or thanksgiving to God for his manifold mercies. This was particularly the case at the feast of the passover, which our Saviour was celebrating with his Apostles when he instituted this holy sacrament. At that feast, they commemorated the deliverance of their own peculiar nation from the bondage of Egypt; and there could not be a more suitable opportunity for establishing an ordinance which was to commemorate the infinitely more important deliverance of all mankind from the bondage of sin. The former deliverance was typical of the latter; and instead of keeping the Jewish passover, which was now to be abrogated, they were to commemorate Christ, their passover, who was sacrificed for them; the bread broken was to represent his body offered upon the cross; and the wine poured out was to represent his blood, which was shed for the salvation of men. The nourishment which these elements afford to our bodies is figurative of the salutary effects which the thing signified has upon our souls. And as the celebration of the passover was not only a constant memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites out of the land of Egypt, but also a symbolical action, by which they had a title to the blessings of the old covenant; so the celebration of the Lord’s Supper is not only a constant memorial of the death of Christ, but also a pledge or earnest to the communicant of the benefits promised by the new covenant. As the passover was instituted the night before the actual deliverance of the Israelites, so the Lord’s Supper was instituted the night before the

redemption of man was accomplished by the crucifixion of the blessed Jesus. It is to be partaken of by all who look for remission of sins by the death of Christ; we are not only to cherish that trust in our minds, and express it in our devotions, but we are to give an outward proof of our reliance upon the merits of his passion as the means of our salvation, by eating that bread, and drinking that wine, which are typical representations of the body and blood of Christ, who by his one oblation of himself once offered, made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.” See Sacraments.

LOT, the son of Haran, and nephew to Abraham. He accompanied his uncle from Ur to Haran, and from thence to Canaan; a proof of their mutual attachment, and similarity of principles respecting the true religion. With Abraham he descended into Egypt, and afterward returned with him into Canaan: but the multiplicity of their flocks, and still more the quarrels of their servants, rendered a friendly separation necessary. When God destroyed the cities of the plain with fire and brimstone, he delivered just Lot” from the conflagration, according to the account of the divine historian. The whole time that Lot resided there was twenty-three years. During all this period he had been a preacher of righteousness among this degenerate people. In him they had before their eyes an illustrious example of the exercise of genuine piety, supported by unsullied justice and benevolent actions. And doubtless it was for these purposes that Divine Providence placed him for a time in that city. The losses which Lot sustained on this melancholy occasion were very great; his wife, property, and all the prospects of the future settlement of his family blasted. Pity must therefore draw a friendly veil over the closing scene of this man of affliction; and let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall into deeds more reprehensible than those of Lot, without having equal trials and sufferings to plead in his favour. Respecting his wife, whether grieving for the loss of her property, or inwardly censuring the severity of the divine dispensation, or whether moved by unbelief or curiosity, cannot now be known; but, looking back, she became a pillar of salt, Gen. xix, 26. It would be endless to present the reader with all the opinions on this subject. Some contend that nothing more is meant than that she was suffocated: others, that a column or monument of metallic salt was erected upon her grave: others affirm that she became encrusted with the sulphur, insomuch that she appeared like an Egyptian mummy, which is embalmed with salt. Our Lord warns his disciples to remember Lot’s wife in their flight from Jerusalem, and not to imitate her tardiness, Luke xvii, 32.

2. Lot, any thing cast or drawn in order to determine any matter in question, Proverbs xviii, 18. We see the use of lots among the Hebrews in many places of Scripture: God commands, for example, that lots should be cast

upon the two goats which were offered for the sins of the people, upon the solemn day of expiation, to know which of the two should be sacrificed, and which liberated, Lev. xvi, 8–10. He required also that the land of promise should be divided by lot as soon as it was conquered; which command Joshua accordingly executed, Num. xxvi, 55, 56; xxxiii, 54; xxxiv, 13, &c; Joshua xiv-xvi; hence the term lot” is used for an inheritance, Thou maintainest my lot;” and figuratively for a happy state or condition. The priests and Levites had their cities appointed by lot. Lastly, in the time of David, the four and twenty classes of the priests and Levites were distributed by lot, to determine in what order they should wait in the temple, 1 Chron. vi, 54, 61; xxiv, 5; xxv, 8. In the division of the spoil, after victory, lots were likewise cast, to give every man his portion, Obadiah 11; Nahum iii, 10, &c. In the New Testament, after the death of Judas, lots were cast to decide who should occupy the place of the traitor, Acts i, 26. From the above instances, it is clear that when men have recourse to this method, the matter ought to be of the greatest importance, and no other apparent way left to determine it; and the manner of making the appeal should be solemn and grave, if we would escape the guilt of taking the name of God in vain. It unquestionably implies a solemn appeal to the Most High to interpose by his decision; and so every thinking man will be very careful that he has a true and religious ground for so serious a proceeding; and few if any cases can now occur in which it can have any justification. The ancient manner of casting lots, was either in some person’s lap,” or fold of the robe; into a helmet, or urn, or other vessel, in which they might be shaken before they were drawn or cast.

LOVE-FEASTS. It is Godwin’s opinion, that the agapæ, or love-feasts, of the primitive Christians, were derived from the  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota$  or feasts upon the sacrifices, at which the Jews entertained their friends, and fed the poor; Deut. xii, 18; xxvi, 12. There were also feasts of much the same kind in use among the Greeks and Romans. The former were wont to offer certain sacrifices to their gods, which were afterward given to the poor. They had likewise public feasts for certain districts, suppose for a town or a city, toward which all who could afford it, contributed, in proportion to their different abilities, and all partook of it in common. Of this sort were the  $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\sigma\iota\tau\iota\alpha$  of the Cretans; and the  $\phi\iota\delta\iota\tau\iota\alpha$  of the Lacedæmonians, instituted by Lycurgus, and so called  $\pi\alpha\rho\grave{\alpha}$  τῆς φιλίας, (the λ being changed into δ according to their usual orthography,) as denoting that love and friendship which they were intended to promote among neighbours and fellow citizens. The Romans likewise had a feast of the same kind, called charistia; which was a meeting only of those who were akin to each other; and the design of it was, that if any quarrel or misunderstanding had happened among any of them, they might there be reconciled. To this Ovid alludes in the second book of his Fasti:--

Proxima cognati dixere charistia cari,  
Et venit ad socios turba propinqua deos. v. 617.

[The feasts next in order beloved relatives called charistia, at which the kindred throng assembled under their family household gods.]

592In imitation either of these Jewish or Gentile love-feasts, or probably of both, the primitive Christians, in each particular church, had likewise their love-feasts, which were supplied by the contribution of the members, according to their several abilities, and partaken of by all in common. And whether they were converts from among the Jews or Gentiles, they retained their old custom with very little alteration, and as their ἀγάπαι had been commonly annexed to their sacrifices, so they were now annexed to the commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ at the Lord's Supper; and were therefore held on the Lord's day before or after the celebration of that ordinance. It would seem at Corinth, in the Apostles' days, they were ordinarily held before; for when the Corinthians are blamed for unworthily receiving the Lord's Supper, it is partly charged upon this, that some of them came drunk to that ordinance, having indulged to excess at the preceding love-feast: Every one taketh before, προλαμβάνει, his own supper, and one is hungry, and another is drunken," 1 Cor. xi, 21. This shows, says Dr. Whitby, that this banquet, namely, the love-feast, was celebrated before the Lord's Supper. But Chrysostom gives an account of it, as being in his time kept after it. It is commonly supposed, that when St. Jude mentions certain persons, who were spots in the feasts of charity, ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις, verse 12, he means in the Christian love-feasts; though Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Whitby apprehend the reference in this passage is rather a custom of the Jews, who, on the evening of their Sabbath, had their κοινωνία, or communion, when the inhabitants of the same city met in a common place to eat together. However that be, all antiquity bears testimony to the reality of the Christian ἀγάπαι, or love-feasts.

The most circumstantial account, says Dr. Townley, of the manner in which the ancient agapæ were celebrated, is given by Tertullian, in his Apology," written in the second century: Our supper," says he, which you accuse of luxury, shows its reason in its very name, for it is called ἀγάπη, that is, love. Whatever charge we are at, it is gain to be at expense upon the account of piety. For we therewith relieve and refresh the poor. There is nothing vile or immodest committed in it. For we do not sit down before we have first offered up prayer to God. We eat only to satisfy hunger, and drink only so much as becomes modest persons. We fill ourselves in such a manner, as that we remember still that we are to worship God by night. We discourse as in the presence of God, knowing that he hears us. Then, after water to wash our hands, and lights brought in, every one is moved to sing

some hymn to God, either out of Scripture, or, as he is able, of his own composing, and by this we judge whether he has observed the rules of temperance in drinking. Prayer again concludes our feast; and thence we depart, not to fight and quarrel; not to run about and abuse all we meet; not to give up ourselves to lascivious pastime; but to pursue the same care of modesty and chastity, as men that have fed at a supper of philosophy and discipline, rather than a corporeal feast.” Ignatius, in his epistle to the church of Smyrna, in the first century, affords us the additional information, that it was not lawful to baptize, or celebrate the love-feasts, without the bishop, or minister.” Lucian, the epicurean, has also a passage which seems to refer to the agapæ. He tells us that when Peregrinus, a Christian, was in prison, you might have seen, early in the morning, old women, some widows, and orphans, waiting at the prison. Their presidents bribed the guards, and lodged in the prison with him. Afterward (that is, in the evening) various suppers (that is, suppers consisting of various dishes, and various kinds of meat, brought thither by various persons of the company) were brought in, and they held their sacred conversations, ἱεροὶ λόγοι, or their sacred discourses were delivered.” Pliny, in his celebrated epistle to Trajan, mentions the “cibus promiscuus et innoxius,”--“common and harmless meal” of the Christians, which they ate together after the celebration of the eucharist. This primitive practice, though under a simpler form, and more expressly religious, is retained in modern times, only by the Moravians, and by the Wesleyan Methodists.

LOVE TO GOD. To serve and obey God on the conviction that it is right to serve and obey him, is in Christianity joined with that love to God which gives life and animation to service, and renders it the means of exalting our pleasures, at the same time that it accords with our convictions. The supreme love of God is the chief, therefore, of what have sometimes been called our theopathic affections. It is the sum and the end of the law; and though it has been lost by us in Adam, it is restored to us by Christ. When it regards God absolutely, and in himself, as a Being of infinite and harmonious perfections and moral beauties, it is that movement of the soul toward him which is produced by admiration, approval, and delight. When it regards him relatively, it fixes upon the ceaseless emanations of his goodness to us all in the continuance of the existence which he at first bestowed; the circumstances which render that existence felicitous; and, above all, upon that great love wherewith he loved us,” manifested in the gift of his Son for our redemption, and in saving us by his grace; or, in the forcible language of St. Paul, upon the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness to us through Christ Jesus.” Under all these views an unbounded gratitude overflows the heart which is influenced by this spiritual affection. But the love of God is more than a sentiment of gratitude: it rejoices in his perfections and glories, and devoutly contemplates them as the highest and

most interesting subjects of thought; it keeps the idea of this supremely beloved object constantly present to the mind; it turns to it with adoring ardour from the business and distractions of life; it connects it with every scene of majesty and beauty in nature, and with every event of general and 593 particular providence; it brings the soul into fellowship with God, real and sensible, because vital; it moulds the other affections into conformity with what God himself wills or prohibits, loves or hates; it produces an unbounded desire to please him, and to be accepted of him in all things; it is jealous of his honour, unwearied in his service, quick to prompt to every sacrifice in the cause of his truth and his church; and it renders all such sacrifices, even when carried to the extent of suffering and death, unreluctant and cheerful. It chooses God as the chief good of the soul, the enjoyment of which assures its perfect and eternal interest and happiness: Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee," is the language of every heart, when its love of God is true in principle and supreme in degree.

If, then, the will of God is the perfect rule of morals; and if supreme and perfect love to God must produce a prompt and unwearied, a delightful subjection to his will, or rather an entire and most free choice of it as the rule of all our principles, affections, and actions; the importance of this affection in securing that obedience to the law of God in which true morality consists, is manifest; and we clearly perceive the reason why an inspired writer has affirmed, that love is the fulfilling of the law." The necessity of keeping this subject before us under those views in which it is placed in the Christian system, and of not surrendering it to mere philosophy, is, however, an important consideration. With the philosopher the love of God may be the mere approval of the intellect; or a sentiment which results from the contemplation of infinite perfection, manifesting itself in acts of power and goodness. In the Scriptures it is much more than either, and is produced and maintained by a different process. We are there taught that the carnal mind is enmity to God," and is not, of course, capable of loving God. Yet this carnal mind may consist with deep attainments in philosophy, and with strongly impassioned poetic sentiment. The mere approval of the understanding, and the susceptibility of being impressed with feelings of admiration, awe, and even pleasure, when the character of God is manifested in his works, as both may be found in the carnal mind which is enmity to God, are not therefore the love of God. They are principles which enter into that love, since it cannot exist without them; but they may exist without this affection itself, and be found in a vicious and unchanged nature. The love of God is a fruit of the Holy Spirit; that is, it is implanted by him only in the souls which he has regenerated; and as that which excites its exercise is chiefly, and in the first place, a sense of the benefits bestowed by the grace of God in our redemption, and a well



grounded persuasion of our personal interest in those benefits, it necessarily presupposes our reconciliation to God through faith in the atonement of Christ, and that attestation of it to the heart by the Spirit of adoption. We here see, then, another proof of the necessary connection of Christian morals with Christian doctrine, and how imperfect and deceptive every system must be which separates them. Love is essential to true obedience; for when the Apostle declares love to be the fulfilling of the law," he declares, in effect, that the law cannot be fulfilled without love; and that every action which has not this for its principle, however virtuous in its show, fails of accomplishing the precepts which are obligatory upon us. But this love to God cannot be felt so long as we are sensible of his wrath, and are in dread of his judgments. These feelings are incompatible with each other, and we must be assured of his reconciliation to us, before we are capable of loving him. Thus the very existence of love to God implies the doctrines of atonement, repentance, faith, and the gift of the Spirit of adoption to believers; and unless it be taught in this connection, and through this process of experience, it will be exhibited only as a bright and beautiful object to which man has no access; or a fictitious and imitative sentimentalism will be substituted for it, to the delusion of the souls of men.

LUCIAN, a philosopher and wit, who appeared as one of the early opposers of the Christian religion and its followers. The hostile sentiments of the Heathens toward Christianity, says Dr. Neander, were different according to the difference of their philosophical and religious views. There entered then upon the contest two classes of men, who have never since ceased to persecute Christianity. These were the superstitious, to whom the honouring God in spirit and in truth was a stumbling stone, and the careless unbeliever, who, unacquainted with all feelings of religious wants, was accustomed to laugh and to mock at every thing which proceeded from them, whether he understood it or not, and at all which supposed such feelings, and proposed to satisfy them. Such was Lucian. To him Christianity, like every other remarkable religious phenomenon, appeared only as a fit object for his sarcastic wit. Without giving himself the trouble to examine and to discriminate, he threw Christianity, superstition, and fanaticism, into the same class. It is easy enough, in any system which lays deep hold on man's nature, to find out some side open to ridicule, if a man brings forward only that which is external in the system, abstracted from all its inward power and meaning, and without either understanding, or attempting to understand, this power. He, therefore, who looked on Christianity with cold indifference, and the profane every-day feelings of worldly prudence, might easily here and there find objects for his satire. The Christian might indeed have profited by that ridicule, and have learned from the children of darkness to join the wisdom of the serpent with the

meekness of the dove. In the end the scoffer brings himself to derision, because he ventures to pass sentence on the phenomena of a world of which he has not the slightest conception, and which to his eyes, buried as they are in the films of the earth, is entirely closed. Such was Lucian. He sought to bring forward all that is striking and remarkable in the external conduct and circumstances of Christians, which might serve for the object of his sarcastic raillery, without any deeper inquiry as to what the religion of the Christians really was. And yet even in that at which he scoffed, there was much which might have taught him to remark in Christianity no common power over the hearts of men, had he been capable of such serious impressions. The firm hope of eternal life which taught them to meet death with tranquillity, their brotherly love one toward another, might have indicated to him some higher spirit which animated these men; but instead of this he treats it all as delusion, because many gave themselves up to death with something like fanatical enthusiasm. He scoffs at the notion of a crucified man having taught them to regard all mankind as their brethren, the moment they should have abjured the gods of Greece; as if it were not just the most remarkable part of all this, that an obscure person in Jerusalem, who was deserted by every one, and executed as a criminal, should be able, a good century after his death, to cause such effects as Lucian, in his own time, saw extending in all directions, and in spite of every kind of persecution. How blinded must he have been to pass thus lightly over such a phenomenon! But men of his ready wit are apt to exert it with too great readiness on all subjects. They are able to illustrate every thing out of nothing; with their miserable *nil admirari*," they can close their hearts against all lofty impressions. With all his wit and keenness, with all his undeniably fine powers of observation in all that has no concern with the deeper impulses of man's spirit, he was a man of very little mind. But hear his own language: The wretched people have persuaded themselves that they are altogether immortal, and will live for ever; therefore they despise death, and many of them meet it of their own accord. Their first lawgiver has persuaded them also to regard all mankind as their brethren, as soon as they have abjured the Grecian gods, and, honouring their crucified Master, have begun to live according to his laws. They despise every thing Heathen equally, and regard all but their own notions as profaneness, while they have yet embraced those notions without sufficient examination." He has no farther accusation to make against them here, except the ease with which they allowed their benevolence toward their fellow Christians to be abused by impostors, in which there may be much truth, but there is, nevertheless, some exaggeration.

LUDIM. There were two Luds; the one the son of Shem, from whom the Lydians of Asia Minor are supposed to have sprung, and the other the son of Mizraim, whose residence was in Africa. The descendants of the latter

only are mentioned in Scripture: they are joined by Isaiah, lxvi, 19, with Pul, whose settlement is supposed to have been about the island Philoe, near the first cataract of the Nile; by Jeremiah, xlvi, 9, with the Ethiopians and Libyans; by Ezekiel, xxvii, 10, with Phut, as the mercenary soldiers of Tyre, and xxx, 5, with the Ethiopians and Libyans; all plainly denoting their African position; but in what particular part of that continent this position was, is not known.

LUKE. The New Testament informs us of very few particulars concerning St. Luke. He is not named in any of the Gospels. In the Acts of the Apostles, which were, as will hereafter be shown, written by him, he uses the first person plural, when he is relating some of the travels of St. Paul; and thence it is inferred, that at those times he was himself with that Apostle. The first instance of this kind is in the eleventh verse of the sixteenth chapter; he there says, Loosing from Troas, we came up with a straight course to Samothracia." Thus, we learn that St. Luke accompanied St. Paul in this his first voyage to Macedonia. From Samothracia they went to Neapolis, and thence to Philippi. At this last place we conclude that St. Paul and St. Luke separated, because in continuing the history of St. Paul, after he left Philippi, St. Luke uses the third person, saying, Now when they had passed through Amphipolis," &c, Acts xvii, 1; and he does not resume the first person till St. Paul was in Greece the second time. We have no account of St. Luke during this interval; it only appears that he was not with St. Paul. When St. Paul was about to go to Jerusalem from Greece, after his second visit into that country, St. Luke, mentioning certain persons, says, These going before tarried for us at Troas; and we sailed away from Philippi," Acts xx, 5, 6. Thus again we learn that St. Luke accompanied St. Paul out of Greece, through Macedonia to Troas; and the sequel of St. Paul's history in the Acts, and some passages in his epistles, 2 Tim. iv, 11; Col. iv, 14, Philemon 24, written while he was a prisoner at Rome, informs us that St. Luke continued from that time with Paul, till he was released from his confinement at Rome; which was a space of about five years, and included a very interesting part of St. Paul's life, Acts xx-xxviii.

Here ends the certain account of St. Luke. It seems probable, however, that he went from Rome into Achaia; and some authors have asserted that he afterward preached the Gospel in Africa. None of the most ancient fathers having mentioned that St. Luke suffered martyrdom, we may suppose that he died a natural death; but at what time, or in what place, is not known. We are told by some that St. Luke was a painter, and Grotius and Wetstein thought that he was in the earlier part of his life a slave; but I find, says Bishop Tomline, no foundation for either opinion in any ancient writer. It is probable that he was by birth a Jew, and a native of Antioch in Syria; and

I see no reason to doubt that Luke, the beloved physician," mentioned in the Epistle to the Colossians, iv, 14, was Luke the evangelist.

Lardner thinks that there are a few allusions to this Gospel in some of the apostolical fathers, especially in Hermas and Polycarp; and in Justin Martyr there are passages evidently taken from it; but the earliest author, who actually mentions St. Luke's Gospel, is Irenæus; and he cites so many peculiarities in it, all agreeing with the Gospel which we now have, that he alone is sufficient to prove its genuineness. We may however observe, that his testimony is supported by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Jerom, Chrysostom, and many others. Dr. Owen and Dr. Townson have compared many parallel passages of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels; and Dr. Townson has concluded that St. Luke had seen St. Mark's Gospel, and Dr. Owen, that St. Mark had seen St. Luke's; but there does not appear to be a sufficient similarity of expression to justify either of these conclusions. There was among the ancients a difference of opinion concerning the priority of these two Gospels; and it must be acknowledged to be a very doubtful point.

There is also great doubt about the place where this Gospel was published. It seems most probable that it was published in Greece, and for the use of Gentile converts. Dr. Townson observes, that the evangelist has inserted many explanations, particularly concerning the scribes and Pharisees, which he would have omitted if he had been writing for those who were acquainted with the customs and sects of the Jews. We must conclude that the histories of our Saviour, referred to in the preface to this Gospel, were inaccurate and defective, or St. Luke would not have undertaken this work. It does not, however, appear that they were written with any bad design; but being merely human compositions, and perhaps put together in great haste, they were full of errors. They are now entirely lost, and the names of their authors are not known. When the four authentic Gospels were published, and came into general use, all others were quickly disregarded and forgotten.

St. Luke's Gospel is addressed to Theophilus; but there was a doubt, even in the time of Epiphanius, whether a particular person, or any good Christian in general, be intended by that name. Theophilus was probably a real person, that opinion being more agreeable to the simplicity of the sacred writings. We have seen that St. Luke was for several years the companion of St. Paul; and many ancient writers consider this Gospel as having the sanction of St. Paul, in the same manner as St. Mark's had that of St. Peter. Whoever will examine the evangelist's and the Apostle's account of the eucharist in their respective original works, will observe a great coincidence of expression, Luke xxii; 1 Cor. xi. St. Luke seems to

have had more learning than any other of the evangelists, and his language is more varied, copious, and pure. This superiority in style may perhaps be owing to his longer residence in Greece, and greater acquaintance with Gentiles of good education, than fell to the lot of the writers of the other three Gospels. This Gospel contains many things which are not found in the other Gospels; among which are the following: the birth of John the Baptist; the Roman census in Judea; the circumstances attending Christ's birth at Bethlehem; the vision granted to the shepherds; the early testimony of Simeon and Anna; Christ's conversation with the doctors in the temple when he was twelve years old; the parables of the good Samaritan, of the prodigal son, of Dives and Lazarus, of the wicked judge, and of the publican and Pharisee; the miraculous cure of the woman who had been bowed down by illness eighteen years; the cleansing of the ten lepers; and the restoring to life the son of a widow at Nain; the account of Zaccheus, and of the penitent thief; and the particulars of the journey to Emmaus. It is very satisfactory that so early a writer as Irenæus has noticed most of these peculiarities; which proves not only that St. Luke's Gospel, but that the other Gospels also, are the same now that they were in the second century.

LUNATICS, *σεληνιαζομένους*, *lunatici*, Matt. iv, 24. Thus those sick persons were called, who were thought to suffer most severely at the changes of the moon; for example, epileptical persons, or those who have the falling sickness, insane persons, or those tormented with fits of morbid melancholy. Mad people are still called lunatics, from an ancient, but now almost exploded, opinion, that they are much influenced by that planet. A sounder philosophy has taught us, that, if there be any thing in it, it must be accounted for, not in the manner the ancients imagined, nor otherwise than by what the moon has in common with other heavenly bodies, occasioning various alterations in the gravity of our atmosphere, and thereby affecting human bodies. However, there is considerable reason to doubt the fact; and it is certain that the moon has no perceivable influence on our most accurate barometers. It has been the fashion to decry and ridicule the doctrine of demoniacal possessions, and to represent the patients merely as lunatics or madmen. And some think that this is countenanced by the calumny of the unbelieving Jews concerning Christ, He hath a demon, and is mad," John x, 20; both possession and madness often producing the same symptoms of convulsions, paralysis, &c, Matt. xvii, 15–18. But that they were distinct diseases, may be collected from the following considerations: 1. The evangelists, enumerating the various descriptions of patients, distinguish *δαιμονιζόμενοι*, demoniacs, *σεληνιαζόμενοι*, lunatics, and *παραλυτικοί*, paralytics, from persons afflicted with other kinds of diseases, Matt. iv, 24; Mark i, 34; Luke vi, 17, 18. 2. That a real dispossession took place, seems to follow from the

number of these impure inmates. Mary of Magdala, or the Magdalene, was afflicted with seven demons, Mark xvi, 9. A legion” besought Christ’s permission to enter into a numerous herd of two thousand swine; which they did, and drove the whole herd down a precipice into the sea, where they were all drowned. This remarkable case is noticed by the three evangelists 596most circumstantially, Matt. viii, 28; Mark v, 1; Luke viii, 26. 3. The testimony of the demoniacs to Christ was not that of madmen or idiots. It evinced an intimate knowledge both of his person and character, which was hidden from the wise and prudent” of the nation, the chief priests, scribes, and Pharisees. Their language was, What hast thou to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to torment us before the time?” I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God:” thou art the Christ, the Son of God, the Son of the most high God,” Matt. viii, 29; Mark i, 24; iii, 11; Luke iv, 34–41. And they repeatedly besought him not to torment them, not to order them to depart into the abyss, Luke viii, 28–31. See Demoniacs.

LUTHERANS, or the LUTHERAN CHURCH, the disciples and followers of Martin Luther, an Augustine friar, who was born at Isleben, in Upper Saxony, in the year 1483. He possessed an invincible magnanimity, and uncommon vigour and acuteness of genius. He first took offence at the indulgences which were granted in 1517, by Pope Leo X., to those who contributed toward finishing St. Peter’s church at Rome, Luther being then professor of divinity at Wittemberg. Those indulgences promised remission of all sins, past, present, and to come, however enormous their nature, to all who were rich enough to purchase them. At this Luther raised his warning voice; and in ninety-five propositions, which he maintained publicly at Wittemberg, September 30, 1517, exposed the doctrine of indulgences, which led him to attack also the authority of the pope. This was the commencement of that memorable revolution in the church which is styled the Reformation; though Mosheim fixes the era of the Reformation from 1520, when Luther was excommunicated by the pope.

In 1523 Luther drew up a liturgy, that, in many things, differed but little from the Mass Book; but he left his followers to make farther reforms, as they saw them necessary; and, in consequence, the forms of worship in the Lutheran churches vary in points of minor importance: but they agree in reading the Scriptures publicly, in offering prayers and praises to God through the Mediator in their own language, in popular addresses to the congregation, and the reverend administration of the sacraments.

The Augsburg Confession (see Confessions) forms the established creed of the Lutheran church. The following are a few of the principal points of

doctrine maintained by this great reformer, and a few of the Scriptures by which he supported them.

1. That the Holy Scriptures are the only source whence we are to draw our religious sentiments, whether they relate to faith or practice, John v, 39; 1 Cor. iv, 16; 2 Tim. iii, 15–17. Reason also confirms the sufficiency of the Scriptures; for, if the written word be allowed to be a rule in one case, how can it be denied to be a rule in another?

2. That justification is the effect of faith exclusive of good works; and that faith ought to produce good works purely in obedience to God, and not in order to our justification; for St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, strenuously opposed those who ascribed our justification, though but in part, to works: If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain," Gal. ii, 21. Therefore it is evident we are not justified by the law, or by our works; but to him that believeth, sin is pardoned, and Christ's righteousness imputed. This article of justification by faith alone, Luther used frequently to call *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesie*;" that by which the church must stand or fall.

3. That no man is able to make satisfaction for his sins; for our Lord teaches us to say, when we have done all things that are commanded us, We are unprofitable servants," Luke xvii, 10. Christ's sacrifice is alone sufficient to satisfy for sin, and nothing need be added to the infinite value of his atonement.

Luther also rejected tradition, purgatory, penance, auricular confession, masses, invocation of saints, monastic vows, and other doctrines of the church of Rome. Luther differed widely from Calvin on matters of church discipline; and on the presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. His followers also deviated from him in some things; but the following may be considered as a fair statement of their principles, and the difference between them and the Calvinists: 1. The Lutherans in Germany reject both Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, but appoint superintendents for the government of the church, who preside in their consistories, when that office is not supplied by a delegate from the civil government; and they hold meetings in the different towns and villages, to inquire into the state of the congregations and the schools. The appointment of superintendents, and the presentation to livings, is generally in the prince, or ecclesiastical courts. The Swedes and Danes have an ecclesiastical hierarchy, similar to that of England. 2. They differ in their views of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. All the Lutherans reject trans-substantiation, but affirm that the body and blood of Christ are materially present in the sacrament, though in an incomprehensible manner: this they called con-substantiation. The

Calvinists hold, on the contrary, that Jesus Christ is only spiritually present in the ordinance, by the external signs of bread and wine. 3. They differ as to the doctrine of the eternal decrees of God respecting man's salvation. The modern Lutherans maintain that the divine decrees, respecting the salvation and misery of men, are founded upon the divine prescience. The Calvinists, on the contrary, consider these decrees as absolute and unconditional.

The Lutherans are generally divided into the moderate and the rigid. The moderate Lutherans are those who submitted to the Interim published by the Emperor Charles V. Melancthon was the head of this party, and they were called Adiaphorists. The rigid Lutherans are those who would not endure any change in their master's sentiments, of whom M. Flaccius was the head. The Lutherans are partial to the use of instrumental music in their churches, and admit statues and paintings, as the church of England does, without allowing them any religious veneration; but the rigid Calvinists reject these, and allow only the simplest forms of psalmody. The modern Lutherans, about the close of the seventeenth century, enlarged their liberality toward other sects, and gave up the supposed right of persecution; confessing that Christians are accountable to God only for their religious faith. They admit, also, into their sacred canon the Epistle of St. James, which Luther rashly rejected, because he could not reconcile it with St. Paul's doctrine of justification; and the Revelation of St. John, which Luther also rejected, because he could not explain it.

On some of the doctrines of the early German reformers the following remarks by Archbishop Laurence are entitled to high consideration:-- Against the church of Rome, which always, when attacked, fled for protection to the shield of scholastical sophistry, Luther had waged a dauntless, unwearied, and effectual warfare. He entered the field of contest without distrust or apprehension, under a rooted persuasion that the victory over superstition would prove easy at an era when learning had already begun to extend itself in every direction, and was become closely allied to theological attainments. When the light of day appeared, the genuine doctrines of Scripture and the primitive opinions of antiquity began to be more distinctly perceived, and more accurately investigated. With an attachment to classical pursuits arose a zeal for Biblical inquiries. Taste and truth went hand in hand. Luther, than whom no one was more capable of infusing energy into the cause in which he had embarked, was of all men the worst adapted to conduct it with moderation: he was calculated to commence, but not to complete, reformation. Prompt, resolute, and impetuous, he laboured with distinguished success in the demolition of long established error; he also hastily threw together the rough and cumbrous materials of a better system. But the office of selecting,



modelling, and arranging them was consigned to a correcter hand. Melancthon was of a character directly opposite to that of Luther, possessing every requisite to render truth alluring and reformation respectable; and hence upon him, in preference, the princes of Germany conferred the honour of compiling the public profession of their faith. But it ought not to be concealed, that, previously to the time when Lutheranism first became settled upon a permanent basis, and added public esteem to public notice, tenets were advanced, which retarded the progress of truth more than all the subtleties of scholastic argument, or the terrors of papal anathema. At the beginning of the Reformation, as Melancthon frankly observed to Cranmer, there existed among its advocates stoical disputations respecting fate, offensive in their nature, and noxious in their tendency. The duration, however, of these stoical disputations was but short; and the substitution of a more rational as well as practical system, for the space of more than twenty years before the appearance of our Articles, prevented the founders of our church from mistaking, for the doctrines of the Lutherans, those which they themselves wished to forget, and were anxious to obliterate. As we descend to particulars, it will be necessary to keep our eye upon one prominent doctrine, which was eminently conspicuous in all the controversies of the Lutherans,--the doctrine of complete redemption by CHRIST, which in their idea their adversaries (the Papists) disregarded, who denied in effect the depravity of our nature, believed the favour of Heaven in this life recoverable by what was denominated merit of congruity, and, in the life to come, by that which was termed merit of condignity, and founded predestination upon merits of such a description; thus in every instance, while retaining the name of Christians, rendering Christianity itself superfluous. In opposition to opinions so repugnant in many respects to reason, and in almost all so subversive of Scripture, the Lutherans constantly pressed the unsophisticated tenet of the atonement, not contractedly in a Calvinistical, but comprehensively in a Christian, point of view,--in one in which both Calvinists and Arminians alike embrace it.

Upon original sin the doctrine of the schoolmen was no less fanciful and remote from every Scriptural idea, than flattering to human pride. They contended that the infection of our nature is not a mental but a mere corporeal taint; that the body alone receives and transmits the contagion, while the soul in all instances proceeds immaculate from the hands of her Creator. This disposition to disease, such as they allowed it to be, was considered by some of them as the effect of a peculiar quality in the forbidden fruit; by others, as having been contracted from the poisonous breath of the infernal spirit which inhabited the serpent's body. On one point they were all united; by preserving to the soul the bright traces of her divine origin unimpaired, they founded on a deceitful basis an arrogant

creed, which, in declaring peace and pardon to the sinner, rested more upon personal merit than the satisfaction of a Saviour. In commenting upon the celebrated Book of Sentences, a work once not much less revered than the Scriptures themselves, the disciples of Lombard never failed to improve every hint which tended to degrade the grace of God and exalt the pride of man. Original sin the Romish schoolmen directly opposed to original righteousness; and this they considered not as something connatural with man, but as a superinduced habit or adventitious ornament, the removal of which could not prove detrimental to the native powers of his mind. When, therefore, they contemplated the effects of the fall, by confining the evil to a corporeal taint, and not extending it to the nobler faculties of the soul, they regarded man as an object of divine displeasure, not because he possessed that which was offensive, but because he was defective in that which was pleasing to the Almighty. Adam, they said, received for himself and his posterity the gift of righteousness, which he subsequently forfeited; in his loins we were included, and by him were virtually represented: his will was ours, and hence the consequence of his lapse is justly imputable to us his descendants. By our natural birth, therefore, under this idea, we are alienated from God, innocent in our individual persons, but guilty in that of him from whom we derived our existence; a guilt which, although contracted through the fault of another, yet so closely adheres to us that it effectually precludes our entrance at the gate of everlasting life, until the reception of a new birth in baptism. Thus they contended, that the sin of Adam conveys to us solely imputed guilt; the corporeal infection which they admitted not being sin itself, but only the subject matter of it,--not peccatum, but, according to their phraseology, fomes peccati, a kind of fuel which the human will kindles or not at pleasure. Such was the outline of the doctrine maintained in the church of Rome. The tenet of the Lutherans, on the other hand, is remarkable for its simplicity and perspicuity. Avoiding all intricate questions upon the subject, they taught that original sin is a corruption of our nature in a general sense, a depravation of the mental faculties and the corporeal appetites; that the resplendent image of the Deity, which man received at the creation of the world, although not annihilated, is nevertheless greatly impaired; and that, in consequence, the bright characters of unspotted sanctity, once deeply engraven on his mind by the hand of the living God, are become obliterated, the injury extending to his intellect, and affecting as well his reason and his will as his affections and passions. To conceive that inclination to evil incurs not in itself the disapprobation of Heaven, appeared to them little better than an apology for crime, or at least a dangerous palliation of that which the Christian's duty compels him not only to repress but abhor.

The case of Cornelius, whose prayers and alms are said to have ascended up for a memorial before God, was often quoted, by the advocates of the

church of Rome, to prove the merit of works before the reception of grace; to prove the human will capable, by its own inherent rectitude, of deserving the favour and approbation of Heaven. The Lutherans, on the other hand, contended, that the argument supported not the conclusion drawn from it, and was therefore irrelevant; that the works of Cornelius were not the causes but the effects of grace; and that this is sufficiently apparent from the context, in which he is described as a devout man, who feared God and prayed continually." The disciples of Lombard, in whatever mode disposed to pervert reason and annihilate Scripture, universally held, that neither before nor after the fall was man in himself capable of meriting heaven; that by the gratuitous endowments of his creation, even in paradise, he was only enabled to preserve his innocence, and not to sin; and that he was utterly incompetent to proceed one step farther, efficaciously to will a remunerable good, and by his natural exertions to obtain a reward above his nature; original righteousness being reputed not a connate quality, but a supernatural habit. Thus, he could resist evil, but not advance good to perfection; could in some sense live well, by living free from sin, but could not without divine aid so live as to deserve everlasting life. For such a purpose they asserted that grace was necessary, to operate upon his will in its primary determinations, and to co-operate with it in its ultimate acts. It was, therefore, in the loss of this celestial aid, this superadded gift, and not in any depravity of his mind, that they supposed the principal evil derivable from his lapse to consist; a loss, however, which, by a due exertion of his innate abilities, they deemed to be retrievable; and hence sprung that offensive doctrine of human sufficiency which, in the Lutheran's eye, completely obscured the glory of the Gospel, and which, when applied to the sinner's conscience, taught the haughty to presume, and the humble to despair. According, then, to the system under consideration, the favour of God in this life, and his beatific vision in the life to come, are both attainable by personal merit; the former by congruous, as it was termed, the latter by condign; the one without, the other with, the assistance of grace. By our natural strength, it was said, we can fulfil the commands of God as far as their obligation extends; yet was it added, that we cannot fulfil them according to the intention of the divine Legislator; an intention of rewarding only those who obey them in virtue formed by charity, under the influence of a quality rather regulating the tendency, than augmenting the purity, of the action. They stated, that we may so prepare ourselves for grace as to become entitled to it congruously, not as to a debt which in strict justice God is bound to pay, but as to a grant which it is congruous in him to give, and which it would be inconsistent with his attributes to withhold. This favourite doctrine was supported by every denomination of scholastics, and by every individual of the church of Rome. Congruous merit was universally esteemed a pearl above all price, the intrinsic value of which attracted the regard, and conciliated the benevolence, of the

Almighty. According to their conception, we are endowed with an innate propensity to good, which vice itself can never obliterate, and are able not only to reverence and adore the supreme Being, but to love him above other objects. They supposed man competent no less to the efficient practice, than to the barren admiration, of holiness; enabled as well to obey the laws, as to love the goodness, of the Almighty; and, if not to deserve the rewards, at least to discharge the obligations, of religion. Impressed, therefore, with such exalted notions of human ability, and forgetful of the Christian propitiation for sin, the sophists of the schools maintained, that the soul of man possesses in the freedom, or rather in the capacity, of her WILL a faculty almost divine. Stimulated by the most upright propensities, and undepraved in her noblest powers, she directs her progress in the path of truth and the road to bliss, by the pure and inextinguishable light of an unperverted reason. Although mutable in her decisions, nevertheless complete controller of her conduct, she becomes at pleasure either the servant of righteousness or the slave of sin; and, disdaining to be anticipated by God himself, prevents him in his supernatural gifts by a previous display of her own meritorious deeds, challenging, as a congruous right, that which only could have been otherwise conferred as a favour undeserved. By the bare observance of my holy order," exclaimed the secluded devotee, I am able not solely to obtain grace for myself, but, by the works which I then may do, can accumulate merit sufficient both to supply my own wants and those of others; so that I may sell the superabundance of my acquired treasure." Can we be surprised that a reformer of Luther's manly disposition, who wrote without reserve and reasoned without control, when adverting to opinions of so noxious a tendency, should sometimes, from excess of zeal, lose sight of moderation in his censures? The Lutherans commenced the attack upon these unscriptural dogmas, under a persuasion that the position of their opponents militated against the leading principles of Christianity. If man," they said, be capable of pleasing God by his own works abstractedly considered, without divine assistance, where is the necessity, and what is the utility, of that assistance?" They argued, that, were it possible for the moral virtues of the mind by their own efficiency to render our persons acceptable to God and obtain his lost favour, no need would exist of any other satisfaction for sin, and thus the whole scheme of Gospel redemption would have been fruitless, and Christ have died in vain. While, therefore, the doctrine of the atonement presented nothing but a cloud and darkness to their adversaries, it gave light by night to these; on them it shone, amidst surrounding gloom, with lustre unobscured. Luther advanced a proposition which proved highly offensive to the Papists, and which they never ceased to condemn and calumniate. His assertion was, that he who exerts himself to the utmost of his ability still continues to sin. On the other side, unassisted man was thought incapable of performing an action

remunerably good, or, as it was usually termed, condignly meritorious, even before his lapse; and that consequently, in his fallen state, all to which he was conceived competent by his innate strength was not to sin. When Luther therefore drew up his thesis for public disputation against the tenet of congruous works, if little delicacy, yet some caution, and much discrimination, appeared requisite. Had he stated them to be thus good in a scholastic sense, he would have completely lost sight of his object, and allowed more than even his opponents themselves. Had he described them as not demeritorious, or, in other words, not sinful, he would have precisely maintained the adverse position, and might consequently have spared his labour, at the same time that he would have tacitly acknowledged them to possess, what he could not consistently with truth attribute to them, every natural perfection of virtue and holiness. Under what denomination, then, could he class them, except under that of sinful? a denomination which he the more readily adopted because, even among his adversaries themselves, the words SIN and GRACE, as he remarked, were in general immediately opposed to each other. Anxious to rescue Christian theology from the grasp of those who embraced only to betray, the Lutherans laboured to restore that importance to the doctrine of redemption with which the Scriptures invest it, but of which, by a subtle perversity, it had been deprived. The principal object, therefore, in their view evidently was, to Christianize the speculations of the schools; and the principal drift of their argument is to prove, that human virtue, how extravagantly soever extolled by a vain philosophy, is wholly insufficient (because imperfect) to merit the favour of Heaven. Allowing no medium between righteousness and unrighteousness, the approbation and disapprobation of the Almighty, characterizing that as sinful which is confessedly not holy, and thus annihilating every ground of self-presumption, they inculcated the necessity of contemplating with the eye of faith those means of reconciliation which Christianity alone affords. But it has been insinuated, that the Lutheran doctrine went to prove man's total inability to extricate himself from crime, until the arrival of some uncertain moment, which brings with it a regeneration from on high, the sudden transfusion of a new light and new virtues. But those who thus conceive of it are not probably aware, that Melancthon, the venerable author of the Augsburg Confession, warmly reprobates this precise idea, which he denominates a Manichean conceit and a horrible falsehood. Upon the abstract question of free will it is indeed true, that Melancthon, no less than Luther, at first held opinions which he was happy to retract. But when this is acknowledged it should be added, that he made ample amends for his indiscretion by not only expunging the offensive passages from the single work which contained them, but by introducing others of a nature diametrically opposite. And although the more inflexible coadjutor of Melancthon was too lofty to correct what he had once made public, and too magnanimous

to regard the charge of inconsistency which his adversaries urged against him; yet what his better judgment approved clearly appears from a preface written not long before his death; in which, while he expressed an anxiety to have his own chaotic labours, as he styled them, buried in 600eternal oblivion, he recommended in strong terms, as a work admirably adapted to form the Christian divine, that very performance of his friend which was remarkable for something more than a mere recantation of the opinions alluded to. It was not against any conceived deficiency in the quality of our virtue that they argued, but against its supposed competency, whether wrought in or out of grace, with greater or less degrees of purity, to effect that which the oblation of Christ alone accomplishes. Upon both points Luther treated the doctrine of his adversaries as altogether frivolous, and incapable of corroboration by a single fact. Futile, however, as the scholastical tenet appeared to be, although deficient in proof and unsupported by example, upon this, he remarked with indignation and grief, was founded the whole system of papal delusion.

Justification was on both sides supposed to consist entirely in the remission of sins. The popish scholastics, on this head, were remarkably distinct in their ideas, and express in their language. They represented it as an effect produced by the infusion of divine grace into the mind; not as a consequent to a well spent life, but as preceding all remunerable obedience, as the intervening point between night and day, the gloom of a guilty and the light of a self-approving conscience; or, in other words, and to adopt their own phraseology, as the exact boundary where merit of congruity ends and where merit of condignity begins, the infallible result of a previous disposition on our part, which never fails of alluring from on high that supernatural quality which, being itself love, renders the soul beloved. While the Lutherans, however, adhered to the general import of the term as understood in the schools, they waged an incessant warfare upon another point; while they allowed that justification consists in the remission of sin, they denied that this remission is to be acquired by the merit of the individual. Their scholastic opponents maintained that man is justified in the sight of God in consequence of his own preparation, and on account of his personal qualities. They, on the other band, argued with an inflexibility which admitted of no compromise, that, possessing not merits of his own to plead, man freely received forgiveness through the mercy of God solely on account of the merits of Christ. The effective principle, therefore, or meritorious cause of justification, was the great point contested. The doctrine of the popish divines, explained more at large, was this: When the sinner, conscious of his past transgressions, inquired where he was to seek the expiation of his crime, and deliverance from the dreadful consequences of it, the general answer was, In the merit of penitence; a merit capable of annihilating guilt, and appeasing the anger of incensed Omnipotence. He,

they argued, who, having disobeyed the laws of Heaven, is desirous of returning into that state of acceptance from which he has fallen, must not expect free forgiveness; but previously by unfeigned sorrow of heart deserve the restoration of grace, and, with it, the obliteration of his offences. To effect this desirable purpose he is bound strictly to survey and detest his former conduct, accurately to enumerate his transgressions and deeply feel them; and, impressed with a due sense of their magnitude, impurity, and consequences, to condemn his folly and deplore his fault, which have made him an outcast of Heaven, and exposed him to eternal misery. So far he can proceed by that operation of the mind which they denominated ATTRITION, and which, being within the sphere of his natural powers, they regarded as congruous piety meritorious of justification, as a preparation of the soul more or less necessary to receive and merit justifying grace. When, therefore, he is arrived at this point, ATTRITION ceases and CONTRITION commences; the habit of sin is expelled, while that of holiness is superinduced in its stead, and with the infusion of charity, the plastic principle of a new obedience, justification becomes complete. But even here it was not conceived that a total deliverance takes place; a liberation from guilt and eternal punishment is effected, but not from temporal, which is never remitted unless either by the infliction of some personal suffering or satisfactory compensation required of him who is already justified and approved by Heaven. However, to accomplish this remaining object, nothing more is wanting than a continuation, to a sufficient intensity, of that compunction of heart which is now denominated CONTRITION, grace supplying the defects of nature, and enabling penitential merit not only to justify, but to obtain exemption from punishment of every species. But so great appeared to the popish scholastics the frailty of man and the severity of God, that no inconsiderable difficulty occurred in the due application of this favourite doctrine to individuals; for the means of expiation, they imagined, ought always to be proportionate to the magnitude of the offences. How," they reasoned, are we to be assured that our contrition has been either sufficient or sincere, and whether it has been so in the obliteration not only of one crime, but of all; whether it has atoned for past transgressions of every kind, the number of which may perplex, as well as their guilt confound, us?" Instead, therefore, of penitence in its strictest acceptation as a perfect virtue, God, they said, in condescension to human infirmity, has substituted for general practice the sacrament of penitence, which, for the attainment of full remission, requires only a moderate compunction of soul, with confession to the priest, and the discharge of such satisfaction as he may enjoin. And, still lower to reduce the terms of acceptance, they even argued that it is not absolutely necessary for the penitent to experience an entire conversion of heart, but only not to oppose the impediment of mortal crime, to feel some displeasure at his past conduct, and to express a resolution of

amending it in future. But, after all, and in spite of the boasted authority of the keys, complete confidence in divine forgiveness was never inculcated; for it was neither the 601 interest nor the inclination of the church of Rome to teach the simple doctrine of Christian faith, but rather to involve it in metaphysical obscurity. Under the pretext, therefore, of relieving the throbbing breast from its apprehensions, they had recourse to numerous inventions for propping the insecure fabric of penitential hope; asserting, among other extravagancies, that the sacraments are in themselves efficacious by virtue of their own operation, exclusively of all merit in the recipient; and that the sacrament of the altar, in particular, acts so powerful in this respect as to communicate grace not only to those who partake of it, but to others from whom it is received by substitution, provided its operation be not hindered by confessedly flagrant immorality. So deeply rooted in the minds of the papists had become the persuasion of its thus effecting the best of purposes, and that even without the necessity of an actual participation of it by him upon whom the benefit is conferred, that the celebration of the mass was universally regarded as the means of appeasing the anger of Heaven, and obtaining pardon and peace, of procuring divine assistance for the living, and, for the dead, deliverance from the bitter pains of purgatory. Nor by the sacraments alone, but by every good external work, as well as internal disposition, was justifying grace supposed to be merited congruously, and satisfaction for sin to be made condignly. In monastical institutions, likewise, were found no mean materials for similar purposes; for in those feigned religions," as the homily On Good Works describes them, the devotees boasted of having lamps which ran always over, able to satisfy not only for their own sins, but also for all other their benefactors, brothers and sisters of religion, as most ungodly and craftily they had persuaded the multitude of ignorant people; keeping in divers places marts or markets of merits, being full of their holy relics, images, shrines, and works of overflowing abundance, ready to be sold." Yet, whether the dubious penitent was instructed to derive consolation from the efficacy of the sacraments, from his own personal qualities, or from any of what Cranmer aptly termed "the fantastical works of man's invention," it should be observed that he was not directly taught to consider these as wholly superseding the virtue of repentance, but as supplying his deficiencies in the performance of it; an incongruous system of atonement, fabricated by the avarice of Rome, and the obsequiousness of scholastical philosophy, to augment the treasures and extend the influence of the church, to extinguish the light of Gospel truth, and, while keeping the world at large in ignorance, to hold the conscience of the individual in slavery. Upon the whole, then, the scholastics maintained that justification is unattainable without repentance, at least, without some degree of attrition on our part; but in the common apprehension of the doctrine even this seems to have been forgotten, and



merit of congruity considered in a general point of view as alone efficacious. Thus good works of every species preceding grace were said to deserve it, and, by deserving grace, to deserve the justifying principle. And always were they careful to impute the cause of forgiveness, not to the mercy of God in Christ, but to the sole change in the individual, to his transmutation from a state of unrighteousness to one of righteousness, to his possession of a quality which renders him a worthy object of divine approbation. For in every instance personal merit was conceived to be the solid basis upon which rests the complete remission of sin. Upon no one point, perhaps, has the opinion of Luther been more misrepresented than upon this. Some have ascribed to it a solifidian tendency, if not of the most enthusiastical, at least, of the most unqualified, description. But it seems indeed impossible accurately to comprehend the position which he maintained, if we examine it in an insulated point of view, unless we connect it with that of which in the church of Rome it properly formed a part, and from which he never intended to separate it,—the doctrine of penitence. In opposing the absurdity of papal indulgences, (the first impiety against which his manly mind revolted,) a ray of light, before unnoticed, darted upon him, and opened a completely new scene, which, while it stimulated his efforts as a reformer, animated his hopes as a Christian. Hence, averting with disdain from the speculations of sophists, and turning to the sacred page of revelation, he there beheld an affiance very different from what the schools inculcated; and thus, while their vain language was, Repent, and trust to the efficacy of your contrition, either with or without extraneous works, according to the degree of its intensity, for the expiation of your offences;” his, more Scriptural and more consoling, became simply this: Repent, and trust not for expiation to your own merits of any kind, but solely to those of your Redeemer.” Rejecting the dreams of their adversaries with respect to the nature and effects of this important duty, they represented it as consisting of two essential parts, CONTRITION and FAITH, the latter as always associated with the former. Hence, in the Apology of their Confession, they repeatedly declared a disavowal of all faith, except such as exists in the contrite heart. Far was it from their intention to encourage the presumptuous or fanatical sinner in a false security; their object was very different and laudable,—they laboured to fix the eye of him who both laments and detests his offences, upon the only deserving object of human confidence and divine complacency. Properly, then, as they frequently remarked, their doctrine of justification was appropriated to troubled consciences, at every period of true repentance, and particularly at the awful hour of death, when the time for habitual proofs of amendment has elapsed, and when the past appears replete with guilt and the future with terror. At such moments, they taught not, with the schools, an affiance in human merit, but in the gratuitous mercy of God through Christ: to contrition, as a preparatory qualification

602or previous requisite, they added faith; and from faith they deemed every principle of real piety and virtue inseparable. Good works, or the outward fruits of an inward renovation of mind, were said to follow remission of sins; internal necessarily preceding external reformation. For the individual, they argued, must himself be good before the action can be so denominated, be justified before it can be deemed just, and accepted before it can prove acceptable,--distinguishing between the primary admission into God's favour, and the subsequent preservation of that favour.

The unfathomable depths of divine predestination and predetermination human reason in vain attempts to sound, finite faculties to scan infinite, or the limited intellect of man to comprehend the immensity of the Godhead. Erasmus, a peculiar favourite with the reformers of our own country, when contemplating this inexplicable subject, observed, that in the Holy Scriptures there are certain secret recesses, which God is unwilling for us too minutely to explore; and which, if we endeavour to explore, in proportion as we penetrate farther, our minds become more and more oppressed with darkness and stupefaction; that thus we might acknowledge the inscrutable majesty of the divine wisdom, and the imbecility of the human mind." Congenial, also, with the feelings and sentiments of Erasmus upon this point were those of Luther. To acquire any knowledge," he remarked, of a deity not revealed in Scripture, to know what his existence is, his actions and dispositions, belongs not to me. My duty is only this; to know what are his precepts, his promises, and his threatenings. Pernicious and pestilent is the thought of investigating causes, and brings with it inevitable ruin, especially when we ascend too high, and wish to philosophize upon predestination." How differently Calvin felt upon the same subject, and with what little reserve, or rather with what bold temerity, he laboured to scrutinize the unrevealed Divinity, is too well known to require any thing beyond a bare allusion to the circumstance. His sentiments, however, were much less regarded than some are disposed to allow; and upon this particular question, so far were they from having attained their full celebrity at the period when the articles of the church of England were framed, that they were not taught without opposition even in his own unimportant territory of Geneva. For at that precise era he was publicly accused (by Sebastian Castellio) of making God the author of sin; and although, not contented with silencing, he first imprisoned and afterward banished his accuser, yet he could not expel the opinions of his adversary. While the church of Rome maintained a predestination to life of one man in preference to another individually on account of personal merit, the Lutherans taught a gratuitous predestination of Christians collectively, of those whom God has chosen in Christ out of mankind; and by this single point of difference were the contending opinions principally

contradistinguished. With us the system of Calvin still retains so many zealous advocates, that to a modern ear the very term PREDESTINATION seems to convey a meaning only conformable with his particular system. It should, however, be observed that this word was in familiar use for centuries before the Reformation, in a sense, very different from what Calvin imputed to it, not as preceding the divine prescience, but as resulting from it, much in the same sense as that in which it has since been supported by the Arminians. Yet, obvious as this appears, writers of respectability strangely persuade themselves, that, immediately prior to the Reformation, the doctrines of the church of Rome were completely Calvinistical; a conclusion to which, certainly, none can subscribe who are sufficiently conversant with the favourite productions of that time. So far, indeed, was this from being the fact, that Calvin peculiarly prided himself on departing from the common definition of the term, which had long been adopted by the adherents of the schools, and retained with a scrupulous precision. For while they held that the expression *predestinati* is exclusively applicable to the elect, whom God, foreknowing as meritorious objects of his mercy, predestinates to life; and while they appropriated that of *præsciti* to the non-elect, whose perseverance in transgression is simply foreknown; Calvin, on the other side, treating the distinction as a frivolous subterfuge, contended that God, decreeing the final doom of the elect and non-elect irrespectively, predestinates both, not subsequently but previously to all foreknowledge of their individual dispositions, especially devotes the latter to destruction through the medium of crime, and creates them by a fatal destiny to perish. Whatever, therefore, modern conjecture may have attributed to the popish scholastics, it is certain that, abhorring every speculation which tends in the remotest degree to make God the author of sin, they believed that only salutary good is predestinated; grace to those who deserve it congruously, and glory to those who deserve it condignly. They maintained that almighty God, before the foundations of the world were laid, surveying in his comprehensive idea, or, as they phrased it, in his prescience of simple intelligence, the possibilities of all things before he determined their actual existence, foresaw that, if mankind were created, (although he willed the salvation of all, and was inclined to assist all indifferently, yet) some would deserve eternal happiness, and others eternal misery; and that therefore he approved and elected the former, but disapproved or reprobated the latter. Thus, grounding election upon foreknowledge, they contemplated it, not as an arbitrary principle, separating one individual from another under the influence of a blind chance or an irrational caprice; but, on the contrary, as a wise and just principle, which presupposes a diversity between those who are accepted and those who are rejected. Hence it was, that in order to systematize upon this principle of election, and to show how consistent it is as well with the justice as the benevolence of the Deity, the will of God was considered

in a double point of view, as absolute and conditional, or, in the technical language of the schools, as antecedent and consequent. In the first instance, by his absolute or antecedent will, he was said to desire the salvation of every man; in the latter, by his conditional or consequent will, that only of those whom he foresaw abstaining from sin and obeying his commandments: the one expressed his general inclination, the other his particular resolution upon the view of individual circumstances and conditions. To the inquiry, why some are unendowed with grace, their answer was, Because some are not willing to receive it, and not because God is unwilling to give it." He," they said, offers his light to all. He is absent from none; but man absents himself from the present Deity, like one who shuts his eyes against the noon-day blaze." To the foregoing statement it should be added, that they held an election, or rather an ordination, to grace (which they expressly asserted to be defectible) distinct from an election to glory; that according to them, a name may be written in the book of life at one period, which at another many be erased from it; and that predestination to eternal happiness solely depends upon final perseverance in well doing. On the whole it is evident, that they considered the dignity or worthiness of the individual as the meritorious basis of predestination; merit of congruity as the basis of a preordination to grace, and merit of condignity as that of a preordination to glory. Thus, not more fastidious in the choice of their terms than accurate in the use of them, while they denied that the prescience of human virtue, correctly speaking, could be the primary cause of the divine will, because nothing in time can properly give birth to that which has existed from eternity, they strenuously maintained it to be a secondary cause, the ratio or rule in the mind of the Deity which regulated his will in the formation of its ultimate decisions. Although in the established confession of their faith the Lutherans avoided all allusion to the subject of predestination, it was nevertheless introduced into another work of importance, and of considerable public authority, the *Loci Theologici* of Melancthon, a production which was every where received as the standard of Lutheran divinity. Both Luther and Melancthon, after the Diet of Augsburgh, kept one object constantly in view,--to inculcate only what was plain and practical, and never to attempt philosophizing. But to what, it may be asked, did the Lutherans object in the theory of their opponents when they themselves abandoned the tenet of necessity? Certainly, not to the sobriety and moderation of that part of it which vindicated the justice, and displayed the benevolence, of the Almighty; but, generally, to the principles upon which it proceeded; to the presumption, in overleaping the boundary which Heaven has prescribed to our limited faculties, and which we cannot pass without plunging into darkness and error; and to its impiety in disregarding, if not despising, the most important truths of Christianity. A system of such a nature they hesitated not to reject, anxious to conduct themselves by the light of Scripture alone,

nor presuming to be wise above what God has been pleased to discover. Maintaining not a particular election of personal favourites, either by an absolute will, or even a conditional one, dependent upon the ratio of merit, but a general election of all who, by baptism in their infancy, or by faith and obedience in mature years, become the adopted heirs of Heaven; they conceived this to be the only election to which the Gospel alludes, and, consequently, the only one upon which we can speak with confidence, or reason without presumption. If it be observed, that the selection of an integral body necessarily infers that of its component parts, the answer is obvious: The latter, although indeed it be necessarily inferred by the former, is nevertheless not a prior requisite, but a posterior result of the divine ordination. What they deemed absolute on the part of God was his everlasting purpose to save his elect in Christ, or real Christians considered as a whole, and contrasted with the remainder of the human race; the completion of this purpose being regulated by peculiar circumstances, operating as inferior causes of a particular segregation. For, persuaded of his good will toward all men without distinction, of his being indiscriminately disposed to promote the salvation of all, and of his seriously (not fictitiously, as Calvin taught) including all in the universal promise of Christianity, they imputed to him nothing like a partial choice, no limitation of favours, no irrespective exclusion of persons; but assuming the Christian character as the sole ground of individual preference, they believed that every baptized infant, by being made a member of Christ, not by being comprised in a previous arbitrary decree, is truly the elect of God, and, dying in infancy, certain of eternal happiness; that he who, in maturer years, becomes polluted by wilful crime, loses that state of salvation which before he possessed; that nevertheless by true repentance, and conversion to the Father of mercy and God of all consolation, he is again reinstated in it; and that, by finally persevering in it, he at length receives the kingdom prepared for every sincere Christian before the foundation of the world. Can any man, whom prejudice has not blinded, rank these sentiments with those of Calvin? It may seem almost unnecessary to subjoin, that the Lutherans held the defectibility of grace; its indefectibility being a position supported but by those who think that the Redeemer died for a selected few alone. Upon the whole then it appears, that the Lutherans, affecting not in any way to philosophize, but committing themselves solely to the guidance of Scripture, differed from the church of Rome in several important particulars. For, although on some points they coincided with her, although they inculcated, with equal zeal and upon a better principle, both the universality and the defectibility of grace, as well as a conditional admission into the number of the elect, they nevertheless were entirely at variance with her upon the very foundation of the system. Thus while their opponents taught, that predestination consists in the prospective discrimination of individuals by divine favour, according to the foreseen

ratio of every man's own merit,--works of congruity deserving grace here, and works of condignity eternal life hereafter, and that in this way it principally rests upon human worth; the Lutherans, disclaiming every idea of such a discrimination, placed it upon the same basis as they assumed in the case of justification,--that of an effectual redemption by Christ. Instead, therefore, of holding the election of individuals as men on account of personal dignity or worthiness, they maintained the election of a general mass as Christians on account of Christ alone; adding that we are admitted into that number, or discarded from it, in the eye of Heaven, proportionably as we embrace or reject the salvation offered to all, embracing it with a faith inseparable from genuine virtue, or rejecting it by incredulity and crime. For neither in this, nor in the instance of justification, did they exclude repentance and a true conversion of the heart and life, as necessary requisites, but only as meritorious causes, from the contemplation of God's omniscient intellect. Let those," said Luther, who wish to be elected avoid an evil conscience, and not transgress the divine commandments." Instructed then by the unerring page of truth, they asserted no other predestination than what is there expressly revealed; that of the good and gracious Father of mankind, who from eternity has been disposed to promote the happiness and welfare of all men, has destined Christ to be the Saviour of the whole world, and withholden from none the exalted hope of the Christian calling. Convinced that this is the only predestination which Christianity discloses, and consequently the only one which we can either with safety or certainty embrace, they discouraged every attempt at investigating the will, out of the word, of God; every attempt at effecting impossibilities, at unveiling the secret counsels of Him who shrouds his divine perfections in darkness impervious to mortal eyes. With such investigations, indeed, the world had already been sufficiently bewildered by the scholastics, who, endowed with a ready talent at perplexing what before was plain, and at rendering abstruseness still more abstruse, had made the subject totally inexplicable, vainly labouring to develop with precision that mysterious will upon which the wise must ever think it folly, and the good impiety, to speculate. Disquisitions of this presumptuous nature, from a personal experience of their mischievous tendency, Luther abjured himself, and deprecated in others. Are we, miserable men," he exclaimed, "who as yet are incapable of comprehending the rays of God's promises, the glimmerings of his precepts and his works, although confirmed by words and miracles, are we, infirm and impure, eager to comprehend all that is great and glorious in the solar light itself, in the incomprehensible light of a miraculous Godhead? Do we not know, that God dwells in splendour inaccessible? And yet do we approach, or rather do we presume to approach it? Are we not aware, that his judgments are inscrutable? And yet do we endeavour to scrutinize them? And these things we do, before we are habituated even to the faint lustre of his promises and

precepts, with a vision still imperfect, blindly rushing into the majesty of that light which, secret and unseen, has never been by words or miracles exhibited. What wonder, then, if, while we explore its majesty, we are overwhelmed with its glory?" For a farther account of the Lutheran views on predestination, see the last pages of the article Calvinism.

After this very ample exposition of the sentiments of the German reformers on the chief points of Christian doctrine, it is only necessary to give a few additional particulars in corroboration of some portions of the preceding statement. The high estimation in which Luther held the productions of the judicious Melancthon is apparent from a passage in the preface to the first volume of Luther's works, dated 1545. In that year also appeared the last amended edition of Melancthon's *Common Places*," to which he alludes. Long and earnestly," he says, have I resisted the importunity of those who have wished me to publish my works, or, to speak more correctly, my confused and disorderly lucubrations; not only because I was unwilling that the labours of the ancients should be turned aside by my novelties, and that the reader should be hindered from perusing them, but likewise because now, by the grace of God, a great number of methodical books are extant; among which the *Common Places* of our Philip claim the preference, for by them a divine and a bishop may be abundantly and satisfactorily confirmed, so as to become powerful in the word of the doctrine of piety, especially when the Holy Bible itself can now be procured in almost every language. But the want of order in the matters to be discussed in my books induced, nay compelled, me to render them a sort of rude and indigested chaos, which it would now require even on my part no small exertion to digest into a methodical form. Under the influence of such motives as these, I was desirous that all my productions should be buried in perpetual oblivion, that they might give place to others of a better description." In this preface Luther also gives the following testimony to the general usefulness of Melancthon's labours: In the same year Philip Melancthon had been called to this university by Prince Frederick to fill the chair of Greek professor, but no doubt with the intention that I should have him as my colleague in the labours of the divinity professorship. For his works are sufficiently in proof of what the Lord hath effected by this his choice instrument, not only in polite literature, but in theology, although Satan be enraged and all his party." Though the early opinions of Luther upon the doctrine of a philosophical necessity appear to have been occasionally expressed in a harsh and repulsive manner, yet his followers pertinaciously contend that even the harshest of them cannot, with propriety, be construed into a sense favourable to the Calvinistical system. Those of Melancthon in the first edition of his *Loci Theologici*, although occurring but in one or two instances, were nevertheless still more offensive, and less capable of a mitigated interpretation. So far indeed did

he carry the doctrine of divine predetermination as to degrade man to a level with the brutes, as will be obvious from the following passage in the edition of 1525. Lastly, divine predestination takes away human liberty. For all things come to pass according to divine predestination, not only external works, but also internal thoughts in all creatures." After the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, we hear no more of this obnoxious tenet. Indeed so early as 1527 these reformers seem to have abandoned it. At least, when in that year a form of doctrine was drawn up for the churches of Saxony, free will in acts of morality was thus inculcated: The human will is so far free as to be able in some sort to perform the righteousness of the flesh, or civil justice, when it is obliged by the law and by force not to steal, not to kill, not to commit adultery, &c. Therefore let ministers teach, that it is in a measure in our own hands to restrain carnal affections, and to perform civil justice; and let them diligently exhort men to a strict and proper course of life, because God also requires this kind of righteousness, and will grievously punish those men who live so negligent of their duty. For as we are bound to make a good use of the other gifts of God, so is it likewise our duty to employ to good purpose those powers which God has bestowed on nature." For God takes no delight in that ferocious mode of life which is adopted by some men, who, after having heard that we are not justified by our own powers and works, foolishly dream that they will wait until they be drawn by God, and in the mean time their course of life is most impure. Such persons God will most severely punish; and they must therefore be earnestly reprehended and admonished by those whose province it is to teach in the churches." This work, which is generally termed, *Libellus Visitationis Saxonice*, was first composed in German by Melancthon in 1527, and afterward republished by Luther with a preface, in which he thus expresses himself: We do not publish these as rigorous precepts, nor do we again employ ourselves in drawing up pontifical decrees, but we relate matters of history and public deeds, and present the confession and symbol of our belief." The previous controversy between Luther and Erasmus, on the topic of free will, had probably tended to produce an amelioration of the doctrinal system of the Lutheran church. In this view it was not without reason that Erasmus made the following reflections in a letter dated 1528, soon after he had seen this production: The Lutheran fever, every succeeding day, assumes a milder form; so that Luther himself now writes recantations on almost every thing, and on this account he is considered by the rest as a heretic and a madman." Similar caustic remarks occur in other letters of Erasmus; and as, in those days of high religious excitement, taunts of this kind were considered too good to be confined as secrets within the breast of the correspondents to whom they were addressed, it is not improbable that Luther might be prevented through them, among other reasons, from making farther doctrinal concessions; it being no uncommon circumstance in the history of the human mind for persons of otherwise



strong understandings to be under the influence of this pitiable weakness. That Melancthon not only abandoned but reprehended the doctrine in 1529, we cannot doubt, because his own express testimony in proof of it remains on record. In a letter to Christopher Stathmio, dated March 20th, 1559, which was not long before his death, he notices the subject in these words: Thirty years ago, not through the desire of contention, but on account of the glory of God, and for the sake of discipline, I sharply reprehended the Stoical paradoxes concerning necessity, because they are reproachful toward God and injurious to morals. At this time the legions of the Stoics are waging war against me; but in the answer which I have written in opposition to the Bavarian inquisition, I have once more pointed out in a modest manner that opinion (on fate or predestination) in which anxious minds may acquiesce and be at rest." On consulting the tract to which his letter alludes, we find him employing this strong and unequivocal language: I also openly reject and abhor those Stoical and Manichean furies who affirm that all things necessarily happen, evil as well as good actions. But concerning these I refrain at present from any lengthened discussion; only I entreat young people to avoid these monstrous opinions, which are contumelious against God, and pernicious to morals." From the *Loci Theologici*, in which Melancthon had first introduced this obnoxious tenet, he expunged necessity in the edition of 1533, and inserted in its place the opposite one of contingency. The following are extracts from this amended work: The discussion on the cause of sin and that on contingency have sometimes greatly agitated the church, and excited mighty tragedies. Men of acute minds collect multitudes of inextricable and absurd things about both these subjects. Because there is some danger in them, young people must be warned to abstain from these interminable disputes, and in preference to search out a simple and pious opinion, beneficial to religion and morals, in which they may abide, nor suffer themselves to be withdrawn from it by those fallacious tricks of disputations. But this is a pious and true sentiment to be embraced with both hands, and to be retained rather by the whole heart,—that God is not the cause of sin, and that he does not will sin. But the causes of sin are the will of the devil, and the will of man." But this sentiment being once laid down, that God is not the cause of sin, it evidently follows that contingency must be granted. The freedom of the will is the cause of the contingency of our actions." Neither must the delirious doatings about Stoical fate, or about necessity, be conveyed into the church, because they are inextricable and sometimes injurious to piety and morals." From these opinions it becomes the pious to be abhorrent in their ears and in their hearts." These extracts serve to prove, that Melancthon reprobated the idea of introducing into the church the doctrine of Stoical fate, before Calvin had distinguished himself either as an author or a reformer. Into his subsequent productions of almost every description Melancthon introduced the doctrine of contingency, and

strenuously defended it, particularly in the amended edition of his *Loci Theologici* in 1545. Luther never formally revoked any of his own writings; but on this last corrected production of his friend, as we have shown, he bestowed the highest commendations. Yet he did not scruple publicly to assert, that at the beginning of the Reformation he had not completely settled his creed. In the seventh volume of his works this sentence is found: I have also published the confession of my faith; in which I have openly testified what and how I believe, and in what articles I think myself at length to be at rest." He seems, indeed, to have generally avoided the subject, from the period of his controversy with Erasmus, to the publication of his *Commentary on Genesis*,--his last work of any importance. But in this, after a long argument to prove that, as we have no knowledge of the unrevealed Deity, we have nothing to do with those things which are above our comprehension; and that we are not to reason upon predestination out of Christianity; he thus apologizes for his former opinions: "It has been my wish diligently and accurately to deliver these charges and admonitions; because, after my death, many persons will publish my books to the world, and by that course will confirm errors of every kind and their own delirious ravings. But among other matters I have written, that all things are absolute and necessary; but at the same time I added, that we must behold God as he is revealed to us, as we sing in the Psalm, 'Jesus Christ is the Lord of sabaoth, nor is there any other God.' In several other passages I have used similar expressions. But these people will pass by all such passages, and will only seize upon those concerning a hidden Deity. You, therefore, who now hear me, recollect that I have taught this,--We must not inquire concerning the predestination of a hidden God, but we must abide and acquiesce in those things which are revealed by calling and by the ministry of the word." But in other passages of my different works I have inculcated the same sentiments, and I now deliver them again with an audible voice; therefore I am excused." For the more modern state of the Lutheran church see Neology.

The following account of the union between the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches, as given in the advertisement to Baron Von Wessenberg's *Correspondence with the Court of Rome*," may not be uninteresting to the reader: The Germans have just set the noble example of forming a union between these two branches of the Protestant faith. This union, which originated, we believe, in the grand duchy of Nassau, has taken place almost universally throughout Germany; and the separate appellations of Lutheran and Calvinistic churches have merged in the common appellation of the Evangelical church. The Lutheran and Reformed churches of Prussia met in synod together, on the invitation of their monarch, the first of October, 1817, and soon came to an agreement; and the union was celebrated on the day of the tri-centenary festival of the Reformation. A

similar synod of the Lutherans and Calvinists in Hesse-Cassel was held at Hanau in May and June, 1818, and attended with the same result. The royal confirmation was given to the Bavarian union on the first of October following. Saxe-Weimar, and most of the other small states have followed this example. The Protestant Germans have now, therefore, only one Gospel, one temple, one divine Instructor, and one mode of communion; and, what is singular, and highly honourable to their liberality, this union was every where accomplished with the greatest ease, and without a dissentient voice having been raised against it." How different was this result from that of the synods and councils of other times; and what a change in the state of public opinion does it indicate! And yet it is to be feared that the liberality from which this union has resulted, is rather indifference to the grand peculiarities of the Christian faith than mutual charity.

LYCAONIA, a province of Asia Minor, accounted a part of Cappadocia, having Pisidia on the west, and Cilicia on the south. In it were the cities of Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, mentioned in the travels of St. Paul. The former was the capital, and the country itself at that time a Roman province. The speech of Lycaonia," mentioned Acts xiv, 11, is supposed to have been a corrupt Greek, intermingled with many oriental words.

LYCIA, a country of Asia Minor, having Phrygia on the north, Pamphylia on the east, the Mediterranean on the south, and Caria on the west. The greatest part of the country, however, is a peninsula projecting into the Mediterranean. Lycia derived its name from Lycus, the son of Pandion, who settled here. It was conquered by Cræsus, king of Lydia, and passed with his kingdom into the hands of the Persians. It afterward, in common with the neighbouring countries of Asia Minor, formed part of the Macedonian empire, under Alexander; then of that of the Seleucidæ, his successors in those countries; and, at the time of the Apostles, was reduced to the state of a Roman province.

LYDDA, by the Greeks called Diospolis. It lay in the way from Jerusalem to Cæsarea, four or five leagues to the east of Joppa. Lydda belonged to the tribe of Ephraim. It seems to have been inhabited by the Benjamites, 607 at the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, Neh. xi, 35. St. Peter coming to Lydda, cured a sick man of the palsy named Eneas, Acts ix, 33, 34.

LYDIA, a woman of Thyatira, a seller of purple, who dwelt in the city of Philippi, in Macedonia. She was converted to the faith by St. Paul, and both she and her family were baptized. She offered her house to the Apostle, and

pressed him to abide there so earnestly, that he yielded to her entreaties. She was not a Jewess by birth, but a proselyte, Acts xvi, 14, 15, 40.

2. Lydia, an ancient celebrated kingdom of Asia Minor, which, in the time of the Apostles, was reduced to a Roman province. Sardis was the capital.

LYSTRA, a city of Lycaonia, the native place of Timothy. The Apostle Paul and Barnabas having preached here, and healed a cripple, were taken for gods. But so fickle are human praise and popular encomiums, that, in the space of a few hours, those who had been deemed gods were regarded as less than mortals, and were stoned by the very persons who so lately deified them. See Acts xiv.

MAACAH, or BETH-MAACHA, a little province of Syria to the east and the north of the sources of the river Jordan, upon the road to Damascus. Abel or Abela was in this country, whence it was called Abelbeth-Maachah. We learn from Joshua xiii, 13, that the Israelites did not destroy the Maachathites, but permitted them to dwell in the land among them. The distribution of the half tribe of Manasseh, beyond Jordan, extended as far as this country, Deut. iii, 14; Joshua xii, 5.

MACCABEES, two apocryphal books of Scripture, containing the history of Judas and his brothers, and their wars against the Syrian kings in defence of their religion and liberties, so called from Judas, the son of Mattathias, surnamed Maccabæus, as some authors say, from the word מכבי, formed of the initials of יהוה באלים מי-כמכה, "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods?" Exod. xv, 11, which was the motto of his standard; whence those who fought under his standard were called Maccabees, and the name was generally applied to all who suffered in the cause of true religion, under the Egyptian or Syrian kings. This name, formed by abbreviation according to the common practice of the Jews, distinguished Judas Maccabæus by way of eminence, as he succeeded his father, B. C. 166, in the command of those forces which he had with him at his death; and, being joined by his brothers, and all others that were zealous for the law, he erected his standard, on which he inscribed the above mentioned motto. Those, also, who suffered under Ptolemy Philopater of Alexandria, fifty years before this period, were afterward called Maccabees; and so were Eleazar, and the mother and her seven sons, though they suffered before Judas erected his standard with the motto from which the appellation originated. And therefore, as these books which contain the history of Judas and his brothers, and their wars against the Syrian kings, in defence of their religion and liberties, are called the first and second books of the Maccabees; so that book which gives us the history of those who, in the like cause, under Ptolemy Philopater, were exposed to his elephants at

Alexandria, is called the third book of the Maccabees; and that which is written by Josephus, of the martyrdom of Eleazar, and the seven brothers and their mother, is called the fourth book of the Maccabees.

The first book of the Maccabees is an excellent history, and comes nearest to the style and manner of the sacred historians of any extant. It was written originally in the Chaldee language, of the Jerusalem dialect, and was extant in this language in the time of Jerom, who had seen it. From the Chaldee it was translated into Greek, from the Greek into Latin. Theodotion is conjectured to have translated it into Greek; but this version was probably more ancient, as we may infer from its use by ancient authors, as Tertullian, Origen, and others. It is supposed to have been written by John Hyrcanus, the son of Simon, who was prince and high priest of the Jews near thirty years, and began his government at the time where this history ends. It contains the history of forty years, from the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes to the death of Simon, the high priest; that is, from the year of the world 3829 to the year 3869, B. C. 131. The second book of the Maccabees begins with two epistles sent from the Jews of Jerusalem to the Jews of Egypt and Alexandria, to exhort them to observe the feast of the dedication of the new altar erected by Judas, on his purifying the temple. The first was written in the 169th year of the era of the Seleucidæ, that is, B. C. 144; and the second, in the 188th year of the same era, or B. C. 125; and both appear to be spurious. After these epistles follows the preface of the author to his history, which is an abridgment of a larger work, composed by one Jason, a Jew of Cyrene, who wrote in Greek the history of Judas Maccabæus, and his brethren, and the wars against Antiochus Epiphanes, and Eupator his son. The two last chapters contain events under the reign of Demetrius Soter, the successor of Antiochus Eupator, and contain such varieties in their style, as render it doubtful whether they had the same author as the rest of the work. This second book does not by any means equal the accuracy and excellency of the first. It contains a history of about fifteen years, from the execution of Heliodorus's commission, who was sent by Seleucus to fetch away the treasures of the temple, to the victory obtained by Judas Maccabæus over Nicanor; that is, from the year of the world 3828 to the year 3843, B. C. 157.

There are in the Polyglott Bibles, both of Paris and London, Syriac versions of both these books; but they, as well as the English versions which we have among the apocryphal writers in our Bibles, are derived from the Greek. For a farther account of Judas Maccabæus, and of his brothers, whose history is recorded in the first and second books of the Maccabees, and also by Josephus, we refer to the article Jews. The third book of the Maccabees contains the history of the persecution of Ptolemy Philopater against the Jews in Egypt, and their sufferings under it; and seems to have

been written by some Alexandrian Jew in the Greek language, not long after the time of Siracides. This book, with regard to its subject, ought to be called the first, as the things which are related in it occurred before the Maccabees, whose history is recorded in the first and second books; but as it is of less authority and repute than the other two, it is reckoned after them. It is extant in Syriac, though the translator did not seem to have well understood the Greek language. It is in most of the ancient manuscript copies of the Greek Septuagint, particularly in the Alexandrian and Vatican, but was never inserted into the vulgar Latin version of the Bible, nor, consequently, into any of our English copies. The first authentic mention we have of this book is in Eusebius's Chronicon." It is also named with two other books of the Maccabees in the eighty-fifth of the apostolic canons. But it is uncertain when that canon was added. Grotius thinks that this book was written after the two first books, and shortly after the book of Ecclesiasticus, from which circumstance it was called the third book of Maccabees. Moreover, Josephus's history of the martyrs that suffered under Antiochus Epiphanes, is found in some manuscript Greek Bibles, under the name of the fourth book of the Maccabees. This book, ascribed to Josephus, occurs under the title, Concerning the Empire or Government of Reason;" but learned men have expressed a doubt whether this was the book known to the ancients as the fourth book of the Maccabees.

MACEDONIA, a kingdom of Greece, having Thrace to the north, Thessaly south, Epirus west, and the Ægean Sea east. Alexander the Great, son of Philip, king of Macedonia, having conquered Asia, and subverted the Persian empire, the name of the Macedonians became very famous throughout the east; and it is often given to the Greeks, the successors of Alexander in the monarchy. In like manner, the name of Greeks is often put for Macedonians, 2 Maccabees iv, 36. When the Roman empire was divided, Macedonia fell to the share of the emperor of the east. After it had long continued subject to the Romans, it fell under the power of the Ottoman Turks, who are the present masters of it.

St. Paul was invited by an angel of the Lord, who appeared to him at Troas, to come and preach the Gospel in Macedonia, Acts xvi, 9. After this vision, the Apostle no longer doubted his divine call to preach the Gospel in Macedonia; and the success that attended his ministry confirmed him in his persuasion. Here he laid the foundation of the churches of Thessalonica and Philippi.

MAGDALA, a city on the west side of the sea of Galilee, near Dalmanutha; Jesus, after the miracle of the seven loaves, being said by St. Matthew to have gone by ship to the coasts of Magdala, Matt. xv, 39; and by St. Mark, to the parts of Dalmanutha," Mark viii, 10. Mr. Buckingham came to a

small village in this situation called Migdal, close to the edge of the lake, beneath a range of high cliffs, in which small grottoes are seen, with the remains of an old square tower, and some larger buildings, of rude construction, apparently of great antiquity. Migdol implies a tower, or fortress; and this place, from having this name particularly applied to it, was doubtless, like the Egyptian Migdol, one of considerable importance; and may be considered as the site of the Migdal of the Naphtalites, as well as the Magdala of the New Testament.

MAGI, or MAGIANS, a title which the ancient Persians gave to their wise men, or philosophers. Magi, among the Persians, answers to σοφοί, or φιλόσοφοι, among the Greeks; sapientes, among the Latins; druids, among the Gauls; gymnosophists, among the Indians; and priests, among the Egyptians.

The ancient magi, according to Aristotle and Laertius, were the sole authors and conservators of the Persian philosophy; and the philosophy principally cultivated among them was theology and politics; they being always esteemed as the interpreters of all law, both divine and human; on which account they were wonderfully revered by the people. Hence Cicero observes that none were admitted to the crown of Persia, but such as were well instructed in the discipline of the magi; who taught τὰ βασιλικὰ, and showed princes how to govern. Plato, Apuleius, Laertius, and others, agree that the philosophy of the magi related principally to the worship of the gods: they were the persons who were to offer prayers, supplications, and sacrifices, as if the gods would be heard by them alone. But, according to Lucian, Suidas, &c, this theology, or worship of the gods, as it is called, about which the magi were employed, was little more than the diabolical art of divination; so that μαγεί.ά, strictly taken, was the art of divination. These people were held in such veneration among the Persians, that Darius, the son of Hystaspes, among other things, had it engraven on his monument, that he was the master of the magi. Philo Judæus describes the magi to be diligent inquirers into nature, out of the love they bear to truth; and who, setting themselves apart from other things, contemplate the divine virtues the more clearly, and initiate others in the same mysteries. The magi, or magians, formed one of the two grand sects into which the idolatry of the world was divided between 500 and 600 years before Christ. These abominated all those images which were worshipped by the other sect, denominated Sabians, and paid their worship to the Deity under the emblem of fire. Their chief doctrine was, that there were two principles, one of which was the cause of all good, and the other the cause of all evil. The former was represented by light, and the latter by darkness, as their truest symbols; and of the composition of these two they supposed that all things in the world were made. The sect of the magians was revived

and reformed by Zoroaster. This celebrated philosopher, called by the Persians Zerdusht, or Zaratush, began about the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Darius to restore and reform the magian system of religion. He was not only excellently skilled in all the learning of the east that prevailed in his time, but likewise thoroughly versed in the Jewish religion, and in all the sacred writings of the Old Testament that were then extant: whence some have inferred that he was a native Jew both by birth and profession; and that he had been servant to one of the prophets, probably Ezekiel or Daniel. He made his first appearance in Media, in the city of Xix, now called Aderbijan, as some say; or, according to others in Ecbatana, now called Tauris. Instead of admitting the existence of two first causes, with the magians, he asserted the existence of one supreme God, who created both these, and out of these two produced, according to his sovereign pleasure, every thing else. According to his doctrine, there was one supreme Being independently and self-existing from all eternity. Under him there are two angels: one the angel of light, the author and director of all good; and the other the angel of darkness, who is the author and director of all evil. These two, probably speaking figuratively, out of the mixture of light and darkness, made all things that are; and they are in a state of perpetual conflict; so that where the angel of light prevails, there the most is good; and where the angel of darkness prevails, there the most is evil. This struggle shall continue to the end of the world; and then there shall be a general resurrection, and a day of judgment: after which, the angel of darkness and his disciples shall go into a world of their own, where they shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds; and the angel of light and his disciples shall go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds: and henceforward they shall for ever remain separate.

Of the controversy as to Zoroaster, Zeratusht, or Zertushta, and the sacred books said to have been written by him, called Zend or Zendavesta, which has divided the most eminent critics, it would answer no important end to give an abstract. Those who wish for information on the subject are referred to Hyde's *Religio Veterum Persarum*;" Prideaux's *Connection*;" Warburton's *Divine Legation*;" Bryant's *Mythology*;" The *Universal History*;" Sir W. Jones's *Works*, vol. iii, p. 115; M. Du Perron, and Richardson's *Dissertation*," prefixed to his *Persian and Arabic Dictionary*. But whatever may become of the authority of the whole or part of the *Zendavesta*, and with whatever fables the history of the reformer of the magian religion may be mixed, the learned are generally agreed that such a reformation took place by his instrumentality. Zeratusht," says Sir W. Jones, reformed the old religion by the addition of genii or angels, of new ceremonies in the veneration shown to fire, of a new work which he pretended to have received from heaven, and, above all, by establishing the



actual adoration of the supreme Being;" and he farther adds, The reformed religion of Persia continued in force till that country was conquered by the Musselmans; and, without studying the Zend, we have ample information concerning it in the modern Persian writings of several who profess it. Bahman always named Zeratusht with reverence; he was, in truth, a pure Theist, and strongly disclaimed any adoration of the fire or other elements; and he denied that the doctrine of two coëval principles, supremely good and supremely bad, formed any part of his faith." The Zeratusht of Persia, or the Zoroaster of the Greeks," says Richardson, was highly celebrated by the most discerning people of ancient times; and his tenets, we are told, were most eagerly and rapidly embraced by the highest in rank, and the wisest men in the Persian empire." He distinguished himself by denying that good and evil, represented by light and darkness, were coëval, independent principles; and asserted the supremacy of the true God, in exact conformity with the doctrine contained in a part of that celebrated prophecy of Isaiah in which Cyrus is mentioned by name: I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me," no coëval power. I form the light, and create darkness, I make peace," or good, and create evil, I the Lord do all these things." Fire, by Zerdushta, appears to have been used emblematically only; and the ceremonies for preserving and transmitting it, introduced by him, were manifestly taken from the Jews, and the sacred fire of their tabernacle and temple.

The old religion of the Persians was corrupted by Sabianism, or the worship of the host of heaven, with its accompanying superstition. The magian doctrine, whatever it might be at first, had degenerated; and two eternal principles, good and evil, had been introduced. It was therefore necessarily idolatrous also, and, like all other false systems, flattering to the vicious habits of the people. So great an improvement in the moral character and influence of the religion of a whole nation as was effected by Zoroaster, a change which is not certainly paralleled in the ancient history of the religion of mankind, can scarcely, therefore, be thought possible, except we suppose a divine interposition, either directly, or by the occurrence of some very impressive events. Now as there are so many authorities for fixing the time of Zoroaster or Zeratusht not many years subsequent to the death of the great Cyrus, the events connected with the conquest of Babylon may account for his success in that reformation of religion of which he was the author. For, had not the minds of men been prepared for this change by something extraordinary, it is not supposable that they would have adopted a purer faith from him. 610 That he gave them a better doctrine, is clear from the admission of even Dean Prideaux, who has very unjustly branded him as an impostor. Let it then be remembered, that as the Most High ruleth in the kingdoms of men," he often overrules great political events for moral purposes. The Jews were sent into captivity

to Babylon to be reformed from their idolatrous propensities, and their reformation commenced with their calamity. A miracle was there wrought in favour of three Hebrew confessors of the existence of one only God, and that under circumstances to put shame upon a popular idol in the presence of the king and all the rulers of the provinces," that the issue of this controversy between Jehovah and idolatry might be made known throughout that vast empire.--Worship was refused to the idol by a few Hebrew captives, and the idol had no power to punish the public affront:--the servants of Jehovah were cast into a furnace, and he delivered them unhurt; and a royal decree declared that there was no god who could deliver after this sort." The proud monarch himself also is smitten with a singular disease;--he remains subject to it until he acknowledges the true God; and, upon his recovery, he publicly ascribes to him both the justice and the mercy of the punishment. This event takes place, also, in the accomplishment of a dream which none of the wise men of Babylon could interpret. It was interpreted by Daniel, who made the fulfilment to redound to the honour of the true God, by ascribing to him the perfection of knowing the future, which none of the false gods, appealed to by the Chaldean sages, possessed; as the inability of their servants to interpret the dream sufficiently proved. After these singular events, Cyrus takes Babylon, and he finds there the sage and the statesman, Daniel, the worshipper of the true God, who creates both good and evil," who makes the light, and forms the darkness." There is little doubt but that he and the principal Persians throughout the empire would have the prophecy of Isaiah respecting Cyrus, delivered more than a hundred years before he was born, and in which his name stood recorded, along with the predicted circumstances of the capture of Babylon, pointed out to them. Every reason, religious and political, urged the Jews to make the prediction a matter of notoriety; and from Cyrus's decree in Ezra it is certain that he was acquainted with it; because there is in the decree an obvious reference to the prophecy. This prophecy, so strangely fulfilled, would give mighty force to the doctrine connected with it, and which it proclaims with so much majesty:--

I am Jehovah, and none else,  
Forming LIGHT, and creating DARKNESS,  
Making PEACE, and creating EVIL;  
I Jehovah am the author of all these things."

Here the great principle of corrupted magianism was directly attacked; and, in proportion as the fulfilment of the prophecy was felt to be singular and striking, the doctrine blended with it would attract notice. Its force was both felt and acknowledged, as we have seen, in the decree of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the temple. In that Cyrus acknowledged the true God to be supreme, and thus renounced his former faith; and the example, the

public example, of a prince so beloved, and whose reign was so extended, could not fail to influence the religious opinions of his people. That the effect did not terminate in Cyrus, we know; for, from the book of Ezra, it appears that both Darius and Artaxerxes made decrees in favour of the Jews, in which Jehovah has the emphatic appellation repeatedly given to him, the God of heaven," the very terms used by Cyrus himself. Nor are we to suppose the impression confined to the court; for the history of the three Hebrew youths, of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, sickness, and reformation from idolatry, of the interpretation of the hand writing on the wall by Daniel the servant of the living God, of his deliverance from the lions, and the publicity of the prophecy of Isaiah respecting Cyrus, were too recent, too public, and too striking in their nature, not to be often and largely talked of. Beside, in the prophecy respecting Cyrus, the intention of almighty God in recording the name of that monarch in an inspired book, and showing beforehand that he had chosen him to overturn the Babylonian empire, is expressly mentioned as having respect to two great objects, first, the deliverance of Israel, and, second, the making known his supreme divinity among the nations of the earth. We again quote Lowth's translation:--

For the sake of my servant Jacob,  
 And of Israel my chosen,  
 I have even called thee by thy name,  
 I have surnamed thee, though thou knewest me not.  
 I am Jehovah, and none else,  
 Beside me there is no God;  
 I will gird thee, though thou hast not known me,  
 That they may know, from the rising of the sun,  
 And from the west, that there is NONE BESIDE ME."

It was therefore intended by this proceeding on the part of Providence to teach, not only Cyrus, but the people of his vast empire, and surrounding nations, 1. That the God of the Jews was Jehovah, the self-subsistent, the eternal God; 2. That he was God alone, there being no deity beside himself; and, 3. That good and evil, represented by light and darkness, were neither independent nor eternal subsistences, but his great instruments, and under his control.

The Persians, who had so vastly extended their empire by the conquest of the countries formerly held by the monarchs of Babylon, were thus prepared for such a reformation of their religion as Zoroaster effected. The principles he advocated had been previously adopted by Cyrus and other Persian monarchs, and probably by many of the principal persons of that nation. Zoroaster himself thus became acquainted with the great truths contained in this famous prophecy, which attacked the very foundations of

every idolatrous and Manichean system. From the other sacred books of the Jews, who mixed with the Persians in every part of the empire, he evidently learned more. 611 This is sufficiently proved from the many points of similarity between his religion and Judaism, though he should not be allowed to speak so much in the style of the Holy Scriptures as some passages in the Zendavesta would indicate. He found the people, however, prepared of the Lord" to admit his reformatations, and he carried them. This cannot but be looked upon as one instance of several merciful dispensations of God to the Gentile world, through his own peculiar people, the Jews, by which the idolatries of the Heathen were often checked, and the light of truth rekindled among them. In this view the ancient Jews evidently considered the Jewish church as appointed not to preserve only but to extend true religion. God be merciful to us and bless us; that thy way may be known upon earth, thy saving health unto all nations." This renders Pagan nations more evidently without excuse." That this dispensation of mercy was afterward neglected among the Persians, is certain. How long the effect continued we know not, nor how widely it spread; perhaps longer and wider than may now distinctly appear. If the magi, who came from the east to seek Christ, were Persians, some true worshippers of God would appear to have remained in Persia to that day; and if, as is probable, the prophecies of Isaiah and Daniel were retained among them, they might be among those who waited for redemption," not at Jerusalem, but in a distant part of the world. The Parsees, who were nearly extirpated by Mohammedan fanaticism, were charged by their oppressors with the idolatry of fire, and this was probably true of the multitude. Some of their writers, however, warmly defended themselves against the charge. A considerable number of them remain in India to this day, and profess to have the books of Zoroaster.

2. The term magi was also anciently used generally throughout the east, to distinguish philosophers, and especially astronomers. Pliny and Ptolemy mention Arabi as synonymous with magi; and it was the opinion of many learned men in the first ages of Christianity, that the magi who presented offerings to the infant Saviour, Matt. ii, 1, came from southern Arabia; for it is certain that gold, frankincense, and myrrh," were productions of that country. They were philosophers among whom the best parts of the reformed magian system, which was extensively diffused, were probably preserved. They were pious men, also, who had some acquaintance, it may be, with the Hebrew prophecies, and were favoured themselves with divine revelations. They are to be regarded as members of the old patriarchal church, never quite extinguished among the Heathen; and they had the special honour to present the homage of the Gentile world to the infant Saviour.

MAGICIAN not unfrequently occurs in Scripture. Generally it signifies a diviner, a fortune teller, &c. Moses forbids recourse to such on pain of death: The soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and even cut him off from among his people," Leviticus xix, 31; xx, 6. The Hebrew is אֵל-הַאֲבֹת וְאֵל-הַיִּדְעָנִים, which signify literally,--the first, those possessed with a spirit of Python, or a demon that foretells future events;--the second, knowers, they who boast of the knowledge of secret things. It was such sort of people that Saul extirpated out of the land of Israel, 1 Sam. xxviii, 3. Daniel also speaks of magicians and diviners in Chaldea, under Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel i, 20, &c; לְהַרְטֹמִים וְלְאֲשָׁפִים. He names four sorts: Chartumim, Asaphim, Mecasphim, and Casdim, Daniel ii, 2. The first, Chartumim, according to Theodotion, signifies enchanters;" according to the LXX, sophists;" according to Jerom, hariolas, diviners, fortune tellers, casters of nativities." The second word, Asaphim, has a great resemblance to the Greek word σοφὸς, wise man;" whether the Greeks took this word from the Babylonians, or vice versâ. Theodotion and Jerom have rendered it magicians;" the LXX, philosophers." The third word, Mecasphim, by Jerom and the Greeks, is translated malefici, enchanters;" such as used noxious herbs and drugs, the blood of victims, and the bones of the dead, for their superstitious operations. The fourth word, Casdim, or Chaldeans, has two significations: first, the Chaldean people, over whom Nebuchadnezzar was monarch; the second, a sort of philosophers, who dwelt in a separate part of the city, who were exempt from all public offices and employments. Their studies were physic, astrology, divination, foretelling of future events by the stars, interpretation of dreams, augury, worship of the gods, &c. All these inquisitive and superstitious arts were prohibited among the Israelites, as founded on imposture or devilism, and as inconsistent with faith in God's providence, and trust in his supremacy.

MAGOG. See Gog.

MAHANAIM, a city of the Levites, of the family of Merari, in the tribe of Gad, upon the brook Jabbok, Joshua xxi, 38; xiii, 26. The name Mahanaim signifies two hosts," or two fields." The patriarch gave it this name because in this place he had a vision of angels coming to meet him, Genesis xxxii, 2. Mahanaim was the seat of the kingdom of Ishbosheth, after the death of Saul, 2 Sam. ii, 9, 12. It was also to this place that David retired during the usurpation of Absalom, 2 Sam. xvii, 24; and this rebellious son was subdued, and suffered death, not far from this city.

MAHOMETANISM. Mohammed, its distinguished founder, was born in Arabia, toward the conclusion of the sixth century. Although he had been

reduced to poverty, he was descended from ancestors who had long been conspicuous by rank and by influence; but having been shut out from the advantages of education, which in his peculiar case might have rather cramped than invigorated the astonishing powers of his mind, he had been compelled to seek his subsistence by devoting himself to a menial occupation. Yet although thus unfavourably situated, he was led, in conducting the commercial transactions which, in the service of Cadijah, a woman of great wealth, he was employed to arrange, to survey the state of several of the neighbouring nations; became acquainted with the most striking features in the characters of those by whom he was surrounded; and he was enabled to profit by the information which he thus procured, from his adding to the graces of personal elegance and beauty, the most captivating manners, and the most winning address. Exalted by the partiality of Cadijah, who conferred on him her hand and her extensive possessions, he seems early to have formed the scheme of announcing himself as the author of a new religion, and, in virtue of this sacred office, of ascending to that supremacy of political influence which it was his singular fortune, soon after he unfolded his pretensions, to attain. Taking advantage of that insensibility into which, by the attacks of epilepsy, he was occasionally thrown, he pretended that he was wrapped in divine contemplation, or was actually holding communication with higher orders of beings, who were committing to him the divine instructions which he was to disseminate through the world.

When the time which he conceived to be favourable for the grand object of his ambition had arrived, he openly declared that he was the prophet of the most high God; but the magistrates of Mecca, despising his pretensions, or dreading the evils which might result from religious innovation, vigorously opposed him, and he found himself compelled, in order to avoid the punishment which they were preparing to inflict on him, to have recourse to flight. He did not, however, relinquish the scheme upon which he had so long meditated, and which he was convinced that he was qualified to carry into execution. After his departure from Mecca, from which event the Mohammedan era of the hegira takes its commencement, he was joined by a few followers determined to share his fate; and having solemnly consecrated the banner under which he was to extend his power and propagate his tenets, he commenced hostilities against those by whom he had been opposed. His first efforts, however, were not crowned with success, but he had infused into his attendants a spirit which misfortune could not subdue: they renewed their enterprise, and Mecca at length submitted to his arms. From this period his exaltation was very rapid; he was venerated as the favoured messenger of Heaven, and his countrymen bowed down before a sovereign protected, as they believed, by the Omnipotent, and commissioned to reveal his will. There were many causes

which satisfactorily account for his success. The Christian religion, in the corrupted form in which it existed in the regions contiguous to the country of the prophet, was not interwoven with the affections of its professors; they were split into factions, contending about the most frivolous distinctions and the most ridiculous tenets; and the sword of persecution was mutually wielded by them all, to spread misery where there should have been the ties of charity and love. Thus divided, they presented no steady resistance to the attempt made to wrest from them their religion; and, indeed, as many of them had adopted that religion, not from conviction, but from dread of the tyranny by which it had been imposed on them, they only did what they had previously done, when, shrinking from the ferocious zeal of the emissaries of the prophet, they submitted to his doctrine. With admirable address, too, he had framed his religious system, so as to gratify those to whom it was announced. Laying down the sublime and unquestionable doctrine of the unity of God, he professed to revere the patriarchs, whose memory the Arabs held in veneration; he admitted that Moses was a messenger from God; he acknowledged Jesus as an exalted prophet; and he founded his own pretensions upon the intimation which our Saviour had given that the Paraclete, or Comforter, was to be sent to lead the world into all truth. Thus each party found in the Koran much of what it had been accustomed to believe; and the transition was in this way rendered more easy to the admission that a new revelation had been vouchsafed.

This effect was facilitated by the ignorance which prevailed in Arabia. Accustomed to a wandering life, the Arabs had devoted no time to the acquisition of knowledge; most of them were even unable to read the Koran, the sublimity and beauty of which were held forth to them as incontestable proofs of the inspiration of its author. Had Mohammed, indeed rested his doctrine upon miracles, it might have happened that the imposture by some would have been detected; but, with his usual policy, he avoided what he knew was so hazardous; and, with the exception of his reference to the Koran, as surpassing the capacity of man, he explicitly disclaimed having been authorized to do such mighty works as had been wrought to establish the previous dispensations of the Almighty. The fascinating representation that he gave of the joys of paradise, which he accommodated to the conceptions and wishes of the eastern nations, also made a deep and favourable impression; the wantonness of imagination was gratified with the anticipation of a state abounding with sensual gratification raised to the highest degree of exquisiteness; while the dismal fate allotted through eternity to all who rejected the message which he brought, alarmed the fears of the credulous and superstitious multitude whom he was eager to allure. When with these causes are combined the vigour of his administration, and the certainty of suffering or of death in

the event of withstanding his doctrine, there is sufficient to account for the success of his religion; and there is in that success nothing which can, with the shadow of reason, be employed, as, with strange perversion of argument, it has sometimes been, to invalidate the proof for the truth of Christianity deduced from its rapid diffusion. That proof does not rest upon the mere circumstance that the religion of Jesus was widely and speedily propagated; there might, under particular circumstances, have been in this nothing wonderful; but on the facts that it was so propagated, when all the human means to which they who preached it could have recourse, would have retarded rather than promoted what actually took place; that it employed no force; that it held out no earthly advantages; that it accommodated itself to no previous religious prejudices; and that it opposed and reprov'd all, and did not gratify any, of the corruptions and lusts of human nature.

But Mohammed did not limit his views to the sovereignty of Arabia: he was elevated by the hope of universal empire; and he moulded his system so as to promote what he was eager to attain. For this purpose he promised to all who enrolled themselves under his banner full license to plunder the nations against which they were led; and he made it a fundamental tenet of his faith that they who fell in the warlike enterprises destined to enlarge the number of believers were at once delivered from the guilt and misery of their sins, and were admitted to the happy scenes prepared for the faithful. He thus collected around him an army thoroughly devoted, prepared for meeting every danger, stimulated to the most laborious exertions by the hope of plunder, and steeled against all which can weaken courage or exhaust resolution, by the enthusiasm of hope; whatever was their fate, they had nothing to dread; if they escaped the weapons of their enemies, they were loaded with spoil, and invited to indulgence; and if they fell, they were canonized by those who survived, and exchanged the vicissitudes and troubles of this world for the delights of a sensual paradise. An army thus constituted and thus impelled must, under any circumstances, have been formidable; against them the usual methods to defeat invasion and to prevent conquest would have failed; they could have been successfully encountered only by men who had imbibed a similar spirit, and who identified patience and courage in the field with the most sacred duty required by religion. Of the advantages which, after Arabia had acknowledged his sway, and hailed him as the prophet of the Lord, he might confidently anticipate, Mohammed was abundantly sensible; but while he was preparing to bring into action the mighty machine which he had erected, his earthly career was terminated, and he left to others to execute the schemes which he had fondly devised.



The energy of the system remained after the author of it was removed from the world; and his successors lost no time in extending their dominions far beyond the bounds of Arabia. The obstacles opposed to them instantly yielded; a feeble and degenerate empire sinking under its own weight, and unable to resist any power acting against it, at once submitted to the host of fanatical plunderers, who spread desolation as they advanced; the richest provinces soon were wrested from it; and the most fertile regions of Asia fell under the conquering fury of the caliphs. Persia, which had long persecuted Christianity, was added to their increasing territories; Syria submitted to their yoke; and, what filled with horror and with anguish the believers in the Gospel, Palestine, that holy land from which the light of divine truth had beamed upon the nations, which had been the scene of those awful or interesting events recorded in the inspired Scriptures, which had witnessed the life, the ministry, the death, the resurrection, and ascension of the Redeemer of mankind, bent under the iron sceptre of an infidel sovereign, nominally, indeed, revering the Founder of its religion, but filled with bigoted and implacable hatred against the most attached and conscientious of his disciples. But the caliphs did not accomplish their principal object when they reduced to subjection the countries which they ravaged: to them it was of infinitely more moment to propagate the Musselman faith; and, accordingly, although in the commencement of that faith some indulgence was, from political considerations, granted to the Christians, there was soon no alternative left to the trembling captives but to embrace the doctrine of the prophet, or to submit to slavery or death. We cannot wonder that tenets thus enforced rapidly spread; they supplanted, in many extensive regions, the religion of Jesus; and, incorporating themselves with civil governments, or rather founding all governments upon the Koran, they continue, at the distance of eleven hundred years, to be believed through a large proportion of the world.

The effect of this signal revolution was first experienced by those Christians who inhabited the eastern parts of the empire; but the account of it must have been speedily conveyed throughout Christendom, and the gigantic enterprises of the Saracens soon threatened all nations with slavery and superstition. The successors of the prophet, in the eighth century, directed their steps toward Europe; and having at length crossed the narrow sea which separates Africa from Spain, they dispersed the troops of Roderick, king of the Goths, took possession of the greater part of his dominions, subverted the empire of the Visigoths, which had been established in Spain for upward of three centuries, and planted themselves along the coast of Gaul, from the Pyrenean mountains to the Rhine. Charlemagne, alarmed at their progress, made a great effort to crush them; but he failed in accomplishing his object, and they committed, in various parts of Europe which they visited, the most shocking devastations.

When a great part of the life of Mohammed had been spent in preparatory meditation on the system he was about to establish, the chapters of the Alcoran or Koran, which was to contain the rule of the faith and practice of his followers, were dealt out slowly and separately during the long period of three-and-twenty years. He entrusted his beloved wife, Raphsa, the daughter of Omar, with the keeping of the chest of his apostleship, in which 614 were laid up all the originals of the revelations he pretended to have received by the ministration of the Angel Gabriel, and out of which the Koran, consisting of one hundred and fourteen surats, or chapters, of very unequal length, was composed after his death. Yet, defective in its structure, and not less exceptionable in its doctrines and precepts, was the work which he thus delivered to his followers as the oracles of God. We will not detract from the real merit of the Koran; we allow it to be generally elegant and often sublime; but at the same time we reject with disdain its arrogant pretensions to any thing supernatural. Nay, if, descending to a minute investigation of it, we consider its perpetual inconsistency and absurdity, we shall indeed have cause for astonishment at that weakness of humanity which could ever have received such compositions as the work of the Deity, and which could still hold it in such high admiration as it is held by the followers of Mohammed to the present day. Far from supporting its arrogant claim to a supernatural work, it sinks below the level of many compositions confessedly of human original; and still lower does it fall when compared with that pure and perfect pattern which we justly admire in the Scriptures of truth. The first praise of all the productions of genius is invention; but the Koran bears little impression of this transcendent character. It does not contain one single doctrine which may not fairly be derived either from the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, from the spurious and apocryphal Gospels, then current in the east, from the Talmudical legends, or from the traditions, customs, and opinions of the Arabians. And the materials collected from these several sources are here heaped together with perpetual and needless repetitions, without any settled principle, or visible connection. The most prominent feature of the Koran, that point of excellence in which the partiality of its admirers has ever delighted to view it, is the sublime notion it generally impresses of the nature and attributes of God. But if its author had really derived these just conceptions from the inspiration of that Being whom they attempt to describe, they would not have been surrounded, as they now are, on every side with error and absurdity. By attempting to explain what is inconceivable, to describe what is ineffable, and to materialize what in itself is spiritual, he absurdly and impiously aimed to sensualize the purity of the divine essence. But it might easily be proved, that whatever the Koran justly defines of the divine attributes, was borrowed from our Holy Scriptures; which, even from their first promulgation, but especially from

the completion of the New Testament, have extended the views, and enlightened the understandings, of mankind.

The Koran, indeed, every where inculcates that grand and fundamental doctrine of the unity of the supreme Being, the establishment of which was constantly alleged by the impostor as the primary object of his pretended mission; but on the subject of the Christian trinity, its author seems to have entertained very gross and mistaken ideas, and to have been totally ignorant of the perfect consistency of that opinion with the unity of the Deity. With respect to the great doctrine of a future life, and the condition of the soul after its departure from the body, it must indeed be acknowledged that the prophet of Arabia has presented us with a nearer prospect of the invisible world, and disclosed to us a thousand particulars concerning it, which the Holy Scriptures had wrapped in the most profound and mysterious silence. But in his various representations of another life, he generally descends to an unnecessary minuteness and particularity, which excite disgust and ridicule, instead of reverence. He constantly pretended to have received these stupendous secrets by the ministry of the Angel Gabriel, from that eternal book in which the divine decrees have been written by the finger of the Almighty from the foundation of the world; but the learned inquirer will discover a more accessible, and a far more probable, source whence they might be derived, partly in the wild and fanciful opinions of the ancient Arabs, and chiefly in those exhaustless stores of marvellous and improbable fiction, the works of the rabbins. Hence, that romantic fable of the angel of death, whose peculiar office it is, at the destined hour, to dissolve the union between soul and body, and to free the departing spirit from its prison of flesh. Hence, too, the various descriptions of the general resurrection and final judgment with which the Koran every where abounds; and hence the vast but ideal balance in which the actions of all mankind shall then be impartially weighed, and their eternal doom be assigned them, either in the regions of bliss or misery, according as their good or evil deeds shall preponderate. Here, too, may be traced the grand and original outlines of that sensual paradise, and those luxurious enjoyments, which were so successfully employed in the Koran, to gratify the ardent genius of the Arabs, and allure them to the standard of the prophet.

The same observation which has been applied with respect to the sources whence the doctrines were drawn, may, with some few limitations, be likewise extended to the precepts which the Arabian legislator has enjoined. That the Koran, amidst a various and confused heap of ridiculous and even immoral precepts, contains many interesting and instructive lessons of morality, cannot with truth be denied. Of these, however, the merit is to be ascribed, not to the feeble imitation, but to the great and

perfect original from which they were manifestly drawn. Instead of improving on the Christian precepts by a superior degree of refinement; instead of exhibiting a purer and more perfect system of morals than that of the Gospel; the prophet of Arabia has miserably debased and weakened even what he has borrowed from that system. We are told by our Saviour, that a man is to be the husband of one wife, and that there is to be an inseparable union between them. By Mohammed's confession, 615 Jesus Christ was a prophet of the true God, and the Holy Spirit was with him. Yet in the Koran we find permission for any person to have four wives, and as many concubines as he can maintain. Again: our Saviour expressly tells us, that, at the resurrection, they will neither marry nor be given in marriage; but be like the angels of God in heaven." We are informed also by St. Paul, that we shall be changed, and have a spiritual and glorified body; for flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven; neither can corruption inherit incorruption." But Mohammed gives a very different account: it is clear, from his own confession, that the happiness promised in the Koran consists in base and corporeal enjoyments. According to its author, there will not only be marriage, but also servitude in the next world. The very meanest in paradise will have eighty thousand servants, and seventy-two wives of the girls of paradise, beside the wives he had in this world; he will also have a tent erected for him of pearls, hyacinths, and emeralds. And as marriage will take place, so a new race will be introduced in heaven; for, says the Koran, If any of the faithful in paradise be desirous of issue, it shall be conceived, born, and grown up in the space of an hour." But on the contradictions in point of doctrine, though sufficient of themselves to confute the pretensions of Mohammed, we forbear to insist.

The impure designs which gave birth to the whole system may be traced in almost every subordinate part; even its sublimest descriptions of the Deity, even its most exalted moral precepts, not unfrequently either terminate in, or are interwoven with, some provision to gratify the inordinate cravings of ambition, or some license for the indulgence of the corrupt passions of the human heart. It has allowed private revenge, in the case of murder; it has given a sanction to fornication; and, if any weight be due to the example of its author, it has justified adultery. It has made war, and rapine, and bloodshed, provided they be exercised against unbelievers, not only meritorious acts, but even essential duties to the good Musselman; duties by the performance of which he may secure the constant favour and protection of God and his prophet in this life, and in the next entitle himself to the boundless joys of paradise. In the Koran are advanced the following assertions, among others already noticed: That both Jews and Christians are idolaters; that the patriarchs and Apostles were Mohammedans; that the angels worshipped Adam, and that the fallen angels were driven from heaven for not doing so; that our blessed Saviour was neither God, nor the

Son of God; and that he assured Mohammed of this in a conference with the Almighty and him; yet that he was both the word and Spirit of God: not to mention numberless absurdities concerning the creation, the deluge, the end of the world, the resurrection, the day of judgment, too gross to be received by any except the most debased understandings.

It was frequently the triumphant boast of St. Paul, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ had for ever freed mankind from the intolerable burden of ceremonial observances. But the Koran renews and perpetuates the slavery, by prescribing to its votaries a ritual still more oppressive, and entangling them again in a yoke of bondage yet more severe than that of the law. Of this kind, amidst a variety of instances, is that great and meritorious act of Mohammedan devotion, the pilgrimage to the holy city of Mecca; an act which the Koran has enjoined, and the pious Musselman implicitly performs, as necessary to the obtaining pardon of his sins, and qualifying him to be a partaker of the alluring pleasures and exquisite enjoyments of paradise. To the several articles of faith to which all his followers were to adhere, Mohammed added four fundamental points of religious practice; namely, prayer five times a day, fasting, alms-giving, and the pilgrimage to Mecca. Under the first of these are comprehended those frequent washings or purifications which he prescribed as necessary preparations for the duty of prayer. So necessary did he think them, that he is said to have declared, that the practice of religion is founded upon cleanliness, which is one half of faith, and the key of prayer. The second of these he conceived to be a duty of so great moment, that he used to say it was the gate of religion, and that the odour of the mouth of him who fasteth is more grateful to God than that of musk. The third is looked upon as so pleasing in the sight of God, that the Caliph Omar Ebn Abdalaziz used to say, Prayer carries us half way to God; fasting brings us to the door of his palace; and alms procure us admission." The last of these practical religious duties is deemed so necessary, that, according to a tradition of Mohammed, he who dies without performing it, may as well die a Jew or a Christian." As to the negative precepts and institutions of this religion, the Mohammedans are forbidden the use of wine, and are prohibited from gaming, usury, and the eating of blood and swine's flesh, and whatever dies of itself, or is strangled, or killed by a blow, or by another beast. They are said, however, to comply with the prohibition of gaming, (from which chess seems to be excepted,) much better than they do with that of wine, under which all strong and inebriating liquors are included; for both the Persians and Turks are in the habit of drinking freely.

However successful and triumphant from without, the progress of the followers of Mohammed received a considerable check by the civil dissensions which arose among themselves soon after his death. Abubeker

and Ali, the former the father-in-law, the latter the son-in-law, of this pretended prophet, aspired both to succeed him in the empire which he had erected. Upon this arose a cruel and tedious contest, whose flames produced that schism which divided the Mohammedans into two great factions; and this separation not only gave rise to a variety of opinions and rites, but also excited the most implacable hatred, and the most deadly animosities, which have been continued to the present day. With such furious zeal is this contention still carried on between these two factions, who are distinguished by the name of Sonnites and Schiites, that each party detest and anathematize the other as abominable heretics, and farther from the truth than either the Christians or the Jews. The chief points in which they differ are: 1. The Schiites reject Abubeker, Omar, and Othman, the first three caliphs, as usurpers and intruders; but the Sonnites acknowledge and respect them as rightful caliphs or imams. 2. The Schiites prefer Ali to Mohammed, or, at least, esteem them both equal; but the Sonnites admit neither Ali, nor any of the prophets, to be equal to Mohammed. 3. The Sonnites charge the Schiites with corrupting the Koran, and neglecting its precepts; and the Schiites retort the same charge on the Sonnites.

4. The Sonnites receive the Sonna, or book of traditions of their prophet, as of canonical authority; but the Schiites reject it as apocryphal, and unworthy of credit. The Sonnites are subdivided into four chief sects, of which the first is that of the Hanefites, who generally prevail among the Turks and Tartars; the second, that of the Malecites, whose doctrine is chiefly followed in Barbary, and other parts of Africa; the third, that of the Shafeites, who are chiefly confined to Arabia and Persia; and the fourth orthodox sect is that of the Hanbalites, who are not very numerous, and seldom to be met with out of the limits of Arabia. The heretical sects among the Mohammedans are those which are counted to hold heterodox opinions in fundamentals, or matters of faith; and they are variously compounded and decomposed of the opinions of four chief sects; the Motazalites, the Safatians, the Kharejites, and the Schiites.

Ever since the valour of John Sobieski rolled back the hosts of Islamism from eastern and central Europe, the civil dominion of the false prophet has been rather retrograde than advancing. A free philosophy in many places is destroying the influence of the system among the better informed; and the barbarism and misery which a bad government inflicts upon the people, weakens its power, and is preparing the way for great changes. The throwing off the Turkish yoke by the Greeks, and the rising greatness of Russia, are symptoms of the approaching subversion of Mohammedanism as a power; and thus the fall of this eastern antichrist cannot long be delayed. It is, indeed, even now supported only by the rival interests of

Christian powers; and a new combination among them would suddenly withdraw its only support.

MALACHI, the last of the twelve minor prophets. Malachi prophesied about B. C. 400; and some traditionary accounts state that he was a native of Sapha, and of the tribe of Zebulun. He reproves the people for their wickedness, and the priests for their negligence in the discharge of their office; he threatens the disobedient with the judgments of God, and promises great rewards to the penitent and pious; he predicts the coming of Christ, and the preaching of John the Baptist; and with a solemnity becoming the last of the prophets, he closes the sacred canon with enjoining the strict observance of the Mosaic law, till the forerunner, already promised, should appear in the spirit of Elias, to introduce the Messiah, who was to establish a new and everlasting covenant.

MAMMON, a Syriac word which signifies riches, Matt. vi, 24.

MAMRE, an Amorite, brother of Aner and Eshcol, and friend of Abraham, Gen. xiv, 13. It was with these three persons, together with his own and their domestics, that Abraham pursued and overcame the kings after their conquest of Sodom and Gomorrah.

2. Mamre, the same as Hebron. In Gen. xxiii, 19, it is said, that Abraham buried Sarah in the cave of the field of Machpelah, before Mamre: the same is Hebron in the land of Canaan." And in Gen. xxxv, 27, it is said, that Jacob came unto Isaac his father, unto Mamre, unto the city of Arba, which is Hebron." The city probably derived its name from that Mamre who joined Abraham in the pursuit of Chedorlaomer, and the rescue of Lot, Gen. xiv.

Mamre, Plain of, a plain near Mamre, or Hebron, said to be about two miles to the south of the town. Here Abraham dwelt after his separation from Lot; here he received from God himself a promise of the land, in which he was then a stranger, for his posterity; here he entertained the angels under an oak, and received a second promise of a son; and here he purchased a burying place for Sarah; which served also as a sepulchre for himself and the rest of his family.

MANAHEM was the sixteenth king of Israel, and son of Gadi. He revenged the death of his master Zachariah, by killing Shallum, son of Jabesh, who had usurped the crown of Israel, A. M. 3232, 2 Kings xv, 13, &c. Manahem reigned in his stead.

MANASSEH, the eldest son of Joseph, and grandson of the patriarch Jacob, Gen. xii, 50, was born, A. M. 2290, B. C. 1714. The name Manasseh signifies forgetfulness, because Joseph said, "God hath made me forget all my toil, and all my father's house." When Jacob was going to die, Joseph brought his two sons to him, that his father might give them his last blessing, Gen. xlviii. Jacob, having seen them, adopted them. The tribe of Manasseh came out of Egypt in number thirty-two thousand two hundred men, upward of twenty years old, under the conduct of Gamaliel, son of Pedahzur, Num. ii, 20, 21. This tribe was divided in the land of promise. One half tribe of Manasseh settled beyond the river Jordan, and possessed the country of Bashan, from the river Jabbok, to Mount Libanus; and the other half tribe of Manasseh settled on this side Jordan, and possessed the country between the tribe of Ephraim south, and the tribe of Issachar north, having the river Jordan east, and the Mediterranean Sea west, Joshua xvi; xvii.

6172. Manasseh, the fifteenth king of Judah, and son and successor of Hezekiah, was twelve years old when he began to reign, and reigned fifty-five years, 2 Kings xx, 21; xxi, 1, 2; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 1, 2, &c. His mother's name was Hephzibah. He did evil in the sight of the Lord; worshipped the idols of the land of Canaan; rebuilt the high places that his father Hezekiah had destroyed; set up altars to Baal; and planted groves to false gods. He raised altars to the whole host of heaven, in the courts of God's house; made his son pass through the fire in honour of Moloch; was addicted to magic, divinations, auguries, and other superstitions; set up the idol Astarte in the house of God; finally, he involved his people in all the abomination of the idolatrous nations to that degree, that Israel committed more wickedness than the Canaanites, whom the Lord had driven out before them. To all these crimes Manasseh added cruelty; and he shed rivers of innocent blood in Jerusalem. The Lord being provoked by so many crimes, threatened him by his prophets, I will blot out Jerusalem as a writing is blotted out of a writing tablet." The calamities which God had threatened began toward the twenty-second year of this impious prince. The king of Assyria sent his army against him, who, seizing him among the briers and brambles where he was hid, fettered his hands and feet, and carried him to Babylon, 2 Chron. xxxiii, 11, 12, &c. It was probably Sargon or Esar-haddon, king of Assyria, who sent Tartan into Palestine, and who taking Azoth, attacked Manasseh, put him in irons, and led him away, not to Nineveh, but to Babylon, of which Esar-haddon had become master, and had reunited the empires of the Assyrians and the Chaldeans. Manasseh, in bonds at Babylon, humbled himself before God, who heard his prayers, and brought him back to Jerusalem; and Manasseh acknowledged the hand of the Lord. Manasseh was probably delivered out of prison by Saosduchin, the successor of Esar-haddon, 2 Chron. xxxiii, 13, 14, &c. Being returned



to Jerusalem, he restored the worship of the Lord; broke down the altars of the false gods; abolished all traces of their idolatrous worship; but he did not destroy the high places: which is the only thing Scripture reproaches him with, after his return from Babylon. He caused Jerusalem to be fortified; and he inclosed with a wall another city, which in his time was erected west of Jerusalem, and which went by the name of the second city, 2 Chron. xxxiii, 14. He put garrisons into all the strong places of Judah. Manasseh died at Jerusalem, and was buried in the garden of his house, in the garden of Uzza, 2 Kings xxi, 18. He was succeeded by his son Amon.

MANDRAKE, מַדְאִימָה, Gen. xxx, 14–16; Cant. vii, 13. Interpreters have wasted much time and pains in endeavouring to ascertain what is intended by the Hebrew word dudaim. Some translate it by violet,” others, lilies,” jasmynes,” truffle or mushroom,” and some think that the word means flowers,” or fine flowers,” in general. Bochart, Calmet, and Sir Thomas Browne, suppose the citron intended; Celsius is persuaded that it is the fruit of the lote tree; Hiller, that cherries are spoken of; and Ludolf maintains that it is the fruit which the Syrians call mauz, resembling in figure and taste the Indian fig; but the generality of interpreters and commentators understand by dudaim, mandrakes, a species of melon; and it is so rendered in the Septuagint, and in both the Targums, on Gen. xxx, 14. It appears from Scripture, that they were in perfection about the time of wheat harvest, have an agreeable odour, may be preserved, and are placed with pomegranates. Hasselquist, the pupil and intimate friend of Linnæus, who travelled into the Holy Land to make discoveries in natural history, imagines that the plant commonly called mandrake, is intended. Speaking of Nazareth, in Galilee, he says, “What I found most remarkable at this village was the great number of mandrakes which grew in a vale below it. I had not the pleasure to see this plant in blossom, the fruit now (May 5th, O. S.) hanging ripe on the stem, which lay withered on the ground. From the season in which this mandrake blossoms and ripens fruit, one may form a conjecture that it was Rachel’s dudaim. These were brought her in the wheat harvest, which in Galilee is in the month of May, about this time, and the mandrake was now in fruit.”

MANICHÆANS, or MANICHEES, a denomination founded in the latter part of the third century, by Mani, Manes, or Manichæus. Being a Persian or Chaldean by birth, and educated among the magi, he attempted a coalition of their doctrine with the Christian system, or rather, the explication of the one by the other. Dr. Lardner, so far from taking Mani and his followers for enthusiasts, as some have done, thinks they erred on the other side, and were rather a sect of reasoners and philosophers, than visionaries and enthusiasts. So Faustus, one of their leaders, says, the doctrine of Mani taught him not to receive every thing recommended as

said by our Saviour, but first to examine and consider whether it be true, sound, right, genuine; while the Catholics, he says, swallowed every thing, and acted as if they despised the benefit of human reason, and were afraid to examine and distinguish between truth and falsehood. St. Augustine, it is well known, was for some time among this sect; but they were not pretensions to inspiration, but specious and alluring promises of rational discoveries, by which Augustine was deluded, as he particularly states in his letter to his friend Honoratus. So Beausobre remarks: These heretics were philosophers, who, having formed certain systems, accommodated revelation to them, which was the servant of their reason, not the mistress.”

Mani, according to Dr. Lardner, believed in an eternal self-existent Being, completely happy and perfect in goodness, whom alone he called God, in a strict and proper sense; but he believed, also, in an evil principle or being, which he called hyle, or the devil, whom he considered as the god of this world, blinding the eyes of them that believe not, 2 Cor. iv, 4. God, the supreme and good, they considered as the Author of the universe; and, according to St. Augustine, they believed, also, in a consubstantial trinity, though they strangely supposed the Father to dwell in light inaccessible, the Son to have his residence in the solar orb, and the Holy Spirit to be diffused throughout the atmosphere; on which account they paid a superstitious, and perhaps an idolatrous, reverence to the sun and moon. Their belief in the evil principle was, no doubt, adopted to solve the mysterious question of the origin of evil, which, says Dr. Lardner, was the ruin of these men, and of many others. As to the hyle, or the devil, though they dared not to consider him as the creature of God, neither did they believe in his eternity; for they contended, from the Greek text of John viii, 44, that he had a father. But they admitted the eternity of matter, which they called darkness; and supposed hyle to be the result of some wonderful and unaccountable commotion in the kingdom of darkness, which idea seems to be borrowed from the Mosaic chaos. In this commotion darkness became mingled with light, and thus they account for good and evil being so mixed together in the world. Having thus brought hyle, or Satan, into being, they next found an empire and employment for him. Every thing, therefore, which they conceived unworthy of the fountain of goodness, they attributed to the evil being; particularly the material world, the Mosaic dispensation, and the Scriptures on which it was founded. This accounts for their rejecting the Old Testament. Dr. Lardner contends, however, that they received generally the books of the New Testament, though they objected to particular passages as corrupted, which they could not reconcile to their system. On Rom. vii, Mani founded the doctrine of two souls in man, two active principles; one, the source and cause of vicious passions, deriving its origin from matter; the other, the cause of the ideas of just and right, and of inclinations to follow those ideas, deriving its origin from

God. Considering all sensual enjoyments to be in some degree criminal, they were enemies to marriage; though, at the same time, knowing that all men cannot receive this saying, they allowed it to the second class of their disciples, called auditors; but by no means to the perfect or confirmed believers. Another absurd consequence of believing the moral evil of matter was, that they denied the real existence of Christ's human nature, and supposed him to suffer and die in appearance only. According to them, he took the form only of man; a notion that was afterward adopted by Mohammed, and which necessarily excludes all faith in the atonement. Construing too literally the assertion that flesh and blood could not inherit the kingdom of God, they denied the doctrine of the resurrection. Christ came, they said, to save the souls of men, and not the bodies. No part of matter, according to them, could be worthy of salvation. In many leading principles they thus evidently agreed with the Gnostics, of whom, indeed, they may be considered a branch.

MANNA, מַן, Exod. xvi, 15, 33, 35; Num. xi, 6, 7, 9; Josh. v, 12; Neh. ix, 20; Psa. lxxviii, 24; μάννα, John vi, 31, 49, 58; Heb. ix, 4; Rev. ii, 17; the food which God gave the children of Israel during their continuance in the deserts of Arabia, from the eighth encampment in the wilderness of Sin. Moses describes it as white like hoar frost, round, and of the bigness of coriander seed. It fell every morning upon the dew; and when the dew was exhaled by the heat of the sun, the manna appeared alone, lying upon the rocks or the sand. It fell every day except on the Sabbath, and this only around the camp of the Israelites. Every sixth day there fell a double quantity; and though it putrefied and bred maggots when it was kept any other day, yet on the Sabbath there was no such alteration. The same substance which was melted by the heat of the sun when it was left abroad, was of so hard a consistence when brought into the tent, that it was beaten in mortars, and would even endure the fire, being made into cakes and baked in pans. It fell in so great quantities during the whole forty years of their journey, that it was sufficient to feed the whole multitude of above a million of souls. Every man, that is, every male or head of a family, was to gather each day the quantity of an omer, about three quarts English measure; and it is observed that he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack," because his gathering was in proportion to the number of persons for whom he had to provide. Or every man gathered as much as he could; and then, when brought home and measured by an omer, if he had a surplus, it went to supply the wants of some other family that had not been able to collect a sufficiency, the family being large, and the time in which the manna might be gathered, before the heat of the day, not being sufficient to collect enough for so numerous a household, several of whom might be so confined as not to be able to collect for themselves. Thus there was an equality; and in this light the

words of St. Paul lead us to view the passage, 2 Cor. viii, 15. To commemorate their living upon manna, the Israelites were directed to put one omer of it into a golden vase; and it was preserved for many generations by the side of the ark.

Our translators and others make a plain contradiction in the relation of this account of the manna, by rendering it thus: And when the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, It is manna; for they knew not what it was;” whereas the Septuagint, and several authors, both ancient and modern, have translated the text according to the original: “The Israelites seeing this, said one to another, What is it? מִן הוּא; for they knew not what it was,” and therefore they could not give it a name. Moses immediately answers the question, and says, This is the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat.” From Exod. xvi, 31, we learn that this substance was afterward called <sup>619</sup>מַן, probably in commemoration of the question they had asked on its first appearance. What this substance was, we know not. It was nothing that was common in the wilderness. It is evident that the Israelites never saw it before; for Moses says, He fed thee with manna which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know,” Deut. viii, 3, 16; and it is very likely that nothing of the kind had ever been seen before; and by a pot of it being laid up in the ark, it is as likely that nothing of the kind ever appeared after the miraculous supply in the wilderness had ceased. The author of the book of Wisdom, xvi, 20, 21, says, that the manna so accommodated itself to every one’s taste that it proved palatable and pleasing to all. It has been remarked that at this day, what is called manna is found in several places; in Arabia, on Mount Libanus, Calabria, and elsewhere. The most famous is that of Arabia, which is a kind of condensed honey, which exudes from the leaves of trees, from whence it is collected when it has become concremented. Salmasius thinks this of the same kind which fed the children of Israel; and that the miracle lay, not in creating any new substance, but in making it fall duly at a set time every day throughout the whole year, and that in such plenty as to suffice so great a multitude. But in order for this, the Israelites must be supposed every day to have been in the neighbourhood of the trees on which this substance is formed; which was not the case, neither do these trees grow in those deserts. Beside, this kind of manna is purgative, and the stomach could not endure it in such quantity as is implied by its being eaten for food. The whole history of the giving the manna is evidently miraculous; and the manna was truly bread from heaven,” as sent by special interposition of God.

MANOAH, the father of Samson, was of the tribe of Dan, and a native of the city of Zorah, Judges xiii, 6–23. See Samson.

MARAH, or MARA, a word which signifies bitterness. When the Israelites came out of Egypt, and had arrived at the desert of Etham, they found the water so bitter that neither themselves nor their cattle could drink of it, *Exod. xv, 23*. On this account they gave the name of Marah to that encampment. And here their murmurings began against Moses; for they asked, "What shall we drink?" Moses prayed to the Lord, who instructed him to take a particular kind of wood, and cast it into the water, which he did; and immediately the water became palatable. According to the orientals, this wood was called Alnah.

MARANATHA. See Anathema.

MARBLE, 1, שיש *Chron. xxix, 2*; *Esther i, 6*; *Canticles v, 15*; a valuable kind of stone, of a texture so hard and compact, and of a grain so fine, as readily to take a beautiful polish. It is dug out of quarries in large masses, and is much used in buildings, ornamental pillars, &c. Marble is of different colours, black, white, &c; and is sometimes elegantly clouded and variegated. The stone mentioned in the places cited above is called the stone of sis or sish: the LXX and Vulgate render it Parian stone," which was remarkable for its bright white colour. Probably the cliff Ziz, *2 Chron. xx, 16*, was so called from being a marble crag: the place was afterward called Petra. The variety of stones, סהרת, דר, שיש, בהט, mentioned in the pavement of Ahasuerus, might be marble of different colours. The ancients sometimes made pavements wherein were set very valuable stones.

MARK was the nephew of Barnabas, being his sister's son; and he is supposed to have been converted to the Gospel by St. Peter, who calls him his son, *1 Peter v, 13*; but no circumstances of his conversion are recorded. The first historical fact mentioned of him in the New Testament is, that he went, in the year 44, from Jerusalem to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas. Not long after, he set out from Antioch with those Apostles upon a journey, which they undertook by the direction of the Holy Spirit, for the purpose of preaching the Gospel in different countries: but he soon left them, probably without sufficient reason, at Perga in Pamphylia, and went to Jerusalem, *Acts xiii*. Afterward, when Paul and Barnabas had determined to visit the several churches which they had established, Barnabas proposed that they should take Mark with them; to which Paul objected, because Mark had left them in their former journey. This produced a sharp contention between Paul and Barnabas, which ended in their separation. Mark accompanied his uncle Barnabas to Cyprus, but it is not mentioned whither they went when they left that island. We may conclude that St. Paul was afterward reconciled to St. Mark, from the manner in which he mentions him in his epistles written subsequently to this dispute; and particularly from the direction which he gives to Timothy: Take Mark, and

bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry," 2 Tim. iv, 11. No farther circumstances are recorded of St. Mark in the New Testament; but it is believed, upon the authority of ancient writers, that soon after his journey with Barnabas he met Peter in Asia, and that he continued with him for some time; perhaps till Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome. Epiphanius, Eusebius, and Jerom, all assert that Mark preached the Gospel in Egypt; and the two latter call him bishop of Alexandria.

Dr. Lardner thinks that St. Mark's Gospel is alluded to by Clement of Rome; but the earliest ecclesiastical writer upon record who expressly mentions it is Papias. It is mentioned, also, by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerom, Augustine, Chrysostom, and many others. The works of these fathers contain numerous quotations from this Gospel; and, as their testimony is not contradicted by any ancient writer, we may safely conclude that the Gospel of St. Mark is genuine. The authority of this Gospel is not affected by the 620question concerning the identity of Mark the evangelist, and Mark the nephew of Barnabas; since all agree that the writer of this Gospel was the familiar companion of St. Peter, and that he was qualified for the work which he undertook, by having heard, for many years, the public discourses and private conversation of that Apostle.

Some writers have asserted that St. Peter revised and approved this Gospel, and others have not scrupled to call it the Gospel according to St. Peter; by which title they did not mean to question St. Mark's right to be considered as the author of this Gospel, but merely to give it the sanction of St. Peter's name. The following passage in Eusebius appears to contain so probable an account of the occasion of writing this Gospel, and comes supported by such high authority, that we think it right to transcribe it: "The lustre of piety so enlightened the minds of Peter's hearers at Rome, that they were not contented with the bare hearing and unwritten instruction of his divine preaching, but they earnestly requested St. Mark, whose Gospel we have, being an attendant upon St. Peter, to leave with them a written account of the instructions which had been delivered to them by word of mouth; nor did they desist till they had prevailed upon him; and thus they were the cause of the writing of that Gospel, which is called according to St. Mark; and they say, that the Apostle being informed of what was done, by the revelation of the Holy Ghost, was pleased with the zeal of the men, and authorized the writing to be introduced into the churches. Clement gives this account in the sixth book of his Institutions; and Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, bears testimony to it." Jerom also says, that St. Mark wrote a short Gospel from what he had heard from St. Peter, at the request of the brethren at Rome, which, when St. Peter knew, he approved, and published it in the church, commanding the reading of it by his own authority.

Different persons have assigned different dates to this Gospel; but there being almost a unanimous concurrence of opinion, that it was written while St. Mark was with St. Peter at Rome, and not finding any ancient authority for supposing that St. Peter was in that city till A. D. 64, we are inclined to place the publication of this Gospel about A. D. 65. St. Mark having written this Gospel for the use of the Christians at Rome, which was at that time the great metropolis and common centre of all civilized nations, we accordingly find it free from all peculiarities, and equally accommodated to every description of persons. Quotations from the ancient prophets, and allusions to Jewish customs, are, as much as possible, avoided; and such explanations are added as might be necessary for Gentile readers at Rome; thus, when Jordan is first mentioned in this Gospel, the word river is prefixed, Mark i, 5; the oriental word corban is said to mean a gift, Mark vii, 11; the preparation is said to be the day before the Sabbath, Mark xv, 42; and defiled hands are said to mean unwashed hands, Mark vii, 2; and the superstition of the Jews upon that subject is stated more at large than it would have been by a person writing at Jerusalem.

Some learned men, from a collation of St. Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels have pointed out the use of the same words and expressions in so many instances that it has been supposed St. Mark wrote with St. Matthew's Gospel before him; but the similarity is not strong enough to warrant such a conclusion; and seems no greater than might have arisen from other causes. St. Peter would naturally recite in his preaching the same events and discourses which St. Matthew recorded in his Gospel; and the same circumstances might be mentioned in the same manner by men who sought not after excellency of speech," but whose minds retained the remembrance of facts or conversations which strongly impressed them, even without taking into consideration the idea of supernatural guidance. We may farther observe that the idea of St. Mark's writing from St. Matthew's Gospel does not correspond with the account given by Eusebius and Jerom as stated above.

MARK ON THE FOREHEAD. See Forehead.

MARONITES, a sect of eastern Christians who follow the Syrian rite, and are subject to the pope; their principal habitation being on Mount Libanus, or between the Ansarians to the north and the Druses to the south. Mosheim informs us, that the Monothelites, condemned and expelled by the council of Constantinople, found a place of refuge among the Mardaites, signifying in Syriac rebels, a people who took possession of Lebanon, A. D. 676, which became the asylum of vagabonds, slaves, and all sorts of rabble; and about the conclusion of the seventh century they were called Maronites,

after Maro, their first bishop; a name which they still retain. None, he says, of the ancient writers, give any certain account of the first person who instructed these mountaineers in the doctrine of the Monothelites; it is probable, however, from several circumstances, that it was John Maro, whose name they have adopted; and that this ecclesiastic received the name of Maro from his having lived in the character of a monk, in the famous convent of St. Maro, upon the borders of the Orontes, before his settlement among the Mardaites of Mount Libanus. One thing is certain, from the testimony of Tyrius, and other unexceptionable witnesses, as also from the most authentic records, namely, that the Maronites retained the opinions of the Monothelites until the twelfth century, when, abandoning and renouncing the doctrine of one will in Christ, they were readmitted into the communion of the Roman church. The most learned of the modern Maronites have left no method unemployed to defend their church against this accusation; they have laboured to prove, by a variety of testimonies, that their ancestors always persevered in the Catholic faith, and in their attachment to the Roman pontiff, 621 without ever adopting the doctrine of the Monophysites or Monothelites. But all their efforts are insufficient to prove the truth of these assertions, and the testimonies they allege will appear absolutely fictitious and destitute of authority.

The nation may be considered as divided into two classes, the common people and the shaiks, by whom must be understood the most eminent of the inhabitants, who, from the antiquity of their families, and the opulence of their fortunes are superior to the ordinary class. They all live dispersed in the mountains, in villages, hamlets, and even detached houses; which is never the case in the plains. The whole nation consists of cultivators. Every man improves the little domain he possesses, or farms, with his own hands. Even the shaiks live in the same manner, and are only distinguished from the rest by a bad peliss, a horse, and a few slight advantages in food and lodging; they all live frugally, without many enjoyments, but also with few wants, as they are little acquainted with the inventions of luxury. In general, the nation is poor, but no one wants necessaries; and if beggars are sometimes seen, they come rather from the sea coast than the country itself. Property is as sacred among them as in Europe; nor do we see there those robberies and extortions so frequent with the Turks. Travellers may journey there, either by night or by day, with a security unknown in any other part of the empire, and the stranger is received with hospitality, as among the Arabs: it must be owned, however, that the Maronites are less generous, and rather inclined to the vice of parsimony. Conformably to the doctrines of Christianity, they have only one wife, whom they frequently espouse without having seen, and always without having been much in her company. Contrary to the precepts of that same religion, however, they have admitted, or retained, the Arab custom of retaliation, and the nearest



relation of a murdered person is bound to avenge him. From a habit founded on distrust, and the political state of the country, every one, whether shaik or peasant, walks continually armed with a musket and poinards. This is, perhaps, an inconvenience; but this advantage results from it, that they have no novices in the use of arms among them, when it is necessary to employ them against the Turks. As the country maintains no regular troops, every man is obliged to join the army in time of war; and if this militia were well conducted, it would be superior to many European armies. From accounts taken in late years, the number of men fit to bear arms, amounts to thirty-five thousand.

In religious matters the Maronites are dependent on Rome. Though they acknowledge the supremacy of the pope, their clergy continue, as heretofore, to elect a head, with the title of batrak, or patriarch of Antioch. Their priests marry, as in the first ages of the church; but their wives must be maidens, and not widows; nor can they marry a second time. They celebrate mass in Syriac, of which the greatest part of them comprehend not a word. The Gospel, alone, is read aloud in Arabic, that it may be understood by the people. The communion is administered in both kinds. In the small country of the Maronites there are reckoned upward of two hundred convents for men and women. These religious are of the order of St. Anthony, whose rules they observe with an exactness which reminds us of earlier times. The court of Rome, in affiliating the Maronites, has granted them a hospitium at Rome, to which they may send several of their youth to receive a gratuitous education. It should seem that this institution might introduce among them the ideas and arts of Europe; but the pupils of this school, limited to an education purely monastic, bring home nothing but the Italian language, which is of no use, and a stock of theological learning, from which as little advantage can be derived; they accordingly soon assimilate with the rest. Nor has a greater change been operated by the three or four missionaries maintained by the French capuchins at Gazir, Tripoli, and Bairout. Their labours consist in preaching in their church, in instructing children in the catechism, Thomas a Kempis, and the Psalms, and in teaching them to read and write. Formerly, the Jesuits had two missionaries at their house at Antoura, and the Lazarites have now succeeded them in their mission. The most valuable advantage that has resulted from these labours is, that the art of writing has become more common among the Maronites, and rendered them, in this country, what the Copts are in Egypt, that is, they are in possession of all the posts of writers, intendants, and kaiyas among the Turks, and especially of those among their allies and neighbours, the Druses.

Mosheim observes, that the subjection of the Maronites to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff was agreed to with this express condition,

that neither the popes nor their emissaries should pretend to change or abolish any thing that related to the ancient rites, moral precepts, or religious opinions of this people; so that, in reality, there is nothing to be found among the Maronites that savours of popery, if we except their attachment to the Roman pontiff. It is also certain that there are Maronites in Syria, who still behold the church of Rome with the greatest aversion and abhorrence; nay, what is still more remarkable, great numbers of that nation residing in Italy, even under the eye of the pontiff, opposed his authority during the seventeenth century, and threw the court of Rome into great perplexity. One body of these non-conforming Maronites retired into the valleys of Piedmont, where they joined the Waldenses; another, above six hundred in number, with a bishop, and several ecclesiastics at their head, flew into Corsica, and implored the protection of the republic of Genoa, against the violence of the inquisitors.

MARRIAGE, a civil and religious contract, by which a man is joined and united to a woman, for the ends of procreation. The essence of marriage consists in the mutual consent of the parties. Marriage is a part of the law of nations, and is in use among all people. The public use of marriage institutions consists, according to Archdeacon Paley, in their promoting the following beneficial effects: 1. The private comfort of individuals. 2. The production of the greatest number of healthy children, their better education, and the making of due provision for their settlement in life. 3. The peace of human society, in cutting off a principal source of contention, by assigning one or more women to one man, and protecting his exclusive right by sanctions of morality and law. 4. The better government of society, by distributing the community into separate families, and appointing over each the authority of a master of a family, which has more actual influence than all civil authority put together. 5. The additional security which the state receives for the good behaviour of its citizens, from the solicitude they feel for the welfare of their children, and from their being confined to permanent habitations. 6. The encouragement of industry.

Whether marriage be a civil or a religious contract, has been a subject of dispute. The truth seems to be that it is both. It has its engagements to men, and its vows to God. A Christian state recognizes marriage as a branch of public morality, and a source of civil peace and strength. It is connected with the peace of society by assigning one woman to one man, and the state protects him, therefore, in her exclusive possession. Christianity, by allowing divorce in the event of adultery, supposes, also, that the crime must be proved by proper evidence before the civil magistrate; and lest divorce should be the result of unfounded suspicion, or be made a cover for license, the decision of the case could safely be lodged no where else. Marriage, too, as placing one human being more completely under the

power of another than any other relation, requires laws for the protection of those who are thus so exposed to injury. The distribution of society into families, also, can only be an instrument for promoting the order of the community, by the cognizance which the law takes of the head of a family, and by making him responsible, to a certain extent, for the conduct of those under his influence. Questions of property are also involved in marriage and its issue. The law must, therefore, for these and many other weighty reasons, be cognizant of marriage; must prescribe various regulations respecting it; require publicity of the contract; and guard some of the great injunctions of religion in the matter by penalties. In every well ordered society marriage must be placed under the cognizance and control of the state. But then those who would have the whole matter to lie between the parties themselves, and the civil magistrate, appear wholly to forget that marriage is also a solemn religious act, in which vows are made to God by both persons, who, when the rite is properly understood, engage to abide by all those laws with which he has guarded the institution; to love and cherish each other; and to remain faithful to each other until death. For if, at least, they profess belief in Christianity, whatever duties are laid upon husbands and wives in Holy Scripture, they engage to obey, by the very act of their contracting marriage. The question, then, is whether such vows to God as are necessarily involved in marriage, are to be left between the parties and God privately, or whether they ought to be publicly made before his ministers and the church. On this the Scriptures are silent; but though Michaëlis has shown that the priests under the law were not appointed to celebrate marriage; yet in the practice of the modern Jews it is a religious ceremony, the chief rabbi of the synagogue being present, and prayers being appointed for the occasion. This renders it probable that the character of the ceremony under the law, from the most ancient times, was a religious one. The more direct connection of marriage with religion in Christian states, by assigning its celebration to the ministers of religion, appears to be a very beneficial custom, and one which the state has a right to enjoin. For since the welfare and morals of society are so much interested in the performance of the mutual duties of the married state; and since those duties have a religious as well as a civil character, it is most proper that some provision should be made for explaining those duties; and for this a standing form of marriage is best adapted. By acts of religion, also, they are more solemnly impressed upon the parties. When this is prescribed in any state, it becomes a Christian cheerfully, and even thankfully, to comply with a custom of so important a tendency, as matter of conscientious subjection to lawful authority, although no Scriptural precept can be pleaded for it. That the ceremony should be confined to the clergy of an established church, is a different consideration. We think that the religious effect would be greater, were the ministers of each religious body to be authorized by the state to celebrate marriages among their own people, due

provision being previously made by the civil magistrate for the regular and secure registry of them, and to prevent the laws respecting marriage from being evaded; which is indeed his business. The offices of religion would then come in by way of sanction and moral enforcement.

When this important contract is once made, then certain rights are acquired by the parties mutually, who are also bound by reciprocal duties, in the fulfilment of which the practical virtue of each consists. And here the superior character of the morals of the New Testament, as well as their higher authority, is illustrated. It may, indeed, be within the scope of mere moralists to show that fidelity, and affection, and all the courtesies necessary to maintain affection, are rationally obligatory upon those who are connected by the nuptial bond; but in Christianity nuptial fidelity is guarded by the express law, "Thou shalt not commit adultery;" and by our Lord's exposition of the spirit of that law which forbids the indulgence of loose thoughts and desires, and places the purity of the heart under the guardianship of that hallowed fear which his authority tends to inspire. Affection, too, is made a matter of diligent cultivation upon considerations, and by a standard, peculiar to our religion. Husbands are placed in a relation to their wives, similar to that which Christ bears to his church, and his example is thus made their rule. As Christ loved the church, so husbands are to love their wives; as Christ gave himself," his life, for the church," Eph. v, 25, so are they to hazard life for their wives; as Christ saves his church, so is it the bounden duty of husbands to endeavour, by every possible means, to promote the religious edification and salvation of their wives. The connection is thus exalted into a religious one; and when love which knows no abatement, protection at the hazard of life, and a tender and constant solicitude for the salvation of a wife, are thus enjoined, the greatest possible security is established for the exercise of kindness and fidelity. The oneness of this union is also more forcibly stated in Scripture than any where beside. "They twain shall be one flesh." So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies; he that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church." Precept and illustration can go no higher than this; and nothing evidently is wanting either of direction or authority to raise the state of marriage into the highest, most endearing, and sanctified relation in which two human beings can stand to each other.

2. We find but few laws in the books of Moses concerning the institution of marriage. Though the Mosaic law no where obliges men to marry, the Jews have always looked upon it as an indispensable duty implied in the words, "Increase and multiply," Gen. i, 28; so that a man who did not marry his daughter before she was twenty years of age, was looked upon as accessory to any irregularities the young woman might be guilty of for want

of being timely married. Moses restrained the Israelites from marrying within certain degrees of consanguinity; which had till then been permitted, to prevent their taking wives from among the idolatrous nations among whom they lived. Abraham gave this as a reason for choosing a wife for Isaac from among his own kindred, Gen. xxxiv, 3, &c. But when his descendants became so exceedingly multiplied, this reason ceased; and the great lawgiver prohibited, under pain of death, certain degrees of kindred as incestuous. Polygamy, though not expressly allowed, is however tacitly implied in the laws of Moses, Gen. xxxi; Exod. xxi, 10. This practice likewise was authorized by the example of the patriarchs. Thus Jacob married both the daughters of Laban. In respect to which custom, Moses enjoins that, upon the marriage of a second wife, a man shall be bound to continue to the first her food, raiment, and the duty of marriage. The Jews did not always content themselves with the allowance of two wives, as may be seen in the examples of David, Solomon, and many others. However, they made a distinction between the wives of the first rank, and those of the second. The first they called *nashim*, and the other *pilgashim*; which last, though most versions render it by the words *concubines*,” *harlots*,” and *prostitutes*,” yet it has no where in Scripture any such bad sense. There is a particular law called the *Levirate*, which obliged a man, whose brother died without issue, to marry his widow, and raise up seed to his brother, Deut. xxv, 5, &c. But Moses in some measure left it to a man’s choice, whether he would comply with this law or not; for in case of a refusal, the widow could only summon him before the judges of the place, when, if he persisted, she untied his shoe, and spit in his face, and said, “Thus shall it be done unto the man who refuses to build up his brother’s house.” A man was at liberty to marry not only in the twelve tribes, but even out of them, provided it was among such nations as used circumcision; such were the Midianites, Ishmaelites, Edomites, Moabites, and Egyptians. Accordingly, we find Moses himself married to a Midianite, and Boaz to a Moabite. Amasa was the son of Jether, an Ishmaelite, by Abigail, David’s sister; and Solomon, in the beginning of his reign, married Pharaoh’s daughter. Whenever we find him and other kings blamed for marrying strange women, we must understand it of those nations which were idolatrous and uncircumcised.

It appears almost impossible to Europeans, says Mr. Hartley, that a deception like that of Laban’s could be practised. But the following extract, from a journal which I kept at Smyrna, presents a parallel case: “The Armenian brides are veiled during the marriage ceremony; and hence deceptions have occurred, in regard to the person chosen for wife. I am informed that, on one occasion, a young Armenian at Smyrna solicited in marriage a younger daughter, whom he admired. The parents of the girl consented to the request, and every previous arrangement was made. When

the time for solemnizing the marriage arrived, the elder daughter, who was not so beautiful, was conducted by the parents to the altar, and the young man was unconsciously married to her. And 'it came to pass, that in the morning, behold, it was the elder daughter.' The deceit was not discovered, till it could not be rectified; and the manner in which the parents justified themselves was precisely that of Laban: 'It must not be so done in our country, to give the younger before the first-born.' It is really the rule among the Armenians, that neither a younger son nor daughter be married, till their elder brother or sister have preceded them." I was once present at the solemnization of matrimony among the Armenians; and some recollections of it may tend to throw light on this and other passages of Scripture. The various festivities attendant on these occasions continue for three days; and during the last night the marriage is celebrated. I was conducted to the house of the bride, where I found a very large assemblage of persons. The company was dispersed through various rooms; reminding me of the directions of our Saviour, in regard to the choice of the lowermost rooms at feasts. On the ground floor I actually observed that the persons convened were of an inferior order of the community, while in the upper rooms were assembled those of higher rank. The large number of young females who were present, naturally reminded me of the wise and foolish virgins in our Saviour's parable. These being friends of the bride, the virgins, her companions, had come to meet the bridegroom, Psalm xlv, 14. It is usual for the bridegroom to come at midnight; so that, literally, at midnight the cry is made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh! go ye out to meet him," Matt. xxv, 6. But, on this occasion the bridegroom tarried: it was two o'clock before he arrived. The whole party then proceeded to the Armenian church, where the bishop was waiting to receive them; and there the ceremony was completed. See Divorce and Bride.

MARTHA was sister of Lazarus and Mary, and mistress of the house where our Saviour was entertained, in the village of Bethany. Martha is always named before Mary, probably because she was the elder sister.

MARY, the mother of Jesus, and wife of Joseph. She is called by the Jews the daughter of Eli; and by the early Christian writers, the daughter of Joakim and Anna: but Joakim and Eliakim are sometimes interchanged, 2 Chron. xxxvi, 4; and Eli, or Heli, is therefore the abridgment of Eliakim, Luke iii, 23. She was of the royal race of David, as was also Joseph her husband; and she was also cousin to Elizabeth, the wife of Zacharias the priest, Luke i, 5, 36. Mary being espoused to Joseph, the Angel Gabriel appeared to her, to announce to her that she should be the mother of the Messiah, Luke i, 26, 27, &c. To confirm his message, and to show that nothing is impossible to God, he added that her cousin Elizabeth, who was old, and had been hitherto barren, was then in the sixth month of her

pregnancy. Mary answered, Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word;" and presently she conceived. She set out for Hebron, a city in the mountains of Judah, to visit her cousin Elizabeth. As soon as Elizabeth heard the voice of Mary, her child, John the Baptist, leaped in her womb; and she was filled with the Holy Ghost, and spake with a loud voice, saying, Blessed art thou among women," &c. Then Mary praised God, saying, My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour," &c. Mary continued with Elizabeth about three months, and then returned to her own house. An edict of Cæsar Augustus having decreed, that all subjects of the empire should go to their own cities, to register their names according to their families, Joseph and Mary, who were both of the lineage of David, went to Bethlehem, from whence sprung their family. But while they were here, the time being fulfilled in which Mary was to be delivered, she brought forth her first-born son. She wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in the manger of the stable or cavern whither they had retired, because there was no room in the inn. Angels made this event known to shepherds, who were in the fields near Bethlehem, and these came in the night to Joseph and Mary, and saw the child lying in the manger, and paid him their adoration. The presentation of Christ in the temple, the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the innocents, and other events connected with the birth and infancy of our Lord, are plainly related in the Gospels.

Mary and Joseph went every year to Jerusalem to the passover; and when Jesus was twelve years of age, they took him with them. When they were returning, the youth continued at Jerusalem, without their perceiving it. Three days after, they found him in the temple, sitting among the doctors, hearing them and asking them questions. Afterward, he returned with them to Nazareth, and lived in filial submission to them. But his mother laid up all these things in her heart, Luke ii, 51, &c. The Gospel speaks nothing more of the Virgin Mary till the marriage at Cana of Galilee, at which she was present with her son Jesus. She was at Jerusalem at the last passover our Saviour celebrated there. There she saw all that was transacted; followed him to Calvary; and stood at the foot of his cross with an admirable constancy and courage. Jesus seeing his mother, and his beloved disciple near, he said to his mother, Woman, behold thy son; and to the disciple, Behold thy mother. And from that hour the disciple took her home to his own house." No farther particulars of this favoured woman are mentioned, except that she was a witness of Christ's resurrection. A veil is drawn over her character and history; as though with the design to reprove that wretched idolatry of which she was made the subject when Christianity became corrupt and paganized.

2. Mary, the mother of John Mark, a disciple of the Apostles. She had a house in Jerusalem, whither, it is thought, the Apostles retired after the ascension of our Lord, and where they received the Holy Ghost. After the imprisonment of St. Peter, the faithful assembled in this house, and were praying there when Peter, delivered by the ministry of an angel, knocked at the door of the house, Acts xii, 12.

3. Mary, of Cleophas. St. Jerom says, she bore the name of Cleophas, either because of her father, or for some other reason which cannot now be known. Others believe, with greater probability, that she was wife of Cleophas, as our version of the New Testament makes her, by supplying the word wife, John xix, 25, and mother of James the less, and of Simon, brethren of our Lord. These last mentioned authors take Mary mother of James, and Mary wife of Cleophas, to be the same person, Matthew xxvii, 56; Mark xv, 40, 41; Luke xxiv, 10; John xix, 25. St. John gives her the name of Mary of Cleophas; and the other evangelists, the name of Mary, mother of James. Cleophas and Alpheus are the same person; as James, son of Mary, wife of Cleophas, is the same as James, son of Alpheus. It is thought she was the sister of the Virgin Mary, and that she was the mother of James the less, of Joses, of Simon, and of Judas, who in the Gospel are named the brethren of Jesus Christ, Matt. xiii, 55; xxvii, 56; Mark vi, 3; that is, his cousin-germans. She was an early believer in Jesus Christ, and attended him on his journeys, to minister to him. She was present at the last passover, and at the death of our Saviour she followed him to Calvary; and during his passion she was with the mother of Jesus at the foot of the cross. She was also present at his burial; and on the Friday before had, in union with others, prepared the perfumes to embalm him, Luke xxiii, 56. But going to his tomb very early on the Sunday morning, with other women, they there learned from the mouth of an angel, that he was risen; of which they carried the news to the Apostles, Luke xxiv, 1–5; Matt. xxviii, 9. By the way, Jesus appeared to them; and they embraced his feet, worshipping him. This is all we know with certainty concerning Mary, the wife of Cleophas.

4. Mary, sister of Lazarus, who has been preposterously confounded with that female sinner spoken of, Luke vii, 37–39. She lived with her brother and her sister Martha at Bethany; and Jesus Christ, having a particular affection for this family, often retired to their house with his disciples. Six days before the passover, after having raised Lazarus from the dead, he came to Bethany with his disciples, and was invited to sup with Simon the leper, John xii, 1, &c; Matthew xxvi, 6, &c; Mark xiv, 3, &c. Martha attended at the table, and Lazarus was one of the guests. Upon this occasion, Mary, taking a pound of spikenard, which is the most precious perfume of its kind, poured it upon the head and feet of Jesus. She wiped



his feet with her hair, and the whole house was filled with the odour of the perfume. Judas Iscariot murmured at this; but Jesus justified Mary in what she had done, saying, that by this action she had prevented his embalmment, and in a manner had declared his death and burial, which were at hand. From this period the Scriptures make no mention of either Mary or Martha.

5. Mary Magdalene, so called, it is probable, from Magdala, a town of Galilee, of which she was a native, or where she had resided during the early part of her life. Out of her, St. Luke tells us, Jesus had cast seven devils, Luke viii, 2. He informs us, also, in the same place, that Jesus, in company with his Apostles, preached the Gospel from city to city; and that there were several women with them, whom he had delivered from evil spirits, and healed of their infirmities; among whom was this Mary, whom some, without a shadow of proof, have supposed to be the sinful woman spoken of, Luke vii, 37–39; as others have as erroneously imagined her to be Mary, the sister of Lazarus. Mary Magdalene is mentioned by the evangelists as being one of those women that followed our Saviour, to minister to him, according to the custom of the Jews. She attended him in the last journey he made from Galilee to Jerusalem, and was at the foot of the cross with the holy virgin, John xix, 25; Mark xv, 47; after which she returned to Jerusalem, to buy and prepare with others certain perfumes, that she might embalm him after the Sabbath was over, which was then about to begin. All the Sabbath day she remained in the city; and the next day, early in the morning, went to the sepulchre along with Mary, the mother of James, and Salome, Mark xvi, 1, 2; Luke xxiv, 1, 2. For other particulars respecting her, see also Matt. xxviii, 1–5; John xx, 11–17. In Dr. Townley's Essays, there is one of considerable research on Mary Magdalene; and his conclusion is, that it is probable that the woman mentioned by St. Luke, and called in the English translation a sinner," had formerly been a Heathen; but whether subsequently a proselyte to Judaism or not, is uncertain; and that, having been brought to the knowledge of Christian truth, and having found mercy from the Redeemer, she pressed into Simon's house, and gave the strongest proofs of her gratitude and veneration by anointing the Saviour's feet, bedewing them with her tears, and wiping them with the hairs of her head:--that by a wilful and malicious misrepresentation, the Jews confounded Mary Magdalene with Mary the mother of Jesus, and represented her as an infamous character:--and that, from the blasphemous calumny of the Jews, a stigma of infamy has been affixed to the name of Mary Magdalene, and caused her to be regarded in the false light of a penitent prostitute. There is no doubt but that Mary Magdalene, both in character and circumstances, was a woman of good reputation.

MASCHIL, a title, or inscription, at the head of several psalms of David and others, in the book of Psalms. Thus Psalm xxxii is inscribed, "A Psalm of David, Maschil;" and Psalm xlii, "To the chief musician, Maschil, for the sons of Korah." The word Maschil, in the Hebrew, signifies, "he that instructs;" though some interpreters take it for the name of a musical instrument. Some of the rabbins believe that, in repeating the psalms which have this inscription, it was usual to add an interpretation or explication to them. Others, on the contrary, think it shows the clearness and perspicuity of such psalms, and that they needed no particular explication. The most probable opinion is, that Maschil means an instructive song.

MASS, MISSA, in the church of Rome, the office of prayers used at the celebration of the eucharist; or, in other words, the consecrating the bread and wine so that it is transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, and offer them as an expiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. Nicod, after Baronius, observes that the word comes from the Hebrew *missach*, (oblatum,) or from the Latin *missa* *missorum*; because in former times the catechumens and excommunicated were sent out of the church, when the deacons said, "Ite, missa est," after sermon and reading of the epistle and Gospel; they not being allowed to assist at the consecration. Menage derives the word from *missio*, "dismissing;" others, from *missa*, "sending;" because in the mass the prayers of men on earth are sent up to heaven.

As the mass is in general believed to be a representation of the passion of our blessed Saviour, so every action of the priest, and every particular part of the service, are supposed to allude to the particular circumstances of his passion and death. The general division of masses is into high and low mass. The first is that sung by the choristers, and celebrated with the assistance of a deacon and sub-deacon: low masses are those in which the prayers are barely rehearsed without singing. There are a great number of different or occasional masses in the Romish church, many of which have nothing peculiar but the name. Such are the masses of the saints: that of St. Mary of the Snow, celebrated on the fifth of August; that of St. Margaret, patroness of lying-in women; that at the feast of St. John the Baptist, at which are said three masses; that of the Innocents, at which the Gloria in excelsis and Hallelujah are omitted; and, it being a day of mourning, the altar is of a violet colour. As to ordinary masses, some are said for the dead, and, as is supposed, contribute to extricate the soul out of purgatory. At these masses the altar is put in mourning, and the only decorations are a cross in the middle of six yellow wax lights; the dress of the celebrant, and the very mass book, are black; many parts of the office are omitted, and the people are dismissed without the benediction. If the mass be said for a person distinguished by his rank or virtues, it is followed with a funeral

oration; they erect a chapelle ardente, that is, a representation of the deceased, with branches and tapers of yellow wax, either in the middle of the church, or near the deceased's tomb, where the priest pronounces a solemn absolution of the deceased. There are likewise private masses said for stolen or strayed goods or cattle, for health, for travellers, &c, which go under the name of votive masses. There is still a farther distinction of masses, denominated from the countries in which they were used: thus the Gothic mass, or missa mosarabum, is that used among the Goths when they were masters of Spain, and which is still observed at Toledo and Salamanca; the Ambrosian mass is that composed by St. Ambrose, and used only at Milan, of which city he was bishop; the Gallic mass, used by the ancient Gauls; and the Roman mass, used by almost all the churches in the Roman communion.

MATERIALISM, the doctrine which resolves the thinking principle in man, or the immaterial and immortal soul with which God was pleased to endue Adam at his creation, into mere matter, or into a faculty resulting from its organization. Much has been written of late years against this doctrine, and the different modifications which it has assumed; but in substance nothing new has been said on either side; and the able and condensed argument of Wollaston in his *Religion of Nature Delineated*," if well considered, will furnish every one with a most clear and satisfactory refutation of this antisciptural and irrational error:--The soul cannot be mere matter: for if it is, then either all matter must think; or the difference must arise from the different modification, magnitude, figure, or motion of some parcels of matter in respect of others; or a faculty of thinking must be superadded to some systems of it, which is not superadded to others. But in the first place, that position, which makes all matter to be cogitative, is contrary to all the apprehensions and knowledge we have of the nature of it; nor can it be true, unless our senses and faculties be contrived only to deceive us. We perceive not the least symptom of cogitation or sense in our tables, chairs, &c. Why doth the scene of thinking lie in our heads, and all the ministers of sensation make their reports to something there, if all matter be apprehensive and cogitative? For in that case there would be as much thought and understanding in our heels, and every where else, as in our heads. If all matter be cogitative, then it must be so quatenus [so far forth as] matter, and thinking must be of the essence and definition of it; whereas by matter no more is meant than a substance extended and impenetrable to other matter. And since, for this reason, it cannot be necessary for matter to think, (because it may be matter without this property,) it cannot think as matter only; if it did, we should not only continue to think always, till the matter of which we consist is annihilated, and so the asserter of this doctrine would stumble upon immortality unawares; but we must also have thought always in time past, ever since

that matter was in being; nor could there be any the least intermission of actual thinking; which does not appear to be our case. If thinking, self-consciousness, &c, were essential to matter, every part of it must have them; and then no system could have them. For a system of material parts would be a system of things conscious, every one by itself of its own existence and individuality, and, consequently, thinking by itself; but there could be no one act of self-consciousness or thought common to the whole. Juxtaposition, in this case, could signify nothing; the distinction and individuation of the several particles would be as much retained in their vicinity, as if they were separated by miles.

In the next place, the faculties of thinking, &c, cannot arise from the size, figure, texture, or motion of it; because bodies by the alteration of these only become greater or less, round or square, &c, rare or dense, translated from one place to another with this or that new direction or velocity, or the like; all which ideas are quite different from that of thinking; 627there can be no relation between them. These modifications and affections of matter are so far from being principles or causes of thinking and acting, that they are themselves but effects, proceeding from the action of some other matter or thing upon it, and are proofs of its passivity, deadness and utter incapacity of becoming cogitative: this is evident to sense. They who place the essence of the soul in a certain motion given to some matter, (if any such men there really be,) should consider, among many other things, that to move the body spontaneously, is one of the faculties of the soul; and that this, which is the same with the power of beginning motion, cannot come from motion already begun, and impressed ab extra. Let the materialist examine well, whether he does not feel something within himself that acts from an internal principle; whether he does not experience some liberty, some power of governing himself, and choosing; whether he does not enjoy a kind of invisible empire in which he commands his own thoughts, sends them to this or that place, employs them about this or that business, forms such and such designs and schemes; and whether there is any thing like this in bare matter, however fashioned or proportioned; which, if nothing should protrude or communicate motion to it, would for ever remain fixed to the place where it happens to be, an eternal monument of its own being dead. Can such an active being as the soul is, the subject of so many powers, be itself nothing but an accident? When I begin to move myself, I do it for some reason, and with respect to some end, the means to effect which I have, if there be occasion for it, concerted within myself; and this does not at all look like motion merely material, or in which matter is only concerned, which is all mechanical. Who can imagine matter to be moved by arguments, or ever placed syllogisms and demonstrations among levers and pullies? We not only move ourselves upon reasons which we find in ourselves, but upon reasons imparted by words or writings from

others, or perhaps merely at their desire or bare suggestion: in which case, again, nobody surely can imagine that the words spoken or written, the sound in the air, or the strokes on the paper, can, by any natural or mechanical efficiency, cause the reader or hearer to move in any determinate manner, or at all. The reason, request, or friendly admonition, which is the true motive, can make no impression upon matter. It must be some other kind of being that apprehends the force and sense of them. Do not we see in conversation, how a pleasant thing said makes people break out into laughter, a rude thing into passion, and so on? These affections cannot be the physical effects of the words spoken; because then they would have the same effect, whether they were understood or not. And this is farther demonstrable from hence, that though the words do really contain nothing which is either pleasant or rude, or perhaps words are thought to be spoken which are not spoken; yet if they are apprehended to do that, or the sound to be otherwise than it was, the effect will be the same. It is therefore the sense of the words, which is an immaterial thing, that by passing through the understanding, and causing that which is the subject of the intellectual faculties to influence the body, produces these motions in the spirits, blood, and muscles.

They who can fancy that matter may come to live, think, and act spontaneously, by being reduced to a certain magnitude, or having its parts placed after a certain manner, or being invested with such a figure, or excited by such a particular motion; they, I say, would do well to discover to us that degree of fineness, that alteration in the situation of its parts, &c, at which matter may begin to find itself alive and cogitative; and which is the critical minute, that introduces these important properties. If they cannot do this, nor have their eye upon any particular crisis, it is a sign that they have no good reason for what they say. For if they have no reason to charge this change upon any particular degree or difference, one more than another, they have no reason to charge it upon any degree or difference at all; and then they have no reason by which they can prove that such a change is made at all. Beside all which, since magnitude, figure, and motion are but accidents of matter, not matter, and only the substance is truly matter; and since the substance of any one part of matter does not differ from that of another, if any matter can be by nature cogitative, all must be so: but this we have seen cannot be. So then, in conclusion, if there is any such thing as matter that thinks, &c, this must be a particular privilege granted to it; that is, a faculty of thinking must be superadded to certain parts or parcels of it; which, by the way, must infer the existence of some being able to confer this faculty; who, when the ineptness of matter has been well considered, cannot appear to be less than omnipotent, or God. But the truth is, matter seems not to be capable of such improvement, of being made to think. For since it is not the essence of matter, it cannot

be made to be so without making matter another kind of substance from what it is. Nor can it be made to arise from any of the modifications or accidents of matter; and in respect of what else can any matter be made to differ from other matter.

The accidents of matter are so far from being made by any power to produce cogitation, that some even of them show it incapable of having a faculty of thinking superadded. The very divisibility of it does this. For that which is made to think must either be one part, or more parts joined together. But we know no such thing as a part of matter purely one, or indivisible. It may, indeed, have pleased the Author of nature, that there should be atoms, whose parts are actually indiscerptible, and which may be the principles of other bodies; but still they consist of parts, though firmly adhering together. And if the seat of cogitation be in more parts than one, whether they lie close together, or are loose, or in a state of fluidity, it is the same thing, how can it be avoided, but that either there must be so many several minds, or thinking substances, as there are parts, and then the consequence which has been mentioned would return upon us again; or else that there must be something else superadded for them to centre in, to unite their acts, and make their thoughts to be one? And then what can this be but some other substance, which is purely one?

Matter by itself can never entertain abstracted and general ideas, such as many in our minds are. For could it reflect upon what passes within itself, it could possibly find there nothing but material and particular impressions; abstractions and metaphysical ideas could not be printed upon it. How could one abstract from matter who is himself nothing but matter?

If the soul were mere matter, external visible objects could only be perceived within us according to the impressions they make upon matter, and not otherwise. For instance: the image of a cube in my mind, or my idea of a cube, must be always under some particular prospect, and conform to the rules of perspective; nor could I otherwise represent it to myself; whereas now I can form an idea of it as it is in itself, and almost view all its hedræ at once, as it were encompassing it with my mind. I can within myself correct the external appearances and impressions of objects, and advance, upon the reports and hints received by my senses, to form ideas of things that are not extant in matter. By seeing a material circle I may learn to form the idea of a circle, or figure generated by the revolution of a ray about its centre; but then, recollecting what I know of matter upon other occasions, I can conclude there is no exact material circle. So that I have an idea, which perhaps was raised from the hints I received from without, but is not truly to be found there. If I see a tower at a great distance, which, according to the impressions made upon my material organs, seems

little and round, I do not therefore conclude it to be either; there is something within that reasons upon the circumstances of the appearance, and as it were commands my sense, and corrects the impression; and this must be something superior to matter, since a material soul is no otherwise impressible itself but as material organs are: instances of this kind are endless. If we know any thing of matter, we know that by itself it is a lifeless thing, inert and passive only; and acts necessarily, or rather is acted, according to the laws of motion and gravitation. This passiveness seems to be essential to it. And if we know any thing of ourselves, we know that we are conscious of our own existence and acts, that is, that we live; that we have a degree of freedom; that we can move ourselves spontaneously; and, in short, that we can, in many instances, take off the effect of gravitation, and impress new motions upon our spirits, or give them new directions, only by a thought. Therefore, to make mere matter do all this is to change the nature of it; to change death into life, incapacity of thinking into cogitativity, necessity into liberty. And to say that God may superadd a faculty of thinking, moving itself, &c, to matter, if by this be meant, that he may make matter to be the suppositum of these faculties, that substance in which they inhere, is the same in effect as to say, that God may superadd a faculty of thinking to incogitativity, of acting freely to necessity, and so on. What sense is there in this? And yet so it must be, while matter continues to be matter.

That faculty of thinking, so much talked of by some as superadded to certain systems of matter, fitly disposed, by virtue of God's omnipotence, though it be so called, must in reality amount to the same thing as another substance with the faculty of thinking. For a faculty of thinking alone will not make up the idea of a human soul, which is endued with many faculties; apprehending, reflecting, comparing, judging, making deductions and reasoning, willing, putting the body in motion, continuing the animal functions by its presence, and giving life; and therefore, whatever it is that is superadded, it must be something which is endued with all those other faculties. And whether that can be a faculty of thinking, and so these other faculties be only faculties of a faculty, or whether they must not all be rather the faculties of some substance, which, being by their own concession, superadded to matter, must be different from it, we leave the unprejudiced to determine. If men would but seriously look into themselves, the soul would not appear to them as a faculty of the body, or a kind of appurtenance to it, but rather as some substance, properly placed in it, not only to use it as an instrument, and act by it, but also to govern it, or the parts of it, as the tongue, hands, feet, &c, according to its own reason. For I think it is plain enough, that the mind, though it acts under great limitations, doth, however, in many instances govern the body arbitrarily; and it is monstrous to suppose this governor to be nothing but some fit disposition or accident,

superadded, of that matter which is governed. A ship, it is true, would not be fit for navigation, if it was not built and provided in a proper manner; but then, when it has its proper form, and is become a system of materials fitly disposed, it is not this disposition that governs it: it is the man, that other substance, who sits at the helm, and they who manage the sails and tackle, that do this. So our vessels without a proper organization and conformity of parts would not be capable of being acted as they are; but still it is not the shape, or modification, or any other accident, that can govern them. The capacity of being governed or used can never be the governor, applying and using that capacity. No, there must be at the helm something distinct, that commands the body, and without which the vessel would run adrift or rather sink.

For the foregoing reasons it is plain, that matter cannot think, cannot be made to think. 629But if a faculty of thinking can be superadded to a system of matter, without uniting an immaterial substance to it; yet a human body is not such a system, being plainly void of thought, and organized in such a manner as to transmit the impressions of sensible objects up to the brain, where the percipient, and that which reflects upon them, certainly resides; and therefore that which there apprehends, thinks, and wills, must be that system of matter to which a faculty of thinking is superadded. All the premises then well considered, judge whether, instead of saying that this inhabitant of our heads (the soul) is a system of matter to which a faculty of thinking is superadded, it might not be more reasonable to say, it is a thinking substance intimately united to some fine material vehicle, which has its residence in the brain. Though I understand not perfectly the manner how a cogitative and spiritual substance can be thus closely united to such a material vehicle, yet I can understand this union as well as how it can be united to the body in general, perhaps as how the particles of the body itself cohere together, and much better than how a thinking faculty can be superadded to matter; and beside, several phenomena may more easily be solved by this hypothesis; which, in short, is this, that the human soul is a cogitative substance united to a material vehicle; that these act in conjunction, that which affects the one affecting the other; that the soul is detained in the body till the habitation is spoiled, and their mutual tendency interrupted, by some hurt or disease, or by the decays and ruins of old age, or the like.

But many a man, says Mr. Rennell, has maintained, that the brain has the power of thought, from the conclusions which his own experience, and, perhaps, his extended knowledge of the human frame, have enabled him to draw. He has observed the action of the brain, has watched the progress of its diseases, and has seen the close connection which exists between many of its afflictions, and the power of thought. But in this, as in most other



cases, partial knowledge leads him to a more mistaken view of the matter than total ignorance. Satisfied with the correctness of his observations, he hastily proceeds to form his opinion, forgetting that it is not on the truth only, but on the whole truth, that he should rest his decision. By an accidental blow, the skull is beaten in, the brain is pressed upon, and the patient lies without sense or feeling. No sooner is the pressure removed than the power of thought immediately returns. It is known, again, that the phenomena of fainting arise from a temporary deficiency of blood in the brain; the vessels collapse, and the loss of sense immediately ensues. Restore the circulation, and the sense is as instantly recovered. On the contrary, when the circulation in the brain is too rapid, and inflammation of the organ succeeds, we find that delirium, frenzy, and other disorders of the mind arise in proportion to the inflammatory action, by which they are apparently produced. It is observed, also, that when the stomach is disordered by an excess of wine, or of ardent spirits, the brain is also affected through the strong sympathies of the nervous system, the intellect is disordered, and the man has no longer a rational command over himself or his actions. From these, and other circumstances of a similar nature, it is concluded, that thought is a quality or function of the brain, that it is inseparable from the organ in which it resides, and as Mr. Lawrence, after the French physiologists, represents it, that medullary matter thinks.”

Now it must certainly be inferred from all these circumstances, that there is a close connection between the power of thinking and the brain; but it by no means follows, that they are, therefore, one and the same. Allowing, however, for a moment, the justice of the inference, from the premises which have been stated, we must remember, that we have not as yet taken in all the circumstances of the case. We have watched the body rather than the mind, and that only in a diseased state; and from this partial and imperfect view of the subject, our conclusions have been deduced. Let us take a healthy man in a sound sleep. He lies without sense or feeling, yet no part of his frame is diseased, nor is a single power of his life of vegetation suspended. All within his body is as active as ever. The blood circulates as regularly, and, almost as rapidly, in the sleeping as in the waking subject. Digestion, secretion, nutrition, and all the functions of the life of vegetation proceed, and yet the understanding is absent. Sleep, therefore, is an affection of the mind, rather than of the body; and the refreshment which the latter receives from it, is from the suspension of its active and agitating principle. Now if thought was identified with the brain, when the former was suspended, the latter would undergo a proportionate change. Memory, imagination, perception, and all the stupendous powers of the human intellect are absent; and yet the brain is precisely the same, the same in every particle of matter, the same in every animal function. Of not a single organ is the action suspended. When, again, the man awakens,

and his senses return, no change is produced by the recovery; the brain, the organs of sense, and all the material parts of his frame remain precisely in the same condition. Dreaming may perhaps be adduced as an exception to this statement. But it is first to be remarked, that this affection is by no means general. There are thousands who never dream at all, and thousands who dream only occasionally. Dreaming therefore, even though it were to be allowed as an exception, could not be admitted to invalidate the rule. And if there be a circumstance, which to any philosophic mind will clearly intimate the independency of thought upon matter, it is the phenomenon of dreaming. Perception, that faculty of the soul which unites it with the external world, is then suspended, and the avenues of sense are closed. All communication with outward objects being thus removed, the soul is transported, as it were, into a world of its own creation. There appears to be an activity in the motions, and a perfection in the faculties, of the mind, when disengaged from the body, and disencumbered of its material organs. The slumber of its external perception seems to be but the awakening of every other power. The memory is far more keen, the fancy far more vivid, in the dreaming than in the waking man. Ideas rise in rapid succession, and are varied in endless combination; so that the judgment, which, next to the perception, depends most upon external objects, is unable to follow the imagination in all its wild and unwearied flights. A better notion of the separate and independent existence of the soul cannot be formed, than that which we derive from our observations on the phenomena of dreaming. Again: when the mind is anxiously engaged in any train of thought, whether in company or alone, it frequently neglects the impressions made upon the external organs. When a man is deeply immersed in meditation, or eagerly engaged in a discussion, he often neither hears a third person when he speaks, nor observes what he does, nor even when gently touched does he feel the pressure. Yet there is no defect either in the ear, the eye, or the nervous system; the brain is not disordered, for if his mind were not so fully occupied, he would perceive every one of those impressions which he now neglects. In this case, therefore, as in sleep, the independence of mind upon the external organ is clearly shown.

But let us take the matter in another point of view. We have observed the action of the brain upon thought, and have seen that when the former is unnaturally compressed, the latter is immediately disordered or lost. Let us now turn our attention to the action of thought upon the brain. A letter is brought to a man containing some afflicting intelligence. He casts his eye upon its contents, and drops down without sense or motion. What is the cause of this sudden affection? It may be said that the vessels have collapsed, that the brain is consequently disordered, and that loss of sense is the natural consequence. But let us take one step backward, and inquire what is the cause of the disorder itself, the effects of which are thus visible.

It is produced by a sheet of white paper distinguished by a few black marks. But no one would be absurd enough to suppose, that it was the effect of the paper alone, or of the characters inscribed upon it, unless those characters conveyed some meaning to the understanding. It is thought then which so suddenly agitates and disturbs the brain, and makes its vessels to collapse. From this circumstance alone we discover the amazing influence of thought upon the external organ; of that thought which we can neither hear, nor see, nor touch, which yet produces an affection of the brain fully equal to a blow, a pressure, or any other sensible injury. Now this very action of thought upon the brain clearly shows that the brain does not produce it, while the mutual influence which they possess over each other, as clearly shows that there is a strong connection between them. But it is carefully to be remembered, that connection is not identity. While we acknowledge then, on the one side, the mutual connection of the understanding and the brain, we must acknowledge, on the other, their mutual independence. The phenomena which we daily observe lead us of necessity to the recognition of these two important principles. If then from the observations which we are enabled to make on the phenomena of the understanding and of the brain, we are led to infer mutual independence, we shall find our conclusions still farther strengthened by a consideration of the substance and composition of the latter. Not only is the brain a material substance, endowed with all those properties of matter which we have before shown to be inconsistent with thought, but it is a substance, which, in common with the rest of our body, is undergoing a perpetual change. Indeed experiments and observations give us abundant reason for concluding that the brain undergoes within itself precisely the same change with the remainder of the body. A man will fall down in a fit of apoplexy, and be recovered; in a few years he will be attacked by another, which will prove fatal. Upon dissection it will be found that there is a cavity formed by the blood effused from the ruptured vessel, and that a certain action had been going on, which gradually absorbed the coagulated blood. If then an absorbent system exists in the brain, and the organ thereby undergoes, in the course of a certain time, a total change, it is impossible that this flux and variable substance can be endowed with consciousness or thought. If the particles of the brain, either separately or in a mass, were capable of consciousness, then after their removal the consciousness which they produced must for ever cease. The consequence of which would be, that personal identity must be destroyed, and that no man could be the same individual being that he was ten years ago. But our common sense informs us, that as far as our understanding and our moral responsibility are involved, we are the same individual beings that we ever were. If the body alone, or any substance subject to the laws of body, were concerned, personal identity might reasonably be doubted: but it is something beyond the brain that makes the man at every period of his life the same: it is

consciousness, that, amidst the perpetual change of our material particles, unites every link of successive being in one indissoluble chain. The body may be gradually changed, and yet by the deposition of new particles, similar to those which absorption has removed, it may preserve the appearance of identity. But in consciousness there is real, not an apparent, individuality, admitting of no change or substitution.

So inconsistent with reason is every attempt which has been made to reduce our thoughts to a material origin, and to identify our understanding with any part of our corporeal frame! 631The more carefully we observe the operation, both of the mind and of the brain, the more clearly we shall distinguish, and the more forcibly shall we feel, the independence of the one upon the other. We know that the brain is the organ or instrument by which the mind operates on matter, and we know that the brain again is the chain of communication between the mind and the material world. That certain disorders therefore in the chain should either prevent or disturb this communication is reasonably to be expected; but nothing more is proved from thence than we knew before, namely, that the link is imperfect. And when that link is again restored, the mind declares its identity, by its memory of things which preceded the injury or the disease; and where the recovery is rapid, the patient awakes as it were from a disturbed dream. How indeed the brain and the thinking principle are connected, and in what manner they mutually affect each other, is beyond the reach of our faculties to discover. We must, for the present, be contented with our ignorance of the cause, while from the effects we are persuaded both of their connection on the one hand, and of their independence on the other.

MATTHEW, called also Levi, was the son of Alpheus, but probably not of that Alpheus who was the father of the Apostle James the less. He was a native of Galilee; but it is not known in what city of that country he was born, or to what tribe of the people of Israel he belonged. Though a Jew, he was a publican or tax-gatherer under the Romans; and his office seems to have consisted in collecting the customs due upon commodities which were carried, and from persons who passed, over the lake of Gennesareth. Our Saviour commanded him, as he was sitting at the place where he received these customs, to follow him. He immediately obeyed; and from that time he became a constant attendant upon our Saviour, and was appointed one of the twelve Apostles. St. Matthew, soon after his call, made an entertainment at his house, at which were present Christ and some of his disciples, and also several publicans. After the ascension of our Saviour, he continued, with the other Apostles, to preach the Gospel for some time in Judea; but as there is no farther account of him in any writer of the first four centuries, we must consider it as uncertain into what country he afterward went, and likewise in what manner and at what time he died.

In the few writings which remain of the apostolical fathers, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, there are manifest allusions to several passages in St. Matthew's Gospel; but the Gospel itself is not mentioned in any one of them. Papias, the companion of Polycarp, is the earliest author on record who has expressly named St. Matthew as the writer of a Gospel; and we are indebted to Eusebius for transmitting to us this valuable testimony. The work itself of Papias is lost; but the quotation in Eusebius is such as to convince us that in the time of Papias no doubt was entertained of the genuineness of St. Matthew's Gospel. This Gospel is repeatedly quoted by Justin Martyr, but without mentioning the name of St. Matthew. It is both frequently quoted, and St. Matthew mentioned as its author, by Irenæus, Origen, Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Jerom, Chrysostom, and a long train of subsequent writers. It was, indeed, universally received by the Christian church; and we do not find that its genuineness was controverted by any early profane writer. We may therefore conclude, upon the concurrent testimony of antiquity, that this Gospel is rightly ascribed to St. Matthew. It is generally agreed, upon the most satisfactory evidence, that St. Matthew's Gospel was the first which was written; but though this is asserted by many ancient authors, none of them, except Irenæus and Eusebius, have said any thing concerning the exact time at which it was written. The only passage in which the former of these fathers mentions this subject, is so obscure, that no positive conclusion can be drawn from it; Dr. Lardner, and Dr. Townson, understand it in very different senses; and Eusebius, who lived a hundred and fifty years after Irenæus, barely says, that Matthew wrote his Gospel just before he left Judea to preach the religion of Christ in other countries; but when that was, neither he nor any other ancient author informs us with certainty. The impossibility of settling this point upon ancient authority has given rise to a variety of opinions among moderns. Of the several dates assigned to this Gospel, which deserve any attention, the earliest is A.D. 38, and the latest, A.D. 64.

It appears very improbable that the Christians should be left any considerable number of years without a written history of our Saviour's ministry. It is certain that the Apostles, immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost, which took place only ten days after the ascension of our Saviour into heaven, preached the Gospel to the Jews with great success; and surely it is reasonable to suppose, that an authentic account of our Saviour's doctrines and miracles would very soon be committed to writing, for the confirmation of those who believed in his divine mission, and for the conversion of others; and, more particularly, to enable the Jews to compare the circumstances of the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus with their ancient prophecies relative to the Messiah; and we may conceive

that the Apostles would be desirous of losing no time in writing an account of the miracles which Jesus performed, and of the discourses which he delivered, because the sooner such an account was published, the easier it would be to inquire into its truth and accuracy; and, consequently, when these points were satisfactorily ascertained, the greater would be its weight and authority. We must own that these arguments are so strong in favour of an early publication of some history of our Saviour's ministry, that we cannot but accede to the opinion of Jones, Wetstein, and Dr. Owen, that St. Matthew's Gospel was written A.D. 38.

632There has also of late been great difference of opinion concerning the language in which this Gospel was originally written. Among the ancient fathers, Papias, as quoted by Eusebius, Irenæus, Origen, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Jerom, positively assert that it was written by St. Matthew in Hebrew, that is, in the language then spoken in Palestine; and indeed Dr. Campbell says, that this point was not controverted by any author for fourteen hundred years. Erasmus was one of the first who contended that the present Greek is the original; and he has been followed by Le Clerc, Wetstein, Basnage, Whitby, Jortin, Hug, and many other learned men. On the other hand, Grotius, Du Pin, Simon, Walton, Cave, Hammond, Mill, Michaëlis, Owen, and Campbell have supported the opinion of the ancients. In a question of this sort, which is a question of fact, the concurrent voice of antiquity is decisive. Though the fathers are unanimous in declaring that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, yet they have not informed us by whom it was translated into Greek. No writer of the first three centuries makes any mention whatever of the translator; nor does Eusebius: and Jerom tells us, that in his time it was not known who was the translator. It is, however, universally allowed, that the Greek translation was made very early, and that it was more used than the original. This last circumstance is easily accounted for. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the language of the Jews, and every thing which belonged to them, fell into great contempt; and the early fathers, writing in Greek, would naturally quote and refer to the Greek copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, in the same manner as they constantly used the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. There being no longer any country in which the language of St. Matthew's original Gospel was commonly spoken, that original would soon be forgotten; and the translation into Greek, the language then generally understood, would be substituted in its room. This early and exclusive use of the Greek translation is a strong proof of its correctness, and leaves us but little reason to lament the loss of the original.

As the sacred writers," says Dr. Campbell, "especially the evangelists, have many qualities in common, so there is something in every one of them, which, if attended to, will be found to distinguish him from the rest. That

which principally distinguishes St. Matthew, is the distinctness and particularity with which he has related many of our Lord's discourses and moral instructions. Of these, his sermon on the mount, his charge to the Apostles, his illustrations of the nature of his kingdom, and his prophecy on Mount Olivet, are examples. He has also wonderfully united simplicity and energy in relating the replies of his Master to the cavils of his adversaries. Being early called to the apostleship, he was an eye-witness and ear-witness of most of the things which he relates; and though I do not think it was the scope of any of these historians to adjust their narratives to the precise order of time wherein the events happened, there are some circumstances which incline me to think, that St. Matthew has approached at least as near that order as any of them." And this, we may observe, would naturally be the distinguishing characteristic of a narrative, written very soon after the events had taken place. The most remarkable things recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel, and not found in any other, are the following: the visit of the eastern magi; our Saviour's flight into Egypt; the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem; the parable of the ten virgins; the dream of Pilate's wife; the resurrection of many saints at our Saviour's crucifixion; and the bribing of the Roman guard appointed to watch at the holy sepulchre by the chief priests and elders.

**MATTHIAS** the Apostle was first in the rank of our Saviour's disciples, and one of those who continued with him from his baptism to his ascension, Acts i, 21, 22. It is very probable he was of the number of the seventy, as Clemens Alexandrinus and other ancients inform us. We have no particulars of his youth or education, for we may reckon as nothing what is read in Abdias, or Obadiah, concerning this matter. After the ascension of our Lord, the Apostles retiring to Jerusalem in expectation of the effusion of the Holy Ghost, as had been promised, Peter proposed to fill up the place of Judas: to this the disciples agreed. They then presented two persons, Joseph Barsabas, surnamed Justus, and Matthias. The lot falling on Matthias, he was from that time associated with the eleven Apostles. The Greeks believe that Matthias preached and died at Colchis.

**MEASURE**, that by which any thing is measured, or adjusted, or proportioned, Prov. xx, 10; Micah vi, 10. Tables of Scripture measures of length and capacity are found at the end of this volume.

**MEATS**. The Hebrews had several kinds of animals which they refused to eat. Among domestic animals they only ate the cow, the sheep, and the goat; the hen and pigeon, among domestic birds; beside several kinds of wild animals. To eat the flesh with the blood was forbidden them, much more to eat the blood without the flesh. We may form a judgment of their taste by what the Scripture mentions of Solomon's table, 1 Kings iv, 22,

23. Thirty measures of the finest wheat flour were provided for it every day, and twice as much of the ordinary sort; twenty stall-fed oxen, twenty pasture oxen, a hundred sheep, beside the venison of deer and roebucks, and wild fowls. It does not appear that the ancient Hebrews were very nice about the seasoning and dressing of their food. We find among them roast meat, boiled meat, and ragouts. They roasted the paschal lamb.

At the first settling of the Christian church, very great disputes arose concerning the use of meats offered to idols. Some newly converted Christians, convinced that an idol was nothing, and that the distinction of clean and unclean creatures was abolished by our Saviour, ate indifferently of whatever was served up to them, even among Pagans, without inquiring whether these meats had been first offered to idols. They took the same liberty in buying meat sold in the markets, not regarding whether it was pure or impure according to the Jews, or whether it was that which had been offered to idols. But other Christians, weaker or less instructed, were offended at this liberty; and thought to eat of meat that had been once offered to idols, was a kind of partaking of that wicked and sacrilegious offering. This diversity in opinion produced some scandal, to which St. Paul thought it behoved him to provide a suitable remedy, Rom. xiv, 20; Titus i, 15. He determined, therefore, that all things were clean to such as were clean, and that an idol was nothing at all; that a man might safely eat of whatever was sold in the shambles, and though it might be a part of what had been previously offered in the temple, and there exposed to sale, he need not scrupulously inquire whence it came; that if an unbeliever should invite a believer to eat with him, the believer might eat of whatever was set before him, &c, 1 Cor. x, 25–27. But at the same time he enjoins, that the law of charity and prudence should be observed; that men should be cautious of scandalizing or offending weak minds; that though all things may be lawful, yet all things are not always expedient; that no one ought to seek his own accommodation or satisfaction, but that of his neighbour; that if any one should say to us, This has been offered to idols,” we may not then eat of it, for the sake of him who gives the information; not so much for fear of wounding our own conscience, but his; in a word, that he who is weak, and thinks he may not indifferently use all sorts of food, should forbear, and eat herbs, rather than offend a brother, Rom. xiv, 1, 2. Yet it is certain, that generally Christians abstained from eating meat that had been offered to idols.

**MEDIA.** It has been commonly thought that Media was peopled by the descendants of Madai, son of Japheth, Gen. x, 2. The Greeks maintain that this country took its name from Medus, the son of Medea. If, however, Madai and his immediate descendants did not people this country, some of his posterity might have carried his name thither, since we find it so often



given to Media, from the times of the Prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, and from the transportation of the ten tribes, and the destruction of Samaria under Salmaneser, A. M. 3283. Media Proper was bounded by Armenia and Assyria Proper on the west, by Persia on the east, by the Caspian provinces on the north, and by Susiana on the south. It was an elevated and mountainous country, and formed a kind of pass between the cultivated parts of eastern and western Asia. Hence, from its geographical position, and from the temperature, verdure, and fertility of its climate, Media was one of the most important and interesting regions of Asia. Into this country the ten tribes who composed the kingdom of Israel were transplanted, in the Assyrian captivity, by Tiglath-pileser and Salmaneser. The former prince carried away the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh, on the east side of Jordan, to Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river of Gozan. His successor carried away the remaining seven tribes and a half, to the same places, which are said to be cities of the Medes, by the river of Gozan,” 1 Chron. v, 26; 2 Kings xvii, 6. The geographical position of Media was wisely chosen for the distribution of the great body of the captives; for, it was so remote, and so impeded and intersected with great mountains and numerous and deep rivers, that it would be extremely difficult for them to escape from this natural prison, and return to their own country. They would also be opposed in their passage through Kir, or Assyria Proper, not only by the native Assyrians, but also by their enemies, the Syrians, transplanted thither before them. The superior civilization of the Israelites, and their skill in agriculture and in the arts, would tend to civilize and improve those wild and barbarous regions.

MEDIATOR, one who stands in a middle office or capacity between two differing parties, and has a power of transacting every thing between them, and of reconciling them to each other. Hence a mediator between God and man is one whose office properly is to mediate and transact affairs between them relating to the favour of almighty God, and the duty and happiness of man. No sooner had Adam transgressed the law of God in paradise, and become a sinful creature, than the Almighty was pleased in mercy to appoint a Mediator or Redeemer, who, in due time should be born into the world, to make an atonement both for his transgression, and for all the sins of men. This is what is justly thought to be implied in the promise, that “the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent’s head;” that is, that there should some time or other be born, of the posterity of Eve, a Redeemer, who, by making satisfaction for the sins of men, and reconciling them to the mercy of almighty God, should by that means bruise the head of that old serpent, the devil, who had beguiled our first parents into sin, and destroy his empire and dominion among men. Thus it became a necessary part of Adam’s religion after the fall, as well as that of his posterity after him, to worship God through hope in this Mediator. To keep up the

remembrance of it God was pleased, at this time, to appoint sacrifices of expiation or atonement for sin, to be observed through all succeeding generations, till the Redeemer himself should come, who was to make the true and only proper satisfaction and atonement.

The particular manner in which Christ interposed in the redemption of the world, or his office as Mediator between God and man, is thus represented to us in the Scripture. He is the light of the world, John i; viii, 12; the revealer of the will of God in the most eminent sense. He is a propitiatory sacrifice, Rom. iii, 25; v, 11; 1 Cor. v, 7; Eph. v, 2; 1 John ii, 2; Matt. xxvi, 28; John i, 29, 36; and, as <sup>634</sup>because of his peculiar offering, of a merit transcending all others, he is styled our High Priest. He was also described beforehand in the Old Testament, under the same character of a priest, and an expiatory victim, Isa. liii; Dan. ix, 24; Psa. cx, 4. And whereas it is objected, that all this is merely by way of allusion to the sacrifices of the Mosaic law, the Apostle on the contrary affirms, that the law was a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things," Heb. x, 1; and that the priests that offer gifts according to the law, serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the tabernacle: for see, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount," Heb. viii, 4, 5; that is, the Levitical priesthood was a shadow of the priesthood of Christ; in like manner as the tabernacle made by Moses was according to that showed him in the mount. The priesthood of Christ, and the tabernacle in the mount, were the originals; of the former of which, the Levitical priesthood was a type; and of the latter, the tabernacle made by Moses was a copy. The doctrine of this epistle, then, plainly is, that the legal sacrifices were allusions to the great atonement to be made by the blood of Christ; and not that it was an allusion to those. Nor can any thing be more express or determinate than the following passage: It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin. Wherefore when he [Christ] cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering," that is, of bulls and of goats, thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. Lo, I come to do thy will, O God! By which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all," Heb. x, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10. And to add one passage more of the like kind: Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin;" that is, without bearing sin, as he did at his first coming, by being an offering for it; without having our iniquities again laid upon him; without being any more a sin-offering:-- "And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation," Heb. ix, 28. Nor do the inspired writers at all confine themselves to this manner of speaking concerning the satisfaction of Christ; but declare that there was an efficacy in what he did and suffered

for us, additional to and beyond mere instruction and example. This they declare with great variety of expression: that he suffered for sins, the just for the unjust," 1 Peter iii, 18; that he gave his life a ransom," Matt. xx, 28; Mark x, 45; 1 Tim. ii, 6; that we are bought with a price," 2 Pet. ii, 1; Rev. xiv, 4; 1 Cor. vi, 20; that he redeemed us with his blood," redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," 1 Peter i, 19; Rev. v, 9; Gal. iii, 13; that he is our advocate, intercessor, and propitiation," Heb. vii, 25; 1 John ii, 1, 2; that he was made perfect, through sufferings; and being thus made perfect, he became the author of salvation," Heb. ii, 10; v, 9; that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," 2 Cor. v, 19; Rom. v, 10; Eph. ii, 16; and that through death he destroyed him that had the power of death," Heb. ii, 14. Christ, then, having thus humbled himself, and become obedient to death, even the death of the cross; God, also, hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name;" hath commanded us to pray in his name; constituted him man's advocate and intercessor; distributes his grace only through him, and in honour of his death; hath given all things into his hands; and hath committed all judgment unto him; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow," and that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father," Phil. ii, 8–10; John iii, 35; v, 22, 23.

All the offices of Christ, therefore, arise out of his gracious appointment, and voluntary undertaking, to be the Mediator between God and man;" between God offended, and man offending; and therefore under the penalty of God's violated law, which denounces death against every transgressor. He is the Prophet who came to teach us the extent and danger of our offences, and the means which God had appointed for their remission. He is the great High Priest of our profession," who, having offered himself without spot to God," has entered the holiest to make intercession for us, and to present our prayers and services to God, securing to them acceptance by virtue of his own merits. He is King, ruling over the whole earth, for the maintenance and establishment and enlargement of his church, and for the punishment of those who reject his authority; and he is the final Judge of the quick and the dead, to whom is given the power of distributing the rewards and penalties of eternity. See Atonement and Jesus Christ.

There is an essential connection between the mediation of our Lord and the covenant of grace. (See Covenant.) He is therefore called the Mediator of a better covenant," and of a new covenant." The word μεσίτης literally means a person in the middle," between two parties; and the fitness of there being a Mediator of the covenant of grace arises from this, that the nature of the covenant implies that the two parties were at variance. Those who hold the Socinian principles understand a mediator to mean nothing more than a messenger sent from God to give assurance of forgiveness to his

offending creatures. Those who hold the doctrine of the atonement understand, that Jesus is called the Mediator of the new covenant, because he reconciles the two parties, by having appeased the wrath of God which man had deserved, and by subduing that enmity to God by which their hearts were alienated from him. It is plain that this is being a mediator in the strict and proper sense of the word; and there seems to be no reason for resting in a meaning less proper and emphatical. This sense of the term mediator coincides with the meaning of another phrase applied to him, Heb. vii, 22, where he is called κρείττονος διαθήκης ἔγγυος. If he is a Mediator in the last sense, then he is also ἔγγυος, the sponsor, the surety, of the covenant. He undertook, on the part of the supreme Lawgiver, that the sins of those who repent shall be forgiven; and he fulfilled this undertaking by offering, in their stead, a satisfaction to divine justice. He undertook, on their part, that they should keep the terms of the covenant; and he fulfils this undertaking by the influence of his Spirit upon their hearts.

If a mediator be essential to the covenant of grace, and if all who have been saved from the time of the first transgression were saved by that covenant, it follows that the Mediator of the new covenant acted in that character before he was manifested in the flesh. Hence the importance of that doctrine respecting the person of Christ; that all the communications which the Almighty condescended to hold with the human race were carried on from the beginning by this person; that it is he who spake to the patriarchs, who gave the law by Moses, and who is called in the Old Testament, the angel of the covenant." These views open to us the full importance of a doctrine which manifestly unites in one faith all who obtain deliverance from that condition; for, according to this doctrine, not only did the virtue of the blood which he shed as a priest extend to the ages past before his manifestation, but all the intimations of the new covenant established in his blood were given by him as the great Prophet, and the blessings of the covenant were applied in every age by the Spirit, which he, as the King of his people, sends forth. The Socinians, who consider Jesus as a mere man, having no existence till he was born of Mary, necessarily reject the doctrine now stated: and the church of Rome, although they admit the divinity of our Saviour, yet, by the system which they hold with regard to the mediation of Christ, agree with the Socinians in throwing out of the dispensations of the grace of God that beautiful and complete unity which arises from their having been conducted by one person. The church of Rome considers Christ as Mediator only in respect of his human nature. As that nature did not exist till he was born of Mary, they do not think it possible that he could exercise the office of Mediator under the Old Testament; and as they admit that a mediator is essential to the covenant of grace, they believe that those who lived under the Old Testament, not

enjoying the benefit of his mediation, did not obtain complete remission of sins. They suppose, therefore, that persons in former times who believed in a Saviour that was to come, and who obtained justification with God by this faith, were detained after death in a place of the infernal regions, which received the name of *limbus patrum*; a kind of prison where they did not endure punishment, but remained without partaking of the joys of heaven, in earnest expectation of the coming of Christ, who, after suffering on the cross, descended to hell that he might set them free. This fanciful system has no other foundation than the slender support which it appears to receive from some obscure passages of Scripture that admit of another interpretation. But if Christ acted as the Mediator of the covenant of grace from the time of the first transgression, this system becomes wholly unnecessary; and we may believe, according to the general strain of Scripture, and what we account the analogy of faith, that all who died in faith," since the world began, entered immediately after death into that heavenly country which they desired."

Although the members of the church of Rome adopt the language of Scripture, in which Jesus is styled the Mediator of the new covenant, they differ from all Protestants in acknowledging other mediators; and the use which they make of the doctrine that Christ is Mediator only in his human nature is to justify their admitting those who had no other nature to share that office with him. Saints, martyrs, and especially the Virgin Mary, are called *mediatores secundarii*, because it is conceived that they hold this character under Christ, and that, by virtue of his mediation, the superfluity of their merits may be applied to procure acceptance with God for our imperfect services. Under this character, supplications and solemn addresses are presented to them; and the *mediatores secundarii* receive in the church of Rome, not only the honour due to eminent virtue, but a worship and homage which that church wishes to vindicate from the charge of idolatry, by calling it the same kind of inferior and secondary worship which is offered to the man Christ Jesus, who in his human nature acted as Mediator. In opposition to all this, we hold that Jesus Christ was qualified to act as Mediator by the union between his divine and his human nature; that his divine nature gave an infinite value to all that he did, rendering it effectual for the purpose of reconciling us to God, while the condescension by which he approached to man, in taking part of flesh and blood, fulfilled the gracious intention for which a Mediator was appointed; that the introducing any other mediator is unnecessary, derives no warrant from Scripture, and is derogatory to the honour of him who is there called the one Mediator between God and men;" and that as the union of the divine to the human nature is the foundation of that worship which in Scripture is often paid to the Mediator of the new covenant, this worship does not

afford the smallest countenance to the idolatry and will worship of those who ascribe divine honours to any mortal.

MEGIDDO, a city of the tribe of Manasseh, famous for the battle fought there between Pharaoh-Necho and King Josiah, in which the latter was defeated and mortally wounded, Josh. xvii, 11; Judges i, 27; 2 Kings xxiii, 29.

MELCHIZEDEK. When Abram returned from the slaughter of the Assyrians, in his way to Hebron, he was met at Shaveh, or King's Dale, afterward the valley of Jehoshaphat, 636 between Jerusalem and Mount Olivet, by Melchizedek, king of Salem, the most ancient quarter of Jerusalem, a priest of the most high God, who gave him bread and wine, and blessed him in the name of the most high God, Creator of heaven and earth;" to whom Abram in return piously gave tithes, or the tenth part of all the spoils as an offering to God, Heb. vii, 2. This Canaanitish prince was early considered as a type of Christ in the Jewish church: Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek," Psalm cx, 4. He resembled Christ in the following particulars: 1. In his name, Melchizedek, King of Righteousness;" 2. In his city, Salem, Peace;" 3. In his offices of king and priest of the most high God; and 4. In the omission of the names of his parents and genealogy, the time of his birth and length of his life, exhibiting an indefinite reign and priesthood, according to the Apostle's exposition, Heb. vii, 5. The import of this is, that he came not to his office by right of primogeniture, (which implies a genealogy,) or by the way of succession, but was raised up and immediately called of God to it. In that respect Christ is said to be a priest after his order." Then, again, that he had no successor, nor could have; for there was no law to constitute an order of succession, so that he was a priest only upon an extraordinary call. In this respect our Lord's priesthood answers to his, because it is wholly in himself, who has no successor. An infinite number of absurd opinions have been at different times held respecting this mystic personage, as that he was Shem, or Ham; or, among those who think he was more than human, that he was the Holy Ghost, or the Son of God himself; absurdities which are too obsolete to need refutation.

MELITA, now called Malta, an island in the African or Mediterranean Sea, between Africa and Sicily, twenty miles in length and twelve in breadth, formerly reckoned a part of Africa, but now belonging to Europe. St. Paul suffered shipwreck upon the coast of Malta, Acts xviii, 1-3. In the opinion of Dr. Hales, the island where this happened was not Malta, but Meleda. His words are: "That this island was Meleda, near the Illyrian coast, not Malta, on the southern coast of Sicily, may appear from the following considerations: 1. It lies confessedly in the Adriatic Sea, but Malta a

considerable distance from it. 2. It lies nearer the mouth of the Adriatic than any other island of that sea; and would of course, be more likely to receive the wreck of any vessel driven by tempests toward that quarter. And it lies north-west by north of the south-west promontory of Crete; and came nearly in the direction of a storm from the south-east quarter. 3. An obscure island called Melite, whose inhabitants were ‘barbarous,’ was not applicable to the celebrity of Malta at that time, which Cicero represents as abounding in curiosities and riches, and possessing a remarkable manufacture of the finest linen; and Diodorus Siculus more fully: ‘Malta is furnished with many and very good harbours, and the inhabitants are very rich; for it is full of all sorts of artificers, among whom there are excellent weavers of fine linen. Their houses are very stately and beautiful, adorned with graceful eaves, and pargetted with white plaster. The inhabitants are a colony of Phenicians, who, trading as merchants, as far as the western ocean, resorted to this place on account of its commodious ports and convenient situation for maritime commerce; and by the advantage of this place, the inhabitants frequently became famous both for their wealth and their merchandise.’ 4. The circumstance of the viper, or venomous snake, which fastened on St. Paul’s hand, agrees with the damp and woody island of Meleda, affording shelter and proper nourishment for such, but not with the dry and rocky island of Malta, in which there are no serpents now, and none in the time of Pliny. 5. The disease with which the father of Publius was affected, dysentery combined with fever, probably intermittent, might well suit a country woody and damp, and probably, for want of draining, exposed to the putrid effluvia of confined moisture; but was not likely to affect a dry, rocky, and remarkably healthy island like Malta.”

MELON, אַבֶּטֶחַיִם, Numbers xi, 5, a luscious fruit so well known that a description of it would be superfluous. It grows to great perfection, and is highly esteemed in Egypt, especially by the lower class of people, during the hot months. The juice is peculiarly cooling and agreeable in that sultry climate, where it is justly pronounced one of the most delicious refreshments that nature, amidst her constant attention to the wants of man, affords in the season of violent heat. There are varieties of this fruit; but that more particularly referred to in the text must be the water melon. It is cultivated, says Hasselquist, on the banks of the Nile, in the rich clayey earth, which subsides during the inundation. This serves the Egyptians for meat, drink, and physic. It is eaten in abundance during the season, even by the richer sort of people; but the common people, on whom Providence has bestowed nothing but poverty and patience, scarcely eat any thing but these, and account this the best time of the year, as they are obliged to put up with worse fare at other seasons. This fruit sometimes serves them for drink, the juice refreshing these poor creatures, and they have less occasion

for water than if they were to live on more substantial food in this burning climate. This well explains the regret expressed by the Israelites for the loss of this fruit, whose pleasant liquor had so often quenched their thirst, and relieved their weariness in their servitude, and which would have been exceedingly grateful in a dry scorching desert.

MEMPHIS. See Noph.

MENNONITES, a society of Baptists in Holland, so called from Menno Simon of Friesland, who lived in the sixteenth century. He was originally a Romish priest, but joined a party of the Anabaptists, and, becoming their leader, cured them of many extravagancies, and reduced the system to consistency and moderation. The Mennonites maintain that practical piety is the essence of religion, and that the surest mark of the true church is the sanctity of its members. They plead for universal toleration in religion, and debar none from their societies who lead pious lives, and own the Scriptures for the word of God. They teach that infants are not the proper subjects of baptism; that ministers of the Gospel ought to receive no salary. They also object to the terms person and trinity, as not consistent with the simplicity of the Scriptures. They are, like the Society of Friends, utterly averse to oaths and war, and to capital punishments, as contrary to the spirit of the Christian dispensation. In their private meetings every one has the liberty to speak, to expound the Scriptures, and to pray. They assemble, or used to do so, twice every year from all parts of Holland, at Rynsbourg, a village two leagues from Leyden, at which time they receive the communion, sitting at a table in the manner of the Independents; but in their form of discipline they are said more to resemble the Presbyterians. The ancient Mennonites professed a contempt of erudition and science, and excluded all from their communion who deviated in the least from the most rigorous rules of simplicity and gravity: but this primitive austerity is greatly diminished in their most considerable societies. Those who adhere to their ancient discipline are called Flemings or Flandrians. The whole sect were formerly called Waterlandians, from the district in which they lived. The Mennonites in Pennsylvania do not baptize by immersion, though they administer the ordinance to none but adult persons. Their common method is this: The person to be baptized kneels, the minister holds his hands over him, into which the deacon pours water, so that it runs on the head of the baptized; after which follow imposition of hands and prayer.

Divine worship is conducted among the Mennonites much as among the churches of the reformed, or among the Dissenters in England, only with this peculiarity, that collections are made every Sabbath day, sometimes in the middle of the sermon, in two bags, one for the poor, and the other for



the expenses of public worship. They have a Mennonite college at Amsterdam, and the ministers are chosen in some places by the congregation, and in others by the elders only. As they reject infant baptism, they refuse to commune at the Lord's table with any who administer the ordinance to children, unless resprinkled. They train up catechumens under their ministers, and, about the age of sixteen, baptize them, taking from the candidate, before the minister and elders, an account of his repentance and faith. In some parts of North Holland, young people are baptized on the day of their marriage. They baptize by pouring or sprinkling thrice.

With respect to their confession of faith, as it is stated by one of their ministers, Mr. Gan, of Ryswick, they believe that in the fall man lost his innocence, and that all his posterity are born with a natural propensity to evil, and with fleshly inclinations, and are exposed to sickness and death. The posterity of Adam derive no moral guilt from his fall: sin is personal, and the desert of punishment cannot be inherited. The incarnate Son of God is set forth to us as inferior to the Father, not only in his state of humiliation, but in that of his exaltation, and as subject to the Father: he is nevertheless an object of religious trust and confidence in like manner as the Father. With respect to the number of Mennonites in Holland, they are calculated at only thirty thousand, including children, and form about a hundred and thirty churches. In the United States of America, it appears, there are more than two hundred Mennonite churches, some of which contain as many as three hundred members in each. They are mostly the descendants of the Mennonites who emigrated in great numbers from Paltz.

MERCY SEAT, ἰλαστήριον, propitiatory. This word is properly an adjective, agreeing with ἐπίθεμα, a lid, understood, which is expressed by the LXX, Exod. xxv, 17. In that version, ἰλαστήριον generally answers to the Hebrew כפרת, from the verb כפר, to cover, expiate, and was the lid or covering of the ark of the covenant, made of pure gold, on and before which the high priest was to sprinkle the blood of the expiatory sacrifices on the great day of atonement, and where God promised to meet his people, Exod. xxv, 17, 22; xxix, 42; xxx, 36; Lev. xvi, 2, 14. St. Paul, by applying this name to Christ, Rom. iii, 25, assures us that he is the true mercy seat, the reality of what the כפרת represented to the ancient believers; by him our sins are covered or expiated, and through him God communes with us in mercy. The mercy seat also represents our approach to God through Christ; we come to the throne of grace;" which is only a variation of the term mercy seat."

MEROM, Waters of, or lacus Samechonitis: the most northern and the smallest of the three lakes which are supplied by the waters of the Jordan.

Indeed the numerous branches of this river, descending from the mountains, unite in this small piece of water; out of which issues the single stream which may be considered as the Jordan Proper. It is at present called the lake of Houle; and is situated in a hollow or valley, about twelve miles wide, called the Ard Houle, formed by the Djebel Heish on the west, and Djebel Safat on the east, the two branches into which the mountains of Hasbeya, or Djebel Esheikh, the ancient Hermon, divides itself about fifteen miles to the north.

MEROZ, a place in the neighbourhood of the brook Kishon, whose inhabitants, refusing to come to the assistance of their brethren, when they fought with Sisera, were put under an anathema, Judges v, 23.

MESHECH, Country of. Meshech was the sixth son of Japheth, and is generally mentioned in conjunction with his brother Tubal; and both were first seated in the northeastern angle of Asia Minor, from the shores of the Euxine, along to the south of Caucasus; where were the Montes Moschisi, and where, in after times, were the Iberi, Tibareni, and Moschi; near to whom also, or mingled with them, were the Chalybes, who, it is probable, derived their Grecian appellation from the general occupation of the families of Tubal and Meshech, as workers in brass and iron, as the inhabitants of the same countries have been in all ages, for the supply of Tyre, Persia, Greece, and Armenia. There appears also to have been in the same neighbourhood, namely, in Armenia, a river and country termed Rosh: for so, Bochart says, the river Araxes is called by the Arabs; and that there was a people in the adjoining country called Rhossi. That passage in Ezekiel, xxxviii, also, which in our Bibles is rendered the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal," is, in the Septuagint, the prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal." These Rossi and Moschi, who were neighbours in Asia, dispersed their colonies jointly over the vast empire of Russia; and preserve their names still in those of Russians and Muscovites.

MESOPOTAMIA, an extensive province of Asia, the Greek name of which denotes between the rivers," and on this account Strabo says, ὅτι κεῖται μεταξύ τοῦ Εὐφράτου καὶ τοῦ Τίγρος, that it was situated between the Euphrates and the Tigris." In Scripture this country is called Aram, and Aramea. But as Aram also signifies Syria, it is denominated Aram Naharaim, or the Syria of the rivers. This province, which inclines from the south-east to the north-west, commenced at 33° 20' N. lat., and terminated near 37° 30' N. lat. Toward the south it extended as far as the bend formed by the Jordan at Cunaxa, and to the wall of Semiramis which separated it from Messene. Toward the north, it comprehended part of Taurus and the Mesius, which lay between the Euphrates and the Tigris. The modern name, given by the Arabs to this part, is of the same import

with the ancient appellation; they call it isle," or, in their language, Al-Dgezera. In this northern part is found Osrhoene, which seems to have been the same place with Anthemusir. The northern part of Mesopotamia is occupied by chains of mountains passing from north-west to south-east, in the situation of the rivers. The central parts of these mountains were called Singaræ Montes. The principal rivers were Chaboras, (Al Kabour,) which commenced at Charræ, (Harran,) east of the mountains, and discharged itself into the Euphrates at Circesium (Kirkisieh;) the Mygdonius, (Hanali,) the source of which was near Nisibis, and its termination in the Chaboras. The principal towns in the eastern part along the Tigris and near it, are Nisibis, (Nisibin,) Bezabde, (Zabda,) Singora, (Sindja,) Labbana on the Tigris, (Mosul,) Hatru, (Harder,) and Apamea-Mesenes. At some distance to the south, upon the Tigris and on the borders of Mesopotamia, was the town of Antiochia, near which commenced the wall that passed from the Tigris to the Euphrates, under the name of Murus Mediæ, or Semiramidis. In the western part were Edessa, called also Callin-Rhæ, (Orfa,) Charræ, (Harran,) Nicephorium, (Racca,) Circesium at the mouth of the Chaboras, Anatho, (Anah,) Neharda, (Hadith Unnour,) upon the right of the Euphrates. There are several other towns of less importance. According to Strabo, this country was fertile in vines, and afforded abundance of good wine. According to Ptolemy, Mesopotamia had on the north a part of Armenia, on the west the Euphrates on the side of Syria, on the east the Tigris on the borders of Assyria, and on the south the Euphrates which joined the Tigris. Mesopotamia was a satrapy under the kings of Syria.

In the earliest accounts we have of this country, subsequent to the time of Abraham, it was subject to a king, called Cushan-Rishathaim, then perhaps the most powerful potentate of the east, and the first by whom the Israelites were made captive, which happened soon after the death of Joshua, and about B. C. 1400, Judges iii, 8. The name of this king bespeaks him a descendant of Nimrod; and it was probably of the Lower Mesopotamia only, or Babylonia, of which he was sovereign; the northern parts being in the possession of the Arameans. This is implied in the history of Abraham; who, when ordered to depart from his country, namely, Chaldea, in the southern part of Mesopotamia, removed to Charran, still in Mesopotamia, but beyond the boundary of the Chaldees, and in the territory of Aram. About four hundred years after Cushan-Rishathaim, we find the northern parts of Mesopotamia in the hands of the Syrians of Zobah; as we are told, in 2 Sam. x, that Hadarezer, king of Zobah, after his defeat by Joab, sent and brought out the Syrians that were beyond the river" Euphrates. The whole country was afterward seized by the Assyrians; to whom it pertained till the dissolution of their empire, when it was divided between the Medes and the Babylonians. It subsequently formed a part of the Medo-Persian, second Syrian or Macedonian, and Parthian empires, as it does at the

present day of the modern Persian. The southern part of Mesopotamia answers nearly to the country anciently called the land of Shinar; to which the Prophet Daniel, i, 2, refers, and Zechariah v, 11.

On the fifth or sixth day after leaving Aleppo," says Campbell in his Overland Journey to India, "we arrived at the city of Diarbeker, the capital of the province of that name; having passed over an extent of country of between three and four hundred miles, most of it blessed with the greatest fertility, and abounding with as rich pastures as I ever beheld, covered with numerous herds and flocks. The air was charmingly temperate in the day time, but, to my feeling, extremely cold at night. Yet notwithstanding the extreme fertility of this country, the bad administration of government, conspiring with the indolence of the inhabitants, leaves it unpeopled and uncultivated. 639Diarbeker Proper, called also Mesopotamia from its lying between two famous rivers, and by Moses called Padanaram, that is, 'the fruitful Syria,' abounds with corn, wine, oil, fruits, and all the necessaries of life. It is supposed to have been the seat of the earthly paradise; and all geographers agree that here the descendants of Noah settled immediately after the flood. To be treading that ground which Abraham trod, where Nahor the father of Rebecca lived, where holy Job breathed the pure air of piety and simplicity, and where Laban the father-in-law of Jacob resided, was to me a circumstance productive of delightful sensations. As I rode along, I have often mused upon the contemptible stratagems to which I was reduced, in order to get through this country, for no other reason than because I was a Christian; and I could not avoid reflecting with sorrow on the melancholy effects of superstition, and regretting that this fine tract of country, which ought to be considered above all others as the universal inheritance of mankind, should now be cut off from all except a horde of senseless bigots, barbarous fanatics, and inflexible tyrants."

MESSIAH. The Greek word Χριστός, from whence comes Christ and Christian, exactly answers to the Hebrew Messiah, which signifies him that hath received unction, a prophet, a king, or a priest. See Jesus Christ.

Our Lord warned his disciples that false messiahs should arise, Matt. xxiv, 24; and the event has verified the prediction. No less than twenty-four false Christs have arisen in different places and at different times: Caziba was the first of any note who made a noise in the world. Being dissatisfied with the state of things under Adrian, he set himself up as the head of the Jewish nation, and proclaimed himself their long expected messiah. He was one of those banditti that infested Judea, and committed all kinds of violence against the Romans; and had become so powerful that he was chosen king of the Jews, and by them acknowledged their messiah. However, to facilitate the success of this bold enterprise, he changed his name from

Caziba, which it was at first, to that of Barchocheba, alluding to the star foretold by Balaam; for he pretended to be the star sent from heaven to restore his nation to its ancient liberty and glory. He chose a forerunner, raised an army, was anointed king, coined money inscribed with his own name, and proclaimed himself messiah and prince of the Jewish nation. Adrian raised an army, and sent it against him; he retired into a town called Bither, where he was besieged. Barchocheba was killed in the siege, the city was taken, and a dreadful havoc succeeded. The Jews themselves allow, that, during this short war against the Romans in defence of this false messiah, they lost five or six hundred thousand souls. This was in the former part of the second century. In the reign of Theodosius the younger, A. D. 434, another impostor arose, called Moses Cretensis. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. Their delusion proved so strong and universal, that they neglected their lands, houses, and other concerns, and took only so much with them as they could conveniently carry. And on the day appointed, this false Moses, having led them to the top of a rock, men, women, and children threw themselves headlong down into the sea, without the least hesitation or reluctance, till so great a number of them were drowned as opened the eyes of the rest, and made them sensible of the cheat. They then began to look for their pretended leader; but he had disappeared, and escaped out of their hands. In the reign of Justin, about A. D. 520, another impostor appeared, who called himself the son of Moses. His name was Dunaan. He entered into a city of Arabia Felix, and there he greatly oppressed the Christians; but he was taken prisoner, and put to death by Elesban, an Ethiopian general. The Jews and Samaritans rebelled against the Emperor Justinian, A. D. 529, and set up one Julian for their king, and accounted him the messiah. The emperor sent an army against them, killed great numbers of them, took their pretended messiah prisoner, and immediately put him to death. In the time of Leo Isaurus, about A. D. 721, arose another false messiah in Spain; his name was Serenus. He drew great numbers after him, to their no small loss and disappointment; but all his pretensions came to nothing. The twelfth century was fruitful in messiahs. About A. D. 1137, there appeared one in France, who was put to death, and numbers of those who followed him. In A. D. 1138, the Persians were disturbed with a Jew, who called himself the messiah. He collected a vast army; but he too was put to death, and his followers treated with great inhumanity. A false messiah stirred up the Jews at Corduba in Spain, A. D. 1157. The wiser and better sort looked upon him as a madman, but the great body of the Jews in the nation believed in him. On this occasion nearly all the Jews in Spain were destroyed. Another false messiah arose in the kingdom of Fez, A. D. 1167, which brought great troubles and persecutions upon the Jews that were scattered throughout that country. In the same year, an Arabian professed

to be the messiah, and pretended to work miracles. When search was made for him, his followers fled, and he was brought before the Arabian king. Being questioned by him, he replied, that he was a prophet sent from God. The king then asked him what sign he could show to confirm his mission. Cut off my head," said he, and I will return to life again." The king took him at his word, promising to believe him if his prediction was accomplished. The poor wretch, however, never came to life again, and the cheat was sufficiently discovered. Those who had been deluded by him were grievously punished, and the nation condemned to a very heavy fine. Not long after this, a Jew who dwelt 640 beyond the Euphrates, called himself the messiah, and drew vast multitudes of people after him. He gave this for a sign of it, that he had been leprous, and had been cured in the course of one night. He, like the rest, perished, and brought great persecution on his countrymen. A magician and false christ arose in Persia, A. D. 1174, who seduced many of the common people, and brought the Jews into great tribulation. Another of these impostors arose, A. D. 1176, in Moravia, who was called David Almusser. He pretended he could make himself invisible; but he was soon taken and put to death, and a heavy fine laid upon the Jews. A famous cheat and rebel exerted himself in Persia, A. D. 1199, called David el David. He was a man of learning, a great magician, and pretended to be the messiah. He raised an army against the king, but was taken and imprisoned; and, having made his escape, was afterward retaken and beheaded. Vast numbers of the Jews were butchered for taking part with this impostor. Rabbi Lemlem, a German Jew of Austria, declared himself a forerunner of the messiah, A. D. 1500, and pulled down his own oven, promising his brethren that they should bake their bread in the holy land next year. A false christ arose in the East Indies, A. D. 1615, and was greatly followed by the Portuguese Jews who are scattered over that country. Another in the Low Countries declared himself to be the messiah of the family of David, and of the line of Nathan, A. D. 1624. He promised to destroy Rome, and to overthrow the kingdom of antichrist, and the Turkish empire. In A. D. 1666, appeared the false messiah Sabatai Tzevi, who made a great noise, and gained a great number of proselytes. He was born at Aleppo, and imposed on the Jews for a considerable time; but afterward, with a view of saving his life, he turned Mohammedan, and was at last beheaded. The last false christ that made any considerable number of converts was one rabbi Mordecai, a Jew of Germany: he appeared, A. D. 1682. It was not long before he was found out to be an impostor, and was obliged to flee from Italy to Poland to save his life: what became of him afterward does not seem to be recorded.

METEMPSYCHOSIS, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls into other bodies. This tenet has been attributed to the sect of the Pharisees. Josephus, who was himself a Pharisee, gives this account of their doctrine

in these points: Every soul is immortal; those of the good only enter into another body, but those of the bad are tormented with everlasting punishment." From whence it has been pretty generally concluded, that the resurrection they held was only a Pythagorean one, namely, the transmigration of the soul into another body; from which they excluded all that were notoriously wicked, who were doomed at once to eternal punishment; but their opinion was, that those who were guilty only of lesser crimes were punished for them in the bodies into which their souls were next sent. It is also supposed, that it was upon this notion the disciples asked our Lord, Did this man sin, or his parents, that he was born blind?" John ix, 2; and that some said, Christ was John the Baptist, some Elias, others Jeremias, or one of the prophets," Matt. xvi, 14. The transmigration of souls into other bodies was undoubtedly the opinion of the Pythagoreans and Platonists, and was embraced by some among the Jews; as by the author of the Book of Wisdom, who says, that being good, he came into a body undefiled," viii, 20. Nevertheless, it is questioned by some persons, whether the words of Josephus, before quoted, are a sufficient evidence of this doctrine of the metempsychosis being received by the whole sect of the Pharisees; for passing into another or different body," may only denote its receiving a body at the resurrection; which will be another, not in substance, but in quality; as it is said of Christ at his transfiguration, *το εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον*, the fashion of his countenance was" another, or, as we render it, was altered," Luke ix, 29. As to the opinion which some entertained concerning our Saviour, that he was either John the Baptist, or Elias, or Jeremias, or one of the prophets, Matt. xvi, 14, it is not ascribed to the Pharisees in particular, and if it were, one cannot see how it could be founded on the doctrine of the metempsychosis; since the soul of Elias, now inhabiting the body of Jesus, would no more make him to be Elias, than several others had been, in whose bodies the soul of Elias, according to this doctrine, is supposed to have dwelt since the death of that ancient prophet, near a thousand years before. Beside, how was it possible any person that saw Christ, who did not appear to be less than thirty years old, should, according to the notion of the metempsychosis, conceive him to be John the Baptist, who had been so lately beheaded? Surely this apprehension must be grounded on the supposition of a proper resurrection. It was probably, therefore, upon the same account, that others took him to be Elias, and others Jeremias. Accordingly, St. Luke expresses it thus: Others say, that one of the old prophets is risen from the dead," Luke ix, 19. It may farther be observed, that the doctrine of the resurrection, which St. Paul preached, was not a present metempsychosis, but a real future resurrection, which he calls the hope and resurrection of the dead," Acts xxiii, 6. This he professed as a Pharisee, and for this profession the partisans of that sect vindicated him against the Sadducees, Acts xxiii, 7–9. Upon the whole, therefore, it appears most reasonable to adopt the

opinion of Reland, though in opposition to the sentiments of many other learned men, that the Pharisees held the doctrine of the resurrection in a proper sense.

METHODISTS, a name given in derision at different times to religious persons and parties which have appeared in this country; but which now principally designates the followers of the Rev. John Wesley. The societies raised up by the instrumentality of the Rev. George Whitefield were also called Methodists, and in Wales especially are still known by that appellation. For distinction's sake, therefore, and also because a number of smaller sects have broken off from the Methodist societies since Mr. Wesley's death, the religious body which he raised up and left organized under his rules, have of late been generally denominated the Wesleyan Methodists. In the year 1729, Mr. John Wesley, being then fellow of Lincoln College, began to spend some evenings in reading the Greek Testament with Charles Wesley, student, and Mr. Morgan, commoner of Christ Church, and Mr. Kirkham, of Merton College. Not long after, two or three of the pupils of Mr. John Wesley, and one pupil of Mr. Charles Wesley, obtained leave to attend these meetings. They then began to visit the sick in different parts of the town, and the prisoners also, who were confined in the castle. Two years after, they were joined by Mr. Ingham, of Queen's College, Mr. Broughton, and Mr. Hervey; and in 1735, by the celebrated Mr. George Whitefield, then in his eighteenth year. At this time their number in Oxford amounted to about fourteen. They obtained the name of Methodists, from the exact regularity of their lives, and the manner of spending their time. In October, 1735, John and Charles Wesley, Mr. Ingham, and Mr. Delamotte, son of a merchant in London, embarked for Georgia, having been engaged by the trustees of that colony as chaplains; but their ultimate design was to preach the Gospel to the Indians. No favourable opportunity offering itself for this pious work, and the strict and faithful preaching of the Wesleys having involved them in much persecution, and many disputes with the colonists, they returned to England, Mr. Charles Wesley in 1737, Mr. John Wesley in 1738. On the passage to America, and while in Georgia, Mr. John had met with several pious Moravians; whose doctrines of justification by faith alone, conscious pardon of sin, and peace with God, confirmed by their own calmness in danger and freedom from the fear of death, greatly impressed him. On his return to England, he was more fully instructed in these views by Bohler, a Moravian minister; and having proved their truth in his own experience, he began to preach in the churches of the metropolis, and other places, and then in rooms, fields, and streets, the doctrine of salvation by faith. In this his brother Charles was his zealous coadjutor; and the effect was the awakening of great multitudes to a religious concern, and the commencement of a great revival of religion throughout the land, which



has in its effects extended itself to the most distant parts of the world. At the time of Mr. Wesley's death, the societies in connection with him in Europe, America, and the West Indies, amounted to eighty thousand members; they are now [1831] upward of three hundred thousand, beside about half a million in the United States of America, who since the acquisition of independence by that country have formed a separate church. The rules of this religious society were drawn up by Messrs. John and Charles Wesley in 1743, and continue to be in force. They state the nature and design of a Methodist society in the following words: "Such a society is no other than a company of men, having the form and seeking the power of godliness: united, in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other to work out their own salvation. That it may the more easily be discerned whether they are indeed working out their own salvation, each society is divided into smaller companies, called classes, according to their respective places of abode. There are about twelve persons, sometimes fifteen, twenty, or even more, in each class; one of whom is styled the leader. It is his business, 1. To see each person in his class once a week, at least, in order to inquire how their souls prosper; to advise, reprove, comfort, or exhort, as occasion may require; to receive what they are willing to give to the poor, or toward the support of the Gospel. 2. To meet the minister and the stewards of the society once a week, to inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly and will not be reproved; to pay to the stewards what they have received of their several classes in the week preceding; and to show their account of what each person has contributed. There is only one condition previously required of those who desire admission into these societies, namely, a desire to flee from the wrath to come; to be saved from their sins: but wherever this is really fixed in the soul, it will be shown by its fruits. It is therefore expected of all who continue therein, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, 1. By doing no harm; by avoiding evil in every kind, especially that which is most generally practised, such as taking the name of God in vain; profaning the day of the Lord, either by doing ordinary work thereon, or by buying or selling; drunkenness; buying and selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity; fighting, quarrelling, brawling; brother going to law with brother; returning evil for evil, or railing for railing; the using many words in buying or selling; the buying or selling uncustomed goods; the giving or taking things on usury, that is, unlawful interest; uncharitable or unprofitable conversation, particularly speaking evil of magistrates or of ministers; doing to others as we would not they should do unto us; doing what we know is not for the glory of God, as the putting on of gold or costly apparel; the taking such diversions as cannot be used in the name of the Lord Jesus; singing those songs, or reading those books, which do not tend to the

knowledge or love of God; softness, or needless self-indulgence; laying up treasure upon earth; borrowing without a probability of paying; or taking up goods, without a probability of paying for them. It is expected of all who continue in these societies, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, 2. By doing good; by being in every kind merciful after their power, 642as they have opportunity; doing good of every possible sort, and, as far as possible, to all men; to their bodies, of the ability which God giveth, by giving food to the hungry, by clothing the naked, by visiting or helping them that are sick or in prison; to their souls, by instructing, reproof, or exhorting all we have any intercourse with; trampling under foot that enthusiastic doctrine of devils,--that we are not to do good unless our hearts be free to it: by doing good, especially to them that are of the household of faith, or groaning so to be; employing them preferably to others; buying one of another; helping each other in business, and so much the more as the world will love its own, and them only; by all possible diligence and frugality, that the Gospel be not blamed; by running with patience the race set before them, denying themselves, and taking up their cross daily; submitting to bear the reproach of Christ; to be as the filth and off-scouring of the world, and looking that men should say all manner of evil of them falsely for the Lord's sake. It is expected of all who continue in these societies, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, 3. By attending on all the ordinances of God: such are, the public worship of God; the ministry of the word either read or expounded; the supper of the Lord; family and private prayer; searching the Scriptures, and fasting and abstinence. These are the general rules of our societies, all which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written word, the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice; and all these we know his Spirit writes on every truly awakened heart. If there be any among us who observe them not, who habitually breaks any of them, let it be made known to them who watch over that soul, as they that must give an account. We will admonish him of the error of his ways; we will bear with him for a season; but then, if he repent not, he hath no more place among us: we have delivered our own souls."

The effect produced by the preaching of the two brothers in various parts of the kingdom, and those frequently the most populous and rude, rendered it necessary to call out preachers to their assistance, and especially since the clergy generally remained negligent, and rather opposed and persecuted, than encouraged, the Wesleys in their endeavours to effect a national reformation. The association of preachers with themselves in the work led to an annual meeting of the ministers, then and since called the conference. The first conference was held in June 1744, at which Mr. Wesley met his brother, two or three other clergymen, and a few of the preachers, whom he had appointed to come from various parts, to confer

with them on the affairs of the societies. Monday, June 25," observes Mr. Wesley, and the five following days, we spent in conference with our preachers, seriously considering by what means we might the most effectually save our own souls, and them that heard us; and the result of our consultations we set down to be the rule of our future practice." Since that time a conference has been annually held; Mr. Wesley himself having presided at forty-seven. The subjects of their deliberations were proposed in the form of questions, which were amply discussed; and the questions, with the answers agreed upon, were afterward printed under the title of Minutes of several Conversations between the Rev. Mr. Wesley and others," commonly called Minutes of Conference.

As the kingdom had been divided into circuits, to each of which several preachers were appointed for one or two years, a part of the work of every conference was to arrange these appointments and changes. In the early conferences various points of doctrine were discussed with reference to the agreement of all in a common standard; and when this was settled, and the doctrinal discussions discontinued, new regulations continued to be adopted, as the state of the societies, and the enlarging opportunities of doing good, required. The character of all those who were engaged in the ministry was also annually examined; and those who had passed the appointed term of probation, were solemnly received into the ministry. All the preachers were itinerants, and, animated by the example of Mr. Wesley, went through great labours, and endured many privations and persecutions, but with such success that societies and congregations were in a few years raised up in almost every part of England, and in a very considerable number of places in Ireland, Wales, and Scotland. The doctrines held by the Methodists, Mr. Wesley declared repeatedly in his writings to be those contained in the Articles of the church of England; for he understood the article on predestination, as many others have done, in a sense not contrary to the doctrine of the redemption and the possible salvation of the whole human race. It will, therefore, be merely necessary to state those views of certain doctrines which it has been thought the Wesleyan Methodists hold in a somewhat peculiar way, or on which they have been most liable to misrepresentation.

They maintain the total fall of man in Adam, and his utter inability to recover himself, or take one step toward his recovery, without the grace of God preventing him, that he may have a good will, and working with him when he has that good will." They assert that Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man." This grace they call free, as extending itself freely to all. They say that Christ is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe;" and that, consequently, they are authorized to offer salvation to all, and to preach the Gospel to every creature." They hold

justification by faith. Justification,” says Mr. Wesley, “sometimes means our acquittal at the last day, Matt. xii, 37: but this is altogether out of the present question; for that justification whereof our Articles and Homilies speak, signifies present forgiveness, pardon of sins, and consequently acceptance with God, who therein declares his righteousness, or justice, and mercy, by or for the remission 643of sins that are past, Romans iii, 25, saying, ‘I will be merciful to thy unrighteousness, and thine iniquities I will remember no more.’ I believe the condition of this is faith, Rom. iv, 5, &c; I mean, not only that without faith we cannot be justified, but also that as soon as any one has true faith, in that moment he is justified. Faith, in general, is a divine supernatural evidence, or conviction, of things not seen, not discoverable by our bodily senses, as being either past, future, or spiritual. Justifying faith implies, not only a divine evidence, or conviction, that ‘God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,’ but a full reliance on the merits of his death, a sure confidence that Christ died for my sins; that he loved me, and gave himself for me: and the moment a penitent sinner believes this, God pardons and absolves him.” This faith, Mr. Wesley affirms, “is the gift of God. No man is able to work it in himself. It is a work of Omnipotence. It requires no less power thus to quicken a dead soul, than to raise a body that lies in the grave. It is a new creation; and none can create a soul anew but He who at first created the heavens and the earth. It is the free gift of God, which he bestows not on those who are worthy of his favour, not on such as are previously holy, and so fit to be crowned with all the blessings of his goodness; but on the ungodly and unholy, on those who till that hour were fit only for everlasting destruction; those in whom is no good thing, and whose only plea was, ‘God be merciful to me, a sinner!’ No merit, no goodness, in man, precedes the forgiving love of God. His pardoning mercy supposes nothing in us but a sense of mere sin and misery; and to all who see and feel and own their wants, and their utter inability to remove them, God freely gives faith, for the sake of Him in whom he is always well pleased. Good works follow this faith, Luke vi, 43, but cannot go before it; much less can sanctification, which implies a continued course of good works springing from holiness of heart.” As to repentance he insisted that it is conviction of sin, and that repentance, and works meet for repentance, go before justifying faith; but he held, with the church of England, that all works, before justification, had the nature of sin;” and that, as they had no root in the love of God, which can only arise from a persuasion of his being reconciled to us, they could not constitute a moral worthiness preparatory to pardon. That true repentance springs from the grace of God, is most certain; but, whatever fruits it may bring forth, it changes not man’s relation to God. He is a sinner, and is justified as such; for it is not a saint, but a sinner, that is forgiven, and under the notion of a sinner.” God justifieth the ungodly, not the godly. Repentance, according to his statement, is necessary to true faith;

but faith alone is the direct and immediate instrument of pardon. They hold also the direct internal testimony of the Holy Spirit to the believer's adoption; for an exposition of which see Holy Spirit.

They maintain also that, by virtue of the blood of Jesus Christ, and the operations of the Holy Spirit, it is their privilege to arrive at that maturity in grace, and participation of the divine nature, which excludes sin from the heart, and fills it with perfect love to God and man. This they denominate Christian perfection. On this doctrine Mr. Wesley observes, "Christian perfection does not imply an exemption from ignorance or mistake, infirmities or temptations; but it implies the being so crucified with Christ, as to be able to testify, 'I live not, but Christ liveth in me,' Gal. ii, 23, and 'hath purified their hearts by faith,' Acts xv, 9." Again: To explain myself a little farther on this head: 1. Not only sin, properly so called, that is, a voluntary transgression of a known law; but sin, improperly so called, that is, an involuntary transgression of a divine law known or unknown, needs the atoning blood. 2. I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these involuntary transgressions, which I apprehend to be naturally consequent on the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality. 3. Therefore, sinless perfection is a phrase I never use, lest I should seem to contradict myself. 4. I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to these involuntary transgressions. 5. Such transgressions you may call sins, if you please; I do not, for the reasons above mentioned."

The rules of the Methodist societies have been already given; but, in order to have a general view of their ecclesiastical economy, it must be remarked, that a number of these societies united together form what is called a circuit. A circuit generally includes a large market town, and the circumjacent villages to the extent of ten or fifteen miles. To one circuit two or three, and sometimes four, preachers are appointed, one of whom is styled the superintendent; and this is the sphere of their labour for at least one year, or not more than three years. Once a quarter the preachers meet all the classes, and speak personally to each member. Those who have walked orderly the preceding quarter then receive a ticket. These tickets are in some respects analogous to the tesseræ of the ancients, and answer all the purposes of the commendatory letters spoken of by the Apostle. Their chief use is to prevent imposture. After the visitation of the classes a meeting is held, consisting of all the preachers, leaders, and stewards in the circuit. At this meeting the stewards deliver their collections to a circuit steward, and every thing relating to temporal matters is publicly settled. At this meeting the candidates for the ministry are proposed, and the stewards, after officiating a definite period, are changed. A number of circuits, from five to ten, more or fewer, according to their extent, form a district, the

preachers of which meet annually. Every district has a chairman, who fixes the time of meeting. These assemblies have authority, 1. To examine candidates for the ministry, and probationers, and to try and suspend preachers who are found immoral, erroneous in doctrine, or deficient in abilities. 6442. To decide concerning the building of chapels. 3. To examine the demands from the poorer circuits respecting the support of the preachers and of their families, from the public funds. 4. To elect a representative to attend and form a committee to sit previously to the meeting of the conference, in order to prepare a draught of the stations of all the preachers for the ensuing year. The judgment of this meeting is conclusive until conference, to which an appeal is allowed in all cases.

The conference, strictly speaking, consists only of a hundred of the senior preachers, according to the arrangements prescribed in a deed of declaration, executed by Mr. Wesley, and enrolled in chancery. But the preachers elected at the preceding district meetings as representatives, the superintendents of the circuits, and such preachers as the districts allow to attend, sit and vote usually as one body. At the conference, every preacher's character undergoes the strictest scrutiny; and if any charge be proved against him, he is dealt with accordingly. The preachers are also stationed, the proceedings of the subordinate meetings reviewed, and the state of the connection at large is considered. The conference is commonly held in London, Leeds, Bristol, Manchester, Liverpool, and Sheffield, in rotation, at the latter end of July.

By the minutes of the last conference, 1831, it appears that this religious body had three hundred and sixty-three circuits in England, Wales, and Scotland; forty-five in Ireland; and a hundred and fifty-six mission stations, most of them being also circuits, in Sweden, France, the Mediterranean, Continental India, Ceylon, the South Seas, Africa, the West Indies, and British America. The number of members in the societies were, in Great Britain, two hundred and forty-nine thousand one hundred and nineteen; in Ireland, twenty-two thousand four hundred and seventy; in the foreign stations, forty-two thousand seven hundred and forty-three. Their regular preachers were eight hundred and forty-six in Great Britain; in Ireland, a hundred and forty-six; in foreign stations, exclusive of catechists, a hundred and eighty-seven.

[The preceding account, so far as it respects the original history, the doctrines, and the moral discipline of Wesleyan Methodists, is equally applicable to those in America and in Europe. The Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, however, which became a distinct and independent church in the year 1784, differs considerably in its organization, and in the details of its ecclesiastical economy, from the

British Wesleyan connection. The circuits, into which the whole field of labour occupied by the itinerant ministry is divided, are in general much larger, nor is any preacher allowed to remain on them more than two years successively. Of these circuits, from five or six to fifteen or more, according to circumstances, constitute a district. Of the districts, from four or five to six or eight, usually, comprise the tract of country embraced within the boundaries of an annual conference; and of annual conferences, the whole of the United States and Territories, agreeably to the minutes of the last year, (1831,) were divided into nineteen. From all these annual conferences, delegates, in a certain prescribed ratio, are sent once in four years to constitute a general conference, the highest ecclesiastical assemblage among American Wesleyan Methodists. The minister or preacher first named of those appointed to each circuit or station, is thereby invested with the pastoral charge thereof, and is usually denominated the preacher in charge. Each district is committed to the care of an elder, denominated the presiding elder, who is appointed annually, and may remain four years successively on a district, but not longer; and all the districts comprising the whole extent of the church, are under the general superintendence of the bishops. These at present, (April, 1832,) are four in number, and like all others of our stated ministry, are required to be itinerant. If they cease to travel at large, without the consent of the general conference, they forfeit the exercise of their episcopal functions. Their visitations are annual and alternate, on a preconcerted plan, through the bounds of the entire work. They preside in the annual and general conferences, station the preachers, with (by established usage) the counsel of the presiding elders, and are jointly and severally responsible to the general conference for their administration and conduct. (See also the articles Episcopalians," and Imposition of Hands.")

For a more minute detail of the ecclesiastical economy, spiritual and temporal, of American Wesleyan Methodists, (which would lead us too far for a work of this sort,) reference may be had to the small volume published at the Conference Office, entitled 'The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church.'

By the minutes of the annual conferences for the last year, (1831,) there were in the communion of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, five hundred and thirteen thousand one hundred and twenty-four members; of whom four hundred and thirty-seven thousand and twenty-four were whites, seventy-one thousand five hundred and eighty-nine coloured, and four thousand five hundred and one Indians. The number of itinerant ministers was two thousand and ten, of whom one hundred and thirty four were superannuated, or worn out. In addition to these, there are also several thousand local ministers and preachers, many of whom were

once itinerant; and who, though not stately devoted to the work of the ministerial office, as the itinerant ministers are, yet, by their valuable services on the Sabbath, or at other times occasionally in their respective vicinities, constitute an important auxiliary branch of the system, and contribute much to its compactness and efficiency.

Beside the above, there are in the United States several smaller associations of persons bearing the name of Methodists, who hold and teach, in general, the doctrines of Wesleyan Methodists, but are not in connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and differ from it in various points of ecclesiastical economy and discipline.

The Wesleyan Methodists in Upper Canada, who were formerly in connection with the church in the United States, have recently, with the consent of the general conference of the latter body, been constituted a distinct church, under an episcopal form. Its organization, however, has not yet been completed by the consecration of a bishop, though we understand that a reverend individual has been selected, who will probably shortly be set apart for that holy office. This branch of the American Wesleyan Methodists, agreeably to their minutes for the year 1831, consisted of sixty-five itinerant ministers, and twelve thousand five hundred and sixty-three members; of whom one thousand two hundred and thirty-three were Indians.]

METHUSELAH, the son of Enoch, and father of Lamech, Gen. v, 21. He was born A. M. 687, and died A. M. 1656, being the very year of the deluge, at the age of nine hundred and sixty-nine, the greatest age to which any mortal man ever attained.

MICAH, the seventh in order of the twelve lesser prophets, is supposed to have prophesied about B. C. 750. He was commissioned to denounce the judgments of God against both the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, for their idolatry and wickedness. The principal predictions contained in this book are, the invasions of Shalmanezar and Sennecharib; the destruction of Samaria and of Jerusalem, mixed with consolatory promises of the deliverance of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, and of the downfall of the power of their Assyrian and Babylonian oppressors; the cessation of prophecy in consequence of their continued deceitfulness and hypocrisy; and a desolation in a then distant period, still greater than that which was declared to be impending. The birth of the Messiah at Bethlehem is also expressly foretold; and the Jews are directed to look to the establishment and extent of his kingdom, as an unfailing source of comfort amidst general distress. The style of Micah is nervous, concise, and elegant, often elevated, and poetical, but sometimes obscure from sudden transitions of



subject; and the contrast of the neglected duties of justice, mercy, humility, and piety, with the punctilious observance of the ceremonial sacrifices, affords a beautiful example of the harmony which subsists between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, and shows that the law partook of that spiritual nature which more immediately characterizes the religion of Jesus.

The prophecy of Micah, contained in the fifth chapter, is, perhaps the most important single prophecy in all the Old Testament, and the most comprehensive respecting the personal character of the Messiah, and his successive manifestations to the world. It crowns the whole chain of predictions respecting the several limitations of the promised seed: to the line of Shem; to the family of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; to the tribe of Judah; and to the royal house of David, terminating in his birth at Bethlehem, the city of David.” It carefully distinguishes his human nativity from his divine nature and eternal existence; foretels the casting off of the Israelites and Jews for a season; their ultimate restoration; and the universal peace which should prevail in the kingdom and under the government of the Messiah. This prophecy, therefore, forms the basis of the New Testament revelation which commences with the birth of the Messiah at Bethlehem, the miraculous circumstances of which are recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke in the introduction to their respective histories; the eternal subsistence of Christ as the Word,” in the sublime introduction to St. John’s Gospel; his prophetic character and second coming, illustrated in the four Gospels and in the apostolic epistles.

MICHAEL. See Archangel.

MIDIAN, Land of, a country of the Midianites, derived its name and its inhabitants from Midian, the son of Abraham by Keturah. This country extended from the east of the land of Moab, on the east of the Dead Sea, southward, along the Elanitic gulf of the Red Sea, stretching some way into Arabia. It farther passed to the south of the land of Edom, into the peninsula of Mount Sinai, where Moses met with the daughter of Jethro, the priest of Midian, whom he married. The Midianites, together with their neighbours, the Ishmaelites, were early engaged in the trade between the east and the west, as we find the party to whom Joseph was sold, carrying spices, the produce of the east, into Egypt; and, taking Gilead in their way, to add the celebrated and highly prized balm of that country to their merchandise. It appears that, at the time of the passage of the Israelites through the country of the Amorites, the Midianites had been subdued by that people, as the chiefs or kings of their five principal tribes are called dukes of Sihon, and dwelt in his country, Joshua xiii, 21. It was at this time that the Midianites, alarmed at the numbers and the progress of the Israelites, united with the

Moabites in sending into Syria for Balaam, the soothsayer; thinking to do that by incantation which they despaired of effecting by force. The result of this measure, the constraint imposed on Balaam to bless instead of to curse, and the subsequent defeat and slaughter of the Midianites, forms one of the most interesting narratives in the early history of the Jews, Num. xxii-xxv, xxxi. About two hundred years after this, the Midianites, having recovered their numbers and their strength, were permitted by God to distress the Israelites for the space of seven years, as a punishment for their relapse into idolatry. But at length their armies, like grasshoppers for multitude, with camels out of number as sand by the sea side for multitude," which had encamped in the valley of Jezreel, were miraculously defeated by Gideon, Judges vi-viii. The Midianites appear not to have survived this second discomfiture as a nation; but their remains became gradually incorporated with the Moabites and Arabians.

646MIGDOL. Moses writes, that when the Israelites came out of Egypt, the Lord commanded them to encamp over against Pihahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-Zephon, Exod. xiv, 2. It is not known whether this Migdol was a city, or only a fortress: probably the latter, in which a garrison was stationed.

MILE, a measure of length, containing a thousand paces. Eight stadia or furlongs make a mile. The Romans commonly measured by miles, and the Greeks by furlongs. The furlong was a hundred and twenty-five paces; the pace was five feet. The ancient Hebrews had neither miles, furlongs, nor feet, but only the cubit, the reed, and the line. The rabbins make a mile to consist of two thousand cubits, and four miles make a parasang.

MILETUS, a city on the continent of Asia Minor, and in the province of Caria, memorable for being the birthplace of Thales, one of the seven wise men of Greece, of Anaximander and Anaximenes, the philosophers, and of Timotheus, the musician. It was about thirty-six miles south of Ephesus, and the capital of both Caria and Ionia. The Milesians were subdued by the Persians, and the country passed successively into the power of the Greeks and Romans. At present the Turks call it Molas, and it is not far distant from the true Meander, which encircles all the plain with many mazes, and innumerable windings. It was to this place that St. Paul called the elders of the church of Ephesus, to deliver his last charge to them, Acts xx, 15, &c. There was another Miletus in Crete, mentioned 2 Tim. iv, 20.

MILL. In the first ages they parched or roasted their grain; a practice which the people of Israel, as we learn from the Scriptures, long continued: afterward they pounded it in a mortar, to which Solomon thus alludes: Though thou shouldest bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a pestle,

yet will not his foolishness depart from him," Prov. xxvii, 22. This was succeeded by mills, similar to the hand mills formerly used in this country, of which there were two sorts: the first were large, and turned by the strength of horses or asses; the second were smaller, and wrought by men, commonly by slaves condemned to this hard labour, as a punishment for their crimes. Chardin remarks, in his manuscript, that the persons employed are generally female slaves, who are least regarded, or are least fitted for any thing else; for the work is extremely laborious, and esteemed the lowest employment about the house. Most of their corn is ground by these little mills, although they sometimes make use of large mills, wrought by oxen or camels. Near Ispahan, and some of the other great cities of Persia, he saw water mills; but he did not meet with a single wind mill in the east. Almost every family grind their wheat and barley at home, having two portable mill stones for that purpose; of which the uppermost is turned round by a small handle of wood or iron that is placed in the rim. When this stone is large, or expedition is required, a second person is called in to assist; and as it is usual for the women only to be concerned in this employment, who seat themselves over against each other, with the mill stone between them, we may see the propriety of the expression in the declaration of Moses: And all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne even unto the first-born of the maid-servant that is behind the mill," Exod. xi, 5. The manner in which the hand mills are worked is well described by Dr. E. D. Clarke, in his Travels: "Scarcely had we reached the apartment prepared for our reception, when, looking from the window into the court yard belonging to the house, we beheld two women grinding at the mill, in a manner most forcibly illustrating the saying of our Saviour: 'Two women shall be grinding at the mill, the one shall be taken and the other left.' They were preparing flour to make our bread, as it is always customary in the country when strangers arrive. The two women, seated upon the ground opposite to each other, held between them two round flat stones, such as are seen in Lapland, and such as in Scotland are called querns. In the centre of the upper stone was a cavity for pouring in the corn, and by the side of this an upright wooden handle for moving the stone. As this operation began, one of the women opposite received it from her companion, who pushed it toward her, who again sent it to her companion; thus communicating a rotatory motion to the upper stone, their left hands being all the while employed in supplying fresh corn, as fast as the bran and flour escaped from the sides of the machine." When they are not impelled, as in this instance, to premature exertions by the arrival of strangers, they grind their corn in the morning at break of day: the noise of the mill is then to be heard every where, and is often so great as to rouse the inhabitants of the cities from their slumbers; for it is well known they bake their bread every day, and commonly grind their corn as it is wanted. The noise of the mill

stone is therefore, with great propriety, selected by the prophet as one of the tokens of a populous and thriving country: Moreover, I will take from them the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of mill stones and the light of a candle, and their whole land shall be a desolation," Jer. xxv, 10. The morning shall no more be cheered with the joyful sound of the mill, nor the shadows of evening by the light of a candle; the morning shall be silent, and the evening dark and melancholy, where desolation reigns. At the earliest dawn of the morning," says Mr. Forbes, in all the Hindoo towns and villages, the hand mills are at work, when the menials and widows grind meal for the daily consumption of the family: this work is always performed by women, who resume their task every morning, especially the forlorn Hindoo widows, divested of every ornament, and with their heads shaved, degraded to almost a state of servitude." How affecting, then, is the call to the daughter of Babylon!--"Come down, and sit in the dust, O daughter of Babylon, sit on the ground: there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans; for thou shalt no more be called tender and delicate. Take the mill stones, and grind meal; uncover thy locks, make bare the leg, uncover the thigh, pass over the rivers," Isaiah xlvi, 1, 2.

The custom of daily grinding their corn for the family, shows the propriety of the law: "No man shall take the nether or the upper mill stone to pledge, for he taketh a man's life to pledge;" because if he take either the upper or the nether mill stone, he deprives him of his daily provision, which cannot be prepared without them. That complete and perpetual desolation which, by the just allotment of Heaven, is ere long to overtake the mystical Babylon, is clearly signified by the same precept: The sound of the mill stone shall be heard no more at all in thee," Rev. xviii, 22. The means of subsistence being entirely destroyed, no human creature shall ever occupy the ruined habitations more. In the book of Judges, the sacred historian alludes, with characteristic accuracy, to several circumstances implied in that custom, where he describes the fall of Abimelech. A woman of Thebez, driven to desperation by his furious attack on the tower, started up from the mill at which she was grinding, seized the upper mill stone, פלח רכב, and, rushing to the top of the gate, cast it on his head, and fractured his skull. This was the feat of a woman, for the mill is worked only by females; it was not a piece of a mill stone, but the rider, the distinguishing name of the upper mill stone, which literally rides upon the other, and is a piece or division of the mill: it was a stone of two feet broad, and therefore fully sufficient, when thrown from such a height, to produce the effect mentioned in the narrative. It displays, also, the vindictive contempt which suggested the punishment of Samson, the captive ruler of Israel, that the Philistines, with barbarous contumely, compelled him to perform the meanest service of a female slave; they sent him to grind in the prison,

Judges xvi, 21, but not for himself alone; this, although extremely mortifying to the hero, had been more tolerable; they made him grinder for the prison, perhaps while the vilest malefactor was permitted to look on, and join in the mockery. Samson, the ruler and avenger of Israel, labours, as Isaiah foretold the virgin daughter of Babylon should labour: Come down, and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon: there is no throne," no seat for thee, O daughter of the Chaldeans. Take the mill stones and grind meal," but not with the wonted song; Sit thou silent, and get thee into darkness," there to conceal thy vexation and disgrace, Isaiah xlvii, 1, 2, 5. The females engaged in this operation, endeavoured to beguile the lingering hours of toilsome exertion with a song. We learn from an expression of Aristophanes, preserved by Athenæus, that the Grecian maidens accompanied the sound of the mill stones with their voices. This circumstance imparts force to the description of the prophet, the light of a candle was no more to be seen in the evening; the sound of the mill stones, the indication of plenty, and the song of the grinders, the natural expression of joy and happiness, were no more to be heard at the dawn. The grinding of corn at so early an hour throws light on a passage of considerable obscurity: And the sons of Rimmon the Beerothite, Rechab and Baanah, went, and came about the heat of the day to the house of Ishbosheth, who lay on a bed at noon; and they came thither into the midst of the house, as though they would have fetched wheat, and they smote him under the fifth rib; and Rechab and Baanah his brother escaped," 2 Sam. iv, 5–7. It is still a custom in the east, according to Dr. Perry, to allow their soldiers a certain quantity of corn, with other articles of provisions, together with some pay; and as it was the custom, also, to carry their corn to the mill at break of day, these two captains very naturally went to the palace the day before to fetch wheat, in order to distribute it to the soldiers, that it might be sent to the mill at the accustomed hour in the morning. The princes of the east in those days, as the history of David shows, lounged in their divan, or reposed on their couch, till the cool of the evening began to advance. Rechab and Baanah, therefore, came in the heat of the day, when they knew that Ishbosheth, their master, would be resting on his bed; and as it was necessary, for the reason just given, to have the corn the day before it was needed, their coming at that time, though it might be a little earlier than usual, created no suspicion, and attracted no notice.

MILLENARIANS are those who believe, according to an ancient tradition in the church, grounded on some doubtful texts in the book of Revelation and other scriptures, that our Saviour shall reign a thousand years with the faithful upon earth after the first resurrection, before the full completion of final happiness; and their name, taken from the Latin word mille, a thousand," has a direct allusion to the duration of this spiritual empire, which is styled the millennium. A millennium, or a future paradisaical state

of the earth, is viewed by some as a doctrine not of Christian, but of Jewish, origin. The tradition which fixes the duration of the world, in its present imperfect state, to six thousand years, and announces the approach of a Sabbath of one thousand years of universal peace and plenty, to be ushered in by the glorious advent of the Messiah, has been traced up to Elias, a rabbinical writer, who flourished about two centuries before the birth of Christ. It certainly obtained among the Chaldeans from the earliest times; and it is countenanced by Barnabas, Irenæus, and other primitive writers, and also by the Jews at the present day. But though the theory may not be very improbable, yet, as it has not the sanction of Scripture to support it, we are not bound to respect it any farther than as a doubtful tradition. The Jews understood several passages of the prophets, as Zechariah xiv, 16, &c, of the millennium; in which, according to their carnal apprehensions, the Messiah is to reign on earth, and to bring all nations within the pale, and under subjection to the ordinances, of the Jewish church.

Justin Martyr, the most ancient of the fathers, was a great supporter of the doctrine of the millennium, or that our Saviour shall reign with the faithful upon earth, after the resurrection, for a thousand years; which he declares was the belief of all orthodox Christians. But this opinion is not generally followed; for, though there has been, perhaps, no age of the church in which this doctrine was not admitted by one or more divines of the first eminence, it yet appears, from the writings of Eusebius, Irenæus, and others among the ancients, as well as from the histories of Dupin, Mosheim, and other moderns, that it was never adopted by the whole church, nor formed an article of the established creed in any nation. Origen, the most learned of the fathers, and Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, usually, for his immense erudition, surnamed the Great, both opposed the doctrine that prevailed on the subject in their day; and Dr. Whitby, in his learned treatise on the subject, proves, first, that the millennium was never generally received in the church of Christ; and, secondly, that there is no just ground to think it was derived from the Apostles.

On the other hand, Dr. T. Burnet and others maintain that it was very generally admitted till the Nicene council, in 325, or till the fourth century. The doctor supposes Dionysius of Alexandria, who wrote against Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, before the middle of the third century, to have been the first that attacked this doctrine; but Origen had previously assailed it in many of his fictitious additions. The truth seems to be, as one well remarks, that a spiritual reign of Christ was believed by all who carefully examined the Scriptures, though the popular notions of the millennium were often rejected; and ancient as well as modern writers assailed the extravagant superstructure, not the Scriptural foundation of the doctrine." During the

interregnum in England, in the time of Cromwell, there arose a set of enthusiasts sometimes called Millenarians, but more frequently Fifth Monarchy Men, who expected the sudden appearance of Christ, to establish on earth a new monarchy or kingdom. In consequence of this, some of them aimed at the subversion of all human government. In ancient history we read of four great monarchies; the Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, and the Roman; and these men, believing that this new spiritual kingdom of Christ was to be the fifth, obtained the name by which they were called. They claimed to be the saints of God, and to have the dominion of saints, Dan. vii, 27; expecting that, when Christ was come into this kingdom, to begin his reign on earth, they, as his deputies, were to govern all things under him. They went so far as to give up their own Christian names, and assume others from Scripture, like the Manicheans of old.

The opinions of the moderns on this subject may be reduced to two: 1. Some believe that Christ will reign personally on the earth, and that the prophecies of the millennium point to a resurrection of martyrs and other just men, to reign with him a thousand years in a visible kingdom. 2. Others are inclined to believe that, by the reign of Christ and the saints for a thousand years on earth, nothing more is meant than that, before the general judgment, the Jews shall be converted, genuine Christianity be diffused through all nations, and mankind enjoy that peace and happiness which the faith and precepts of the Gospel are calculated to confer on all by whom they are sincerely embraced." The state of the Christian church, say they, will be, for a thousand years before the general judgment, so pure and so widely extended, that, when compared with the state of the world in the ages preceding, it may, in the language of Scripture, be called a resurrection from the dead. In support of this interpretation, they quote two passages from St. Paul, in which a conversion from Paganism to Christianity, and a reformation of life is called a resurrection from the dead," Rom. vi, 13; Ephesians v, 14. There is, indeed, an order in the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv, 24; but we nowhere observe mention made of a first and second resurrection at the distance of a thousand years from each other: yet, were the millenarian hypothesis well founded, the words should rather have run thus: Christ, the first-fruits, then the martyrs at his coming, and a thousand years afterward the residue of mankind,--then cometh the end," &c.

Mr. Joseph Mede, Dr. Gill, Bishop Newton, Mr. Winchester, Mr. Eyre, Mr. Kett, and a host of writers recently, are advocates for the first of these opinions, and contend for the personal reign of Christ on earth. When these great events shall come to pass," says Bishop Newton, "of which we collect from the prophecies this to be the proper order,--the Protestant witnesses shall be greatly exalted, and the twelve hundred and sixty years of their prophesying in sackcloth, and of the tyranny of the beast, shall end

together; the conversion and restoration of the Jews succeed; then follows the ruin of the Ottoman empire; and then the total destruction of Rome and of antichrist. When these great events, I say, shall come to pass, then shall the kingdom of Christ commence, or the reign of saints upon earth. So Daniel expressly informs us that the kingdom of Christ and the saints will be raised upon the ruins of the kingdom of antichrist, Daniel vii, 26, 27. So likewise St. John saith, that, upon the final destruction of the beast and of the false prophet, ‘Satan is bound,’ &c, Rev. xx, 2–6. It is, I conceive, to these great events, the fall of antichrist, the reestablishment of the Jews, and the beginning of the glorious millennium, that the three different dates in Daniel, of twelve hundred and sixty years, twelve hundred and sixty and ninety years, and thirteen hundred and thirty-five years, are to be referred. And, as Daniel saith, ‘Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thirteen hundred and thirty-five years,’ Daniel xii, 12: so St. John saith, ‘Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection,’ Rev. xx, 6. Blessed and happy, indeed, will be this period; and it is very observable, that the martyrs and confessors of Jesus, in papist as well as Pagan times, will be raised to partake of this felicity. Then shall all those gracious promises in the Old Testament be fulfilled, of the amplitude and extent of the peace and prosperity, of the glory and happiness, of the church in the latter days. Then, in the full sense of the words, ‘shall the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever,’ Rev. xi, 15. According to tradition, these thousand years of the reign of Christ and the saints will be the seventh millenary of the world; for, as God created the world in six days, and rested on the seventh, so the world, it is argued, will continue six thousand years, and the seventh thousand will be the great sabbatism, or holy rest of the people of God; ‘one day being with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day,’ 2 Pet. iii, 8. According to tradition, too, these thousand years of the reign of Christ and the saints are the great day of judgment, in the morning or beginning whereof shall be the coming of Christ in flaming fire, and the particular judgment of antichrist, and the first resurrection; and in the evening or conclusion whereof shall be the general resurrection of the dead, small and great; ‘and they shall be judged every man according to his works.’”

Such is the representation of the millennium, as given by those who embrace the opinion of Christ’s reigning personally on earth during the period of one thousand years. But Dr. Whitby, Mr. Lowman, &c, contend against the literal interpretation of the millennium, both as to its nature and duration. Mr. Faber observes that, “respecting the yet future and mysterious millennium, the less that is said upon the subject the better. Unable myself to form the slightest conception of its specific nature, I shall weary neither my own nor my reader’s patience with premature remarks upon it. That it



will be a season of great blessedness, is certain; farther than this we know nothing definitely." The millenarians do not form a sect distinct from others; but their distinguishing tenet, in one view or other, prevails, in a greater or less degree, among most denominations into which the Christian world is divided.

The following observations from Jones's Biblical Cyclopædia are worthy great attention for their sobriety:--Some have supposed that the passage, Rev. xx, 4, is to be taken literally, as importing that at that time Jesus Christ will come, in his human nature, from heaven to earth, and set his kingdom up here, reigning visibly and personally, with distinguished glory on earth; that the bodies of the martyrs, and of other eminent Christians will then be raised from the dead, in which they shall live and reign with Christ here on earth a thousand years. And some suppose, that all the saints, the true friends to God and Christ, who have lived before that time, will then be raised from the dead, and live on earth perfectly holy, during this thousand years. And this they suppose is meant by the first resurrection. Those who agree in general in this notion of the millennium differ with respect to many circumstances, which it is needless to mention here. Others have understood this paragraph of Scripture in a figurative sense: that by this reign of Christ on earth, is not meant his coming from heaven to earth in his human visible nature; but his taking to himself his power, and utterly overthrowing the kingdom of Satan, and setting up his own kingdom throughout the world which, before this, had been confined to very narrow bounds; subduing all hearts to a willing subjection, and thus reigning generally over the men who shall then be in the world, and live in that thousand years. And by the souls of them which were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands," living again and reigning with Christ a thousand years; they suppose, is not meant a literal resurrection, or the resurrection of their bodies, which is not asserted here, as there is nothing said of their bodies, or of their being raised to life; but that they shall live again, and reign with Christ, in the revival, prosperity, reign, and triumph of that cause and interest in which they lived, and for the promotion of which they died; and in whose death the cause seemed to languish and become extinct. Thus they shall live again in their successors, who shall arise and stand up with the same spirit, and in the same cause, in which they lived and died, agreeable to ancient prophecies. The meek shall inherit the earth." And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve him." And they suppose that this revival of the cause of Christ, by the numerous inhabitants of the earth rising up to a new and

holy life, is that which is here called the first resurrection, in distinction from the second, which will consist in the resurrection of the body; whereas this is a spiritual resurrection; a resurrection of the cause of Christ, which had been, in a great degree, dead and lost; a resurrection of the souls of men, by the renovation of the Holy Spirit. That this important passage of Scripture is to be understood in the figurative sense, last mentioned, is probable, and the following considerations are thought sufficient to support it:--

1. Most if not all the prophecies in this book are delivered in figurative language, referring to types and events recorded in the Old Testament; and in imitation of the language of the ancient prophets. And this was proper, and even necessary, in the best manner to answer the ends of prophecy, as might easily be shown were it necessary. The first part of this passage, all must allow, is figurative. Satan cannot be bound with a literal, material chain. The key, the great chain, and the seal, cannot be understood literally. The whole is a figure, and can mean no more than, that, when the time of the millennium arrives, or rather previous to it, Jesus Christ will lay effectual restraints on Satan, so that his powerful and prevailing influence, by which he had before deceived and destroyed a great part of mankind, shall be wholly taken from him for a thousand years. And it is most natural to understand the other part of the description of this remarkable event to be represented in the same figurative language, as the whole is a representation of one scene; especially, since no reason can be given why it should not be so understood.

2. To suppose that Christ shall come in his human nature to this earth, and live here in his whole person visible a thousand years before the day of judgment, appears to be contrary to several passages of Scripture. The coming of Christ, and his appearing at the day of judgment in his human nature, is said to be his second appearance, answering to his first appearance, in his human nature on earth, from his birth to his ascension into heaven, which was past. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them who look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation," Heb. ix, 27, 28. The appearance here spoken of is the appearance of Christ at the day of judgment, to complete the salvation of his church. This could not be his appearing the second time, were he thus to appear, and to be bodily present in his human nature on earth, in the time of the millennium, which is to take place before the day of judgment. The coming of Christ does not always intend his coming visibly in his human nature; but he is said to come, when he destroyed the temple and nation of the Jews, and appeared in favour of his church. So his destruction of Heathen Rome, and delivering his church from that

persecuting power, was an instance of his coming. And he will, in the same way, come to destroy antichrist, and the kingdom of Satan in the world, and introduce the millennium; and in these instances, and others, he may be said to appear. But his coming to judgment, and appearing to complete the final destruction of all his enemies, and to perfect the salvation of his church, is his last coming and appearance. But if he were here on earth, visible in his human nature, and reigning in his glorified body, during the millennium, he would be already here to attend the last judgment, and he could not be properly said to come from heaven, and to be revealed from heaven, because this was done a thousand years before. Beside, that Christ should come from heaven, and appear and reign in his human nature and presence before the day of judgment, seems to be contrary to the following scriptures: For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first." When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God," &c. When he shall come to be glorified in his saints," 1 Thess. iv, 16; 2 Thess. i, 7, 8, 10. This is evidently his appearing the second time, for the salvation of all them that look for him; but were he on earth before this, in the human nature, during the time of the millennium, how could he be said to be revealed, to descend and come from heaven to judge the world?

3. There is nothing expressly said of the resurrection of the body in this passage. The Apostle John saw the souls of them which were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, &c, and they lived and reigned with Christ. The resurrection of the body is no where expressed in Scripture by the soul's living. And as there is nothing said of the body, and he only saw their souls to live: this does not appear to be a proper expression to denote the resurrection of the body, and their living in that. As this, therefore, does not seem to be the natural meaning of the words, and certainly is not the necessary meaning, we are warranted to look for another meaning, and to acquiesce in it, if one can be found which is more easy and natural, and more agreeable to the whole passage and to the Scripture in general. Therefore,

4. The most easy and probable meaning is, that the souls of the martyrs, and all the faithful followers of Christ, who have lived in the world, and have died before the millennium shall commence, shall revive and live again in their successors, who shall rise up in the same spirit, and in the same character, in which they lived and died; and in the revival and flourishing of that cause which they espoused, and spent their lives in promoting. This is therefore a spiritual resurrection, denoting that all Christ's people shall appear in the spirit and power of those martyrs and

holy men, who had before lived in the world, and who shall live again in these their successors, and in the revival of their cause, or in the resurrection of the church, from the very low state in which it had been before the millennium, to a state of great prosperity and glory. This is agreeable to the way of representing things in Scripture in other instances. John the Baptist was Elijah, because he rose in the spirit of Elijah, and promoted the same cause in which Elijah lived and died; and Elijah revived and lived in John the Baptist, because he went before Christ, in the spirit and power of Elijah, Luke i, 17. Therefore Christ says of John, This is Elijah who was to come," Matt. xi, 14.

With regard to the nature of the millennial state, or the blessings which shall be more particularly enjoyed during that period, the following things seem to be marked out in prophecy:--

1. It is expressly said of those who shall partake of this first resurrection, that they shall be blessed and holy;" by which the inspired writer seems to denote that it will be a time of eminent holiness. This will constitute the peculiar glory and the source of the happiness of the millennium state, Zech. xiv, 20, 21. And that such will be the case, we may infer, also, from the consideration, that,

2. There is reason to expect a remarkable effusion of the Spirit, about the commencement of this happy period, even as there was at the first setting up of Christ's kingdom in the world. Beside the promises of the Spirit which were accomplished in the apostolic age, there are others which from the connection appear to refer to the time we are now speaking of. Thus Isaiah, after having described Christ's kingdom which was set up at his first coming, and then the succeeding desolate state of the Jews, represents this as continuing until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest," Isa. xxxii, 15-19. The Apostle Paul, speaking of the conversion of the Jews at this period, refers to a passage in Isaiah where a promise of the Spirit is made to them: "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My Spirit which is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever," Isa. lix, 20, 21; Rom. xi, 26, 27. The Lord having mentioned the forlorn dispersed state of Israel throughout the nations, among whom they had profaned his name, promises to gather them, cleanse them, and give them a new heart and spirit, and adds, And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes; and ye shall keep my judgments and do them," Ezek. xxxvi, 27; xxxix, 28, 29. The promise of pouring upon them the spirit of grace and supplication has also a view to this period,

Zech. xii, 10. Though we are not to expect the miraculous gifts of the apostolic age, yet the work of the Spirit will abundantly appear in qualifying men for propagating the Gospel throughout the world, filling them with light, zeal, courage, and activity, in that work; in giving success and effect to the Gospel by converting multitudes to the faith, quickening the dead in trespasses and sins, and translating them into the kingdom of Christ; and in enlightening, quickening, purifying, and comforting the children of God, stirring them up to greater liveliness, love, zeal, activity, and fruitfulness in his service.

3. A universal spread of the Gospel, diffusing the knowledge of the Lord throughout the world in a more extensive and effectual manner than ever it was before. This is repeatedly promised: The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea;” and this shall take place in that day when the Gentiles shall seek to the branch of the root of Jesse, whose rest shall be glorious, and when the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, and shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah, from the four corners of the earth,” Isaiah xi, 9–12. The same promise of the universal knowledge of the glory of the Lord is repeated in the prophecy of Habakkuk, ii, 14. This will be attended with corresponding effects: All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him,” Psalm xxii, 27; yea, all kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him,” Psalm lxxii, 11. And though we may not imagine that all the inhabitants of the globe will have the true and saving knowledge of the Lord; yet we may expect such a universal spread of light and religious knowledge as shall root up Pagan, Mohammedan, and antichristian delusions, and produce many good effects upon those who are not really regenerated, by awing their minds, taming their ferocity, improving their morals, and making them peaceable and humane.

4. The Jews will then be converted to the faith of the Messiah, and partake with the Gentiles of the blessings of his kingdom. The Apostle Paul, in the eleventh chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, treats of this at large, and confirms it from the prophecies of the Old Testament. He is speaking of Israel in a literal sense, the natural posterity of Abraham; for he distinguishes them both from the believing Gentiles and the Jewish converts of his time, and describes them as the rest who were blinded, had stumbled and fallen, and so had not obtained, but were broken off and cast away, Rom. xi, 7, 11, 12, 15, 17. Yet he denies that they have stumbled that they should fall, that is, irrecoverably, so as in no future period to be restored; but shows that God’s design in permitting this was, that through their fall salvation might come unto the Gentiles, and that this again might

provoke them to jealousy or emulation, verse 11. He argues that if their fall and diminishing was the riches of the Gentiles, and the casting away of them was the reconciling of the world, their fulness will be much more so, and the receiving of them be life from the dead, verses 12, 15. He farther argues, that if the Gentiles were grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall these which be the natural branches be grafted into their own olive tree?" verse 24. Nor did he consider this event as merely probable, but as absolutely certain; for he shows that the present blindness and future conversion of that people is the mystery or hidden sense of prophecies concerning them; and he cites two of these prophecies where the context foretels both their rejection and recovery, Isaiah lix, 20, 21; xxvii, 9.

5. The purity of visible church communion, worship, and discipline, will then be restored according to the primitive apostolic pattern. During the reign of antichrist a corrupted form of Christianity was drawn over the nations, and established in the political constitutions of the kingdoms which were subject to that monstrous power. By this means the children of God were either mixed in visible religious communion with the profane world, in direct opposition to the word of God, or persecuted for their nonconformity. In reference to this state of things, the angel commands St. John to leave out the court which is without the temple, and not to measure it, for this reason, because it is given to the Gentiles; and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months," Rev. xi, 2; that is, they shall pollute and profane the worship and communion of the church during the one thousand two hundred and sixty years of antichrist's reign, so that it cannot be measured by the rule of God's word. But when the period we are speaking of shall arrive, the sanctuary shall be cleansed, Dan. viii, 14; the visible communion, worship, order, and discipline of the house of God will then be restored to their primitive purity, and accord with the rule of the New Testament. So it is promised to Zion, Henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean," Isaiah lii, 1. Thy people shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified," Isaiah lx, 21. And in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of Hosts," Zech. xiv, 21.

6. The Lord's special presence and residence will then be in the midst of his people. Christ hath promised to be with his people in every period of the church, even unto the end of the world, Matt. xxviii, 20, and that he will be in the midst even of two or three of them when gathered together in his name, Matt. xviii, 20. He also calls them to purity of communion and personal holiness, and promiseth to dwell in them and walk in them, 2 Cor. vi, 16, 17; but this will be fulfilled in an eminent and remarkable manner

during the millennial period. The Lord, having promised to raise Israel out of their graves, to gather them from among the Heathen, and bring them into the church and kingdom of Christ, as one fold having one shepherd, adds, And I will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore; my tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people," Ezek. xxxvii, 11–27. This alludes to his dwelling among Israel in the tabernacle and sanctuary of old, Lev. xxvi, 11, 12; and imports his manifesting himself unto them, admitting them into the most intimate correspondence and communion with himself in his ordinances, communicating light, life, and consolation to them by his Spirit; and also his protection and care of them as his peculiar people. It is intimated that there will be such visible tokens of the divine presence and residence among them as will fall under the notice of the world, and produce conviction and awe, as was in some measure the case in the first churches, Acts ii, 47; v, 11, 13; 1 Cor. xiv, 24, 25; for it is added, And the Heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore," Ezek. xxxvii, 28. Indeed, this is that very promise which is represented to St. John as accomplished: And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God," Rev. xxi, 3.

7. This will be a time of universal peace, tranquillity and safety. Persons naturally of the most savage, ferocious, and cruel disposition, will then be tame and harmless; so it is promised, Isaiah xi, 6–10. Whether we consider the persons represented by these hurtful animals to be converted or not, it is certain they will then be effectually restrained from doing harm, or persecuting the saints. There shall be no war nor bloodshed among the nations during this happy period; for we are told, that, in the last days, when the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it; the Lord shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," Isaiah ii, 4. The same promise is repeated word for word in the prophecies of Micah, iv, 3. Much to the same purpose is that promise in Hosea ii, 18. Though war has hitherto deluged the world with human blood, and been a source of complicated calamities to mankind, yet, when Satan is bound, his influence upon wicked men restrained, and the saints bear rule, it must necessarily cease.

8. The civil rulers and judges shall then be all maintainers of peace and righteousness. Though Christ will put down all that rule, power, and authority which opposeth the peace and prosperity of his kingdom; yet as

rulers are the ordinance of God, and his ministers for good; as some form of government seems absolutely necessary to the order and happiness of society in this world; it is thought that when the kingdoms of this world are become our Lord's and his Christ's, the promise will be accomplished, I will also make thy officers peace, and thine exactors righteousness;" and in consequence of this, violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls salvation, and thy gates praise," Isaiah lx, 17, 18. Peace and righteousness are the two great ends of government: Christ himself is king of righteousness, and king of peace, and the civil rulers during that happy period will resemble him in their character and administration; for then shall that promise be fulfilled: In righteousness shalt thou be established: thou shalt be far from oppression, for thou shalt not fear; and from terror, for it shall not come near thee," Isaiah liv, 14.

9. The saints shall then have the dominion, and the wicked shall be in subjection. This is clear from the united voice of prophecy: The kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High," Dan. vii, 27. The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever," Dan. vii, 18. The meek shall inherit the earth," Matt. v, 5; shall reign on the earth," Rev. v, 10; shall reign with Christ a thousand years," Rev. xx, 4; they shall be priests of God, and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years," Rev. xx, 6. The saints are at present made kings and priests unto God, a kingly priesthood, 1 Peter ii, 9; but then they shall be more eminently so, when, by the holiness of their lives, the purity of their faith and worship, and their diligence in promoting pure and undefiled religion, the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord. Then shall that promise be fully accomplished, Ye shall be named the priests of the Lord; men shall call you the ministers of our God," Isaiah lxi, 6. With regard to the nature of their reign, it will undoubtedly correspond in all respects with the spiritual and heavenly nature of Christ's kingdom, to the promotion of which all their power will be subservient. Those who cannot conceive of any reign upon earth, but such as consists in lordly and oppressive dominion, maintained by policy and force, and made subservient to the purposes of pride, ambition, avarice, and other worldly lusts, can have no idea at all of this reign of the saints with Christ, which is a reign of peace on earth and good will to men; a reign of truth and righteousness, of true godliness and universal humanity. In short, it is the prevalence and triumph of the cause of Christ in this world over that of Satan and all his instruments. How delightful then the prospects which open upon the eye of faith in the prophetic vision! Christianity prevails universally, and the consequences are most blissful. Our race assumes the appearance of one vast virtuous and peaceful family. Our world becomes



the seat of one grand triumphant adoring assembly. At length the scene mingles with the heavens, and, rising in brightness, is blended with the glories on high. The mysteries of God on earth are finished, the times of the regeneration are fulfilled. The Son of God descends. The scene closes with divine grandeur: And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of many thunderings, saying, Alleluia; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ. And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.”

MILLET, מילת, Ezek. iv, 9, a kind of plant so called from its thrusting forth such a quantity of grains. Thus in Latin it is called millium, as if one stalk bore a thousand seeds. It has been supposed that the dochan means what is now called in the east durra; which, according to Niebuhr, is a sort of millet, and when made into bad bread with camel's milk, oil, butter, or grease, is almost the only food which is eaten by the common people in Arabia Felix. I found it so disagreeable,” says he, that I should willingly have preferred plain barley bread to it.” This illustrates the appointment of it to the Prophet Ezekiel as a part of his hard fare. Durra is also used in Palestine and Syria, and it is generally agreed that it yields much more than any other kind of grain. Hiller and Celsius insist that the dochan is the panic; but Forskal has expressly mentioned the dokn, holcus dochna, as a kind of maize, of considerable use in food; and Brown, in his Travels, describes the mode of cultivating it.

MILLO, a part or suburb of Jerusalem. David built round about from Millo and inward,” 2 Sam. v, 9; that is, he built round about from the place where Millo was afterward erected by Solomon, or where more probably the senate house, or Millo of the Jebusites, had stood, which was pulled down to make room for the more sumptuous edifice of Solomon, to his own house; so that David built from Mount Zion, quite round to the opposite point. Hence, the residence of David, even in the reign of that renowned monarch, began to assume the size and splendour of a city.

MINISTER, one who attends or waits on another; so we find Elisha was the minister of Elijah, and did him services of various kinds, 2 Kings iii, 11. So Joshua was the servant of Moses, Exod. xxiv, 13; xxxiii, 11. And these persons did not by any means feel themselves degraded by their stations, but in due time they succeeded to the offices of their masters. In

like manner John Mark was minister to Paul and Barnabas, Acts xiii, 5. Christ is called a minister of the true, that is, the heavenly, sanctuary. The minister of the synagogue was appointed to keep the book of the law, to observe that those who read it, read it correctly, &c, Luke iv, 20. The rabbins say he was the same as the angel of the church, or overseer. Lightfoot says, Baal Aruch expounds the chazan, or minister of the congregation, by sheliach hatzibbor, or angel of the congregation; and from this common platform and constitution of the synagogue, we may observe the Apostle's expression of some elders ruling and labouring in word and doctrine, others in the general affairs of the synagogue. Ministers were servants, yet servants not menial, but honourable; those who explain the word, and conduct the service of God; those who dispense the laws and promote the welfare of the community; the holy angels who in obedience to the divine commands protect, preserve, succour, and benefit the godly, are all ministers, beneficial ministers, to those who are under their charge, Heb. viii, 2; Exod. xxx, 10; Lev. xvi, 15; 1 Cor. iv, 1; Romans xiii, 6; Psalm civ, 4.

MINT, Matt. xxiii, 23; Luke xi, 42; a garden herb well known. The law did not oblige the Jews to give the tithes of this sort of herbs; it only required it of those things which could be comprehended under the name of income or revenue. But the Pharisees, desirous of distinguishing themselves by a more scrupulous and literal observance of the law than others, gave the tithes of mint, anise, and cummin," Matt. xxiii, 23. Christ reprov'd them because that, while they were so precise in these lesser matters, they neglected the more essential commandments of the law, and substituted observances, frivolous and insignificant, in the place of justice, mercy, and truth.

MIRACLES. A miracle, in the popular sense, is a prodigy, or an extraordinary event, which surprises us by its novelty. In a more accurate and philosophic sense, a miracle is an effect which does not follow from any of the regular laws of nature, or which is inconsistent with some known law of it, or contrary to the settled constitution and course of things. Accordingly, all miracles presuppose an established system of nature, within the limits of which they operate, and with the order of which they disagree. Of a miracle in the theological sense many definitions have been given. That of Dr. Samuel Clarke is: A miracle is a work effected in a manner unusual, or different from the common and regular method of providence, by the interposition of God himself, or of some intelligent agent superior to man, for the proof or evidence of some particular doctrine, or in attestation of the authority of some particular person." Mr. Hume has insidiously or erroneously maintained that a miracle is contrary to experience; but in reality it is only different from experience. Experience

informs us that one event has happened often; testimony informs us that another event has happened once or more. That diseases should be generally cured by the application of external causes, and sometimes at the mere word of a prophet, and without the visible application of causes, are facts not inconsistent with each other in the nature of things themselves, nor irreconcilable according to our ideas. Each fact may arise from its own proper cause; each may exist independently of the other; and each is known by its own proper proof, whether of sense or testimony. As secret causes often produce events contrary to those we do expect from experience, it is equally conceivable that events should sometimes be produced which we do not expect. To pronounce, therefore, a miracle to be false, because it is different from experience is only to conclude against its general existence from the very circumstance which constitutes its particular nature; for if it were not different from experience, where would be its singularity? or what particular proof could be drawn from it, if it happened according to the ordinary train of human events, or was included in the operation of the general laws of nature? We grant that it does differ from experience; but we do not presume to make our experience the standard of the divine conduct. He that acknowledges a God must, at least, admit the possibility of a miracle. The atheist, that makes him inseparable from what is called nature, and binds him to its laws by an insurmountable necessity; that deprives him of will, and wisdom, and power, as a distinct and independent Being; may deny even the very possibility of a miraculous interposition, which can in any instance suspend or counteract those general laws by which the world is governed. But he who allows of a First Cause in itself perfect and intelligent, abstractedly from those effects which his wisdom and power have produced, must at the same time allow that this cause can be under no such restraints as to be debarred the liberty of controlling its laws as often as it sees fit. Surely, the Being that made the world can govern it, or any part of it, in such a manner as he pleases; and he that constituted the very laws by which it is in general conducted, may suspend the operation of those laws in any given instance, or impress new powers on matter, in order to produce new and extraordinary effects.

In judging of miracles there are certain criteria, peculiar to the subject, sufficient to conduct our inquiries, and warrant our determination. Assuredly they do not appeal to our ignorance, for they presuppose not only the existence of a general order of things, but our actual knowledge of the appearance which that order exhibits, and of the secondary material causes from which it, in most cases, proceeds. If a miraculous event were effected by the immediate hand of God, and yet bore no mark of distinction from the ordinary effects of his agency, it would impress no conviction, and probably awaken no attention. Our knowledge of the ordinary course of things, though limited, is real; and therefore it is essential to a miracle,

both that it differ from that course, and be accompanied with peculiar and unequivocal signs of such difference. We have been told that the course of nature is fixed and unalterable, and therefore it is not consistent with the immutability of God to perform miracles. But, surely, they who reason in this manner beg the point in question. We have no right to assume that the Deity has ordained such general laws as will exclude his interposition; and we cannot suppose that he would forbear to interfere where any important end could be answered. This interposition, though it controls, in particular cases, the energy, does not diminish the utility, of those laws. It leaves them to fulfil their own proper purposes, and effects only a distinct purpose, for which they were not calculated. If the course of nature implies the general laws of matter and motion, into which the most opposite phenomena may be resolved, it is certain that we do not yet know them in their full extent; and, therefore, that events, which are related by judicious and disinterested persons, and at the same time imply no gross contradiction, are possible in themselves, and capable of a certain degree of proof. If the course of nature implies the whole order of events which God has ordained for the government of the world, it includes both his ordinary and extraordinary dispensations, and among them miracles may have their place, as a part of the universal plan. It is, indeed, consistent with sound philosophy, and not inconsistent with pure religion, to acknowledge that they might be disposed by the supreme Being at the same time with the more ordinary effects of his power; that their causes and occasions might be arranged with the same regularity; and that, in reference chiefly to their concomitant circumstances of persons and times, to the specific ends for which they were employed, and to our idea of the immediate necessity there is for a divine agent, miracles would differ from common events, in which the hand of God acts as efficaciously, though less visibly. On this consideration of the subject, miracles, instead of contradicting nature, might form a part of it. But what our limited reason and scanty experience may comprehend should never be represented as a full and exact view of the possible or actual varieties which exist in the works of God.

2. If we be asked whether miracles are credible, we reply, that, abstractedly considered, they are not incredible; that they are capable of indirect proof from analogy, and of direct, from testimony; that in the common and daily course of worldly affairs, events, the improbability of which, antecedently to all testimony, was very great, are proved to have happened, by the authority of competent and honest witnesses; that the Christian miracles were objects of real and proper experience to those who saw them; and that whatsoever the senses of mankind can perceive, their report may substantiate. Should it be asked whether miracles were necessary, and whether the end proposed to be effected by them could warrant so

immediate and extraordinary an interference of the Almighty, as such extraordinary operations suppose; to this we might answer, that, if the fact be established, all reasonings à priori concerning their necessity must be frivolous, and may be false. We are not capable of deciding on a question which, however simple in appearance, is yet too complex in its parts, and too extensive in its object, to be fully comprehended by the human understanding. Whether God could or could not have effected all the ends designed to be promoted by the Gospel, without deviating from the common course of his providence, and interfering with its general laws, is a speculation that a modest inquirer would carefully avoid; for it carries on the very face of it a degree of presumption totally unbecoming the state of a mortal being. Infinitely safer is it for us to acquiesce in what the Almighty has done, than to embarrass our minds with speculations about what he might have done. Inquiries of this kind are generally inconclusive, and always useless. They rest on no solid principles, are conducted by no fixed rules, and lead to no clear conviction. They begin from curiosity or vanity, they are prosecuted amidst ignorance and error, and they frequently terminate in impious presumption or universal skepticism. God is the best and indeed the only judge how far miracles are proper to promote any particular design of his providence, and how far that design would have been left unaccomplished, if common and ordinary methods only had been pursued. So, from the absence of miracles, we may conclude, in any supposed case, that they were not necessary; from their existence, supported by fair testimony, in any given case, we may infer with confidence that they are proper. A view of the state of the world in general, and of the Jewish nation in particular, and an examination of the nature and tendency of the Christian religion, will point out very clearly the great expediency of a miraculous interposition; and when we reflect on the gracious and important ends that were to be effected by it, we shall be convinced that it was not an idle and useless display of divine power; but that while the means effected and confirmed the end, the end fully justified and illustrated the means. If we reflect on the almost irresistible force of prejudice, and the strong opposition it universally made to the establishment of a new religion on the demolition of rites and ceremonies, which authority had made sacred, and custom had familiarized; if we reflect on the extent and importance, as well as the singularity, of the Christian plan; what was its avowed purpose to effect, and what difficulties it was necessarily called to struggle with before that purpose could be effected; how much it was opposed by the opinions and the practice of the generality of mankind, by philosophy, by superstition, by corrupt passions and inveterate habits, by pride and sensuality, in short, by every engine of human influence, whether formed by craft, or aided by power;--if we seriously reflect on these things, and give them their due force, (and experience shows us that we can scarcely give them too much,) we shall

be induced to admit even the necessity of a miraculous interposition, at a time when common means must inevitably, in our apprehensions, have failed of success.

The revelation of the divine will by inspired persons is, as such, miraculous; and therefore, before the adversaries of the Gospel can employ with propriety their objections to the particular miracles on which its credibility is based, they should show the impossibility of any revelation. In whatever age the revelation is given, succeeding ages can know it only from testimony; and, if they admit, on the report of their fellow creatures, that God had inspired any being with the preternatural knowledge of his will, why should they deny that he had enabled the same being to heal the sick, or to cleanse the leprous? How, may it be asked, should the divine Teacher give a more direct and consistent proof of his preternatural commission, than by displaying those signs and wonders which mark the finger of God? That the Apostles could not be deceived, and that they had no temptation to deceive, has been repeatedly demonstrated. So powerful, indeed, is the proof adduced in support of their testimony, that the infidels of these later days have been obliged to abandon the ground on which their predecessors stood; to disclaim all moral evidences arising from the character and relation of eye-witnesses; and to maintain, upon metaphysical, rather than historical, principles, that miracles are utterly incapable, in their own nature, of existing in any circumstances, or of being supported by any evidence.

Miracles may be classed under two heads: those which consist in a train or combination of events, which distinguish themselves from the ordinary arrangements of Providence; and those particular operations which are performed by instruments and agents incompetent to effect them without a preternatural power. In the conduct of Providence respecting the Jewish people, from the earliest periods of their existence, as a distinct class of society, to the present time, we behold a singularity of circumstance and procedure which we cannot account for on common principles. Comparing their condition and situation with that of other nations, we can meet with nothing similar to it in the history of mankind. So remarkable a difference, conspicuous in every revolution of their history, could not have subsisted through mere accident. There must have been a cause adequate to so extraordinary an effect. Now, what should this cause be, but an interposition of Providence in a manner different from the course of its general government? For the phenomenon cannot be explained by an application of those general causes and effects that operate in other cases. The original propagation of Christianity was likewise an event which clearly discovered a miraculous interposition. The circumstances which attended it were such as cannot rationally be accounted for on any other

postulatum. (See the article Christianity.) It may now be observed, that the institutions of the law and the Gospel may not only appeal for their confirmation to a train of events which, taken in a general and combined view, point out an extraordinary designation, and vindicate their claim to a divine authority; but also to a number of particular operations which, considered distinctly, or in a separate and detached light, evidently display a supernatural power, immediately exerted on the occasion.

Since Christ himself constantly appealed to these works as the evidences of his divine mission and character, we may briefly examine how far they justified and confirmed his pretensions. That our Lord laid the greatest stress on the evidence they afforded; nay, that he considered that evidence as sufficient to authenticate his claims to the office of the Messiah with all reasonable and well disposed inquirers, is manifest not only from his own words, John x, 25, but also from a great variety of other passages in the evangelists. Thus, when the disciples of John were sent to Christ, to receive from his own lips the most satisfactory proofs of his divine mission, he referred them to his miracles. Go," said he, and show to John again those things which ye hear and see: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up," Matt. xi, 4, 5. Again: If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not: but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works," John x, 37. This appeal to miracles was founded on the following just and obvious grounds:--

First: That they are visible proofs of divine approbation, as well as of divine power: for it would have been quite inconclusive to rest an appeal on the testimony of the latter, if it had not at the same time included an evidence of the former; and it was, indeed a natural inference, that working of miracles, in defence of a particular cause, was the seal of Heaven to the truth of that cause. To suppose the contrary, would be to suppose that God not only permitted his creatures to be deceived, but that he deviated from the ordinary course of his providence, purposely with a view to deceive them. The conclusion which the man whom our Saviour restored to sight drew from this miracle was exceedingly just, and founded on the common sentiments and impressions of the human heart. We know," says he, that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth. Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. If this man were not of God, he could do nothing," John ix, 31–33. If the cause which our Saviour was engaged in had not been approved of by God, it would not have been honoured with the seal of miracles: for the divine power can never be supposed to counteract the divine will. This would be to set his nature at variance with itself; and, by destroying his simplicity, would destroy his happiness, and terminate in confusion and misery. Hence we may justly

reject, as incredible, those miracles which have been ascribed to the interposition of wicked spirits. The possibility of their interference is a mere hypothesis, depending upon gratuitous assumption, and leading to very dangerous consequences; and the particular instances in which credulous superstition, or perverted philosophy, has supposed them to interfere, are, as facts, destitute of any clear and solid evidence; or, as effects, often resolvable into natural causes.

Secondly: When our Lord appealed to his miracles, as proofs of his divine mission, it presupposed that those miracles were of such a nature as would bear the strictest examination; that they had all those criteria which could possibly distinguish them from the delusions of enthusiasm, and the artifices of imposture; else the appeal would have been fallacious and equivocal. He appealed to them with all the confidence of an upright mind, 657totally possessed with a consciousness of their truth and reality. This appeal was not drawn out into any laboured argument, nor adorned by any of the embellishments of language. It was short, simple, and decisive. He neither reasoned nor declaimed on their nature or their design: he barely pointed to them as plain and indubitable facts, such as spoke their own meaning, and carried with them their own authority. The miracles which our Lord performed were too public to be suspected of imposture; and, being objects of sense, they were secured against the charge of enthusiasm. An impostor would not have acted so absurdly as to have risked his credit on the performance of what, he must have known, it was not in his power to effect; and though an enthusiast, from the warmth of imagination, might have flattered himself with a full persuasion of his being able to perform some miraculous work; yet, when the trial was referred to an object of sense, the event must soon have exposed the delusion. The impostor would not have dared to say to the blind, Receive thy sight; to the deaf, Hear; to the dumb, Speak; to the dead, Arise; to the raging of the sea, Be still; lest he should injure the credit of his cause, by undertaking more than he could perform; and though the enthusiast, under the delusion of his passions, might have confidently commanded disease to fly, and the powers of nature to be subject to his control; yet their obedience would not have followed his command.

The miracles of Christ then were such as an impostor would not have attempted, and such as an enthusiast could not have effected. They had no disguise; and were in a variety of instances of such a nature as to preclude the very possibility of collusion. They were performed in the midst of his bitterest enemies; and were so palpable and certain, as to extort the following acknowledgment even from persons who were most eager to oppose his doctrines, and to discredit his pretensions: This man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him,” John xi,



47, 48. The miracles Christ performed were indeed sufficient to alarm the fears of those whose downfall was involved in his success. And it was impossible for them to deny the facts, which so many thousands were ready to attest on evidence too certain to admit even the possibility of mistake, delusion, or imposture. But his enemies, who admitted their reality and yet resisted their design, by not acknowledging the person who wrought them to be the Messiah, had recourse to the most impious and most absurd suppositions, in order to evade their evidence. The Heathen imputed them to some occult power of magic: and thus applied what has no existence in nature, in order to account for a phenomenon that existed out of its common course. The stories of the Jews, who confessed the miracles, but denied what they were intended to establish, are too ridiculous to be mentioned. We must not, however, omit to take notice of the wicked and blasphemous cavil of the Pharisees, and the noble reply which our Lord made to it. They could not deny the fact, but they imputed it to the agency of an infernal spirit: This fellow," said they, doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?" Matt. xii, 24–26. The purity of the doctrine which was taught by our blessed Lord was totally adverse to the kingdom of darkness. It tended to overthrow it, by the introduction of principles far different from those which Satan would inspire, and by prosecuting objects totally opposite to those which that wicked and malignant spirit would tempt us to pursue: so that in proportion to the prevalence of the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of Satan would of course be diminished. Now, supposing miracles to be in the power of an infernal spirit, can it be imagined that he would communicate an ability of performing them to persons who were counteracting his designs? Would he by them give credit to a cause that tended to bring his own into disgrace? Thus, as our Saviour appealed to miracles as proofs of his power; so he appealed to the inherent worth and purity of the doctrines they were intended to bear witness to, as a proof that the power was of God. In this manner do the external and internal evidences give and receive mutual confirmation and mutual lustre.

The truth of the Christian religion does not, however, wholly depend on the miracles wrought by its divine Founder, though sufficient in themselves to establish his claims: but, in order to give the evidence of miracles the strongest force they could possibly acquire, that evidence was extended still farther; and the same power that our Lord possessed was communicated to his disciples, and their more immediate successors. While yet on earth he imparted to them this extraordinary gift, as the seal of their commission, when he sent them to preach the Gospel: and after his

glorious resurrection and ascension into heaven, they were endowed with powers yet more stupendous. Sensible of the validity of this kind of evidence, the Apostles of our Lord, with the same artless simplicity, and the same boldness of conscious integrity, which distinguished their great Master, constantly insisted upon the miracles they wrought, as strong and undeniable proofs of the truth of their doctrines. Thus the miracles of our blessed Lord may be justly considered as the evidence of his divine mission and character. If we consider their nature, their greatness, and their number; and if to this consideration we add that which respects their end and design, we must acknowledge that no one could have performed them, unless God was with him. They were too public to be the artifices of imposture; too substantial and too numerous to afford the slightest suspicion of undesigned and fortuitous coincidence. 658 In a word, supposing that the Most High should in any instance so far counteract the common laws of nature, as to produce a miracle; and should design that miracle as a monument to future times of the truth of any peculiar doctrine, we cannot conceive any mode of communicating it more effectual than that which he has chosen. Stronger proofs could not be afforded, consistently with the design of the Gospel, which is not to overpower our understandings by an irresistible and compulsory light, but to afford us such rational evidence as is sufficient to satisfy moral inquirers, who are endowed with faculties to perceive the truth; but at the same time who also have power totally to resist it, and finally to forfeit all its blessings. These miracles were of a nature too palpable to be mistaken. They were the objects of sense, and not the precarious speculations of reason concerning what God might do; or the chimerical suggestions of fancy concerning what he did. The facts were recorded by those who must have known whether they were true or false. The persons who recorded them were under no possible temptations to deceive the world. We can only account for their conduct on the supposition of their most perfect conviction and disinterested zeal. That they should assert what they knew to be false; that they should publish it with so much ardour; that they should risk every thing dear to humanity, in order to maintain it; and at last submit to death, in order to attest their persuasion of its truth in those moments when imposture usually drops its mask, and enthusiasm loses its confidence; that they should act thus in opposition to every dictate of common sense, and every principle of common honesty, every restraint of shame, and every impulse of selfishness, is a phenomenon not less irreconcilable to the moral state of things than miracles are to the natural constitution of the world. Falsehood naturally entangles men in contradiction, and confounds them with dismay: but the love of truth invigorates the mind; the consciousness of integrity anticipates the approbation of God; and conscience creates a fortitude, to which mere unsupported nature is often a stranger.

3. How long miracles were continued in the church, has been a matter of keen dispute, and has been investigated with as much anxiety as if the truth of the Gospel depended upon the manner in which it was decided. Assuming, as we are here warranted to do, that real miraculous power was conveyed in the way detailed by the inspired writers, it is plain, that it may have been exercised in different countries, and may have remained, without any new communication of it, throughout the first, and a considerable part of the second century. The Apostles, wherever they went to execute their commission, would avail themselves of the stupendous gift which had been imparted to them; and it is clear, not only that they were permitted and enabled to convey it to others, but that spiritual gifts, including the power of working miracles, were actually conferred on many of the primitive disciples. Allusions to this we find in the epistles of St. Paul; such allusions, too, as it is utterly inconceivable that any man of a sound judgment could have made, had he not known that he was referring to an obvious fact, about which there could be no hesitation. Of the time at which several of the Apostles died, we have no certain knowledge. St. Peter and St. Paul suffered at Rome about A. D. 66, or 67; and it is fully established, that the life of John was much longer protracted, he having died a natural death, A. D. 100, or 101. Supposing that the two former of these Apostles imparted spiritual gifts till the time of their suffering martyrdom, the persons to whom they were imparted might, in the course of nature, have lived through the earlier part of the second century; and if John did the same till the end of his life, such gifts as were derived from him might have remained till more than the half of that century had elapsed. That such was the fact, is asserted by ancient ecclesiastical writers. Whether, after the generation immediately succeeding the Apostles had passed away, the power of working miracles was anew communicated, is a question, the solution of which cannot be nearly so satisfactory. The probability is, that there was no such renewal; and this opinion rests upon the ground that natural causes were now sufficient to accomplish the end for which miracles were originally designed; and it does not appear to have been any part of the scheme of the blessed Author of our religion, that, solely for the purpose of hastening that conversion of the nations which might gradually be accomplished, miracles should be wrought, when these could be of no use in establishing after ages in the faith.

**MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION.** By this is meant, that the human nature of Jesus Christ was formed, not in the ordinary method of generation, but out of the substance of the Virgin Mary, by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost. The evidence upon which this article of the Christian faith rests is found in Matt. i, 18–23, and in the more particular narration which St. Luke has given in the first chapter of his Gospel. If we admit this evidence of the fact, we can discern the emphatical meaning of the

appellation given to our Saviour when he is called the seed of the woman," Gen. iii, 15; we can perceive the meaning of a phrase which St. Luke has introduced into the genealogy of Jesus, Luke iii, 23, and of which, otherwise, it is not possible to give a good account, ὡν, ὡς ενομιζετο, υἱος Ἰωσηφ; [being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph;] and we can discover a peculiar significancy in an expression of the Apostle Paul, Gal. iv, 4, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman." The conception of Jesus is the point from which we date the union between his divine and human nature; and, this conception being miraculous, the existence of the person in whom they are united, was not physically derived from Adam. But, as Dr. Horsley speaks in his sermon on the 659incarnation, the union with the uncreated Word is the very principle of personality and individual existence in the son of Mary. According to this view of the matter, the miraculous conception gives a completeness and consistency to the revelation concerning Jesus Christ. Not only is he the Son of God, but, as the Son of man, he is exalted above his brethren, while he is made like them. He is preserved from the contamination adhering to the race whose nature he assumed; and when the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, was made flesh, the intercourse which, as man, he had with God, is distinguished, not in degree only, but in kind, from that which any prophet ever enjoyed, and it is infinitely more intimate, because it did not consist in communications occasionally made to him, but arose from the manner in which his human nature had its existence.

MIRIAM, sister of Moses and Aaron, and daughter of Amram and Jochebed, was born about A. M. 2424. She might be ten or twelve years old when her brother Moses was exposed on the banks of the Nile, since Miriam was watching there, and offered herself to Pharaoh's daughter to fetch her a nurse. The princess accepting the offer, Miriam fetched her own mother, to whom the young Moses was given to nurse, Exod. ii, 4, 5, &c. It is thought that Miriam married Hur, of the tribe of Judah; but it does not appear that she had any children by him, Exod. xvii, 10, 11. Miriam had the gift of prophecy, as she intimates, Num. xii, 2: Hath the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? hath he not spoken also by us?" After the passage of the Red Sea, Miriam led the choirs and dances of the women, and sung with them the canticle, Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea:" while Moses led the choir of men, Exod. xv, 21. When Zipporah, the wife of Moses, arrived in the camp of Israel, Miriam and Aaron disputed with her, speaking against Moses on her account, Num. xii. This conduct the Lord punished by visiting Miriam with a leprosy. Aaron interceded with Moses for her recovery, and besought the Lord, who ordered her to be shut out of the camp seven days. We are acquainted with no subsequent particulars of the life of Miriam. Her death happened in the first month of the fortieth

year after the exodus, at the encampment of Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin, Num. xx, 1. The people mourned for her, and she was there buried.

MIRRORS, usually, but improperly, rendered looking glasses. The eastern mirrors were made of polished metal, and for the most part convex. So Callimachus describes Venus as taking the shining brass," that is, to adjust her hair. If they were thus made in the country of Elihu, the image made use of by him will appear very lively: Hast thou with him spread out the sky, which is strong, and as a molten looking glass?" Job xxxvii, 18. Shaw informs us that "in the Levant, looking glasses are a part of female dress. The Moorish women in Barbary are so fond of their ornaments, and particularly of their looking glasses, which they bang upon their breasts, that they will not lay them aside, even when, after the drudgery of the day, they are obliged to go two or three miles with a pitcher or a goat's skin, to fetch water." The Israelitish women used to carry their mirrors with them, even to their most solemn place of worship. The word mirror should be used in the passages here referred to. To speak of looking glasses made of steel," and glasses molten," is palpably absurd; whereas the term mirror obviates every difficulty, and expresses the true meaning of the original.

MISHNA, or MISNA, מִשְׁנָה, signifies repetition, and is properly the code of the Jewish civil law. The Mishna contains the text; and the Gemara, which is the second part of the Talmud, contains the commentaries: so that the Gemara is, as it were, a glossary on the Mishna. The Mishna consists of various traditions of the Jews, and of explanations of several passages of Scripture. These traditions, serving as an explication of the written law, and supplementary to it, are said to have been delivered to Moses during the time of his abode upon the mount; which he afterward communicated to Aaron, Eleazar, and his servant Joshua. By these they were transmitted to the seventy elders; by them to the prophets, who communicated them to the men of the great sanhedrim, from whom the wise men of Jerusalem and Babylon received them. According to Dr. Prideaux, they passed from Jeremiah to Baruch, from him to Ezra, and from Ezra to the men of the great synagogue, the last of whom was Simon the Just, who delivered them to Antigonus of Socho. From him they came down in regular succession to Simeon, who took our Saviour in his arms; to Gamaliel, at whose feet St. Paul was brought up; and last of all to rabbi Judah the holy, who committed them to writing in the Mishna. Dr. Prideaux, rejecting this Jewish fiction, observes, that after the death of Simon the Just, about B. C. 299, arose the Tannaim or Mishnical doctors, who by their comments and conclusions, added to the number of those traditions which had been received and allowed by Ezra and the men of the great synagogue. Hence toward the middle of the second century after Christ, under the reign of the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius, it was found necessary to commit these traditions

to writing. This was requisite, because the traditions had been so much increased that they could no longer be preserved by the memory of man; and also because their country had suffered considerably in the reign of the Emperor Adrian, and many of their schools being dissolved, and their learned men cut off, the usual method of preserving their traditions had failed. Lest, therefore, the traditions should be forgotten and lost, it was resolved that they should be collected and committed to writing. Rabbi Judah, who was at that time rector of the school at Tiberias in Galilee, and president of the sanhedrim at that place, undertook the work. He compiled it in six books, each consisting of several tracts, which altogether form the number of sixty-three. Dr. Prideaux computes, that the Mishna was composed about A. D. 150. Dr. Lightfoot, however, says, that Rabbi Judah compiled the Mishna about A. D. 190, in the latter end of the reign of Commodus; or, as some compute, A. D. 220. Dr. Lardner is of opinion, that this work could not have been finished before A. D. 190, or later. Thus the book called the Mishna was formed; a book which was received by the Jews with great veneration, and which has been always held in high esteem among them. Their opinion of it is, that all the particulars which it contains were dictated by God himself to Moses upon Mount Sinai, as well as the written word itself; and, consequently, that it must be of the same divine authority, and ought to be as religiously observed. See Cabbala, Gemara, Jews.

MITE. See Money.

MITYLENE, the capital of the island of Lesbos, through which St. Paul passed as he went from Corinth to Jerusalem, Acts xx, 14.

MIZPAH, or MIZPEH, a city of the tribe of Benjamin, situated in a plain, about eighteen miles west of Jerusalem. Here Samuel dwelt; and here he called Israel together, to observe a solemn fast for their sins, and to supplicate God for his assistance against the Philistines; after which they sallied out on their enemies, already discomfited by the thunders of heaven, and gave them a total defeat, 1 Sam. vii. Here, also, Saul was anointed king, 1 Sam. x, 17–25. It appears that between this and the time of Asa, king of Judah, Mizpah had suffered probably in some of the intervening wars, as we are told that Asa built it with the stones and timber of Ramah, 1 Kings xv, 22. There was another Mizpeh in Gilead; on the spot where Jacob set up the pillar or heap of stones, to commemorate the covenant there made between him and Laban, Gen. xxxi, 49. (See Gilead.) There was also a third Mizpeh, in the land of Moab, where David placed his father and mother, while he remained in his retreat at Adullam, 1 Sam. xxii, 3. It is to be observed, that Mizpeh implies a beacon or watch tower, a pillar or heap of commemoration; and at all the places bearing this name, it is

probable that a single pillar, or a rude pile, was erected as the witness and the record of some particular event. These, subsequently, became altars and places of convocation on public occasions, religious and civil.

MIZRAIM, or MESRAIM, son of Ham, and father of Ludim, Anamim, Lehabim, Naphtuhim, Pathrusim, and Casluhim, Gen. x, 6. Meser or Misor was father of the Mizraim, the Egyptians; and he himself is commonly called Mizraim, although there is very strong probability that Mizraim, being of the plural number, signifies rather the Egyptians themselves, than the father of that people. Mizraim is also put for the country of Egypt: thus it has three significations, which are perpetually confounded and used promiscuously, sometimes denoting the land of Egypt, sometimes him who first peopled Egypt, and sometimes the inhabitants themselves. Cairo, the capital of Egypt, and even Egypt itself, are to this day called Mezer by the Arabians. But the natives call Egypt Chemi, that is, the land of Cham, or Ham, as it is also sometimes called in Scripture, Psalm lxxviii, 12; cv, 23; cvi, 22. The Prophet Micah, vii, 15, gives to Egypt the name of Mezor, or Matzor; and rabbi Kimchi, followed in this by several learned commentators, explains by Egypt what is said of the rivers of Mezor, 2 Kings xix, 24; Isaiah xix, 6; xxxvii, 25.

MOAB was the son of Lot, and of his eldest daughter, Gen. xix, 31, &c. He was born about the same time as Isaac, A. M. 2108, and was father of the Moabites, whose habitation lay beyond Jordan and the Dead Sea, on both sides of the river Arnon. Their capital city was situated on that river, and was called Ar or Areopolis, or Ariol of Moab, or Rabbah Moab, that is, the capital of Moab, or Kir-haresh, that is, a city with brick walls. This country was originally possessed by a race of giants called Emim, Deut. ii, 11, 12. The Moabites conquered them, and afterward the Amorites took a part from the Moabites, Judges xi, 13. Moses conquered that part which belonged to the Amorites, and gave it to the tribe of Reuben. The Moabites were spared by Moses, for God had restricted him, Deut. ii, 9. But there always was a great antipathy between the Moabites and the Israelites, which occasioned many wars between them. Balaam seduced the Hebrews to idolatry and uncleanness, by means of the daughters of Moab, Num. xxv, 1, 2; and Balak, king of this people, endeavoured to prevail on Balaam to curse Israel. God ordained that the Moabites should not enter into the congregation of his people, because they had the inhumanity to refuse the Israelites a passage through their country, nor would they supply them with bread and water in their necessity. Eglon, king of the Moabites, was one of the first that oppressed Israel after the death of Joshua. Ehud killed Eglon, and Israel expelled the Moabites, Judges iii, 12, &c. Hanun king of the Ammonites having insulted David's ambassadors, David made war against him, and subdued Moab and Ammon; under which subjection they

continued till the separation of the ten tribes. The Ammonites and the Moabites continued in subjection to the kings of Israel to the death of Ahab. Presently after the death of Ahab the Moabites began to revolt, 2 Kings iii, 4, 5. Meshah, king of Moab, refused the tribute of a hundred thousand lambs, and as many rams, which till then had been customarily paid, either yearly, or at the beginning of every reign; which of these two is not clearly expressed in Scripture. The reign of Ahaziah was too short to make war with them; but Jehoram, son of Ahab, and brother to Ahaziah, having ascended the throne, thought of reducing them to obedience. He invited Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, who, with the king of Edom, then his vassal, entered Moab, where they were near perishing with thirst, but were miraculously relieved, 2 Kings iii, 16, &c.

It is not easy to ascertain what were the circumstances of the Moabites from this time; but Isaiah, at the beginning of the reign of King Hezekiah, threatens them with a calamity, which was to happen three years after his prediction, and which probably referred to the war that Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, made with the ten tribes and the other people beyond Jordan. Amos, i, 13, &c, also foretold great miseries to them, which, probably, they suffered under Uzziah and Jothan, kings of Judah, or under Shalmaneser, 2 Chron. xxvi, 7, 8; xxvii, 5; or, lastly, in the war of Nebuchadnezzar, five years after the destruction of Jerusalem. This prince carried them captive beyond the Euphrates, as the prophets had threatened, Jer. ix, 26; xii, 14, 15; xxv, 11, 12; xlviii, 47, &c; xlix, 3, 6, 39; l, 16; and Cyrus sent them home again, as he did the rest of the captives. After their return from captivity they multiplied, and fortified themselves, as the Jews did, and other neighbouring people, still in subjection to the kings of Persia. They were afterward conquered by Alexander the Great, and were in obedience to the kings of Syria and Egypt successively, and finally to the Romans. There is a probability, also, that in the later times of the Jewish republic they obeyed the Asmonean kings, and afterward Herod the Great. The principal deities of the Moabites were Chemosh and Baal-peor.

The prophecies concerning Moab are numerous and remarkable. There are, says Keith, abundant predictions which refer so clearly to its modern state, that there is scarcely a single feature peculiar to the land of Moab, as it now exists, which was not marked by the prophets in their delineation of the low condition to which, from the height of its wickedness and haughtiness, it was finally to be brought down.

The land of Moab lay to the east and south-east of Judea, and bordered on the east, north-east, and partly on the south of the Dead Sea. Its early history is nearly analogous to that of Ammon; and the soil, though perhaps more diversified, is, in many places where the desert and plains of salt have



not encroached on its borders, of equal fertility. There are manifest and abundant vestiges of its ancient greatness: the whole of the plains are covered with the sites of towns, on every eminence or spot convenient for the construction of one; and as the land is capable of rich cultivation, there can be no doubt that the country now so deserted once presented a continued picture of plenty and fertility. The form of fields is still visible; and there are the remains of Roman highways, which in some places are completely paved, and on which there are mile stones of the times of Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, and Severus, with the number of the miles legible upon them. Wherever any spot is cultivated the corn is luxuriant; and the riches of the soil cannot perhaps be more clearly illustrated than by the fact, that one grain of Heshbon wheat exceeds in dimensions two of the ordinary sort, and more than double the number of grains grow on the stalk. The frequency, and almost, in many instances, the close vicinity of the sites of the ancient towns, prove that the population of the country was formerly proportioned to its natural fertility. Such evidence may surely suffice to prove that the country was well cultivated and peopled at a period so long posterior to the date of the predictions, that no cause less than supernatural could have existed at the time when they were delivered, which could have authorized the assertion with the least probability or apparent possibility of its truth, that Moab would ever have been reduced to that state of great and permanent desolation in which it has continued for so many ages, and which vindicates and ratifies to this hour the truth of the Scriptural prophecies. The cities of Moab were to be desolate without any to dwell therein;" no city was to escape: Moab was to flee away." And the cities of Moab have all disappeared. Their place, together with the adjoining part of Idumea, is characterized, in the map of Volney's Travels, by the ruins of towns. His information respecting these ruins was derived from some of the wandering Arabs; and its accuracy has been fully corroborated by the testimony of different European travellers of high respectability and undoubted veracity, who have since visited this devastated region. The whole country abounds with ruins; and Burckhardt, who encountered many difficulties in so desolate and dangerous a land, thus records the brief history of a few of them: The ruins of Eleale, Heshbon, Meon, Medaba, Dibon, Aroer, still subsist to illustrate the history of the Beni Israel." And it might with equal truth have been added, that they still subsist to confirm the inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures, or to prove that the seers of Israel were the prophets of God; for the desolation of each of these very cities was a theme of a prediction. Every thing worthy of observation respecting them has been detailed, not only in Burckhardt's Travels in Syria," but also by Seetzen, and, more recently, by Captains Irby and Mangles, who, along with Mr. Banks and Mr. Leigh, visited this deserted district. The predicted judgment has fallen with such truth upon these cities, and upon all the cities of the land of Moab far and near, and they are so utterly broken down,"

that even the prying curiosity of such indefatigable travellers could discover among a multiplicity of ruins only a few remains so entire as to be worthy of particular notice. The subjoined description is drawn from their united testimony: Among the ruins of El Aal (Eleale) are a number of large cisterns, fragments of buildings, and foundations of houses. At Heshban, (Heshbon,) are the ruins of a large ancient town, together with the remains of a temple, and some edifices. A few broken shafts of columns are still standing; and there are a number of deep wells cut in the rock. The ruins of Medeba are about two miles in circumference. There are many remains of the walls of private houses constructed with blocks of silex, but not a single edifice is standing. The chief object of interest is an immense tank or cistern of hewn stones, which, as there is no stream at Medeba," Burckhardt remarks, might still be of use to the Bedouins, were the surrounding ground cleared of the rubbish to allow the water to flow into it; but such an undertaking is far beyond the views of the wandering Arabs." There is also the foundation of a temple built with large stones, and apparently of great antiquity, with two columns near it. The ruins of Diban, (Dibon,) situated in the midst of a fine plain, are of considerable extent, but present nothing of interest. The neighbouring hot wells, and the similarity of the name, identify the ruins of Myoun with Meon, or Beth Meon of Scripture. Of this ancient city, as well as of Araayr, (Areor,) nothing is now remarkable but what is common to them with all the cities of Moab, their entire desolation. The extent of the ruins of Rabba, (Rabbath Moab,) formerly the residence of the kings of Moab, sufficiently proves its ancient importance; though no other object can be particularized among the ruins, than the remains of a palace or temple, some of the walls of which are still standing, a gate belonging to another building, and an insulated altar. There are many remains of private buildings, but none of them is entire. There being no springs on the spot, the town had two birkets, the largest of which is cut entirely out of the rocky ground, together with many cisterns. Mount Nebo was completely barren when Burckhardt passed over it, and the site of the ancient city had not been ascertained. Nebo is spoiled."

While the ruins of all these cities still retain their ancient names, and are the most conspicuous amidst the wide scene of general desolation, and while each of them was in like manner particularized in the visions of the prophet, they yet formed but a small number of the cities of Moab; and the rest are also, in similar verification of the prophecies, desolate, without any to dwell therein." None of the ancient cities of Moab now remain as tenanted by men. Kerek, which neither bears any resemblance in name to any of the cities of Moab which are mentioned as existing in the time of the Israelites, nor possesses any monuments which denote a very remote antiquity, is the only nominal town in the whole country, and, in the words

of Seetzen, who visited it, in its present ruined state it can only be called a hamlet; and the houses have only one floor." But the most populous and fertile province in Europe, especially any situated in the interior of a country like Moab, is not covered so thickly with towns as Moab is plentiful in ruins, deserted and desolate though now it be. Burckhardt enumerates about fifty ruined sites within its boundaries, many of them extensive. In general they are a broken down and undistinguishable mass of ruins; and many of them have not been closely inspected. But, in some instances, there are the remains of temples, sepulchral monuments; the ruins of edifices constructed of very large stones, in one of which buildings some of the stones are twenty feet in length, and so broad that one constitutes the thickness of the wall; traces of hanging gardens; entire columns lying on the ground, three feet in diameter, and fragments of smaller columns; and many cisterns out of the rock. When the towns of Moab existed in their prime, and were at ease; when arrogance, and haughtiness, and pride prevailed among them; the desolation, and total desertion and abandonment of them all, must have utterly surpassed all human conception. And that such numerous cities which subsisted for many ages, some of them being built on eminences, and naturally strong; others on plains, and surrounded by the richest soil; some situated in valleys by the side of a plentiful stream; and others where art supplied the deficiencies of nature, and where immense cisterns were excavated out of the rock, and which exhibit in their ruins many monuments of ancient prosperity, and many remains easily convertible into present utility; should have all fled away, all met the same indiscriminate fate, and be all desolate, without any to dwell therein," notwithstanding all these ancient indications of permanent durability, and their existing facilities and inducements for becoming the habitations of men, is a matter of just wonder in the present day. They shall cry of Moab, How is it broken down!"

The strong contrast between the ancient and the actual state of Moab is exemplified in the condition of the inhabitants as well as of the land; and the coincidence between the prediction and the fact is as striking in the one case as in the other. The days come, saith the Lord, that I will send unto him (Moab) wanderers that shall cause him to wander, and shall empty his vessels." The Bedouin (wandering) Arabs are now the chief and almost the only inhabitants of a country once studded with cities. Traversing the country, and fixing their tents for a short time in one place, and then decamping to another, depasturing every part successively, and despoiling the whole land of its natural produce, they are wanderers who have come up against it, and who keep it in a state of perpetual desolation. They lead a wandering life; and the only regularity they know or practise, is to act upon a systematic scheme of spoliation. They prevent any from forming a fixed settlement who are inclined to attempt it; for although the fruitfulness

of the soil would abundantly repay the labour of settlers, and render migration wholly unnecessary, even if the population were increased more than tenfold; yet the Bedouins forcibly deprive them of the means of subsistence, compel them to search for it elsewhere, and, in the words of the prediction, literally cause them to wander." It may be remarked generally of the Bedouins," says Burckhardt, in describing their extortions in this very country, that wherever they are the masters of the cultivators, the latter are soon reduced to beggary by their unceasing demands." "O ye that dwell in Moab, leave the cities and dwell in the rock, and be like the dove that maketh her nest in the sides of the hole's mouth." In a general description of the condition of the inhabitants of that extensive desert which now occupies the place of these ancient flourishing states, Volney in plain but unmeant illustration of this prediction, remarks, that the wretched peasants live in perpetual dread of losing the fruit of their labours; and no sooner have they gathered in their harvest, than they hasten to secrete it in private places, and retire among the rocks which border on the Dead Sea." Toward the opposite extremity of the land of Moab, and at a little distance from its borders, Seetzen relates, that there are many families living in caverns;" and he actually designates them the inhabitants of the rocks." And at the distance of a few miles from the ruined site of Heshbon, according to Captains Irby and Mangles, there are many artificial caves in a large range of perpendicular cliffs, in some of which are chambers and small sleeping apartments." While the cities are desolate, without any to dwell therein, the rocks are tenanted. But whether flocks lie down in the city without any to make them afraid, or whether men are to be found dwelling in the rocks, and are "like the dove that maketh her nest in the sides of the hole's mouth," the wonderful transition, in either case, and the close accordance, in both, of the fact to the prediction, assuredly mark it in characters that may be visible to the purblind mind, as the word of that God before whom the darkness of futurity is as light, and without whom a sparrow cannot fall unto the ground.

MOLE. This word, in our version of Lev. xi, 30, answers to the word תושמת, which Bochart has shown to be the cameleon; but he conjectures, with great propriety, that חולד, translated weasel," in the preceding verse, is the true word for the mole. The present name of the mole in the east is khuld, which is undeniably the same word as the Hebrew choled. The import of the Hebrew word is, to creep into," and the same Syriac word implies, to creep underneath," to creep into by burrowing; which are well known characteristics of the mole.

MOLOCH, מלך, signifies king. Moloch, Molech, Milcom, or Melchom, was a god of the Ammonites. The word Moloch signifies king," and Melchom signifies their king." Moses in several places forbids the

Israelites, under the penalty of death, to dedicate their children to Moloch, by making them pass through the fire in honour of that god, Lev. xviii, 21; xx, 2–5. God himself threatens to pour out his wrath against such offenders. There is great probability that the Hebrews were addicted to the worship of this deity, even before their coming out of Egypt; since the Prophet Amos, v, 26, and after him St. Stephen, reproach them with having carried in the wilderness the tabernacle of their god Moloch, Acts vii, 43. Solomon built a temple to Moloch upon the Mount of Olives, 1 Kings xi, 7; and Manasseh a long time after imitated his impiety, making his son pass through the fire in honour of Moloch, 2 Kings xxi, 3–6. It was chiefly in the valley of Tophet and Hinnom, east of Jerusalem, that this idolatrous worship was paid, Jer. xix, 5, 6, &c. Some are of opinion that they contented themselves with making their children leap over a fire sacred to Moloch, by which they consecrated them to some false deity: and by this lustration purified them; this being a usual ceremony among the Heathens on other occasions. Some believe that they made them pass through two fires opposite to each other, for the same purpose. But the word העביר, to cause to pass through,” and the phrase to cause to pass through the fire,” are used in respect to human sacrifices in Deut. xii, 31; xviii, 10; 2 Kings xvi, 3; xxi, 6; 2 Chron. xxviii, 3; xxxiii, 6. These words are not to be considered as meaning in these instances literally to pass through, and that alone. They are rather synonymous with שרף, to burn, and זבח, to immolate, with which they are interchanged, as may be seen by an examination of Jer. vii, 31; xix, 5; Ezek. xvi, 20, 21; Psalm cvi, 38. In the later periods of the Jewish kingdom, this idol was erected in the valley south of Jerusalem, namely, in the valley of Hinnom, and in the part of that valley called Tophet, תפח, so named from the drums, תפים תף, which were beaten to prevent the groans and cries of children sacrificed from being heard, Jer. vii, 31, 32; xix, 6–14; Isaiah xxx, 33; 2 Kings xxiii, 10. The place was so abhorrent to the minds of the more recent Jews, that they applied the name ge hinnom or gehenna to the place of torments in a future life. The word gehenna is used in this way, namely, for the place of punishment beyond the grave, very frequently in oriental writers, as far as India. There are various sentiments about the relation that Moloch had to the other Pagan divinities. Some believe that Moloch was the same as Saturn, to whom it is well known that human sacrifices were offered; others think it was the same with Mercury; others, Venus; others, Mars, or Mithra. Calmet has endeavoured to prove that Moloch signified the sun, or the king of heaven.

**MONEY.** Scripture often speaks of gold, silver, brass, of certain sums of money, of purchases made with money, of current money, of money of a certain weight; but we do not observe coined or stamped money till a late period; which makes it probable that the ancient Hebrews took gold and silver only by weight; that they only considered the purity of the metal, and

not the stamp. The most ancient commerce was conducted by barter, or exchanging one sort of merchandise for another. One man gave what he could spare to another, who gave him in return part of his superabundance. Afterward, the more precious metals were used in traffic, as a value more generally known and fixed. Lastly, they gave this metal, by public authority, a certain mark, a certain weight, and a certain degree of alloy, to fix its value, and to save buyers and sellers the trouble of weighing and examining the coins. At the siege of Troy in Homer, 664no reference is made to gold or silver coined; but the value of things is estimated by the number of oxen they were worth. For instance: they bought wine, by exchanging oxen, slaves, skins, iron, &c, for it. When the Greeks first used money, it was only little pieces of iron or copper, called oboli or spits, of which a handful was a drachma, says Plutarch. Herodotus thinks that the Lydians were the first that stamped money of gold or silver, and introduced it into commerce. Others say it was Ishon, king of Thessaly, a son of Deucalion. Others ascribe this honour to Erichthonius; who had been educated by the daughters of Cecrops, king of Athens: others, again, to Phidon, king of Argos. Among the Persians it is said Darius, son of Hystaspes, first coined golden money. Lycurgus banished gold and silver from his commonwealth of Lacedæmon, and only allowed a rude sort of money, made of iron. Janus, or rather the kings of Rome, made a kind of gross money of copper, having on one side the double face of Janus, on the other the prow of a ship. We find nothing concerning the money of the Egyptians, Phenicians, Arabians, or Syrians, before Alexander the Great. In China, to this day, they stamp no money of gold or silver, but only of copper. Gold and silver pass as merchandise. If gold or silver be offered, they take it and pay it by weight, as other goods: so that they are obliged to cut it into pieces with shears for that purpose, and they carry a steel yard at their girdles to weigh it.

But to return to the Hebrews. Abraham weighed out four hundred shekels of silver, to purchase Sarah's tomb, Genesis xxiii, 15, 16; and Scripture observes that he paid this in current money with the merchant." Joseph was sold by his brethren to the Midianites for twenty pieces (in Hebrew twenty shekels) of silver, Gen. xxxvii, 28. The brethren of Joseph bring back with them into Egypt the money they found in their sacks, in the same weight as before, Gen. xliii, 21. The bracelets that Eliezer gave Rebekah weighed ten shekels, and the ear rings two shekels, Gen. xxiv, 22. Moses ordered that the weight of five hundred shekels of myrrh, and two hundred and fifty shekels of cinnamon, of the weight of the sanctuary, should be taken, to make the perfume which was to be burnt to the Lord on the golden altar, Exod. xxx, 24. He acquaints us that the Israelites offered for the works of the tabernacle seventy-two thousand talents of brass, Exod. xxxviii, 29. We read, in the books of Samuel, that the weight of Absalom's hair was two

hundred shekels of the ordinary weight, or of the king's weight, 2 Sam. xiv, 26. Isaiah, xlvi, 6, describes the wicked as weighing silver in a balance, to make an idol of it; and Jeremiah, xxxii, 10, weighs seventeen pieces of silver in a pair of scales, to pay for a field he had bought. Isaiah says, Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do ye weigh money for that which is not bread?" Amos, viii, 5, represents the merchants as encouraging one another to make the ephah small, wherewith to sell, and the shekel great, wherewith to buy, and to falsify the balances by deceit.

In all these passages three things only are mentioned: 1. The metal, that is, gold or silver, and never copper, that not being used in traffic as money. 2. The weight, a talent, a shekel, a gerah or obolus, the weight of the sanctuary, and the king's weight. 3. The alloy (standard) of pure or fine gold and silver, and of good quality, as received by the merchant. The impression of the coinage is not referred to; but it is said they weighed the silver, or other commodities, by the shekel and by the talent. This shekel, therefore, and this talent, were not fixed and determined pieces of money, but weights applied to things used in commerce. Hence those deceitful balances of the merchants, who would increase the shekel, that is, would augment the weight by which they weighed the gold and silver they were to receive, that they might have a greater quantity than was their due; hence the weight of the sanctuary, the standard of which was preserved in the temple to prevent fraud; hence those prohibitions in the law, Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights," in Hebrew, stones, a great and a small," Deut. xxv, 13; hence those scales that the Hebrews wore at their girdles, Hosea xii, 7, and the Canaanites carried in their hands, to weigh the gold and silver which they received in payment. It is true that in the Hebrew we find Jacob bought a field for a hundred kesitahs, Gen. xxxiii, 19; and that the friends of Job, after his recovery, gave to that model of patience each a kesitah, and a golden pendant for the ears, Job xlii, 11. We also find there darics, (in Hebrew, darconim or adarconim,) and minæ, stateræ, oboli; but this last kind of money was foreign, and is put for other terms, which in the Hebrew only signifies the weight of the metal. The kesitah is not well known to us: some take it for a sheep or a lamb; others, for a kind of money, having the impression of a lamb or a sheep: but it was more probably a purse of money. The darconim or darics are money of the kings of Persia; and it is agreed that Darius, son of Hystaspes, first coined golden money. Ezekiel, xlv, 12, tells us that the mina makes fifty shekels: he reduces this foreign money to the weight of the Hebrews. The mina might probably be a Persian money originally, and adopted by the Greeks and by the Hebrews. But under the dominion of the Persians, the Hebrews were hardly at liberty to coin money of their own, being in subjection to those princes, and very low in their own country. They were still less able

under the Chaldeans, during the Babylonish captivity; or afterward under the Grecians, to whom they were subject till the time of Simon Maccabæus, to whom Antiochus Sidetes, king of Syria, granted the privilege of coining money in Judea, 1 Mac. xv, 6. And this is the first Hebrew money, properly so called, that we know of. There were shekels and demi-shekels, also the  $\frac{2}{3}$  third part of a shekel, and a quarter of a shekel, of silver.

The shekel of silver, or the silverling, Isa. vii, 23, originally weighed three hundred and twenty barleycorns; but it was afterward increased to three hundred and eighty-four barleycorns, its value, being considered equal to four Roman denarii, was two shillings and seven pence, or, according to Bishop Cumberland, two shillings and four pence farthing. It is said to have had Aaron's rod on the one side, and the pot of manna on the other. The bekah was equal to half a shekel, Exod. xxxviii, 26. The denarius was one-fourth of a shekel, seven pence three farthings of our money. The gerah, or meah, Exod. xxx, 13, was the sixth part of the denarius, or diner, and the twenty-fourth part of the shekel. The assar, or assarion, Matt. x, 29, was the ninety-sixth part of a shekel: its value was rather more than a farthing. The farthing, Matt. v, 26, was in value the thirteenth part of a penny sterling. The mite was the half of a farthing, or the twenty-sixth part of a penny sterling. The mina, or maneh, Ezek. xlv, 12, was equal to sixty shekels, which, taken at two shillings and seven pence, was seven pounds fifteen shillings. The talent was fifty minas; and its value, therefore, three hundred and eighty-seven pounds ten shillings. The gold coins were as follows: a shekel of gold was about fourteen and a half times the value of silver, that is, one pound seventeen shillings and five pence halfpenny. A talent of gold consisted of three thousand shekels. The drachma was equal to a Roman denarius, or seven pence three farthings of our money. The didrachma, or tribute money, Matt. xvii, 24, was equal to fifteen pence halfpenny. It is said to have been stamped with a harp on one side, and a vine on the other. The stater, or piece of money which Peter found in the fish's mouth, Matt. xvii, 27, was two half shekels. A daric, dram, 1 Chron. xxix, 7; Ezra viii, 27, was a gold coin struck by Darius the Mede. According to Parkhurst its value was one pound five shillings. A gold penny is stated by Lightfoot to have been equal to twenty-five silver pence.

Hug derives a satisfactory argument for the veracity of the Gospels from the different kinds of money mentioned in them:--The admixture of foreign manners and constitutions proceeded through numberless circumstances of life. Take, for example, the circulation of coin; at one time it is Greek coin; at another, Roman; at another time ancient Jewish. But how accurately is even this stated according to history, and the arrangement of things! The ancient imposts which were introduced before the Roman dominion were valued according to the Greek coinage; for example, the taxes of the



temple, the δίδραχμον, Matt. xvii, 24. The offerings were paid in these, Mark xii, 42; Luke xxi, 2. A payment which proceeded from the temple treasury was made according to the ancient national payment by weight, Matt. xxvi, 15; but in common business, trade, wages, sale, &c, the assis and denarius and Roman coin were usual, Matt. x, 29; xx, 3; Luke xii, 6; Mark xiv, 5; John xii, 5; vi, 7. The more modern state taxes are likewise paid in the coin of the nation which exercises at the time the greatest authority, Matthew xxii, 19; Mark xii, 15; Luke xx, 24. Writers, who, in each little circumstance, which otherwise would pass by unnoticed, so accurately describe the period of time, must certainly have had a personal knowledge of it.

MONEY-CHANGERS, in the Gospels, were persons who exchanged native for foreign coin, to enable those who came to Jerusalem from distant countries to purchase the necessary sacrifices. In our Lord's time they had established themselves in the court of the temple; a profanation which had probably grown up with the influence of Roman manners, which allowed the argentarii [money-dealers] to establish their usurious mensas, tables, by the statues of the gods, even at the feet of Janus, in the most holy places, in porticibus Basilicarum, or in the temples, pone ædem Castoris. The following extract from Buckingham's Travels among the Arabs, is illustrative:--"The mosque at the time of our passing through it was full of people, though these were not worshippers, nor was it at either of the usual hours of public prayers. Some of the parties were assembled to smoke, others to play at chess, and some apparently to drive bargains of trade, but certainly none to pray. It was, indeed, a living picture of what we might believe the temple at Jerusalem to have been, when those who sold oxen, and sheep, and doves, and the changers of money sitting there, were driven out by Jesus, with a scourge of cords, and their tables overturned. It was, in short, a place of public resort and thoroughfare, a house of merchandise, as the temple of the Jews had become in the days of the Messiah."

MONK anciently denoted a person who retired from the world to give himself up wholly to God, and to live in solitude and abstinence. The word is derived from the Latin monachus, and that from the Greek μοναχὸς, solitary. The original of monks seems to have been this: The persecutions which attended the first ages of the Gospel forced some Christians to retire from the world, and live in deserts and places more private and unfrequented, in hopes of finding that peace and comfort among beasts which were denied them among men; and this being the case of some very extraordinary persons, their example gave such reputation to retirement, that the practice was continued when the reason of its commencement ceased. After the empire became Christian, instances of this kind were numerous; and those whose security had obliged them to live separately

and apart became afterward united into societies. We may also add, that the mystic theology, which gained ground toward the close of the third century, contributed to produce the same effect, and to drive men into solitude, for the purposes of devotion. The monks, at least 666<sup>th</sup> the ancient ones, were distinguished into solitaries, cœnobites, and sarabaites. The first were those who lived in places remote from all towns and habitations of men, as do still some of the hermits. The cœnobites were those who lived in community with several others in the same house, and under the same superiors. The sarabaites were strolling monks, having no fixed rule of residence. Those who are now called monks are cœnobites, who live together in a convent or monastery, who make vows of living according to a certain rule established by the founder, and wear a habit which distinguishes their order. Those that are endowed, or have a fixed revenue, are most properly called monks, monachi; as the Chartereux, Benedictines, Bernardines, &c. The Mendicants, or those that beg, as the Capuchins and Franciscans, are more properly called religious, and friars, though the names are frequently confounded.

The first monks were those of St. Anthony, who, toward the close of the fourth century, formed them into a regular body, engaged them to live in society with each other, and prescribed to them fixed rules for the direction of their conduct. These regulations, which Anthony had made in Egypt, were soon introduced into Palestine and Syria by his disciple Hilarion. Almost about the same time, Aones, or Eugenius, with their companions, Gaddanus and Azyzas, instituted the monastic order in Mesopotomia, and the adjacent countries; and their example was followed with such rapid success, that in a short time the whole east was filled with a lazy set of mortals, who, abandoning all human connections, advantages, pleasures, and concerns, wore out a languishing and miserable existence amidst hardships of want, and various kinds of suffering, in order to arrive at a more close and rapturous communication with God and angels. From the east this gloomy institution passed into the west, and first into Italy and its neighbouring islands, though it is uncertain who transplanted it thither. St. Martin, the celebrated bishop of Tours, erected the first monasteries in Gaul, and recommended this religious solitude with such power and efficacy, both by his instruction and example, that his funeral is said to have been attended by no less than two thousand monks. From hence the monastic discipline extended its progress gradually through the other provinces and countries of Europe. There were beside, the monks of St. Basil, called in the east calogeri, from *καλος γερον*, a good old man, and those of St. Jerom, the hermits of St. Augustine, and afterward those of St. Benedict and St. Bernard: at length came those of St. Francis and St. Dominic, with a legion of others.

Toward the close of the fifth century, the monks who had formerly lived only for themselves in solitary retreats, and had never thought of assuming any rank among the sacerdotal order, were gradually distinguished from the populace, and endowed with such opulence and honourable privileges that they found themselves in a condition to claim an eminent station among the pillars and supporters of the Christian community. The fame of their piety and sanctity was so great, that bishops and presbyters were often chosen out of their order; and the passion of erecting edifices and convents, in which the monks and holy virgins might serve God in the most commodious manner, was at this time carried beyond all bounds. However, their licentiousness, even in this century, was become a proverb; and they are said to have excited the most dreadful tumults and seditions in various places. The monastic orders were at first under the immediate jurisdiction of the bishops, from which they were exempted by the Roman pontiff about the end of the seventh century; and the monks in return devoted themselves wholly to advance the interest and to maintain the dignity of the bishop of Rome. This immunity which they obtained was a fruitful source of licentiousness and disorder, and occasioned the greatest part of the vices with which they were afterward so justly charged.

In the eighth century the monastic discipline was extremely relaxed, both in the eastern and western provinces, and all efforts to restore it were ineffectual. Nevertheless, this kind of institution was in the highest esteem; and nothing could equal the veneration that was paid about the close of the ninth century to such as devoted themselves to the sacred gloom and indolence of a convent. This veneration caused several kings and emperors to call them to their courts, and to employ them in civil affairs of the greatest moment. Their reformation was attempted by Louis the meek, but the effect was of short duration. In the eleventh century, they were exempted by the popes from the authority of their sovereigns, and new orders of monks were continually established, insomuch that in the council of Lateran, that was held A. D. 1215, a decree was passed, by the advice of Innocent III., to prevent any new monastic institutions; and several were entirely suppressed. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it appears, from the testimony of the best writers, that the monks were generally lazy, illiterate, profligate, and licentious epicures, whose views in life were confined to opulence, idleness, and pleasure. However, the reformation had a manifest influence in restraining their excesses, and rendering them more circumspect and cautious in their external conduct.

Monks are distinguished by the colour of their habits, into black, white, gray, &c. Among the monks, some are called monks of the choir, others, professed monks, and others, lay monks; which last are destined for the service of the convent, and have neither clericate nor literature. Cloistered

monks are those who actually reside in the house, in opposition to extra monks, who have benefices depending on the monastery. Monks are also distinguished into reformed, whom the civil and ecclesiastical authority have made masters of ancient convents, and empowered to retrieve the ancient discipline, which had been relaxed; and ancient, who remain in the convent, to live in it according to its establishment at the time when they made their vows, without obliging themselves to any new reform. Anciently the monks were all laymen, and were only distinguished from the rest of the people by a peculiar habit and an extraordinary piety or devotion. Not only the monks were prohibited the priesthood, but even priests were expressly prohibited from becoming monks, as appears from the letters of St. Gregory. Pope Syricius was the first who called them to the clericate, on account of some great scarcity of priests that the church was supposed to labour under; and since that time the priesthood has been usually united to the monastical profession.

MONOPHYSITES. See Hypostatic Union.

MONOTHELITES, a denomination in the seventh century. See Hypostatic Union.

MONTHS, ירחים, sometimes also called חדשים, new moons, from the circumstance of their commencing with the new moon, anciently had no separate names, with the exception of the first, which was called Abib, that is, the month of the young ears of corn,” Exod. xiii, 4; xxiii, 15; xxxiv, 18; Deut. xvi, 1. During the captivity, the Hebrews adopted the Babylonian names for their months; which were as follows, and they were reckoned thus:--

1. ניסן, Nisan, from the new moon of April, Neh. ii, 1.
2. זיו, Zif or Ziv, also called אייר, of May, 1 Kings vi, 1.
3. סיון, Sivan, of June, Esther viii, 9.
4. תמוז, Tammuz, of July.
5. אב, Ab, of August.
6. אלול, Elul, of September, Neh. vi, 15.
7. תשרי, Tishri, also ירח האתנים, of October, 1 Kings viii, 2.
8. בול, Bul, also מרחשון, of November, 1 Kings vi, 38.
9. כסלו, Kislev, of December, Neh. i, 1.
10. טבת, Tebeth, of January, Esther ii, 16.
11. שבט, Shebat, of February, Zech. i, 7.
12. אדר, Adar, of March, Esther iii, 7.

The first month here mentioned, Nisan, was originally called Abib. The intercalary month is denominated in Hebrew אדר.

MOON. Particular sacrifices were enjoined by Moses at every new moon, which day was also celebrated as a feast. It is promised in Psalm cxxi, 6, "The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night." The effect of a coup de soleil, or stroke of the sun, is well known; and in some climates the beams of the moon are reputed hurtful. Anderson, in his Description of the East," says, "One must here (in Batavia) take great care not to sleep in the beams of the moon uncovered. I have seen many people whose neck has become crooked, so that they look more to the side than forward. I will not decide whether it is to be ascribed to the moon, as people imagine here." In some of the southern parts of Europe the same opinions are entertained of the pernicious influence of the moon beams. An English gentleman walking in the evening in the garden of a Portuguese nobleman at Lisbon, was most seriously admonished by the owner to put on his hat, to protect him from the moon beams. The fishermen in Sicily are said to cover, during the night, the fish which they expose to dry on the sea shore, alleging that the beams of the moon cause them to putrefy.

MORAL OBLIGATION. Different opinions have been held as to the ground of moral obligation. Grotius, Balguy, and Dr. Samuel Clarke, place it in the eternal and necessary fitness of things. To this there are two objections. The first is, that it leaves the distinction between virtue and vice, in a great measure, arbitrary and indefinite, dependent upon our perception of fitness and unfitness, which, in different individuals will greatly differ. The second is, that when a fitness or unfitness is proved, it is no more than the discovery of a natural essential difference or congruity, which alone cannot constitute a moral obligation to choose what is fit, and to reject what is unfit. When we have proved a fitness in a certain course of action, we have not proved that it is obligatory. A second step is necessary before we can reach this conclusion. Cudworth, Butler, Price, and others, maintain, that virtue carries its own obligation in itself; that the understanding at once perceives a certain action to be right, and therefore it ought to be performed. Several objections lie to this notion: 1. It supposes the understandings of men to determine precisely in the same manner concerning all virtuous and vicious actions; which is contrary to fact. 2. It supposes a previous rule, by which the action is determined to be right; but if the revealed will of God is not to be taken into consideration, what common rule exists among men? There is evidently no such rule, and therefore no means of certainly determining what is right. 3. If a common standard were known among men, and if the understandings of men determined in the same manner as to the conformity, or otherwise, of an action to that standard; what renders it a matter of obligation that any one should perform it? The rule must be proved to be binding, or no ground of obligation is established.

An action is obligatory, say others, because it is agreeable to the moral sense. This is the theory of Lord Shaftesbury and Dr. Hutcheson. By moral sense appears to be meant an instinctive approbation of right, and abhorrence of wrong, prior to all reflection on their nature, or their consequences. If any thing else were understood by it, then the moral sense must be the same with conscience, which we know to vary with the judgment, and cannot therefore be the basis of moral obligation. If conscience be not meant, then the moral sense must be considered as instinctive: a notion, certainly, which is disproved by the whole moral history of man. It may, indeed, be conceded, that such is the constitution of the human soul, that when those distinctions between actions, which have been taught by religious tradition or direct revelation, are known in their nature, relations, and consequences, the calm and sober judgments of men will approve of them; and that especially when they are considered abstractedly, that is, as not affecting and controlling their own interests and passions immediately, virtue may command complacency, and vice provoke abhorrence: but that, independent of reflection on their nature or their consequences, there is an instinctive principle in man which abhors evil, and loves good, is contradicted by that variety of opinion and feeling on the vices and virtues, which obtains among all uninstructed nations. We applaud the forgiveness of an injury as magnanimous; a savage despises it as mean. We think it a duty to support and cherish aged parents; many nations, on the contrary, abandon them as useless, and throw them to the beasts of the field. Innumerable instances of this contrariety might be adduced, which are all contrary to the notion of instinctive sentiment. Instincts operate uniformly, but this assumed moral sense does not. Beside, if it be mere matter of feeling, independent of judgment, to love virtue, and abhor vice, the morality of the exercise of this principle is questionable; for it would be difficult to show, that there is any more morality, properly speaking, in the affections and dis gusts of instinct than in those of the palate. If judgment, the knowledge and comparison of things, be included, then this principle supposes a uniform and universal individual revelation as to the nature of things to every man, or an intuitive faculty of determining their moral quality; both of which are too absurd to be maintained.

The only satisfactory conclusion on this subject, is that which refers moral obligation to the will of God. Obligation," says Warburton, necessarily implies an obliger, and the obliger must be different from, and not one and the same with, the obliged. Moral obligation, that is, the obligation of a free agent, farther implies a law, which enjoins and forbids; but a law is the imposition of an intelligent superior, who hath power to exact conformity thereto." This lawgiver is God; and whatever may be the reasons which have led him to enjoin this, and to prohibit that, it is plain that the obligation

to obey lies not merely in the fitness and propriety of a creature obeying an infinitely wise and good Creator, (though such a fitness exists,) but in that obedience being enjoined. For, since the question respects the duty of a created being with reference to his Creator, nothing can be more conclusive than that the Creator has an absolute right to the obedience of his creatures; and that the creature is in duty obliged to obey him from whom it not only has received being, but by whom that being is constantly sustained. It has, indeed, been said, that even if it be admitted, that I am obliged to obey the will of God, the question is still open, Why am I obliged to obey his will?" and that this brings us round to the former answer; because he can only will what is upon the whole best for his creatures. But this is confounding that which may be, and doubtless is, a rule to God in the commands which he issues, with that which really obliges the creature. Now, that which in truth obliges the creature is not the nature of the commands issued by God; but the relation in which the creature itself stands to God. If a creature can have no existence, nor any power or faculty independently of God, it can have no right to employ its faculties independently of him; and if it have no right to employ its faculties in an independent manner, the right to rule its conduct must rest with the Creator alone; and from this results the obligation of absolute and universal obedience.

MORAVIANS, or UNITED BRETHREN. The name of Moravians, or Moravian Brethren, was in England given to the members of a foreign Protestant church, calling itself the *Unitas Fratrum*, or United Brethren. This church formerly consisted of three branches, the Bohemian, Moravian, and Polish. After its renovation in the year 1722, some of its members came to England in 1728, who being of the Moravian branch, became known by that appellation; and all those who joined them, and adopted their doctrines and discipline, have ever since been called Moravians. Strictly speaking, however, that name is not applicable to them, nor generally admitted, either by themselves, or in any public documents, in which they are called by their proper names, the *Unitas Fratrum*, or United Brethren.

The few remaining members of the ancient church of the United Brethren in Bohemia, Moravia, and Poland, being much persecuted by the popish clergy, many of them left all their possessions, and fled with their families into Silesia and Saxony. In Saxony they found protection from a Saxon nobleman, Nicholas Lewis, count of Zinzendorff, who gave them some waste land on one of his estates, on which, in 1722, they built a village at the foot of a hill, called the Hut-Berg, or Watch-Hill. This occasioned them to call their settlement Herrnhut, the watch of the Lord." Hence their enemies designated them in derision by the name of Herrnhuters, which is altogether improper, but by it they are known in some countries abroad. By

their own account, the community derive their origin from the ancient Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, who existed as a distinct people ever since the year 1457, when, separating from those who took up arms in defence of 669their protestations against popish errors, they formed a plan for church fellowship and discipline, agreeable to their insight into the Scriptures, and called themselves at first, *Fratres Legis Christi*, or Brethren after the Law of Christ; and afterward, on being joined by others of the same persuasion in other places, *Unitas Fratrum*, or *Fratres Unitatis*. By degrees, they established congregations in various places, and spread themselves into Moravia and other neighbouring states. Being anxious to preserve among themselves regular episcopal ordination, and, at a synod held at Lhota in 1467, taking into consideration the scarcity of ministers regularly ordained among them, they chose three of their priests ordained by Calixtine bishops, and sent them to Stephen, bishop of the Waldenses, then residing in Austria, by whom they were consecrated bishops; co-bishops and conseniores being appointed from the rest of their presbyters. In 1468 a great persecution arose against them, and many were put to death. In 1481 they were banished from Moravia, when many of them fled as far as Mount Caucasus, and established themselves there, till driven away by subsequent troubles.

In the mean time, disputes respecting points of doctrine, the enmity of the papists, and other causes, raised continual disturbances and great persecutions at various periods, till the Reformation by Luther, when they opened a correspondence with that eminent reformer and his associates, and entered into several negotiations, both with him and Calvin, concerning the extension of the Protestant cause. But their strict adherence to the discipline of their own church, founded, in their view, on that of the primitive churches, and the acknowledged impossibility of its application among the mixed multitude, of which the Lutheran and Calvinist churches consisted, occasioned a cessation of coöperation, and, in the sequel, the Brethren were again left to the mercy of their persecutors, by whom their churches were destroyed, and their ministers banished, till the year 1575, when they obtained an edict from the emperor of Germany, for the public exercise of their religion. This toleration was renewed in 1609, and liberty granted them to erect new churches. But a civil war, which broke out in Bohemia in 1612, and a violent persecution which followed it in 1621, again occasioned the dispersion of their ministers, and brought great distress upon the Brethren in general. Some fled into England, others to Saxony and Brandenburg; while many, overcome by the severity of the persecution, conformed to the rites of the church of Rome.

About the year 1640, by incessant persecution, and the most oppressive measures, this ancient church was brought to so low an ebb, that it appeared



nearly extinct. The persecutions which took place at the beginning of the eighteenth century, were the occasion that many of the scattered descendants of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren at length resolved to quit their native land, and seek liberty of conscience in foreign countries. Some emigrated into Silesia, and others into Upper Lusatia, a province of Saxony, adjoining to Bohemia. The latter, as before observed, found a protector in Nicholas Count Zinzendorff, a pious, zealous man, and a Lutheran by education. He hoped that the religious state of the Lutherans in his neighbourhood would be greatly improved by the conversation and example of these devout emigrants; and he therefore sought to prevail upon the latter to join the Lutheran church altogether. To this the Brethren objected, being unwilling to give up their ancient discipline, and would rather proceed to seek an asylum in another place; when the count, struck with their steadfast adherence to the tenets of their forefathers, began more maturely to examine their pretensions; and being convinced of the justness of them, he procured for the Brethren the renovation of their ancient constitution, and ever after proved a most zealous promoter of their cause. He is, therefore, very justly esteemed by them as the chief instrument, in the hand of God, in restoring the sinking church, and, in general, gratefully remembered for his disinterested and indefatigable labours in promoting the interests of religion, both at home and abroad. In 1735, having been examined and received into the clerical order, by the theological faculty at Tuebingen, in the duchy of Wurtemberg, he was consecrated a bishop of the Brethren's church.

After the establishment of a regular congregation of the United Brethren at Herrnhut, multitudes of pious persons from various parts flocked to it, many of whom had private opinions in religious matters, to which they were strongly attached. This occasioned great disputes, which even threatened the destruction of the society; but, by the indefatigable exertions of Count Zinzendorff, these disputes were allayed, and the statutes being drawn up, and agreed to in 1727, for better regulation, brotherly love and union were reëstablished, and no schism whatever, in point of doctrine, has since that period disturbed the peace of the church.

Though the Brethren acknowledge no other standard of truth than the sacred Scriptures, they in general profess to adhere to the Augsburg Confession of Faith. Their church is episcopal; but though they consider episcopal ordination as necessary to qualify the servants of the church for their respective functions, they allow to their bishops no elevation of rank or preëminent authority. The Moravian church, from its first establishment, has been governed by synods, consisting of deputies from all the congregations, and by other subordinate bodies, which they call conferences. According to their regulations, episcopal ordination, of itself,

does not confer any power to preside over one or more congregations; and a bishop can discharge no office except by the appointment of a synod, or of its delegate, the elders' conference of the unity. Presbyters among them can perform every function of the bishop, except ordination. Deacons are assistants to presbyters, much in the same way as in the church of England. Deaconesses are retained for the purpose of privately admonishing their own sex, and visiting them in their sickness; but they are not permitted to teach in public, and, far less, to administer the sacraments. They have also *seniores civiles*, or lay elders, in contradistinction to spiritual elders or bishops, who are appointed to watch over the constitution and discipline of the unity of the Brethren, &c. The synods are generally held once in seven years; and beside all the bishops, and the deputies sent by each congregation, those women who have appointments as above described, if on the spot, are also admitted as hearers, and may be called upon to give their advice in what relates to the ministerial labour among their own sex; but they have no decisive vote in the synod. The votes of all the other members are equal. In questions of importance, or of which the consequence cannot be foreseen, neither the majority of votes, nor the unanimous consent of all present, can decide: but recourse is had to the lot, which, however, is never made use of except after mature deliberation and prayer; nor is any thing submitted to its decision which does not, after being thoroughly weighed, appear to the assembly eligible in itself.

MORDECAI was the son of Jair, of the race of Saul, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin. He was carried captive to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, with Jehoiachin, or Jeconiah, king of Judah, A. M. 3405, Esther ii, 5, 6. He settled at Shushan, and there lived to the first year of Cyrus, when it is thought he returned to Jerusalem, with several other captives; but he afterward returned to Shushan. There is great probability that Mordecai was very young when taken into captivity. The book of Esther gives the whole history of Mordecai's elevation, the punishment of Haman, and the wonderful deliverance of the Jews, in clear and regular narrative. But it may be asked, For what reason did Mordecai refuse to pay that respect to Haman, the neglect of which incensed him against the Jews? Esther iii, 1–6. Some think the reason was, because Haman was an Amalekite; a people whom the Israelites had been commissioned from God to destroy, because of the injuries they had formerly done them, Deut. xxv, 17–19. But this scarcely seems to be a sufficient account of Mordecai's refusing civil respect to Haman, who was first minister of state; especially when by so doing he exposed his whole nation to imminent danger. Beside, if nothing but civil respect had been intended to Haman, the king need not have enjoined it on his servants after he had made him his first minister and chief favourite, Esther iii, 1, 2; they would have been ready enough to show it

on all occasions. Probably, therefore, the reverence ordered to be done to this great man was a kind of divine honour, such as was sometimes addressed to the Persian monarchs themselves; which, being a species of idolatry, Mordecai refused for the sake of a good conscience. And perhaps it was because Haman knew that his refusal was the result of his Jewish principles, that he determined to attempt the destruction of the Jews in general, knowing they were all of the same mind. As to another question, why Haman cast lots, in order to fix the day for the massacre of the Jews, Esther iii, 7; from whence the feast of purim, which is a Persic word, and signifies lots, took its name, Esther ix, 26; it was no doubt owing to the superstitious conceit which anciently prevailed, of some days being more fortunate than others for any undertaking; in short, he endeavoured to find out, by this way of divining, what month, and what day of the month, was most unfortunate to the Jews, and most fortunate for the success of his bloody design against them. It is very remarkable, that while Haman sought for direction in this affair from the Persian idols, the God of Israel so overruled the lot as to fix the intended massacre to almost a year's distance, from Nisan the first month to Adar the last of the year, in order to give time and opportunity to Mordecai and Esther to defeat the conspiracy.

**MORIAH, Mount.** A hill on the north-east side of Jerusalem, once separated from that of Acra by a broad valley, which, according to Josephus, was filled up by the Asmoneans, and the two hills converted into one. In the time of David it stood apart from the city, and was under cultivation; for here was the threshing floor of Araunah, the Jebusite, which David bought, on which to erect an altar to God, 2 Sam. xxiv, 15–25. On the same spot Solomon afterward built the temple, 2 Chron. iii, 1; when it was included within the walls of the city. Here, also, Abraham is supposed to have been directed to offer his son Isaac, Gen. xxii, 1, 2. Moriah implies vision;” and the land of Moriah,” mentioned in the above passage in the history of Abraham, was probably so called from being seen afar off.” It included the whole group of hills on which Jerusalem was afterward built.

**MOSES.** This illustrious legislator of the Israelites was of the tribe of Levi, in the line of Koath and of Amram, whose son he was, and therefore in the fourth generation after the settlement of the Israelites in Egypt. The time of his birth is ascertained by the exode of the Israelites, when Moses was eighty years old, Exod. vii, 7. By a singular providence, the infant Moses, when exposed on the river Nile, through fear of the royal decree, after his mother had hid him three months, because he was a goodly child, was taken up and adopted by Pharaoh's daughter, and nursed by his own mother, whom she hired at the suggestion of his sister Miriam. Thus did he find an asylum in the very palace of his intended destroyer; while his intercourse with his own family and nation was still most naturally, though

unexpectedly, maintained: so mysterious are the ways of Heaven. And while he was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians,” and bred up in the midst of a luxurious court, he acquired at home the knowledge of the promised redemption of Israel; and, by faith” in the Redeemer Christ, “refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ,” or persecution for Christ’s sake, greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he had respect to the recompense of reward,” Exodus ii, 1–10; Acts vii, 20–22; Heb. xi, 23–26; or looked forward to a future state.

When Moses was grown to manhood, and was full forty years old, he was moved by a divine intimation, as it seems, to undertake the deliverance of his countrymen; for he supposed that his brethren would have understood how that God, by his hand, would give them deliverance; but they understood not.” For when, in the excess of his zeal to redress their grievances, he had slain an Egyptian, who injured one of them, in which he probably went beyond his commission, and afterward endeavoured to reconcile two of them that were at variance, they rejected his mediation; and the man who had done wrong said, Who made thee a judge and a ruler over us? Intendest thou to kill me, as thou killedst the Egyptian yesterday?” So Moses, finding it was known, and that Pharaoh sought to slay him, fled for his life to the land of Midian, in Arabia Petraea, where he married Zipporah, the daughter of Jethro, or Reuel, prince and priest of Midian; and, as a shepherd, kept his flocks in the vicinity of Mount Horeb, or Sinai, for forty years, Exodus ii, 11–21; iii, 1; xviii, 5; Num. x, 29; Acts vii, 23–30. During this long exile Moses was trained in the school of humble circumstances for that arduous mission which he had prematurely anticipated; and, instead of the unthinking zeal which at first actuated him, learned to distrust himself. His backwardness, afterward, to undertake that mission for which he was destined from the womb, was no less remarkable than his forwardness before, Exod. iv, 10–13.

At length, when the oppression of the Israelites was come to the full, and they cried to God for succour, and the king was dead, and all the men in Egypt that sought his life, the God of glory” appeared to Moses in a flame of fire, from the midst of a bush, and announced himself as the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob,” under the titles of Jahoh and Æhjah, expressive of his unity and sameness; and commissioned him first to make known to the Israelites the divine will for their deliverance; and next to go with the elders of Israel to Pharaoh, requiring him, in the name of “the Lord, the God of the Hebrews, to suffer the people to go three days’ journey into the wilderness, to sacrifice unto the Lord their God,” after such sacrifices had been long intermitted during their bondage; for the

Egyptians had sunk into bestial polytheism, and would have stoned them, had they attempted to sacrifice to their principal divinities, the apis, or bull, &c, in the land itself: foretelling, also, the opposition they would meet with from the king, the mighty signs and wonders that would finally compel his assent, and their spoiling of the Egyptians, by asking or demanding of them (not borrowing) jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment, (by way of wages or compensation for their services,) as originally declared to Abraham, that they should go out from thence with great substance,” Gen. xv, 14; Exod. ii, 23–25; iii, 2–22; viii, 25, 26.

To vouch his divine commission to the Israelites, God enabled Moses to work three signal miracles: 1. Turning his rod into a serpent, and restoring it again: 2. Making his hand leprous as snow, when he first drew it out of his bosom, and restoring it sound as before when he next drew it out: and, 3. Turning the water of the river into blood. And the people believed the signs, and the promised deliverance, and worshipped. To assist him, also, in his arduous mission, when Moses had represented that he was not eloquent, but slow of speech,” and of a slow or stammering tongue, God inspired Aaron, his elder brother, to go and meet Moses in the wilderness, to be his spokesman to the people, Exod. iv, 1–31, and his prophet to Pharaoh; while Moses was to be a god to both, as speaking to them in the name, or by the authority, of God himself, Exod. vii, 1, 2. At their first, interview with Pharaoh, they declared, Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness. And Pharaoh said, Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not,” or regard not, the Lord, neither will I let Israel go.” In answer to this haughty tyrant, they styled the Lord by a more ancient title, which the Egyptians ought to have known and respected, from Abraham’s days, when he plagued them in the matter of Sarah: “The God of the Hebrews hath met with us: Let us go, we pray thee, three days’ journey into the desert, and sacrifice unto the Lord our God, lest he fall upon us with pestilence or with the sword:” plainly intimating to Pharaoh, also, not to incur his indignation, by refusing to comply with his desire. But the king not only refused, but increased the burdens of the people, Exod. v, 1–19; and the people murmured, and hearkened not unto Moses, when he repeated from the Lord his assurances of deliverance and protection, for anguish of spirit, and for cruel bondage, Exod. v, 20–23; vi, 1–9.

At their second interview with Pharaoh, in obedience to the divine command, again requiring him to let the children of Israel go out of his land; Pharaoh, as foretold, demanded of them to show a miracle for themselves, in proof of their commission, when Aaron cast down his rod, and it became a serpent before Pharaoh and before his servants, or officers

of his court. The king then called upon his wise men and magicians, to know if they could do as much by the power of their gods, “and they did so with their enchantments; for they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents; but Aaron’s rod swallowed up their serpents.” Here the original 672phrase, ויעשו כן, and they did so,” or in like manner,” may only indicate the attempt, and not the deed; as afterward, in the plague of lice, when they did so with their enchantments, but could not,” Exod. viii, 18. And, indeed, the original term, להטיהם, rendered their enchantments,” as derived from the root לאט, or לוט, to hide or cover, fitly expresses the secret deceptions of legerdemain, or sleight-of-hand, to impose on spectators: and the remark of the magicians, when unable to imitate the production of lice, which was beyond their skill and dexterity, on account of their minuteness,--“This is the finger of a God!”--seems to strengthen the supposition; especially as the Egyptians were famous for legerdemain and for charming serpents: and the magicians, having had notice of the miracle they were expected to imitate, might make provision accordingly, and bring live serpents, which they might have substituted for their rods. And though Aaron’s serpent swallowed up their serpents, showing the superiority of the true miracle over the false, 2 Thess. ii, 9, it might only lead the king to conclude, that Moses and Aaron were more expert jugglers than Jannes and Jambres, who opposed them, 2 Timothy iii, 8. And the heart of Pharaoh was hardened, so that he hearkened not unto them, as the Lord had said,” or foretold, Exod. vi, 10, 11; vii, 8–13. For the conduct of Moses as the deliverer and lawgiver of the Israelites, see Plagues of Egypt, Red Sea, and Law.

At Mount Sinai the Lord was pleased to make Moses, the redeemer of Israel, an eminent type of the Redeemer of the world. I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him: and it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him:” which Moses communicated to the people. The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me: unto him shall ye hearken,” Deut. xviii, 15–19. This prophet like unto Moses was our Lord Jesus Christ, who was by birth a Jew, of the middle class of the people, and resembled his predecessor, in personal intercourse with God, miracles, and legislation, which no other prophet did, Deut. xxxiv, 10–12; and to whom God, at his transfiguration, required the world to hearken, Matt. xvii, 5. Whence our Lord’s frequent admonition to the Jewish church, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear,” Matthew xiii, 9, &c; which is addressed, also, by the Spirit to the Christian churches of Asia Minor, Rev. iii, 22.

In the affair of the Golden Calf, (see Calf,) the conduct of Moses showed the greatest zeal for God's honour, and a holy indignation against the sin of Aaron and the people. And when Moses drew nigh, and saw their proceedings, his anger waxed hot, and he cast away the tables of the covenant, or stone tablets on which were engraven the ten commandments by the finger of God himself, and brake them beneath the mount, in the presence of the people; in token that the covenant between God and them was now rescinded on his part, in consequence of their transgression. He then took the golden calf, and burned it in the fire, and ground it to powder, and mixed it with water, and made the children of Israel drink of it. After thus destroying their idol, he inflicted punishment on the idolaters themselves; for he summoned all that were on the Lord's side to attend him; and all the Levites having obeyed the call, he sent them, in the name of the Lord, to slay all the idolaters, from one end of the camp to the other, without favour or affection either to their neighbour or to their brother; and they slew about three thousand men. The Lord also sent a grievous plague among them for their idolatry, Exodus xxxii, 2–35, on which occasion Moses gave a signal proof of his love for his people, by interceding for them with the Lord; and of his own disinterestedness, in refusing the offer of the Almighty to adopt his family in their room, and make of them a great nation." He prayed that God would blot him out of his book, that is, take away his life, if he would not forgive the great sin of his people;" and prevailed with God to alter his determination of withdrawing his presence from them, and sending an inferior angel to conduct them to the land of promise. So wonderful was the condescension of God to the voice of a man, and so mighty the power of prayer.

When the Lord had pardoned the people, and taken them again into favour, he commanded Moses to hew two tablets of stone, like the former which were broken, and to present them to him on the top of the mount; and on these the Lord wrote again the ten commandments, for a renewal of the covenant between him and his people. To reward and strengthen the faith of Moses, God was pleased, at his request, to grant him a fuller view of the divine glory, or presence, than he had hitherto done. And, to confirm his authority with the people on his return, after the second conference of forty days, he imparted to him a portion of that glory or light by which his immediate presence was manifested: for the face of Moses shone so that Aaron and all the people were afraid to come nigh him, until he had put a veil on his face, to hide its brightness. This was an honour never vouchsafed to mortal before nor afterward till Christ, the Prophet like Moses, in his transfiguration also, appeared arrayed in a larger measure of the same lustre. Then Moses again beheld the glory of the Word made flesh, and ministered thereto in a glorified form himself, Exod. xxxiv, 1–35; Matt. xvii, 1–8.

At Kibroth Hataavah, when the people loathed the manna, and longed for flesh, Moses betrayed great impatience, and wished for death. He was also reproved for unbelief. At Kadesh-barnea, Moses having encouraged the people to proceed, saying, Behold, the Lord thy God hath set the land before thee, 673 go up and possess it, as the Lord God of thy fathers hath said unto you: fear not," Deut. i, 19–21; they betrayed great diffidence, and proposed to Moses to send spies to search out the land, and point out to them the way they should enter, and the course they should take. And the proposal pleased him well," and with the consent of the Lord he sent twelve men, one out of each tribe, to spy out the land, Deut. i, 22, 23; Num. xiii, 1–20. All these, except Caleb and Joshua, having brought an evil report," so discouraged the people, that they murmured against Moses and against Aaron, and said unto them, Would God that we had died in the land of Egypt; or would God that we had died in the wilderness! And wherefore hath the Lord brought us unto this land to fall by the sword, that our wives and our children shall be a prey? Were it not better for us to return into Egypt? And they said one to another, Let us make a captain, and return into Egypt." They even went so far as to propose to stone Joshua and Caleb, because they exhorted the people not to rebel against the Lord, nor to fear the people of the land, Num. xiv, 1–10; Deut. i, 26–28. Here again the noble patriotism of Moses was signally displayed. He again refused the divine offer to disinherit the Israelites, and make of him and his family a greater and mightier nation than they." He urged the most persuasive motives with their offended God, not to destroy them with the threatened pestilence, lest the Heathen might say, that the Lord was not able to bring them into the land which he swore unto them." He powerfully appealed to the long-trying mercies and forgivenesses they had experienced ever since their departure from Egypt; and his energetic supplication prevailed; for the Lord graciously said, I have pardoned, according to thy word: but verily, as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord;" or shall adore him for his righteous judgments; for all these men which have seen my glory and my miracles which I did in Egypt, and in the wilderness, and have tempted me these ten times, and have not hearkened to my voice, surely shall not see the land which I swore unto their fathers: neither shall any of them that provoked me see it. As ye have spoken in my ears, so will I do unto you," by a righteous retaliation: your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness. But your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, them will I bring in; and they shall wander in the wilderness forty years, and bear your whoredoms, after the number of the days in which ye searched the land, each day for a year, until your carcasses be wasted in the wilderness." And immediately after this sentence, as the earnest of its full accomplishment, all the spies, except Caleb and Joshua, were cut off, and died by the plague before the Lord, Num. xiv, 11–37; Deut. i, 34–39.



The people now, to repair their fault, contrary to the advice of Moses, presumptuously went to invade the Amalekites and Canaanites of Mount Seir, or Hor; who defeated them, and chased them as bees to Hormah, Num. xiv, 39–45; Deut. i, 41–44. On the morrow they were ordered to turn away from the promised land, and to take their journey south-westward, toward the way of the Red Sea: and they abode in the wilderness of Kadesh many days, or years, Num. xiv, 25; Deut. i, 40–46. The ill success of the expedition against the Amalekites, according to Josephus, occasioned the rebellion of Korah, which broke out shortly after, against Moses and Aaron, with greater violence than any of the foregoing, under Korah, the ringleader, who drew into it Dathan and Abiram, the heads of the senior tribe of Reuben, and two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, among whom were even several of the Levites. (See Korah.) But although all Israel round about had fled at the cry of the devoted families of Dathan and Abiram, for fear that the earth should swallow them up also;” yet, on the morrow, they returned to their rebellious spirit, and murmured against Moses and Aaron, saying, Ye have killed the people of the Lord.” On this occasion also, the Lord threatened to consume them as in a moment; but, on the intercession of Moses, only smote them with a plague, which was stayed by an atonement made by Aaron, after the destruction of fourteen thousand seven hundred souls, Num. xvi, 41–50.

On the return of the Israelites, after many years’ wandering, to the same disastrous station of Kadesh-barnea, even Moses himself was guilty of an offence, in which his brother Aaron was involved, and for which both were excluded, as a punishment, from entering the promised land. At Meribah Kadesh the congregation murmured against Moses, for bringing them into a barren wilderness without water; when the Lord commanded Moses to take his rod, which had been laid up before the Lord, and with Aaron to assemble the congregation together, and to speak to the rock before their eyes; which should supply water for the congregation and their cattle. But Moses said unto the congregation, when they were assembled, Hear now, ye rebels, must we fetch you water out of this rock? And he smote the rock twice with his rod, and the water came out abundantly; and the congregation drank, and their cattle also. And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron, Because ye believed me not, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel; therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them,” Num. xx, 1–13; and afterward in stronger terms: Because ye rebelled against my commandment,” &c, Numbers xxvii, 14.

The offence of Moses, as far as may be collected from so concise an account, seems to have been, 1. He distrusted or disbelieved that water

could be produced from the rock only by speaking to it; which was a higher miracle than he had performed before at Rephidim, Exod. xvii, 6. 2. He unnecessarily smote the rock twice; thereby betraying an unwarrantable impatience. 3. He did not, at least in the 674<sup>th</sup> phrase he used, ascribe the glory of the miracle wholly to God, but rather to himself and his brother: Must we fetch you water out of this rock?" And he denominated them rebels" against his and his brother's authority, which, although an implied act of rebellion against God, ought to have been stated, as on a former occasion, Ye have been rebels against the Lord, from the day that I knew you," Deut. ix, 24, which he spake without blame. For want of more caution on this occasion, he spake unadvisedly with his lips, because they provoked his spirit," Psalm cvi, 33. Thus was God sanctified at the waters of Meribah," by his impartial justice, in punishing his greatest favourites when they did amiss, Num. xx, 13. How severely Moses felt his deprivation, appears from his humble, and it should seem repeated, supplications to the Lord to reverse the sentence: O Lord of gods, thou hast begun to show thy servant thy greatness, and thy mighty hand; for what god is there in heaven or in earth that can do according to thy works, and according to thy might? I pray thee let me go over and see the good land beyond Jordan, even that goodly mountain Lebanon," or the whole breadth of the land. But the Lord was wroth with me for your sakes, and would not hear me: and he said unto me, Let it suffice thee; speak no more unto me of this matter. Get thee up unto the top of Pisgah, and lift up thine eyes westward, and northward, and southward, and eastward, and behold it with thine eyes: for thou shalt not go over this Jordan," Deut. iii, 23–27.

The faculties of this illustrious legislator, both of mind and body, were not impaired at the age of a hundred and twenty years, when he died. His eye was not dim, nor his natural strength abated," Deut. xxxiv, 7: and the noblest of all his compositions was his Song, or the Divine Ode, which Bishop Lowth elegantly styles, *Cycnea Oratio*, "the Dying Swan's Oration." His death took place after the Lord had shown him, from the top of Pisgah, a distant view of the promised land, throughout its whole extent. He then buried his body in a valley opposite Beth-peor, in the land of Moab; but no man knoweth his sepulchre unto this day," observes the sacred historian, who annexed the circumstances of his death to the book of Deuteronomy, xxxiv, 6. From an obscure passage in the New Testament, in which Michael the archangel is said to have contended with the devil about the body of Moses, Jude 9, some have thought that he was buried by the ministry of angels, near the scene of the idolatry of the Israelites; but that the spot was purposely concealed, lest his tomb might also be converted into an object of idolatrous worship among the Israelites, like the brazen serpent. Beth-peor lay in the lot of the Reubenites, Joshua xiii, 20. But on so obscure a passage nothing can be built. The body of Moses,"

may figuratively mean the Jewish church; or the whole may be an allusion to a received tradition which, without affirming or denying its truth, might be made the basis of a moral lesson.

Josephus, who frequently attempts to embellish the simple narrative of Holy Writ, represents Moses as attended to the top of Pisgah by Joshua, his successor, Eleazar, the high priest, and the whole senate; and that, after he had dismissed the senate, while he was conversing with Joshua and Eleazar, and embracing them, a cloud suddenly came over and enveloped him; and he vanished from their sight, and he was taken away to a certain valley. In the sacred books," says he, it is written, that he died; fearing to say that on account of his transcendent virtue, he had departed to the Deity." The Jewish historian has here, perhaps, imitated the account of our Lord's ascension, furnished by the evangelist, Luke xxiv, 50; Acts i, 9; wishing to raise Moses to a level with Christ. The preëminence of Moses's character is briefly described by the sacred historian, Samuel or Ezra: And there arose not a prophet since, in Israel, like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face; in all the signs and the wonders which the Lord sent him to do in the land of Egypt, to Pharaoh, and all his servants, and all his land; and in all that mighty hand, and in all the great terror which Moses showed in the sight of all Israel," Deut. xxxiv, 10–12.

So marked and hallowed is the character of this, the most eminent of mere men, that it has often been successfully made the basis of an irresistible argument for the truth of his divine mission. Thus Cellérier observes, Every imposture has an object in view, and an aim more or less selfish. Men practise deceit for money, for pleasure, or for glory. If, by a strange combination, the love of mankind ever entered into the mind of an impostor, doubtless, even then, he has contrived to reconcile, at least, his own selfish interests with those of the human race. If men deceive others, for the sake of causing their own opinions or their own party to triumph, they may sometimes, perhaps, forget their own interests during the struggle, but they again remember them when the victory is achieved. It is a general rule, that no impostor forgets himself long. But Moses forgot himself, and forgot himself to the last. Yet there is no middle supposition. If Moses was not a divinely inspired messenger, he was an impostor in the strongest sense of the term. It is not, as in the case of Numa, a slight and single fraud, designed to secure some good end, that we have to charge him with, but a series of deceits, many of which were gross; a profound, dishonest, perfidious, sanguinary dissimulation, continued for the space of forty years. If Moses was not a divinely commissioned prophet, he was not the saviour of the people, but their tyrant and their murderer. Still, we repeat, this barbarous impostor always forgot himself; and his disinterestedness, as regarded himself personally, his family, and his tribe,

is one of the most extraordinary features in his administration. As to himself personally: He is destined to die in the wilderness; he is never to taste the tranquillity, the plenty, and the delight, the possession of 675 which he promises to his countrymen; he shares with them only their fatigues and privations; he has more anxieties than they, on their account, in their acts of disobedience, and in their perpetual murmurings. As to his family: He does not nominate his sons as his successors; he places them, without any privileges or distinctions, among the obscure sons of Levi; they are not even admitted into the sacerdotal authority. Unlike all other fathers, Moses withdraws them from public view, and deprives them of the means of obtaining glory and favour. Samuel and Eli assign a part of their paternal authority to their sons, and permit them even to abuse it; but the sons of Moses, in the wilderness, are only the simple servants of the tabernacle; like all the other sons of Kohath, if they even dare to raise the veil which covers the sacred furniture, the burden of which they carry, death is denounced against them. Where can we find more complete disinterestedness than in Moses? Is not his the character of an upright man, who has the general good, not his own interests, at heart; of a man who submissively acquiesces in the commands of God, without resistance and without demur? When we consider these several things; when we reflect on all the ministry of Moses, on his life, on his death, on his character, on his abilities, and his success; we are powerfully convinced that he was the messenger of God. If we consider him only as an able legislator, as a Lycurgus, as a Numa, his actions are inexplicable: we find not in him the affections, the interests, the views which usually belong to the human heart. The simplicity, the harmony, the verity of his natural character are gone; they give place to an incoherent union of ardour and imposture; of daring and of timidity, of incapacity and genius, of cruelty and sensibility. No! Moses was inspired by God: he received from God the law which he left his countrymen.

To Moses we owe that important portion of Holy Scripture, the Pentateuch, which brings us acquainted with the creation of the world, the entrance of sin and death, the first promises of redemption, the flood, the peopling of the postdiluvian earth, and the origin of nations, the call of Abraham, and the giving of the law. We have, indeed, in it the early history of religion, and a key to all the subsequent dispensations of God to man. The genuineness and authenticity of these most venerable and important books have been established by various writers; but the following remarks upon the veracity of the writings of Moses have the merit of compressing much argument into few words:--1. There is a minuteness in the details of the Mosaic writings, which bespeaks their truth; for it often bespeaks the eye-witness, as in the adventures of the wilderness; and often seems intended to supply directions to the artificer, as in the construction of the tabernacle.

2. There are touches of nature in the narrative which bespeak its truth, for it is not easy to regard them otherwise than as strokes from the life; as where the mixed multitude," whether half-castes or Egyptians, are the first to sigh for the cucumbers and melons of Egypt, and to spread discontent through the camp, Num. xi, 4; as the miserable exculpation of himself, which Aaron attempts, with all the cowardice of conscious guilt, I cast into the fire, and there came out this calf:" the fire, to be sure, being in the fault, Exod. xxxii, 24. 3. There are certain little inconveniences represented as turning up unexpectedly, that bespeak truth in the story; for they are just such accidents as are characteristic of the working of a new system and untried machinery. What is to be done with the man who is found gathering sticks on the Sabbath day? Num. xv, 32. (Could an impostor have devised such a trifle?) How is the inheritance of the daughters of Zelophehad to be disposed of, there being no heir male? Num. xxxvi, 2. Either of them inconsiderable matters in themselves, but both giving occasion to very important laws; the one touching life, and the other property. 4. There is a simplicity in the manner of Moses, when telling his tale, which bespeaks its truth: no parade of language, no pomp of circumstance even in his miracles, a modesty and dignity throughout all. Let us but compare him in any trying scene with Josephus; his description, for instance, of the passage through the Red Sea, Exod. xiv, of the murmuring of the Israelites and the supply of quails and manna, with the same as given by the Jewish historian, or rhetorician we might rather say, and the force of the observation will be felt. 5. There is a candour in the treatment of his subject by Moses, which bespeaks his truth; as when he tells of his own want of eloquence, which unfitted him for a leader, Exod. iv, 10; his own want of faith, which prevented him from entering the promised land, Num. xx, 12; the idolatry of Aaron his brother, Exod. xxxii, 21; the profaneness of Nadab and Abihu, his nephews, Lev. x; the disaffection and punishment of Miriam, his sister, Num. xii, 1. 6. There is a disinterestedness in his conduct, which bespeaks him to be a man of truth; for though he had sons, he apparently takes no measures during his life to give them offices of trust or profit; and at his death he appoints as his successor one who had no claims upon him, either of alliance, of clanship, or of blood. 7. There are certain prophetic passages in the writings of Moses, which bespeak their truth; as, several respecting the future Messiah, and the very sublime and literal one respecting the final fall of Jerusalem, Deut. xxviii. 8. There is a simple key supplied by these writings, to the meaning of many ancient traditions current among the Heathens, though greatly disguised, which is another circumstance that bespeaks their truth: as, the golden age; the garden of the Hesperides; the fruit tree in the midst, of the garden which the dragon guarded; the destruction of mankind by a flood, all except two persons, and those righteous persons,

Innocuos ambos, cultores numinis ambos;

[Both innocent, both worshippers of Deity;]

676the rainbow, which Jupiter set in the cloud, a sign to men;” the seventh day a sacred day; with many others, all conspiring to establish the reality of the facts which Moses relates, because tending to show that vestiges of the like present themselves in the traditional history of the world at large.

9. The concurrence which is found between the writings of Moses and those of the New Testament bespeaks their truth: the latter constantly appealing to them, being indeed but the completion of the system which the others are the first to put forth. Nor is this an illogical argument; for, though the credibility of the New Testament itself may certainly be reasoned out from the truth of the Pentateuch once established, it is still very far from depending on that circumstance exclusively, or even principally. The New Testament demands acceptance on its own merits, on merits distinct from those on which the books of Moses rest, therefore (so far as it does so) it may fairly give its suffrage for their veracity, valeat quantum valet: [it may avail as far as it goes;] and surely it is a very improbable thing, that two dispensations, separated by an interval of some fifteen hundred years, each exhibiting prophecies of its own, since fulfilled; each asserting miracles of its own, on strong evidence of its own; that two dispensations, with such individual claims to be believed, should also be found to stand in the closest relation to one another, and yet both turn out impostures after all. 10. Above all, there is a comparative purity in the theology and morality of the Pentateuch, which argues not only its truth, but its high original; for how else are we to account for a system like that of Moses, in such an age and among such a people; that the doctrine of the unity, the self-existence, the providence, the perfections of the great God of heaven and earth, should thus have blazed forth (how far more brightly than even in the vaunted schools of Athens at its most refined era!) from the midst of a nation, of themselves ever plunging into gross and grovelling idolatry; and that principles of social duty, of benevolence, and of self-restraint, extending even to the thoughts of the heart, should have been the produce of an age which the very provisions of the Levitical law itself show to have been full of savage and licentious abominations? Exod. iii, 14; xx, 3–17; Lev. xix, 2, 18; Deut. vi, 4; xxx, 6. Such are some of the internal evidences for the veracity of the books of Moses. 11. Then the situation in which the Jews actually found themselves placed, as a matter of fact, is no slight argument for the truth of the Mosaic accounts; reminded, as they were, by certain memorials observed from year to year, of the great events of their early history, just as they are recorded in the writings of Moses, memorials universally recognised both in their object and in their authority. The passover, for instance, celebrated by all, no man doubting its meaning, no man in all Israel assigning to it any other origin than one, viz. that of being a contemporary monument of a miracle

displayed in favour of the people of Israel; by right of which credentials, and no other, it summoned from all quarters of the world, at great cost, and inconvenience, and danger, the dispersed Jews, none disputing the obligation to obey the summons. 12. Then the heroic devotion with which the Israelites continued to regard the law, even long after they had ceased to cultivate the better part of it, even when that very law only served to condemn its worshippers, so that they would offer themselves up by thousands, with their children and wives, as martyrs to the honour of their temple, in which no image, even of an emperor, who could scourge them with scorpions for their disobedience, should be suffered to stand, and they live: so that rather than violate the sanctity of the Sabbath day, the bravest men in arms would lay down their lives as tamely as sheep, and allow themselves to be burned in the holes where they had taken refuge from their cruel and cowardly pursuers. All this points to their law, as having been at first promulgated under circumstances too awful to be forgotten even after the lapse of ages. 13. Then again, the extraordinary degree of national pride with which the Jews boasted themselves to be God's peculiar people, as if no nation ever was or ever could be so nigh to him; a feeling which the early teachers of Christianity found an insuperable obstacle to the progress of the Gospel among them, and which actually did effect its ultimate rejection, this may well seem to be founded upon a strong traditional sense of uncommon tokens of the Almighty's regard for them above all other nations of the earth, which they had heard with their ears, or their fathers had declared unto them, even the noble works that he had done in the old time before them. 14. Then again, the constant craving after a sign," which beset them in the latter days of their history, as a lively certificate of the prophet; and not after a sign only, but after such a one as they would themselves prescribe: What sign showest thou, that we may see, and believe? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert," John vi, 31. This desire, so frequently expressed, and with which they are so frequently reproached, looks like the relic of an appetite engendered in other times, when they had enjoyed the privilege of more intimate communion with God; it seems the wake, as it were, of miracles departed. 15. Lastly, the very onerous nature of the law; so studiously meddling with all the occupations of life, great and small;--this yoke would scarcely have been endured, without the strongest assurance, on the part of those who were galled by it, of the authority by which it was imposed. For it met them with some restraint or other at every turn. Would they plough? then it must not be with an ox and an ass. Would they sow? then must not the seed be mixed. Would they reap? then must they not reap clean. Would they make bread? then must they set apart dough enough for the consecrated loaf. Did they find a bird's nest? then must they let the old bird fly away. Did they hunt? then they must shed the blood of their game, and 677cover it with dust. Did they plant a fruit tree? for three years was the fruit to be uncircumcised.

Did they shave their beards? they were not to cut the corners. Did they weave a garment? then must it be only with threads prescribed. Did they build a house? they must put rails and battlements on the roof. Did they buy an estate? at the year of jubilee, back it must go to its owner. All these (and how many more of the same kind might be named!) are enactments which it must have required extraordinary influence in the lawgiver to enjoin, and extraordinary reverence for his powers to perpetuate.

Still, after all, says Mr. Blunt, unbelievers may start difficulties,--this I dispute not; difficulties, too, which we may not always be able to answer, though I think we may be always able to neutralize them. It may be a part of our trial, that such difficulties should exist and be encountered; for there can be no reason why temptations should not be provided for the natural pride of our understanding, as well as for the natural lusts of our flesh. To many, indeed, they would be the more formidable of the two, perhaps to the angels who kept not their first estate they proved so. With such facts, however, before me, as these which I have submitted to my readers, I can come to no conclusion but one,--that when we read the writings of Moses, we read no cunningly devised fables, but solemn and safe records of great and marvellous events, which court examination, and sustain it; records of such apparent veracity and faithfulness, that I can understand our Lord to have spoken almost without a figure, when he said, that he who believed not Moses, neither would he be persuaded though one rose from the dead.

MOTH, עֵשׂ, Job iv, 19; and עֵשׂ, Job xiii, 28; xxvii, 18; Psalm vi, 7; xxxi, 9, 10; xxxix, 11; Isaiah l, 9; Hosea v, 12. The clothes moth is the *tinea argentea*; of a white, shining silver, or pearl colour. It is clothed with shells, fourteen in number, and these are scaly. Albin asserts this to be the insect that eats woollen stuffs; and says that it is produced from a gray speckled moth, that flies by night, creeps among woollens, and there lays her eggs, which, after a little time, are hatched as worms, and in this state they feed on their habitation, till they change into a chrysalis, and thence emerge into moths. The young moth, or moth worm," says the Abbé Pluche, upon leaving the egg which a papilio had lodged upon a piece of stuff commodious for her purpose, finds a proper place of residence, grows and feeds upon the nap, and likewise builds with it an apartment, which is fixed to the groundwork of the stuff with several cords and a little glue. From an aperture in this habitation, the moth worm devours and demolishes all about him; and, when he has cleared the place, he draws out all the fastenings of his tent; after which he carries it to some little distance, and then fixes it with the slender cords in a new situation. In this manner he continues to live at our expense, till he is satisfied with his food, at which period he is first transformed into the nympha, and then changed into the papilio."



The allusions to this insect in the sacred writings are very striking: Fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilings. For the moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool." They shall perish with as little noise as a garment under the tooth of a moth, Isaiah li, 7, 8. In the prophecies of Hosea, God himself says, I will be as a moth unto Ephraim, and as a lion;" that is, I will send silent and secret judgments upon him, which shall imperceptibly waste his beauty, corrode his power, and diminish his strength, and will finish his destruction with open and irresistible calamities. Or the meaning may be, As the moth crumbles into dust under the slightest pressure, or the gentlest touch, so man dissolves with equal ease, and vanishes into darkness, under the finger of the Almighty. Deeply sensible of this affecting truth, the royal Psalmist earnestly deprecates the judgments of God, humbly confessing his own weakness, and the inability of every man to endure his frown: Remove thy stroke away from me: I am consumed by the blow of thy hand. When thou with rebukes doth correct man for iniquity, thou makest his beauty to consume away like a moth: surely every man is vanity. Selah," Psalm xxxix, 10, 11. Such, in the estimation of Job, is the fading prosperity of a wicked man: He buildeth his house as a moth, and as a booth that the keeper maketh," Job xxvii, 18. His unrighteous acquisitions shall be of short continuance; they shall moulder insensibly away, returning to the lawful owner, or pass into the possession of others. It is in this sense that the Lord threatens: I will be unto Ephraim as a moth," Hosea v, 12. By the secret curse of God he shall fade away, and whatever is most precious in his estimation shall be gradually dissolved and consumed, as a garment eaten by the moth. The same allusion is involved in the direction of our Lord to his disciples: Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal," Matthew vi, 19, 20. The word treasure commonly suggests to our minds the idea of some durable substance, as precious stones, gold, and silver, upon which the persevering industry of a moth can make no impression; but, in the language of inspiration, it denotes every thing collected together which men reckon valuable. The Jews had treasures of raiment as well as of corn, of wine, of oil, of honey, Jer. xli, 8; and of gold, silver, and brass, Ezek. xxxiii, 4; Dan. xi, 43. The robes of princes were a part of their treasure, upon which they often set a particular value. Rich vestments made a conspicuous figure in the treasury of Ulysses. These were, from their nature, exposed to the depredations of the moth; fabricated of perishing materials, they were liable to be prematurely consumed, or taken away by fraud or violence; but the favour of God, and the graces of his Spirit, and the enjoyment of eternal happiness, are neither liable to internal decay

nor external violence, and by consequence, are the proper objects of our highest regard, chief solicitude, and constant pursuit. It is also likely, that by moth” our Lord meant all the kinds of small insects which devour or spoil the different kinds of property, such as corn, honey, fruits, &c, which were treasured up for the future. These, in warm countries, are very numerous and destructive.

MOURNING. See Burial and Dead.

MOUSE, עכבר, in Chaldee acalbar, probably the same with the aliarbui of the Arabians or the jerboa, Leviticus xi, 29; 1 Samuel vi, 4, 5, 11, 18; Isaiah xlvi, 17. All interpreters acknowledge that the Hebrew word achbar signifies a mouse,” and more especially a field mouse.” Moses declares it to be unclean, which insinuates that it was sometimes eaten; and, indeed, it is affirmed that the Jews were so oppressed with famine during the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans, that, notwithstanding this prohibition, they were compelled to eat dogs, mice, and rats. Isaiah, lxvi, 17, justly reproaches the Jews with eating the flesh of mice and other things that were impure and abominable. It is known what spoil was made by mice in the fields of the Philistines, 1 Sam. vi, 5, 6, &c, after this people had brought into the country the ark of the Lord; so that they were obliged to take the resolution to send it back, accompanied with mice and emerods of gold, as an atonement for the irreverence they had committed, and to avert from their land the vengeance that pursued them. Judea has suffered by these animals in other times. William, archbishop of Tyre, records, that in the beginning of the twelfth century a penitential council was held at Naplouse, where five and twenty canons were framed for the correction of the manners of the inhabitants of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem, who, they apprehended, had provoked God to bring upon them the calamities of earthquakes, war, and famine. This last the archbishop ascribes to locusts and devouring mice, which had for four years together so destroyed the fruits of the earth, as seemed to cause almost a total failure in their crops. Bochart has collected many curious accounts relative to the terrible devastation made by these animals.

MULBERRY TREE, 2, בכא, Sam. v, 23, 24; 1 Chronicles xiv, 14, 15; Psalm lxxxiv, 7. The LXX, in Chronicles, render the word by ἀπίων, pear trees;” so Aquila and the Vulgate, both in Samuel and Chronicles, pyrorum.” Others translate it the mulberry tree.” More probably it is the large shrub which the Arabs still call baca;” and which gave name to the valley where it abounded. Of this valley Celsius remarks, that it was rugged and embarrassed with bushes and stones, which could not be passed through without labour and tears;” referring to Psalm lxxxiv, 7; and the rough valley,” Deut. xxi, 4; and he quotes from a manuscript of Abu'l Fideli a

description of the tree which grew there, and mentions it as bearing a fruit of an acrid taste.

MULE, 2, פֶּרֶד Sam. xiii, 29; 1 Kings i, 33; x, 25, &c. A mongrel kind of quadruped, between the horse and the ass. Its form bears a considerable resemblance to the last mentioned animal; but in its disposition it is rather vicious and intractable; so that its obstinacy has become a proverb. With this creature the early ages were probably unacquainted. It is very certain the Jews did not breed mules, because it was forbidden them to couple together two creatures of different species, Lev. xix, 19. But they were not prohibited the making use of them: thus we find in David's time that they had become very common, and made up a considerable part of the equipage of princes, 2 Sam. xiii, 29; xviii, 9; 1 Kings i, 33, 38, 44; x, 25; 2 Chron. ix, 24.

MURDER. Among the Hebrews murder was always punished with death; but involuntary homicide, only by banishment. Cities of refuge were appointed for involuntary manslaughter, whither the slayer might retire and continue in safety till the death of the high priest, Num. xxxv, 28. Then the offender was at liberty to return to his own house, if he pleased. A murderer was put to death without remission, and the kinsman of the murdered person might kill him with impunity. Money could not redeem his life: he was dragged away from the altar, if he had there taken refuge. When a dead body was found in the fields of a person slain by a murderer unknown, Moses commanded that the elders and judges of the neighbouring places should resort to the spot, Deut. xxi, 1–8. The elders of the city nearest to it were to take a heifer which had never yet borne the yoke, and were to lead it into some rude and uncultivated place, which had not been ploughed or sowed, where they were to cut its throat. The priests of the Lord, with the elders and magistrates of the city, were to come near the dead body, and, washing their hands over the heifer that had been slain, were to say, Our hands have not shed this blood, nor have our eyes seen it shed. Lord, be favourable to thy people Israel, and impute not to us this blood, which has been shed in the midst of our country." This ceremony may inform us how much horror they conceived at the crime of murder; and it shows their fear that God might avenge it on the whole country; which was supposed to contract pollution by the blood spilt in it, unless it were expiated, and avenged on him who had occasioned it, if he could be discovered.

MUSIC is probably nearly coeval with our race, or, at least, with the first attempts to preserve the memory of transactions. Before the invention of writing, the history of remarkable events was committed to memory, and handed down by oral tradition. The knowledge of laws and of useful arts was preserved in the same way. Rhythm and song were probably soon

found important helps to the memory; and thus the muses became the early instructors of mankind. Nor was it long, we may conjecture, before dancing and song united contributed to festivity, or to the solemnities of religion. The first instruments of music were probably of the pulsatile kind; and rhythm, it is likely, preceded the observation of those intervals of sound which are so pleasing to the ear. The first mention of stringed instruments, however, precedes the deluge. Tubal, the sixth descendant from Cain, was the father of all such as handle the harp and the organ." About five hundred and fifty years after the deluge, or B. C. 1800, according to the common chronology, both vocal and instrumental music are spoken of as things in general use: And Laban said, What hast thou done, that thou hast stolen away unawares to me, and carried away my daughters, as captives taken with the sword? Wherefore didst thou flee away secretly, and steal away from me; and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth and with songs, with tabret and with harp?" Gen. xxxi, 26, 27.

Egypt has been called the cradle of the arts and sciences, and there can be no doubt of the very early civilization of that country. To the Egyptian Mercury, or Thoth, who is called Trismegistos, or thrice illustrious," is ascribed the invention of the lyre, which had at first only three strings. It would be idle to mention the various conjectures how these strings were tuned, or to try to settle the chronology of this invention. The single flute, which they called photinx, is also ascribed to the Egyptians. Its shape was that of a horn, of which, no doubt, it was originally made. Before the invention of these instruments, as Dr. Burney justly observes, music could have been little more than metrical, as no other instruments except those of percussion were known. When the art was first discovered of refining and sustaining tones, the power of music over mankind was probably irresistible, from the agreeable surprise which soft and lengthened sounds must have occasioned." The same learned writer has given a drawing, made under his own eye, of an Egyptian musical instrument, represented on a very ancient obelisk at Rome, brought from Egypt by Augustus. This obelisk is supposed to have been erected at Heliopolis, by Sesostris, near four hundred years before the Trojan war. The most remarkable thing in this instrument is, that it is supplied with a neck, so that its two strings were capable of furnishing a great number of sounds. This is a contrivance which the Greeks, with all their ingenuity, never hit upon. I have never been able," says the doctor, to discover in any remains of Greek sculpture, an instrument furnished with a neck; and Father Montfaucon says that in examining the representations of near five hundred ancient lyres, harps, and citharas, he never met with one in which there was any contrivance for shortening the strings during the time of performance, as by a neck and finger board." From the long residence of the Hebrews in Egypt, it is no improbable conjecture that their music was derived from that source.

However that may be, music, vocal and instrumental, made one important part of their religious service. If the excellence of the music was conformable to the sublimity of the poetry which it accompanied, there would be no injustice in supposing it unspeakably superior to that of every other people; and the pains that were taken to render the tabernacle and temple music worthy of the subjects of their lofty odes, leaves little doubt that it was so. That the instruments were loud and sonorous, will appear from what follows; but as the public singing was performed in alternate responses, or the chorus of all succeeded to those parts of the psalm which were sung only by the appointed leaders, instruments of this kind were necessary to command and control the voices of so great a number as was usually assembled on high occasions.

The Hebrews insisted on having music at marriages, on anniversary birth days, on the days which reminded them of victories over their enemies, at the inauguration of their kings, in their public worship, and when they were coming from afar to attend the great festivals of their nation, Isaiah xxx, 29. In the tabernacle and the temple, the Levites were the lawful musicians; but on other occasions any one might use musical instruments who chose. There was this exception, however: the holy silver trumpets were to be blown only by the priests, who, by the sounding of them, proclaimed the festival days, assembled the leaders of the people, and gave the signal for the battle and for the retreat, Num. x, 1–10. David, in order to give the best effect to the music of the tabernacle, divided the four thousand Levites into twenty-four classes, who sung psalms, and accompanied them with music. Each of these classes was superintended by a leader, placed over it; and they performed the duties which devolved upon them, each class a week at a time in succession, 1 Chron. xvi, 5; xxiii, 4, 5; xxv, 1–31; 2 Chron. v, 12, 13. The classes collectively, as a united body, were superintended by three directors. This arrangement was subsequently continued by Solomon after the erection of the temple, and was transmitted till the time of the overthrow of Jerusalem. It was indeed sometimes interrupted, during the reign of the idolatrous kings, but was restored by their successors, 2 Chron. v, 12–14; xxix, 27; xxxv, 15. It was even continued after the captivity, Ezra iii, 10; Neh. xii, 45–47; 1 Mac. iv, 54; xiii, 51. It should be remarked, however, that neither music nor poetry attained to the same excellence after the captivity as before that period.

There were women singers as well as men in the temple choir; for in the book of Ezra, among those who returned from the Babylonish captivity, there are said to have been two hundred, Ezra ii, 65; and in Nehemiah vii, 67, we read of two hundred and forty-five singing men and women. The Jewish doctors will, indeed, by no means admit there were any female voices in the temple choir; and as for those משררות, meshoreroth, as they

are called in the Hebrew, they suppose them to be the 680 wives of those who sung. Nevertheless, the following passage makes it evident that women, likewise, were thus employed: God gave to Heman fourteen sons and three daughters; and all these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of the Lord, with cymbals, psalteries, and harps, for the service of the house of God," 1 Chron. xxv, 5, 6. Instrumental music was first introduced into the Jewish service by Moses; and afterward, by the express command of God, was very much improved with the addition of several instruments in the reign of David. When Hezekiah restored the temple service, which had been neglected in his predecessor's reign, "he set the Levites in the house of the Lord, with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet; for so was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets," 2 Chron. xxix, 25.

The harp, כנור, kinnor, was the most ancient of the class of stringed instruments, Gen. iv, 21. It was sometimes called שמינית, or eight stringed," 1 Chron. xv, 21; Psalm vi, 1; xii, 1; although, as we may gather from the coins or medals of the Maccabean age, there were some harps which were furnished with only three strings. The nablum or psaltery, ναβλίον, ναύλα, נבל, is first mentioned in the Psalms of David. In Psalms xxxiii, 2, and cxliv, 9, it is called עשור, a ten-stringed instrument;" but in Psalm xcii, 3, it is distinguished from it. Josephus assigns to it twelve strings, which, taken in connection with the fact above stated, leaves us to conclude that it sometimes had ten and sometimes twelve strings. It was not played with a bow or fret, but with the fingers: the act of playing it is expressed in Hebrew by the word מור. It resembled in form a right-angled triangle, or the Greek delta, ∇, inverted. The body of it was of wood and hollow, and was enclosed with a piece of leather tensely drawn. The chords were extended on the outside of the leather, and were fixed at one end into the transverse part of the triangular body of the instrument. Such is its form at the present day in the east; but it has only five strings in its modern shape, 2 Sam. vi, 5; 1 Kings x, 12. There was another instrument of this kind used in Babylonia: it was triangular in form. In Greek it is called σαμβύκη; in Hebrew, סבכא and שבכא. It had originally only four, but subsequently twenty, strings, Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15. Among their wind instruments was the organ, so called in the English version, in Hebrew, עוגב, Gen. iv, 21. It may be styled the ancient shepherd's pipe, corresponding most nearly to the σύριγξ, or the pipe of Pan among the Greeks. It consisted at first of only one or two, but afterward of about seven, pipes made of reeds, and differing from each other in length. The instrument called משרוקיתא, used in Babylon, Dan. iii, 5, was of a similar construction. נחלול, נחלול, and נקב, chalil, nechiloth, and nekeb, are wind instruments made of various materials, such as wood, reeds, horns, and bones. As far as we may be

permitted to judge from the three kinds of pipes now used in the east, the Hebrew instrument called nechiloth is the one that is double in its structure; chalil is perhaps the one of simpler form, having a single stem with an orifice through it; while nekeb answers to the one without an orifice, Isaiah v, 12; xxx, 29; Jer. xlvi, 36; Psalm v, 1; Ezek. xxviii, 13. סומפניה, or, according to the marginal reading, סיפניא, Dan. iii, 5, 10, was a wind instrument made of reeds, by the Syrians called sambonja, by the Greeks samponja, and by the Italians zampogna. According to Servius, it was of a crooked shape. קרן, the horn or crooked trumpet, was a very ancient instrument. It was made of the horns of oxen, which were cut off at the smaller extremity, and thus presented an orifice which extended through. In progress of time, rams' horns were hollowed and employed for the same purpose. It is probable that in some instances it was made of brass, fashioned so as to resemble a horn. It was greatly used in war, and its sound resembled thunder. תְּחִיָּוָה, chatsoteroth, the silver trumpet, was straight, a cubit in length, hollow throughout, and at the larger extremity shaped so as to resemble the mouth of a small bell. In times of peace, when the people or the rulers were to be assembled together, this trumpet was blown softly. When the camps were to move forward, or the people to march to war, it was sounded with a deeper note.

There were several sorts of drums. The תֹּפִים תָּף, toph, rendered in the English version tabret and timbrel, Gen. xxxi, 27, consisted of a circular hoop, either of wood or brass, three inches and six-tenths wide, was covered with a skin tensely drawn, and hung round with small bells. It was held in the left hand, and beaten to notes of music with the right. The ladies through all the east, even to this day, dance to the sound of this instrument, Exod. xv, 20; Job xvii, 6; xxi, 12; 2 Sam. vi, 5. The cymbals, צִלְצְלִים, tseltselim, מצלות, were of two kinds formerly, as there are to this day, in the east. The first consisted of two flat pieces of metal or plates: the musician held one of them in his right hand, the other in his left, and smote them together, as an accompaniment to other instruments. This cymbal and the mode of using it may be often seen in modern armies. The second kind of cymbals, consisted of four small plates attached, two to each hand, which the ladies, as they danced, smote together. But מצלות, Zech. xiv, 20, rendered in the English version bells, are not musical instruments, as some suppose, nor indeed bells, but concave pieces or plates of brass, which were sometimes attached to horses for the sake of ornament.

MUSTARD, σίναπι, Matt. xiii, 32; xvii, 20; Mark iv, 31; Luke xiii, 19; xvii, 6; a well known garden herb. Christ compares the kingdom of heaven to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and sowed in the earth, which indeed," said he, is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and

lodge in the branches 681thereof,” Matt. xiii, 31, 32. This expression will not appear strange,” says Sir Thomas Browne, if we recollect that the mustard seed, though it be not simply and in itself the smallest of seeds, yet may be very well believed to be the smallest of such as are apt to grow unto a ligneous substance, and become a kind of tree.” The expression, also, that it might grow into such dimensions that birds might lodge on its branches, may be literally conceived, if we allow the luxuriancy of plants in India above our northern regions. And he quotes upon this occasion what is recorded in the Jewish story, of a mustard tree that was to be climbed like a fig tree. The Talmud also mentions one whose branches were so extensive as to cover a tent. Without insisting on the accuracy of this, we may gather from it that we should not judge of eastern vegetables by those which are familiar to ourselves. Scheuchzer describes a species of mustard which grows several feet high, with a tapering stalk, and spreads into many branches. Of this arborescent or treelike vegetable, he gives a print; and Linnæus mentions a species whose branches were real wood, which he names *sinapi erucoides*. But whatever kind of tree our Lord meant, it is clear, from the fact that he never takes his illustrations from any objects but such as were familiar, and often present in the scene around him, that he spoke of one which the Jews well knew to have minute seeds, and yet to be of so large growth as to afford shelter for the birds of the air.

MYRRH, מִרְרָה, Exod. xxx, 23; Esther ii, 12; Psalm xiv, 8; Prov. vii, 17; Cant. i, 13; iii, 6; iv, 6, 14; v, 1, 5, 13; σμύρνα, Ecclus. xxiv, 15; Matt. ii, Mark xv, 23; John xix, 39; a precious kind of gum issuing by incision, and sometimes spontaneously, from the trunk and larger branches of a tree growing in Egypt, Arabia, and Abyssinia. Its taste is extremely bitter, but its smell, though strong, is not disagreeable; and among the ancients it entered into the composition of the most costly ointments. As a perfume, it appears to have been used to give a pleasant fragrance to vestments, and to be carried by females in little caskets in the bosoms. The magi, who came from the east to worship our Saviour at Bethlehem, made him a present of myrrh among other things, Matt. ii, 11.

MYRTLE, מִרְיָה, Neh. viii, 15; Isaiah xli, 19; lv, 13; Zech. i, 8–10; a shrub, sometimes growing to a small tree, very common in Judea. It has a hard woody root that sends forth a great number of small flexible branches, furnished with leaves like those of box, but much less, and more pointed: they are soft to the touch, shining, smooth, of a beautiful green, and have a sweet smell. The flowers grow among the leaves, and consist of five white petals disposed in the form of a rose: they have an agreeable perfume, and ornamental appearance. Savary, describing a scene at the end of the forest of Platanea, says, Myrtles, intermixed with laurel roses, grow in the valleys to the height of ten feet. Their snow-white flowers, bordered with



a purple edging, appear to peculiar advantage under the verdant foliage. Each myrtle is loaded with them, and they emit perfumes more exquisite than those of the rose itself. They enchant every one, and the soul is filled with the softest sensations." The myrtle is mentioned in Scripture among lofty trees, not as comparing with them in size, but as contributing with them to the beauty and richness of the scenery. Thus Isaiah, xii, 19, intending to describe a scene of varied excellence: I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, and the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree;" that is, I will adorn the dreary and barren waste with trees famed for their stature and the grandeur of their appearance, the beauty of their form, and also the fragrance of their odour. The apocryphal Baruch, v, 8, speaking of the return from Babylon, expresses the protection afforded by God to the people by the same image: Even the woods and every sweet-smelling tree shall overshadow Israel by the commandment of God."

**MYSIA**, a country of Asia Minor, having the Propontis on the north, Bithynia on the north-east and east, Phrygia on the south-east, Lydia (from which it was separated by the river Hermus) on the south, the Ægean Sea on the west, and the narrow strait, called the Hellespont, on the north-west. Mysia was visited by St. Paul in his circuit through Asia Minor; but he was not suffered by the Spirit to remain there, being directed to pass over into Macedonia, Acts xvi, 7–10. In this country stood the ancient city Troy; as also that of Pergamus, one of the seven churches of Asia. Under the Romans it was made a province of the empire, and called Hellespontus; and its inhabitants are represented by Cicero as base and contemptible to a proverb.

**MYSTERY**. The Greek word *μυστηριον* denotes, 1. Something hidden, or not fully manifest. Thus, 2 Thess. ii, 7, we read of the mystery of iniquity," which began to work in secret, but was not then completely disclosed or manifested. 2. Some sacred thing hidden or secret, which is naturally unknown to human reason, and is only known by the revelation of God. Thus, Great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified by the Spirit," &c, 1 Tim. iii, 16. The mystery of godliness, or of true religion, consisted in the several particulars here mentioned by the Apostle; particulars, indeed, which it would never have entered into the heart of man to conceive," 1 Cor. ii, 9, had not God accomplished them in fact, and published them by the preaching of his Gospel; but which, being thus manifested, are intelligible, as facts, to the meanest understanding. In like manner, the term mystery, Rom. xi, 25; 1 Cor. xv, 51, denotes what was hidden or unknown, till revealed; and thus the Apostle speaks of a man's understanding all mysteries," 1 Cor. xiii, 2; that is, all the revealed truths of the Christian religion, which is elsewhere called the mystery of faith," 1 Tim. iii, 9. And when he who spake in an unknown tongue is

said to speak mysteries," 1 Cor. xiv, 2, it is plain, that these mysteries, however unintelligible to others on account of the language in which they were spoken, were yet understood by the person himself, because he hereby edified himself," 1 Cor. xiv, 4; Acts ii, 11; x, 46. And though in 1 Cor. ii, 7, 8, we read of the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which none of the princes of this world knew;" yet, says the Apostle, we speak or declare this wisdom; and he observes, verse 10, that God had revealed the particulars of which it consisted to them by his Spirit. So when the Apostles are called stewards of the mysteries of God," 1 Cor. iv, 1, these mysteries could not mean what were, as facts, unknown to them; (because to them it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God," Matt. xiii, 11;) yea, the character here ascribed to them implies not only that they knew these mysteries themselves, but that as faithful stewards they were to dispense or make them known to others, Luke xii, 42; 1 Pet. iv, 10. In Col. ii, 2, St. Paul mentions his praying for his converts, that their hearts might be comforted to the knowledge of the mystery of God, even of the Father, and of Christ;" for thus the passage should be translated. But if, with our translators, we render ἐπίγνωσιν, acknowledgment, still the word μυστηριον can by no means exclude knowledge; for this is life eternal," saith our Lord, John xvii, 3, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." And, lastly, whatever be the particular meaning of the mystery of God," mentioned Rev. x, 7, yet it was something he had declared to (or rather by) his servants the prophets." 3. The word mystery is sometimes in the writings of St. Paul applied in a peculiar sense to the calling of the Gentiles, which he styles the mystery," Eph. iii, 3–6; and the mystery of Christ, which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy Apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of Christ by the Gospel," Rom. xvi, 25; Eph. i, 9; iii, 9; vi, 19; Col. i, 26, 27; iv, 3. 4. It denotes a spiritual truth couched under an external representation or similitude, and concealed or hidden thereby, unless some explanation of it be otherwise given. Thus, Rev. i, 20, The mystery," that is, the spiritual meaning, of the seven stars: The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches." So Rev. xvii, 5, And upon her forehead a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great," that is, Babylon in a spiritual sense, the mother of idolatry and abominations;" and, verse 7, I will tell thee the mystery" or spiritual signification of the woman." Compare Matt. xiii, 11; Mark iv, 11; Luke viii, 10; Eph. v, 32; and their respective contexts.

MYSTICS, who have also been sometimes called Quietists, are those who profess a pure and sublime devotion, accompanied with a disinterested love of God, free from all selfish considerations; and who believe that the Scriptures have a mystic and hidden sense, which must be sought after, in

order to understand their true import. Under this name some comprehend all those who profess to know that they are inwardly taught of God. The system of the Mystics proceeded upon the known doctrine of the Platonic school, which was also adopted by Origen and his disciples, that the divine nature was diffused through all human souls; or that the faculty of reason, from which proceed the health and vigour of the mind, was an emanation from God into the human soul, and comprehended in it the principles and elements of all truth, human and divine. They denied that men could, by labour or study, excite this celestial flame in their breasts; and, therefore, they disapproved highly of the attempts of those who, by definitions, abstract theorems, and profound speculations, endeavoured to form distinct notions of truth, and discover its hidden nature. On the contrary, they maintained that silence, tranquillity, repose, and solitude, accompanied with such acts as might tend to attenuate and exhaust the body, were the means by which the hidden and internal word was excited to produce its latent virtues, and to instruct men in the knowledge of divine things. They reasoned as follows: Those who behold, with a noble contempt, all human affairs, who turn away their eyes from terrestrial vanities, and shut all the avenues of the outward senses against the contagious influence of a material world, must necessarily return to God, when the spirit is thus disengaged from the impediments which prevented that happy union. And, in this blessed frame, they not only enjoy inexpressible raptures from that communion with the supreme Being, but also are invested with the inestimable privilege of contemplating truth undisguised and uncorrupted in its native purity, while others behold it in a vitiated and delusive form.”

The number of the Mystics increased in the fourth century, under the influence of the Grecian fanatic, who gave himself out for Dionysius the Areopagite, a disciple of St. Paul, and who probably lived about this period; and, by pretending to higher degrees of perfection than other Christians, and practising great austerities, their cause gained ground, especially in the eastern provinces, in the fifth century. A copy of the pretended works of Dionysius was sent by Balbus to Lewis the meek, A. D. 824, which kindled the holy flame of Mysticism in the western provinces, and filled the Latins with the most enthusiastic admiration of this new system. In the twelfth century, these Mystics took the lead in their method of expounding the Scriptures. In the thirteenth, they were the most formidable antagonists of the schoolmen; and, toward the close of the fourteenth, many of them resided and propagated their tenets in almost every part of Europe. They had, in the fifteenth century, many persons of distinguished merit in their number. In the sixteenth, previously to the reformation, if any sparks of real piety subsisted under the despotic empire of superstition, they were chiefly to be found among the Mystics; and in the seventeenth, the radical principle of Mysticism was adopted by the Behmists, Bourignonists, and Quietists.

The Mystics propose a disinterestedness of love, without other motives, and profess to feel, in the enjoyment of the temper itself, an abundant reward; and passive contemplation in the state of perfection to which they aspire. They lay little or no stress upon the outward ceremonies and ordinances of religion, but dwell chiefly upon the inward operations of the mind. It is not uncommon for them to allegorize certain passages of Scripture; at the same time they do not deny the literal sense, as having an allusion to the inward experience of believers. Thus, according to them, the word Jerusalem, which is the name of the capital of Judea, signifies, allegorically, the church militant; morally, a believer; and mysteriously, heaven. That sublime passage also in Genesis, Let there be light, and there was light," which is, according to the letter, corporeal light, signifies, allegorically, the Messiah; morally, grace; and mysteriously, beatitude, or the light of glory. All this appears to be harmless; yet we must be careful not to give way to the sallies of a lively imagination in interpreting Scripture. Woolston is said to have been led to reject the Old Testament by spiritualizing and allegorizing the New.

The Mystics are not confined to any particular denomination of Christians, but may be found in most countries, and among many descriptions of religionists. Among the number of Mystics may be reckoned many singular characters, especially Behmen, a shoemaker at Gorlitz, in Germany; Molinos, a Spanish priest, in the seventeenth century; Madam Guion, a French lady who made a great noise in the religious world; and the celebrated Madame Bourignon, who wrote a work entitled, *The Light of the World*," which is full of Mystic extravagancies. Fenelon, also, the learned and amiable archbishop of Cambrai, favoured the same sentiments, for which he was reprimanded by the pope. His work, entitled, *An Explication of the Maxims of the Saints*," which abounds with Mystical sentiments was condemned; and to the pope's sentence against him, the good archbishop quietly submitted, and even read it publicly himself in the cathedral of Cambrai. In this whole affair, his chief opponent is said to have been the famous Bossuet, bishop of Meaux. Mr. William Law, author of the *Serious Call*," &c, degenerated in the latter part of his life, into all the singularities of Mysticism. In the best sense, Mysticism is to be regarded as an error arising out of partial views of the truth, or truth made erroneous, as being put out of its proper relation to, and connection with, other truths. As it respects the inward life of religion, its tendency is to a species of fanaticism, and to induce a contempt for divinely appointed ordinances. In many, however, it has been happily tempered by good principles; and too frequently has all Scriptural Christianity, in its inward influence, been branded with the name of Mysticism.

NAAMAN, general of the army of Benhadad, king of Syria, mentioned 2 Kings v. He appears to have been a Gentile idolater; but being miraculously cured of his leprosy by the power of the God of Israel, and the direction of his Prophet Elisha, he renounced his idolatry, and acknowledged this God to be the only true God: Behold, now I know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel," 2 Kings v, 15, and promised, for the time to come, that he would worship none other but Jehovah, verse 17. He also requested the prophet, that he might have two mules' load of earth to carry home with him from the land of Israel, most probably intending to build an altar with it in his own country; which seems, indeed, to be implied in the reason with which he enforces his request: "Shall there not, I pray thee, be given to thy servant two mules' burden of earth; for thy servant will henceforth offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice to other gods but unto Jehovah." He farther says, In this the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goes into the house of Rimmon, to worship there, and he leaneth upon my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon; when I bow down in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing," verse 18; which some understand to be a reserve, denoting that he would renounce idolatry no farther than was consistent with his worldly interest, with his prince's favour, and his place at court. But, if so, the prophet would hardly have dismissed him with a blessing, saying, Go in peace," verse 19. Others, therefore, suppose, that in these words he begs pardon for what he had done in times past, not for what he should continue to do. They observe, that השתחויתי, though rendered in the future tense by the Targum, and by all the ancient versions, is really the preterperfect; and they, therefore, understand it,--"when I have bowed myself," or, because I have bowed myself" in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant. With this sense Dr. Lightfoot agrees, and it is defended by the learned Bochart in a large dissertation on the case of Naaman. Yet it does not seem very probable, that, if he meant this for a penitential acknowledgment of his former idolatry, he should only mention what he had done as the king's servant, and omit his own voluntary worship of the idol. The more probable opinion, therefore, is, that he consulted the prophet, whether it was lawful for him, having renounced idolatry, and publicly professed the worship of the true God, still, in virtue of his office, to attend his master in the temple of Rimmon, in order that he might lean upon him, either out of state, or perhaps out of bodily weakness; because, if he attended him, as he had formerly done, he could not avoid bowing down when he did. To this the prophet returns no direct answer; making no other reply than, Go in peace;" putting it, 684probably, upon his conscience to act as that should dictate, and not being willing to relieve him from this trial of his recent faith.

After this we have no farther mention of Naaman. But in the following account of the wars between Syria and Israel, Benhadad seems to have

commanded his army in person; from whence Mr. Bedford infers, that Naaman was dismissed from the command for refusing to worship Rimmon. But the premises are not sufficient to support the conclusion; for it appears that Benhadad had commanded his army in person twice before; once in the siege of Samaria, 1 Kings xx, 1, and once at Aphek, verse 26. Yet, from the total silence concerning Naaman, it is probably enough conjectured, that he either died, or resigned, or was dismissed, soon after his return.

NABOTH, an Israelite of the city of Jezreel, who lived under Ahab, king of the ten tribes, and had a fine vineyard near the king's palace. Ahab coveted his property; but Naboth, according to the law, Lev. xxv, 23, 24, refused to sell it: and beside, it was a disgrace for a Hebrew to alienate the inheritance of his ancestors. Ahab, returning into his house, threw himself on his bed, and refused to eat, when Jezebel, his wife, took upon herself to procure the vineyard. She wrote letters in Ahab's name, and sealed them with the king's seal, and sent them to the elders of Jezreel, directing them to publish a fast, to place Naboth among the chief of the people, suborn against him two sons of Belial, or two false witnesses, who might depose, that Naboth had blasphemed God and the king. Accordingly, Naboth was condemned and stoned for the supposed crime, which brought upon Ahab and Jezebel the severest maledictions, 1 Kings xxi. See Ahab.

NADAB, son of Aaron, and brother to Abihu. He offered incense to the Lord with strange fire, that is, with common fire, and not with that which had been miraculously lighted upon the altar of burnt-offerings. Therefore, he was slain by the Lord, together with his brother Abihu, Lev. x, 1, &c.

NAHOR, son of Terah, and brother of Abraham, Gen. xi, 26. Neither the year of his birth nor of his death is exactly known. Nahor married Milcah, the daughter of Haran, by whom he had several sons, namely, Huz, Buz, Kemuel, Chesed, Hazo, Pildash, Jidlaph, and Bethuel. Nahor fixed his habitation at Haran, which is therefore called the city of Nahor, Gen. xi, 29; xxii, 20–22; xxiv, 10.

NAHUM is supposed to have been a native of Elcosh or Elcosha, a village in Galilee, and to have been of the tribe of Simeon. There is great uncertainty about the exact period in which he lived; but it is generally allowed that he delivered his predictions between the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities, and probably about B. C. 715. They relate solely to the destruction of Nineveh by the Babylonians and Medes, and are introduced by an animated display of the attributes of God. Of all the minor prophets, says Bishop Lowth, none seems to equal Nahum in sublimity, ardour, and boldness. His prophecy forms an entire and regular poem. The

exordium is magnificent and truly august. The preparation for the destruction of Nineveh, and the description of that destruction, are expressed in the most glowing colours; and at the same time the prophet writes with a perspicuity and elegance which have a just claim to our highest admiration.

NAIL. The nail of Jael's tent with which she killed Sisera, is called יִתָּה; it was formed for penetrating earth, or other hard substances, when driven by sufficient force, as with a hammer, &c; it includes the idea of strength. The orientals, in fitting up their houses, were by no means inattentive to the comfort and satisfaction arising from order and method. Their furniture was scanty and plain; but they were careful to arrange the few household utensils they needed, so as not to encumber the apartments to which they belonged. Their devices for this purpose, which, like every part of the structure, bore the character of remarkable simplicity, may not correspond with our ideas of neatness and propriety; but they accorded with their taste, and sufficiently answered their design. One of these consisted in a set of spikes, nails, or large pegs fixed in the walls of the house, upon which they hung up the movables and utensils in common use that belonged to the room. These nails they do not drive into the walls with a hammer or mallet, but fix them there when the house is building; for if the walls are of brick, they are too hard, or if they consist of clay, too soft and mouldering, to admit the action of the hammer. The spikes, which are so contrived as to strengthen the walls, by binding the parts together, as well as to serve for convenience, are large, with square heads like dice, and bent at the ends so as to make them cramp irons. They commonly place them at the windows and doors, in order to hang upon them, when they choose, veils and curtains, although they place them in other parts of the room, to hang up other things of various kinds. The care with which they fixed these nails, may be inferred, as well from the important purposes they were meant to serve, as from the promise of the Lord to Eliakim: And I will fasten him as a nail in a sure place," Isa. xxii, 23. It is evident from the words of the prophet, that it was common in his time to suspend upon them the utensils belonging to the apartment: Will men take a pin of it to hang any vessel thereon?" Ezek. xv, 3. The word used in Isaiah for a nail of this sort, is the same which denotes the stake, or large pin of iron, which fastened down to the ground the cords of their tents. These nails, therefore, were of necessary and common use, and of no small importance in all their apartments; and if they seem to us mean and insignificant, it is because they are unknown to us, and inconsistent with our notions of propriety, and because we have no name for them but what conveys to our ear a low and contemptible idea. It is evident from the frequent allusions in Scripture to these instruments, 685that they were not regarded with contempt or indifference by the natives of Palestine. Grace has been shown from the Lord our God," said

Ezra, to leave us a remnant to escape, and to give us a nail in his holy place," Ezra ix, 8; or, as explained in the margin, a constant and sure abode. The dignity and propriety of the metaphor appear from the use which the Prophet Zechariah makes of it: Out of him cometh forth the corner, out of him the nail, out of him the battle bow, out of him every oppressor together," Zech. x, 4. The whole frame of government, both in church and state, which the chosen people of God enjoyed, was the contrivance of his wisdom and the gift of his bounty; the foundations upon which it rested, the bonds which kept the several parts together, its means of defence, its officers and executors, were all the fruits of distinguishing goodness: even the oppressors of his people were a rod of correction in the hand of Jehovah, to convince them of sin, and restore them to his service.

NAIN, a city of Palestine, in which Jesus Christ restored the widow's son to life, as they were carrying him out to be buried. Eusebius says, that this was in the neighbourhood of Endor, and Scythopolis, two miles from Tabor, toward the south.

NAKEDNESS, NUDITY. These terms, beside their ordinary and literal meaning, sometimes signify void of succour, disarmed. So, after worshipping the golden calf, the Israelites found themselves naked in the midst of their enemies. Nakedness of the feet" was a token of respect. Moses put off his shoes to approach the burning bush. Most commentators are of opinion, that the priests served in the tabernacle with their feet naked; and afterward in the temple. In the enumeration that Moses makes of the habit and ornaments of the priests, he no where mentions any dress for the feet. Also the frequent ablutions appointed them in the temple seem to imply that their feet were naked. To uncover the nakedness of any one, is commonly put for a shameful and unlawful conjunction, or an incestuous marriage, Lev. xx, 19; Ezek. xvi, 37. Nakedness is sometimes put for being partly undressed; en déshabillé. Saul continued naked among the prophets; that is, having only his under garments on. Isaiah received orders from the Lord to go naked; that is, clothed as a slave, half clad. Thus it is recommended to clothe the naked; that is, such as are ill clothed. St. Paul says, that he was in cold, in nakedness; that is, in poverty and want of raiment. Naked is put for discovered, known, manifest. So Job xxvi, 6: Hell is naked before him." The sepulchre, the unseen state, is open to the eyes of God. St. Paul says, in the same sense, Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do," Heb. iv, 13.

NAME. A name was given to the male child at the time of its circumcision, but it is probable, previous to the introduction of that rite, that the name was given immediately after its birth. Among the orientals the appellations



given as names are always significant. In the Old Testament, we find that the child was named in many instances from the circumstances of its birth, or from some peculiarities in the history of the family to which it belonged, Gen. xvi, 11; xix, 37; xxv, 25, 26; Exod. ii, 10; xviii, 3, 4. Frequently the name was a compound one, one part being the name of the Deity, and among idolatrous nations the name of an idol. The following instances may be mentioned among others, and may stand as specimens of the whole, namely, שמואל, Samuel, hear God;" אדניה, Adonijah, God is lord;" יהוצדק, Josedech, God is just;" אתבעל, Ethbaal, a Canaanitish name, the latter part of the compound being the name of the idol deity, Baal; בלשאצר, Belshazzar, Bel," a Babylonish deity, is ruler and king." Sometimes the name had a prophetic meaning, Gen. xvii, 15; Isa. vii, 14; viii, 3; Hos. i, 4, 6, 9; Matt. i, 21; Luke i, 13, 60, 63. In the later times names were selected from those of the progenitors of a family; hence in the New Testament hardly any other than ancient names occur, Matt. i, 12; Luke i, 61; iii, 23, &c. The inhabitants of the east very frequently change their names, and sometimes do it for very slight reasons. This accounts for the fact of so many persons having two names in Scripture, Ruth i, 20, 21; 1 Sam. xiv, 49; xxxi, 2; 1 Chron. x, 2; Judges vi, 32; vii, 1; 2 Sam. xxiii, 8. Kings and princes very often changed the names of those who held offices under them, particularly when they first attracted their notice, and were taken into their employ, and when subsequently they were elevated to some new station, and crowned with additional honours, Gen. xli, 45; xvii, 5; xxxii, 28; xxxv, 10; 2 Kings xxiii, 34, 35; xxiv, 17; Dan. i, 6; John i, 42; Mark iii, 17. Hence a name, a new name, occurs tropically, as a token or proof of distinction and honour in the following among other passages, Phil. ii, 9; Heb. i, 4; Rev. ii, 17. Sometimes the names of the dead were changed; for instance that of Abel, הבל, a word which signifies breath, or something transitory as a breath, given to him after his death, in allusion to the shortness of his life, Gen. ii, 8. Sometimes proper names are translated into other languages, losing their original form, while they preserve their signification. This appears to have been the case with the proper names, which occur in the first eleven chapters of Genesis, and which were translated into the Hebrew from a language still more ancient. The orientals in some instances, in order to distinguish themselves from others of the same name, added to their own name the name of their father, grandfather, and even great grandfather. The name of God often signifies God himself; sometimes his attributes collectively; sometimes his power and authority. Of the Messiah it is said, And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords," Rev. xix, 16. In illustration of this it may be remarked, that it appears to have been an ancient custom among several nations, to adorn the images of their deities, princes, victors at their public games, and other eminent persons, with inscriptions expressive of their names, character, titles, or some circumstance which

might contribute to their honour. There are several such images yet extant, with an inscription written either on the garment, or one of the thighs. Herodotus mentions two figures of Sesostris, king of Egypt, cut upon rocks in Ionia, after his conquest of that country, with the following inscription across the breast, extending from one shoulder to the other: I conquered this country by the force of my arms." Gruter has published a naked statue made of marble, and supposed to represent the genius either of some Roman emperor, or of Antinöus, who was deified by Hadrian, with an inscription on the inside of the right thigh, written perpendicularly in Roman letters, and containing the names of three persons. Near the statue, on the same side of it, stands an oval shield with the names of two other persons written round the rim in letters of the same form. In the appendix to Dempster's *Etruria Regalis* is a female image of brass, clothed in a loose tunic down to the feet, with a shorter garment over it, on the right side of which is a perpendicular inscription in Etrurian characters, extending partly on the lower garment. This figure, from the diadem on the head, and other circumstances which accompany it, Philip Bonarota, the editor of that work, supposes to have been designed for some Etrurian deity. Montfaucon has given us a male image of the same metal, dressed in a tunic, and over that another vestment something like a Roman toga, reaching to the middle of the legs, on the bottom of which is an Etrurian inscription written horizontally. There are likewise in both those writers two male figures crowned with laurel, which Montfaucon calls combatants, as the laurel was an emblem of victory. But Bonarota takes one of them for an image of Apollo, which has a chain round the neck, a garment wrapped over the right arm, and a bracelet on the left, with half boots on the legs; the rest of the body being naked has an Etrurian inscription written downward in two lines on the inside of the left thigh. The other figure has the lower part of the body clothed in a loose vestment, with an inscription upon it over the right thigh, perpendicularly written in Roman letters, which Bonarota has thus expressed in a more distinct manner than they appear in Montfaucon: POMPONIO VIRIO I. To these may be added from Montfaucon, a marble statue of a naked combatant, with a fillet about his head in token of victory. It is drawn in two views, one exhibiting the back and the other the fore part of the body, the latter of which has in Greek letters, ΚΑΦΙΣΟΔΟΡΟΣ for ΚΑΦΙΣΟΔΩΡΟΣ, perpendicularly inscribed on the outside of the left thigh; and the former the name ΑΙΣΧΛΑΜΙΟΥ in the like characters and situation on the right thigh; these together make one inscription signifying Caphisodorus filius Æschlamii. [Caphisodorus the son of Æschlamius.]

NAOMI. See Ruth.

NAPHTALI, the sixth son of Jacob by Bilhah, Rachel's handmaid. The word Naphtali signifies wrestling, or struggling. When Rachel gave him this name, she said, "With great wrestlings have I wrestled with my sister, and I have prevailed," Gen. xxx, 8. Naphtali had but four sons, and yet at the coming out of Egypt his tribe made up fifty-three thousand four hundred men, able to bear arms. Moses, in the blessing he gave to the same tribe, says, "O Naphtali, satisfied with favour, and full with the blessing of the Lord, possess thou the west and the south," Deut. xxxiii, 23. The Vulgate reads it, "the sea and the south," and the Hebrew will admit of either interpretation, that is, the sea of Gennesareth, which was to the south by the inheritance of this tribe. His soil was very fruitful in corn and oil. His limits were extended into upper and lower Galilee, having Jordan to the east, the tribes of Asher and Zebulun to the west, Libanus to the north, and the tribe of Issachar to the south. Under Barak, their general, they and the Zebulunites fought with distinguished bravery against the army of Jabin the younger; and at the desire of Gideon they pursued the Midianites, Judges iv, 10; v, 18; vii, 23. A thousand of their captains, with thirty-seven thousand of their troops, assisted at David's coronation, and brought great quantities of provision with them, 1 Chron. xii, 34, 40. We find no person of distinguished note among them, save Barak, and Hiram the artificer. Instigated by Asa, Benhadad the elder, king of Syria, terribly ravaged the land of Naphtali; and what it suffered in after invasions by the Syrians we are partly told, 1 Kings xv, 20. The Naphtalites were, many, if not most of them, carried captive by Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, 2 Kings xv, 29. Josiah purged their country from idols. Our Saviour and his disciples, during his public ministry, resided much and preached frequently in the land of Naphtali, Isaiah ix, 1; Matt. iv, 13, 15.

NAPHTUHIM, a son, or rather the descendants of a son, of Mizraim, whose proper name is Naphtuch. Naphtuch is supposed to have given his name to Naph, Noph, or Memphis, and to have been the first king of that division of Egypt. He is, however, placed by Bochart in Libya; and is conjectured to be the Aphtuchus, or Autuchus, who had a temple somewhere here. He is farther conjectured, and not without reason, to be the original of the Heathen god Neptune; who is represented to have been a Libyan, and whose temples were generally built near the sea coast. By others, he is supposed to have peopled that part of Ethiopia between Syene and Meroe, the capital of which was called Napata.

NATHAN, a prophet of the Lord, who appeared in Israel in the time of King David, and had a great share in the confidence of this prince. His country is unknown, as also the time in which he began to prophesy. The first time we find him mentioned, is when David designed to build the temple, 2 Sam. vii, 3, &c. We find him mentioned again in the 687 affair of

David and Bathsheba, when he faithfully reproveth the king for his wicked conduct, 2 Sam. xii, 1–14. And when Adonijah began to take upon him the state, and to assume the dignity, of a sovereign, and to form a party in opposition to his brother Solomon, Nathan repaired to Bathsheba, and sent her immediately to the king with instructions what to say; and while she was yet discoursing with the king, Nathan came in, reminded David of his promise, that Solomon should be his successor, and procured Solomon to be immediately anointed king of Israel.

NATHANAEL, a disciple of our Lord. He appears to have been a pious Jew who waited for the Messiah: and upon Jesus saying to him, Before Philip called thee, I saw thee under the fig tree,” Nathanael, convinced, by some circumstance not explained, of his omniscience, exclaimed, Master, thou art the Son of God, and the King of Israel.” Many have thought that Nathanael was the same as Bartholomew. The evangelists, who mention Bartholomew, say nothing of Nathanael; and St. John, who mentions Nathanael, takes no notice of Bartholomew. We read at the end of St. John’s Gospel, that our Saviour, after his resurrection, manifested himself to Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, and the sons of Zebedee, as they were fishing in the lake of Gennesareth. We know no other circumstances of the life of this holy man.

NATURAL, ψυχικὸς, is a term that frequently occurs in the apostolic writings: The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned,” 1 Cor. ii, 14. Here it is plain that by the natural man,” is not meant a person devoid of natural judgment, reason, or conscience, in which sense the expression is often used among men. Nor does it signify one who is entirely governed by his fleshly appetites, or what the world calls a voluptuary, or sensualist. Neither does it signify merely a man in the rude state of nature, whose faculties have not been cultivated by learning and study, and polished by an intercourse with society. The Apostle manifestly takes his natural man” from among such as the world hold in the highest repute for their natural parts, their learning, and their religion. He selects him from among the philosophers of Greece, who sought after wisdom, and from among the Jewish scribes, who were instructed in the revealed law of God, 1 Cor. i, 22, 23. These are the persons whom he terms the wise, the scribes, the disputers of this world--men to whom the Gospel was a stumbling block and foolishness, 1 Cor. i, 20, 23. The natural man is here evidently opposed to, ὁ πνευματικὸς, him that is spiritual,” 1 Cor. ii, 15, even as the natural body which we derive from Adam is opposed to the spiritual body which believers will receive from Christ at the resurrection, according to 1 Cor. xv, 44, 45. Now the spiritual man is one who has the Spirit of Christ dwelling in him, Rom. viii, 9, not merely in the way of miraculous gifts, as

some have imagined, (for these were peculiar to the first age of the Christian church, and even then not common to all the saints, nor inseparably connected with salvation, 1 Cor. xiii, 1–4; Heb. vi, 4–7,) but in his saving influences of light, holiness, and consolation, whereby the subject is made to discern the truth and excellency of spiritual things, and so to believe, love, and delight in them as his true happiness. If therefore a man is called spiritual” because the Spirit of Christ dwells in him, giving him new views, dispositions, and enjoyments, then the natural man,” being opposed to such, must be one who is destitute of the Spirit, and of all his saving and supernatural effects, whatever may be his attainments in human learning and science. It is obviously upon this principle that our Lord insists upon the necessity of the new birth in order to our entering into the kingdom of heaven, John iii, 3, 5.

**NATURE.** In Scripture the word nature expresses the orderly and usual course of things established in the world. St. Paul says, to ingraft a good olive tree into a wild olive is contrary to nature, Rom. xi, 24; the customary order of nature is thereby in some measure inverted. Nature is also put for natural descent: We who are Jews by nature,” by birth, and not Gentiles,” Gal. ii, 15. We were by nature the children of wrath,” Eph. ii, 3. Nature also denotes common sense, natural instinct: Doth not even nature itself teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a shame to him?” 1 Cor. xi, 14.

**NAZARENES, or NAZARÆANS,** a name originally given to Christians in general, on account of Jesus Christ’s being of the city of Nazareth; but was, in the second century, restrained to certain judaizing Christians, who blended Christianity and Judaism together. They held that Christ was born of a virgin, and was also in a certain manner united to the divine nature. They refused to abandon the ceremonies prescribed by the law of Moses; but were far from attempting to impose the observance of these ceremonies upon Gentile Christians. They rejected those additions that were made to the Mosaic institutions by the Pharisees and doctors of the law, and admitted the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. The fathers frequently mention the Gospel of the Nazarenes, which differs nothing from that of St. Matthew, but was afterward corrupted by the Ebionites. These Nazarenes preserved this first Gospel in its primitive purity. Some of them were still in being in the time of St. Jerome, who does not reproach them with any errors.

**NAZARETH,** a little city in the tribe of Zebulun, in Lower Galilee, to the west of Tabor, and to the east of Ptolemais. This city is much celebrated in the Scriptures for having been the usual place of the residence of Jesus Christ, during the first thirty years of his life, Luke ii, 51. It was here he lived in obedience to Joseph and Mary, and hence he took the name of

Nazarene. After he had begun to execute his mission he preached here sometimes in the synagogue, Luke iv, 16. But because his countrymen had no faith in him, 688and were offended at the meanness of his original, he did not many miracles here, Matt. xiii, 54, 58, nor would he dwell in the city. So he fixed his habitation at Capernaum for the latter part of his life, Matt. iv, 13. The city of Nazareth was situated upon an eminence, and on one side was a precipice, from whence the Nazarenes designed, at one time, to cast Christ down headlong, because he upbraided them for their incredulity, Luke iv, 29.

The present state of this celebrated place is thus described by modern travellers:--Nassara, or Naszera, is one of the principal towns in the pashalic of Acre. Its inhabitants are industrious, because they are treated with less severity than those of the country towns in general. The population is estimated at three thousand, of whom five hundred are Turks; the remainder are Christians. There are about ninety Latin families, according to Burckhardt; but Mr. Connor reports the Greeks to be the most numerous: there is, beside, a congregation of Greek Catholics, and another of Maronites. The Latin convent is a very spacious and commodious building, which was thoroughly repaired and considerably enlarged in 1730. The remains of the more ancient edifice, ascribed to the mother of Constantine, may be observed in the form of subverted columns, with fragments of capitals and bases of pillars, lying near the modern building. Poccoke noticed, over a door, an old alto-relief of Judith cutting off the head of Holofernes. Within the convent is the church of the annunciation, containing the house of Joseph and Mary, the length of which is not quite the breadth of the church; but it forms the principal part of it. The columns and all the interior of the church are hung round with damask silk, which gives it a warm and rich appearance. Behind the great altar is a subterranean cavern, divided into small grottoes, where the virgin is said to have lived. Her kitchen, parlour, and bed room, are shown, and also a narrow hole in the rock, in which the child Jesus once hid himself from his persecutors. The pilgrims who visit these holy spots are in the habit of knocking off small pieces of stone from the walls, which are thus considerably enlarging. In the church a miracle is still exhibited to the faithful. In front of the altar are two granite columns, each two feet one inch in diameter, and about three feet apart. They are supposed to occupy the very places where the angel and the virgin stood at the precise moment of the annunciation. The innermost of these, that of the virgin, has been broken away, some say by the Turks, in expectation of finding treasure under it; so that," as Maundrell states, "eighteen inches' length of it is clean gone between the pillar and the pedestal." Nevertheless, it remains erect, suspended from the roof, as if attracted by a loadstone. It has evidently no support below; and, though it touches the roof, the hierophant protests that

it has none above. All the Christians of Nazareth," says Burckhardt, with the friars, of course, at their head, affect to believe in this miracle; though it is perfectly evident that the upper part of the column is connected with the roof." The fact is," says Dr. E. D. Clarke, that the capital and a piece of the shaft of a pillar of gray granite have been fastened on to the roof of the cave; and so clumsily is the rest of the hocus pocus contrived, that what is shown for the lower fragment of the same pillar resting upon the earth, is not of the same substance, but of Cipolino marble. About this pillar, a different story has been related by almost every traveller since the trick was devised. Maundrell, and Egmont and Heyman, were told that it was broken, in search of hidden treasure, by a pasha, who was struck with blindness for his impiety. We were assured that it was separated in this manner when the angel announced to the virgin the tidings of her conception. The monks had placed a rail, to prevent persons infected with the plague from coming to rub against these pillars: this had been, for many years, their constant practice, whenever afflicted with any sickness. The reputation of the broken pillar, for healing every kind of disease, prevails all over Galilee."

Burckhardt says that this church, next to that of the holy sepulchre, is the finest in Syria, and contains two tolerably good organs. Within the walls of the convent are two gardens, and a small burying ground: the walls are very thick, and serve occasionally as a fortress to all the Christians in the town. There are, at present, eleven friars in the convent: they are chiefly Spaniards. The yearly expenses of the establishment are stated to amount to upward of nine hundred pounds; a small part of which is defrayed by the rent of a few houses in the town, and by the produce of some acres of corn land: the rest is remitted from Jerusalem. The whole annual expenses of the Terra Santa convents are about fifteen thousand pounds; of which the pasha of Damascus receives about twelve thousand pounds. The Greek convent of Jerusalem, according to Burckhardt's authority, pays much more, as well to maintain its own privileges, as with a view to encroach upon those of the Latins. To the north-west of the convent is a small church, built over Joseph's work shop. Both Maundrell and Pococke describe it as in ruins; but Dr. E. D. Clarke says, This is now a small chapel, perfectly modern, and neatly whitewashed." To the west of this is a small arched building, which, they say, is the synagogue where Christ exasperated the Jews, by applying the language of Isaiah to himself. It once belonged to the Greeks; but, Hasselquist says, was taken from them by the Arabs, who intended to convert it into a mosque, but afterward sold it to the Latins. This was then so late a transaction that they had not had time to embellish it. The Mountain of the Precipitation" is at least two miles off; so that, according to this authentic tradition, the Jews must have led our Lord a marvellous way. But the said precipice is shown as that which the Messiah leaped down to escape from the Jews; and as the monks could not pitch

upon any other place frightful enough for the miracle, they contend that Nazareth formerly stood eastward of its present situation, upon a more elevated spot. Dr. E. D. Clarke, however, remarks that the situation of the modern town answers exactly to the description of St. Luke. "Induced, by the words of the Gospel, to examine the place more attentively than we should otherwise have done, we went, as it is written, out of the city, 'to the brow of the hill whereon the city is built,' and came to a precipice corresponding to the words of the evangelist. It is above the Maronite church, and, probably, the precise spot alluded to by the text."

NAZARITES, those under the ancient law who engaged by a vow to abstain from wine and all intoxicating liquors, to let their hair grow, not to enter any house polluted by having a dead corpse in it, nor to be present at any funeral. If, by accident, any one should have died in their presence, they recommenced the whole of their consecration and Nazariteship. This vow generally lasted eight days, sometimes a month, and sometimes their whole lives. When the time of their Nazariteship was expired, the priest brought the person to the door of the temple, who there offered to the Lord a he-lamb for a burnt-offering, a she-lamb for an expiatory sacrifice, and a ram for a peace-offering. They offered, likewise, loaves and cakes, with wine, for libations. After all was sacrificed and offered, the priest, or some other, shaved the head of the Nazarite at the door of the tabernacle, and burned his hair on the fire of the altar. Then the priest put into the hands of the Nazarite the shoulder of the ram roasted, with a loaf and a cake, which the Nazarite returning into the hands of the priest, he offered them to the Lord, lifting them up in the presence of the Nazarite. And from this time he might again drink wine, his Nazariteship being accomplished.

Perpetual Nazarites, as Samson and John the Baptist, were consecrated to their Nazariteship by their parents, and continued all their lives in this state, without drinking wine or cutting their hair. Those who made a vow of Nazariteship out of Palestine, and could not come to the temple when their vow was expired, contented themselves with observing the abstinence required by the law, and cutting off their hair in the place where they were: the offerings and sacrifices prescribed by Moses, to be offered at the temple, by themselves or by others for them, they deferred till a convenient opportunity. Hence it was that St. Paul, being at Corinth, and having made the vow of a Nazarite, had his hair cut off at Cenchrea, a port of Corinth, and deferred the rest of his vow till he came to Jerusalem, Acts xviii, 18. When a person found he was not in a condition to make a vow of Nazariteship, or had not leisure fully to perform it, he contented himself by contributing to the expense of sacrifices and offerings of those who had made and were fulfilling this vow; and by this means he became a partaker in such Nazariteship. When St. Paul came to Jerusalem, A. D. 58, St.



James, with other brethren, said to him, that to quiet the minds of the converted Jews he should join himself to four persons who had a vow of Nazaritship, and contribute to their charges and ceremonies; by which the new converts would perceive that he did not totally disregard the law, as they had been led to suppose, Acts xxi, 23, 24. The institution of Nazaritism is involved in much mystery; and no satisfactory reason has ever been given of it. This is certain, that it had the approbation of God, and may be considered as affording a good example of self-denial in order to be given up to the study of the law, and the practice of exact righteousness.

NEBO, the name of an idol of the Babylonians: Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth," Isaiah xlvi, 1. The word Nebo comes from a root that signifies to prophesy," and therefore may stand for an oracle. There is some probability in the opinion of Calmet, that Bel and Nebo are but one and the same deity, and that Isaiah made use of these names as synonymous. The god Bel was the oracle of the Babylonians. The name Nebo, or Nabo, is found in the composition of the names of several princes of Babylon; as Nabonassar, Nabopolassar, Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuzar-adan, Nebushasban, &c.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR THE GREAT, son and successor of Nabopolassar, succeeded to the kingdom of Chaldea, A. M. 3399. Some time previously to this, Nabopolassar had associated him in the kingdom, and sent him to recover Carchemish, which had been conquered from him four years before by Necho, king of Egypt. Nebuchadnezzar, having been successful, marched against the governor of Phenicia, and Jehoiakim, king of Judah, who was tributary to Necho, king of Egypt. He took Jehoiakim, and put him in chains in order to carry him captive to Babylon; but afterward left him in Judea, on condition of paying a large tribute. He took away several persons from Jerusalem; among others Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, all of the royal family, whom the king of Babylon caused to be carefully instructed in the language and in the learning of the Chaldeans, that they might be employed at court, Dan. i. Nabopolassar dying about the end of A. M. 3399, Nebuchadnezzar, who was then either in Egypt or in Judea, hastened to Babylon, leaving to his generals the care of bringing to Chaldea the captives whom he had taken in Syria, Judea, Phenicia, and Egypt; for, according to Berosus, he had subdued all those countries. He distributed these captives into several colonies; and deposited the sacred vessels of the temple of Jerusalem, and other rich spoils in the temple of Belus. Jehoiakim, king of Judah, continued three years in fealty to King Nebuchadnezzar; but being then weary of paying tribute, he threw off the yoke. The king of Chaldea sent troops of Chaldeans, Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites, who harassed Judea during three or four years, and at last Jehoiakim was besieged and taken in Jerusalem, put to death, and his body

thrown 690 to the birds of the air, according to the predictions of Jeremiah. See Jehoiakim.

In the mean time, Nebuchadnezzar being at Babylon in the second year of his reign, had a mysterious dream, in which he saw a statue composed of several metals, a head of gold, a breast of silver, belly and thighs of brass, legs of iron, and feet half of iron and half clay; and a little stone rolling by its own impulse from the mountain struck the statue and broke it. This dream gave him great uneasiness, yet it faded away from his memory, and he could not recover more than the general impression of it. He ordered all his diviners and interpreters of dreams to be sent for; but none could tell him the dream or the interpretation: and, in wrath, he sentenced them all to death, which was about to be put in execution, when Daniel was informed of it. He went immediately to the king, and desired him to respite the sentence a little, and he would endeavour to satisfy his desire. God in the night revealed to him the king's dream, and also the interpretation: Thou," said Daniel, art represented by the golden head of the statue. After thee will arise a kingdom inferior to thine, represented by the breast of silver; and after this, another, still inferior, denoted by the belly and thighs of brass. After these three empires," which are the Chaldeans, Persians, and Greeks, will arise a fourth, denoted by the legs of iron," the Romans. Under this last empire God will raise a new one, of greater strength, power, and extent, than all the others. This last is that of the Messiah, represented by the little stone coming out from the mountain and overthrowing the statue." Then the king raised Daniel to great honour, set him over all the wise men of Babylon, and give him the government of that province. At his request he granted to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, the oversight of the works of the same province of Babylon.

In the same year, as Dr. Hales thinks, in which he had this dream, he erected a golden statue, whose height was sixty cubits, and breadth six cubits, in the plains of Dura, in the province of Babylon. Having appointed a day for the dedication of this statue, he assembled the principal officers of his kingdom, and published by a herald, that all should adore this image, at the sound of music, on penalty of being cast into a burning fiery furnace. The result, as to the three Jews, companions of Daniel, who would not bend the knee to the image, is stated in Dan. iii. Daniel probably was absent. The effect of the miracle was so great that Nebuchadnezzar gave glory to the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego; and he exalted the three Hebrews to great dignity in the province of Babylon, Dan. iv.

Jehoiachin, king of Judah, having revolted against Nebuchadnezzar, this prince besieged him in Jerusalem, and forced him to surrender. Nebuchadnezzar took him, with his chief officers, captive to Babylon, with

his mother, his wives, and the best workmen of Jerusalem, to the number of ten thousand men. Among the captives were Mordecai, the uncle of Esther, and Ezekiel the prophet. He took, also, all the vessels of gold which Solomon made for the temple, and the king's treasury, and he set up Mattaniah, Jehoiachin's uncle by his father's side, whom he named Zedekiah. This prince continued faithful to Nebuchadnezzar nine years: being then weary of subjection, he revolted, and confederated with the neighbouring princes. The king of Babylon came into Judea, reduced the chief places of the country, and besieged Jerusalem: but Pharaoh-Hophra coming out of Egypt to assist Zedekiah, Nebuchadnezzar overcame him in battle, and forced him to retire into his own country. After this he returned to the siege of Jerusalem, and was three hundred and ninety days before the place before he could take it. But in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, A. M. 3416, the city was taken. Zedekiah attempted to escape, but was taken and brought to Nebuchadnezzar, who was then at Riblah in Syria. The king of Babylon condemned him to die, caused his children to be put to death in his presence, and then bored out his eyes, loaded him with chains, and sent him to Babylon.

Three years after the Jewish war Nebuchadnezzar besieged the city of Tyre, which siege held thirteen years. But during this interval, he made war, also, on the Sidonians, Moabites, Ammonites, and Idumeans; and these he treated in nearly the same manner as the Jews. Josephus says these wars happened five years after the destruction of Jerusalem, consequently in A. M. 3421. The city of Tyre was taken in A. M. 3432. Ithobaal, who was then king, was put to death, and Baal succeeded him. The Lord, as a reward to the army of Nebuchadnezzar, which had lain so long before Tyre, gave up to them Egypt and its spoils. Nebuchadnezzar made an easy conquest of it, because the Egyptians were divided by civil wars among themselves: he enriched himself with booty, and returned in triumph to Babylon, with a great number of captives. Being now at peace, he applied himself to the adorning, aggrandizing, and enriching of Babylon with magnificent buildings. To him some ascribe those famous gardens, supported by arches, reckoned among the wonders of the world; and also the walls of Babylon, though many give the honour of this work to Semiramis.

About this time Nebuchadnezzar had a dream of a great tree, loaded with fruit. Suddenly, an angel descending from heaven, commanded that the tree should be cut down, but that the root should be preserved in the earth, Dan. iv. The king sent for all the diviners in the country, but none could explain his dream, till Daniel, by divine revelation, showed that it represented his present greatness, his signal approaching humiliation, and his restoration to reason and dignity. A year after, as Nebuchadnezzar was walking on his palace at Babylon, he began to say, Is not this great Babylon, which I have

built for the 691house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?" and scarcely had he pronounced these words, when he fell into a distemper or distraction, which so altered his imagination that he fled into the fields and assumed the manners of an ox. After having been seven years in this state, God opened his eyes, his understanding was restored to him, and he recovered his royal dignity.

Nebuchadnezzar died, A. M. 3442, after having reigned forty-three years. Megasthenes, quoted by Eusebius, says, that this prince having ascended to the top of his palace, was there seized with a fit of divine enthusiasm, and cried out, O Babylonians, I declare to you a misfortune, that neither our father Belus, nor Queen Baltis has been able to prevent. A Persian mule shall one day come into this country, who, supported by the power of your gods, shall bring you into slavery. He shall be assisted by the Mede, the glory of the Assyrians." This Persian mule is Cyrus, whose mother was a Mede, and whose father was a Persian. The Mede who assisted Cyrus was Cyaxares, or Darius the Mede. This story at least shows that the Heathens had traditions of an extraordinary kind respecting this monarch, and that the fate of Babylon had been the subject of prophecy.

NEBUZAR-ADAN, a general of Nebuchadnezzar's army, and the chief officer of his household. He managed the siege of Jerusalem, and made himself master of the city, while his sovereign was at Riblah in Syria, 2 Kings xxv; Jer. xxxix; xl; lii.

NECESSITARIANS. The doctrine of necessity regards the origin of human actions, and the specific mode of the divine government; and it seems to be the immediate result of the materiality of man; for mechanism is the undoubted consequence of materialism. Hence all materialists are of course necessitarians; but it does not follow that all necessitarians are or must be materialists. Whatever is done by a cause or power that is irresistible, is by necessity; in which sense this term is opposed to freedom. Man is, therefore, a necessary agent, if all his actions be so determined by the causes preceding each action, that not one past action could possibly not have come to pass, or have been otherwise than it hath been; and not one future action can possibly not come to pass, or be otherwise than it shall be. But man is a free agent, if he be able at any time, in the circumstances in which he is placed, to do different things; or, in other words, if he be not unavoidably determined in every point of time by the circumstances he is in, and the causes he is under, to do that one thing he does, and not possibly to do any other thing. This abstruse subject has occasioned much controversy, and has been debated by writers of the first eminence, from Hobbes and Clarke, to Priestley and Gregory. The anti-necessitarians allege, that the doctrine of necessity charges God as the

author of sin; that it takes away the freedom of the will; renders man unaccountable to his Maker; makes sin to be no evil, and morality or virtue to be no good; and that it precludes the use of means, and is of the most gloomy tendency. The necessitarians, on the other hand, deny these to be legitimate consequences of their doctrine, which they declare to be the most consistent mode of explaining the divine government; and they observe, that the Deity acts no more immorally in decreeing vicious actions, than in permitting all those irregularities which he could so easily have prevented. All necessity, say they, doth not take away freedom. The actions of a man may be at one and the same time both free and necessary. Thus, it was infallibly certain that Judas would betray Christ, yet he did it voluntarily; Jesus Christ necessarily became man, and died, yet he acted freely. A good man doth naturally and necessarily love his children, yet voluntarily. They insist that necessity doth not render actions less morally good; for, if necessary virtue be neither moral nor praiseworthy, it will follow that God himself is not a moral being, because he is a necessary one; and the obedience of Christ cannot be good, because it was necessary. Farther, say they, necessity does not preclude the use of means; for means are no less appointed than the end. It was ordained that Christ should be delivered up to death; but he could not have been betrayed without a betrayer, nor crucified without crucifiers. That it is not a gloomy doctrine they allege, because nothing can be more consolatory than to believe, that all things are under the direction of an all-wise Being, that his kingdom ruleth over all, and that he doeth all things well. They also urge, that to deny necessity, is to deny the foreknowledge of God, and to wrest the sceptre from the hand of the Creator, and to place that capricious and undefinable principle, the self-determining power of man, upon the throne of the universe. In these statements there is obviously a confused use of terms in different meanings, so as to mislead the unwary. For instance: necessity is confounded with certainty; but an action may be certain, though free; that is to say, certain to an omniscient Being, who knows how a free agent will finally resolve; but this certainty is, in fact, a quality of the prescient Being, not that of the action, to which, however, men delusively transfer it. Again: God is called a necessary Being, which, if it mean any thing, signifies, as to his moral acts, that he can only act right. But then this is a wrong application of the term necessity, which properly implies such a constraint upon actions, exercised *ab extra*, as renders choice or will impossible. But such necessity cannot exist as to the supreme Being. Again: the obedience of Christ unto death was necessary, that is to say, unless he had died guilty man could not have been forgiven; but this could not make the act of the Jews who put him to death a necessary act, that is to say, a forced and constrained one; nor did this necessity affect the act of Christ himself, who acted voluntarily, and might have left man without salvation. That the Jews acted freely, is evident from their being

held liable to punishment, 692 although unconsciously they accomplished the great designs of Heaven, which, however, was no excuse for their crime. Finally: as to the allegation, that the doctrine of free agency puts man's self-determining power upon the throne of the universe, that view proceeds upon notions unworthy of God, as though he could not accomplish his plans without compelling and controlling all things by a fixed fate; whereas it is both more glorious to him, and certainly more in accordance with the Scriptures, to say that he has a perfect foresight of the manner in which all creatures will act, and that he, by a profound and infinite wisdom, subordinates every thing without violence to the evolution and accomplishment of his own glorious purposes.

The doctrine of necessity is nearly connected with that of predestination, which, of late years, has assumed a form very different from that which it formerly possessed; for, instead of being considered as a point to be determined almost entirely by the sacred writings, it has, in the hands of a number of able writers, in a great measure resolved itself into a question of natural religion, under the head of the philosophical liberty or necessity of the will; or, whether all human actions are, or are not, necessarily determined by motives arising from the character which God has impressed on our minds, and the train of circumstances amidst which his providence has placed us? The Calvinistic doctrine of predestination is, that God for his own glory, hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass." The scheme of philosophical necessity, as stated by the most celebrated necessitarian of the age, is, that every thing is predetermined by the divine Being; that whatever has been, must have been; and that whatever will be, must be; that all events are preordained by infinite wisdom and unlimited goodness; that the will, in all its determinations, is governed by the state of mind; that the state of mind is, in every instance, determined by the Deity; and that there is a continued chain of causes and effects, of motives and actions, inseparably connected, and originating from the condition in which we are brought into existence by the Author of our being." On the other hand, it is justly remarked, that "those who believe the being and perfections of God, and a state of retribution, in which he will reward and punish mankind according to the diversity of their actions, will find it difficult to reconcile the justice of punishment with the necessity of crimes punished. And they that believe all that the Scripture says on the one hand, of the eternity of future punishments, and on the other, of God's compassion to sinners, and his solemn assurance that he desires not their death, will find the difficulty greatly increased." It is doubtless an article of the Christian faith, that God will reward or punish every man hereafter according to his actions in this life. But we cannot maintain his justice in this particular, if men's actions be necessary either in their own nature, or by the divine decrees. Activity and self-determining powers are the

foundation of all morality; and to prove that such powers belong to man, it is urged that we ourselves are conscious of possessing them. We blame and condemn ourselves when we do amiss; but guilt, and inward sense of shame, and remorse of conscience, are feelings which are inconsistent with the scheme of necessity. It is also agreed that some actions deserve praise, and afford an inward satisfaction; but for this, there would be no foundation, if we were invincibly determined in every volition: so that approbation and blame are consequent on free actions only. Nor is the matter at all relieved by bringing in a chain of circumstances as motives necessarily to determine the will. This comes to the same result in sound argument, as though there was an immediate coaction of omnipotent power compelling one kind of volitions only; which is utterly irreconcilable to all just notions of the nature and operations of will, and to all accountability. Necessity, in the sense of irresistible control, and the doctrine of Scripture, cannot coexist.

NECROMANCY, νεκρομαντεία, is the art of raising up the ghosts of deceased persons, to get information from them concerning future events. This practice, no doubt, the Israelites brought with them from Egypt, which affected to be the mother of such occult sciences; and from thence it spread into the neighbouring countries, and soon infected all the east. The injunction of the law is very express against this vice; and the punishment to be inflicted on the practisers of it was stoning to death, Lev. xx, 27. What forms of enchantment were used in the practice of necromancy we are at a loss to know, because we read of none that the pythoress of Endor employed; however, that there were several rites, spells, and invocations used upon these occasions, we may learn from almost every ancient author, but from none more particularly than from Lucan in his Pharsalia. Whether the art of conversing with the dead was mere imposture, or grounded upon diabolical agency, is a question which has been disputed in all ages.

NEHEMIAH professes himself the author of the book which bears his name, in the very beginning of it, and he uniformly writes in the first person. He was of the tribe of Judah, and was probably born at Babylon during the captivity. He was so distinguished for his family and attainments, as to be selected for the office of cup bearer to the king of Persia, a situation of great honour and emolument. He was made governor of Judea, upon his own application, by Artaxerxes Longimanus; and his book, which in the Hebrew canon was joined to that of Ezra, gives an account of his appointment and administration through a space of about thirty-six years to A. M. 3595, at which time the Scripture history closes; and, consequently, the historical books, from Joshua to Nehemiah inclusive, contain the history of the Jewish people from the death of Moses,

A. M. 2553, to the reformation established by Nehemiah, after the return from captivity, being a period of one thousand and forty-two years.

693NEOLOGY. This term, which signifies new doctrine, has been used to designate a species of theology and Biblical criticism which has of late years much prevailed among the Protestant divines of Germany, and the professors of their universities. It is now, however, more frequently termed rationalism, and is supposed to occupy a sort of middle place between the orthodox system and pure deism. The German divines themselves speak of naturalism, rationalism, and supernaturalism. The term naturalism arose first in the sixteenth century, and was spread in the seventeenth. It was understood to be the system of those who allowed no other knowledge of religion than the natural, which man could shape out by his own strength, and, consequently, excluded all supernatural revelation. As to the different forms of naturalism, theologians say there are three: the first, which they call Pelagianism, and which considers human dispositions and notions as perfectly pure, and the religious knowledge derived from them as sufficiently explicit. A grosser kind denies all particular revelation; and the grossest of all considers the world as God. Rationalism has been thus explained: Those who are generally termed rationalists," says Dr. Bretschneider, admit universally in Christianity, a divine, benevolent, and positive appointment for the good of mankind, and Jesus as a messenger of Divine Providence, believing that the true and everlasting word of God is contained in the Holy Scripture, and that by the same the welfare of mankind will be obtained and extended. But they deny therein a supernatural and miraculous working of God, and consider the object of Christianity to be that of introducing into the world such a religion as reason can comprehend; and they distinguish the essential from the unessential, and what is local and temporary from that which is universal and permanent in Christianity." There is, however, a third class of divines who in fact differ very little from this, though very widely in profession. They affect to allow a revealing operation of God, but establish on internal proofs rather than on miracles the divine nature of Christianity. They allow that revelation may contain much out of the power of reason to explain, but say that it should assert nothing contrary to reason, but rather what may be proved by it. Supernaturalism consists in general in the conviction that God has revealed himself supernaturally and immediately. The notion of a miracle cannot well be separated from such a revelation, whether it happens out of, on, or in men. What is revealed may belong to the order of nature, but an order higher and unknown to us, which we could never have known without miracles, and cannot bring under the laws of nature.

The difference between the naturalists and the rationalists, as Mr. Rose justly remarks, is not quite so wide either as it would appear to be at first



sight, or as one of them assuredly wishes it to appear. For if I receive a system, be it of religion, of morals, or of politics, only so far as it approves itself to my reason, whatever be the authority that presents it to me, it is idle to say that I receive the system out of any respect to that authority. I receive it only because my reason approves it; and I should, of course, do so if an authority of far inferior value were to present the system to me. This is what that division of rationalists, which professes to receive Christianity, and at the same time to make reason the supreme arbiter in matters of faith, has done. Their system, in a word, is this: They assume certain general principles, which they maintain to be the necessary deductions of reason from an extended and unprejudiced contemplation of the natural and moral order of things, and to be in themselves immutable and universal. Consequently, any thing which, on however good authority, may be advanced in apparent opposition to them must either be rejected as unworthy of rational belief, or, at least, explained away till it is made to accord with the assumed principles; and the truth or falsehood of all doctrines proposed is to be decided according to their agreement or disagreement with those principles.

It is easy, then, to anticipate how, with such principles, the Biblical critics of Germany, distinguished as many of them have been for learning, would proceed to interpret the Scriptures. Many of the sacred books and parts of others have, of course, been rejected by them as spurious, the strongest external evidence being thought by them insufficient to prove the truth of what was determined to be contradictory to their reason; and the inspiration of the rest was understood in no higher a sense, to use the language of one of their professors, than the expressions of Cicero as to the inspiration of the poets, or those of Quintilian respecting Plato. It would be disgusting, says Rose, to go through all the strange fancies which were set afloat, and which tended only to set Scripture on the same footing as an ingenious but improbable romance. They all proceeded from the determination that whatever was not intelligible was incredible, that only what was of familiar and easy explanation deserved belief, and that all which was miraculous and mysterious in Scripture must be rejected; and they rested perpetually on notions and reasonings which were in themselves miracles of incredibility. But there were many of the German divines of this rationalist period who went much farther, and who imputed a deception to our Lord and his disciples, not for evil but for good purposes. In reading or in hearing of these wretched productions, the mind is divided between disgust at folly, and indignation at wickedness. What can be said for the heart which could suppose that the founders of Christianity could have taught the sublime and holy doctrines of the Gospel with a lie in their hearts and on their lips? or for the intellect which could believe that ambitious and designing men would encounter years of poverty, and shame, and danger, with no prospect

but that of an ignominious death? But 694 where the supernatural and miraculous accounts were not rejected, they were, by many of the most eminent of these writers, explained away by a monstrous ingenuity, which, on any other subject, and applied to any ancient classic or other writer, would provoke the most contemptuous ridicule. When Korah, Dathan, and Abiram were swallowed up, Moses had previously secretly undermined the earth.” Jacob wrestled with the angel in a dream;” and a rheumatic pain in his thigh during sleep suggested the incident in his dream of the angel touching the sinew of his thigh. Professor Paulus gravely explains the miracle of the tribute money thus: That Christ only meant to give a moral lesson, that is, that we are not, if we can avoid it by trifling sacrifices, to give offence to our brethren; that he probably reasoned thus with St. Peter: Though there is no real occasion for us to pay the tribute, yet, as we may be reckoned as enemies of the temple, and not attended to when we wish to teach what is good, why should not you who are a fisherman,” a remark which might very properly be made at a place where St. Peter had been engaged in a fishery for two years, “and can easily do it, go and get enough to pay the demand? Go, then, to the sea, cast your hook, and take up πρῶτον ἰχθῦν, the first and best fish.” St. Peter was not to stay longer at his work this time than to gain the required money: πρῶτος often refers not to number but to time; and ἰχθῦν may undoubtedly be taken as a collective. St. Peter must either have caught so many fish as would be reckoned worth a stater at Capernaum, (so near to a sea rich in fish,) or one so large and fine as would have been valued at that sum. As it was uncertain whether one or more would be necessary, the expression is indefinite, τὸν ἀναδάντα πρῶτον ἰχθῦν; [the fish first coming up;] but it would not be ambiguous to St. Peter, as the necessity and the event would give it a fixed meaning. Ἀνοιξας τὸ στόμα. [Opening the mouth.] This opening of the mouth might have different objects, which must be fixed by the context. If the fisherman opens the mouth of a fish caught with a hook, he does it first to release him from the hook; for if he hangs long he is less saleable: he soon decays. The circumstantiality in the account is picturesque. Take the hook out his mouth!” Ἐυρήσεις εὐρίσκειν is used in Greek in a more extended sense than the German finden, as in Xenophon, where it is to get by selling.” When such a word is used of saleable articles, like fish, and in a connection which requires the getting a piece of money, it is clear that getting by sale and not by finding is referred to. “And this from a professor’s chair!” In like manner the miracle of feeding the five thousand in the desert is resolved into the opportune passing by of a caravan with provisions, of which the hungry multitude were allowed to partake, according to eastern hospitality; and the Apostles were merely employed in conveying it out in baskets. Christ’s walking upon the sea is explained by his walking upon the sea shore, and St. Peter’s walking on the sea is resolved into swimming. The miracles of healing were the effect of fancy

operating favourably upon the disorders; and Ananias and Sapphira died of a fright; with many other absurdities, half dreams and half blasphemies; and of which the above are given but as a specimen.

The first step in this sorrowful gradation down to a depth of falsehood and blasphemy, into which certainly no body of Christian ministers, so large, so learned, and influential, in any age or period of the church ever before fell, was, contempt for the authority of the divines of the Reformation, and of the subsequent age. They were about to set out on a voyage of discovery; and it was necessary to assume that truth still inhabited some terra incognita, [unknown region,] to which neither Luther, Melancthon, nor their early disciples, had ever found access. One of this school is pleased, indeed, to denominate the whole even of the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century, the age of theological barbarism; an age, notwithstanding, which produced in the Lutheran church alone Calovius, Schmidt, Hackspan, Walther, Glass, and the Carpzoffs, and others, as many and as great writers as any church can boast in an equal space of time; writers whose works are, or ought to be, in the hands of the theological student. The general statements of the innovators amount to this, that the divines of the age of which we speak had neither the inclination nor the power to do any thing but fortify their own systems, which were dogmatical, and not to search out truth for themselves from Scripture; that theology, as a science, was left from the epoch of the Reformation as it had been received from the schoolmen; that the interpretation of the Bible was made the slave, not the mistress, of dogmatical theology, as it ought to be.

The vain conceit that the doctrines of religion were capable of philosophic demonstration, which obtained among the followers of Wolf, is considered by Mr. Rose as having hastened onward the progress of error. We find some of them not content with applying demonstration to the truth of the system, but endeavouring to establish each separate dogma, the Trinity, the nature of the Redeemer, the incarnation, the eternity of punishment, on philosophical and, strange as it may appear, some of these truths on mathematical, grounds. We have had instances of this in our own country; and the reason why they have done little injury is, that none of those who thus presumed, whether learned or half learned, had success enough to form a school. So far as such a theory does obtain influence, it must necessarily be mischievous. The first authors may hold the mysteries of Christianity sacred; they may fancy that they can render faith in them more easy by affecting demonstrative evidence, which, indeed, were the subjects capable of it, would render faith unnecessary; but they are equally guilty of a vain presumption in their own powers, and of a want of real reverence to God, and to his revelation. 695 With them, this boast of demonstration generally ends in the rejection of some truth, or the adoption of some

positive error; while their followers fail not to bound over the limits at which they have stopped. The fallacy of the whole lies in assuming that divine things are on the same level with those which the human mind can grasp, and may therefore be compared with them. One of these consequences must therefore follow: either that the mind is exalted above its own sphere, or that divine things are brought down below theirs. In the former case, a dogmatical pride is the result; in the latter, the scheme of revelation is stripped of its divinity, and sinks gradually into a system of human philosophy, with the empty name of a revelation still appended to it to save appearances. What can bear the test of the philosophical standard is retained, and what cannot be thus proved is, by degrees, rejected; so that the Scripture is no longer the ground of religious truth; but a sort of witness to be compelled to assent to any conclusions at which this philosophy may arrive.

The effect in Germany was speedily developed, though Wolf, the founder of this school, and most of his followers, were pious and faithful Christians. By carrying demonstrative evidence beyond its own province, they had nurtured in their followers a vain confidence in human reason; and the next and still more fatal step was, that it was the province of human reason in an enlightened and intellectual age to perfect Christianity, which, it was contended, had hitherto existed in a low and degraded state, and to perfect that system of which the elements only were contained in the Scripture. All restraint was broken by this principle. Philosophy, good and bad, was left to build up these elements" according to its own views; and as, after all, many of these elements were found to be too untractable and too rudely shaped to accord with the plans of these manifold constructions, formed according to every pattern," except that in the mount;" when the stone could not be squared and framed by any art which these builders possessed, it was rejected," even to the head stone of the corner." Semler appears to have been the author of that famous theory of accommodation, which, in the hands of his followers, says Mr. Rose, became the most formidable weapon ever devised for the destruction of Christianity." As far as Germany is concerned, this language is not too strong; and we may add, that it was the most impudent theory ever advocated by men professing still to be Christians, and one, the avowal of which can scarcely be accounted for, except on the ground, that as, because of their interests, it was not convenient for these teachers of theology and ministers of the German churches to disavow Christianity altogether; it was devised and maintained, in order to connect the profits of the Christian profession with substantial and almost undisguised deism. This theory was, that we are not to take all the declarations of Scripture as addressed to us; but to consider them as, in many points, purposely adapted to the feelings and dispositions of the age when they originated; but by no means to be received by another

and more enlightened period; that, in fact, Jesus himself and his Apostles had accommodated themselves in their doctrines to the barbarism, ignorance, and prejudices of the Jews; and that it was therefore our duty to reject the whole of this temporary part of Christianity, and retain only what is substantial and eternal. In plain words they assumed, as the very basis of their Scriptural interpretations, the blasphemous principle, that our Lord and his Apostles taught, or, at least, connived at doctrines absolutely false, rather than they would consent to shock the prejudices of their hearers! This principle is shown at length by Mr. Rose, to run through the whole maze of error into which this body of Protestant divines themselves wandered, and led their flocks. Thus the chairs of theology and the very pulpits were turned into the seats of the scornful;” and where doctrines were at all preached, they were too frequently of this daring and infidel character. It became even, at least, a negative good, that the sermons delivered were often discourses on the best modes of cultivating corn and wine, and the preachers employed the Sabbath and the church in instructing their flocks how to choose the best kinds of potatoes, or to enforce upon them the benefits of vaccination. Undisguised infidelity has in no country treated the grand evidences of the truth of Christianity with greater contumely, or been more offensive in its attacks upon the prophets, or more ridiculous in its attempts to account, on natural principles, for the miracles. Extremes of every kind were produced, philosophic mysticism, pantheism, and atheism.

We have hitherto referred chiefly to Mr. Rose’s work on this awful declension in the Lutheran and other continental churches. In a work on the same subject by Mr. Pusey, the stages of the apostasy are more carefully marked, and more copiously and deeply investigated. Our limits will, however, but allow us to advert to two or three points. In Mr. Pusey’s account of the state of German theology in the seventeenth century, he opens to us the sources of the evil. Francke, he observes, assigns as a reason for attaching the more value to the opportunities provided at Halle for the study of Scripture, that “in former times, and in those which are scarcely past, one generally found at universities opportunities for every thing rather than a solid study of God’s word.” In all my university years,” says Knapp, I was not happy enough to hear a lecture upon the whole of Scripture; we should have regarded it as a great blessing which came down from heaven.” It is said to be one only of many instances, that at Leipzig, Carpzoff, having in his lectures for one half year completed the first chapter of Isaiah, did not again lecture on the Bible for twenty years, while Olearius suspended his for ten. Yet Olearius, as well as Alberti, Spener says, were diligent theologians, but that most pains were employed on doctrinal theology and controversy.” It is, moreover, a painful speaking fact, which is mentioned by Francke, (1709,) that in Leipzig, the great mart

of literature as well as of trade, “twenty years ago, in no bookseller’s shop was either Bible or Testament to be found.” Of the passages in Francke, which prove the same state of things, I will select one or two only: Youth are sent to the universities with a moderate knowledge of Latin; but of Greek, and especially of Hebrew next to none. And it would even then have been well, if what had been neglected before had been made up in the universities. There, however, most are borne, as by a torrent, with the multitude; they flock to logical, metaphysical, ethical, polemical, physical, pneumatical lectures, and what not; treating least of all those things whose benefit is most permanent in their future office, especially deferring, and at last neglecting, the study of the sacred languages.” “To this is added, that, they comfort themselves, that in examinations for orders these things are not generally much attended to. Hence most who are anxious about a maintenance, hurry to those things which may hasten their promotion, attend above all things a lecture on the art of preaching, and if they can remain so long at the university, one on doctrinal theology, (would that all were anxious about a salutary knowledge of the sacred doctrines,) and having committed these things to paper and memory, return home, as if excellently armed against Satan, are examined, preach, are promoted, provide for their families.” And having spoken farther on the superficial knowledge, pedantry, and other faults of those few who acquired knowledge of these subjects, he sums up: As the vernacular Scriptures are ordinarily neglected or ill employed by the illiterate, so are the original by the lettered: whence there cannot but arise either ignorance in matters of faith, or an unfruitful and vain knowledge; a pleasurable fancy is substituted for the substance of the faith; impiety daily increases. In a word, from the neglect of Scripture all impiety is derived; and so again from the impiety or unbelief of men, there is derived a contempt of Scripture, or at all events an abuse, and an absurd and perverted employment of it: and hence follows either a neglect of the original languages, or a senseless method, or an unfitting employment of them; which evils, since they are continued from the teachers to the disciples, the corrupted state of the schools and universities continually increases: and these we cannot remedy, unless we can prevail upon ourselves to make the word of God our first object, to look for Christ in it, and to embrace him, when found, with genuine faith, and perseveringly to follow him.” Pfaff thus describes the previous state of doctrinal theology: All the compendia of holy doctrines, which have hitherto appeared, are of such a character, that, though their excellence has been hitherto extolled by the common praise of our countrymen, and they still enjoy considerable reputation, (*suâ utique luce niteat*,) they can even on this ground not be satisfactory to our age,—that since one system was extracted and worked out of the other, with a very few variations, they dwell uniformly on the same string; and that metaphysical clang of causes, which sounds somewhat harshly and

unpleasantly to well cultivated ears, constantly reverberates in them, the same terms uniformly recurring in all. To this is added, that a certain coldness appears to prevail in the common mode of treating these subjects, especially in the practical topics of theology; these being set forth as theoretical propositions, so that scarcely any life or any religious influence finds its way into the minds of readers; and the edification of mind, (though it should be the principal object in sacred theology,) derived from them is very slight. Nor does it appear less a subject of blame, that various theological τόποι, and those the very chief, are here altogether omitted; that every thing is choked with the thorns of scholasticism; and that divine truths are often made secondary to the zeal for authority: nor is there sufficient reference to the language of the symbolical books, to the promotion of the peace of the church, to the exhibition of what is of real importance in controverted points, and of the unreality of the mere logomachies, with which all theology abounds; nor again, to destroy theological pedantry and a sectarian spirit, or to treat the subjects themselves in a style becoming to them: but most of all, sufficient pains are not bestowed upon that which is of chief importance, the building up the kingdom of God in the hearts of men, and the influencing their hearts more thoroughly with vivid conceptions of true Christianity.”

Yet these were but effects of a still higher cause,—the rapid decay of piety in this century, of which the statements of Mr. Pusey, and the authorities he quotes, present a melancholy picture. Speaking of J. V. Andrea, he says, the want of practical religious instruction in the early schools, the perverted state of all education, the extravagance and dissoluteness of the universities, the total unfitness of the teachers whom they sent forth and authorized, the degraded state of general as well as of theological science, the interested motives for entering into holy orders, the canvassing for benefices, the simony in obtaining them, the especial neglect of the poorer, the bad lives, the carelessness and bitter controversies of the preachers, and the general corruption of manners in all ranks, are again and again the subjects of his deep regrets or of his censure. “After the evangelic church,” he says, in an energetic comparison of the evils which reigned in the beginning of this period with those which had occasioned the yoke of Rome to be broken, “after the evangelic church had thrown off the yoke of human inventions, they should have bowed their neck under the easy yoke of the Lord. But now one set of human inventions are but exchanged for another, equally, or indeed very little, human; and these are called the word of God, though in reality things are nothing milder than before. Idols were cast out, but the idols of sins<sup>697</sup> are worshipped. The primacy of the pope is denied, but we constitute lesser popes. The bishops are abrogated, but ministers are still introduced or cast out at will; simony came into ill repute, but who now rejects a hand laden with gold? the monks were reproached

for indolence,--as if there were too much study at our universities; the monasteries were dissolved,--to stand empty, or to be stalls for cattle; the regularly recurring prayers are abolished, yet so that now most pray not at all; the public fasts were laid aside, now the command of Christ is held to be but useless words; not to say any thing of blasphemers, adulterers, extortioners," &c. After many testimonies of a similar and even stronger kind from other pious divines, who lifted up their voice strongly but almost ineffectually against the growing corruption of the universities, the clergy, and the people, Mr. Pusey adds the following passages from Francke: "The works of the flesh are done openly and unrestrainedly, with so little shame, that one who does not approve of many things not consistent with the truth which is in Jesus, would almost be enrolled among heretics. Ambition, pride, love of pleasure, luxury, impurity, wantonness, and all the crop of foulest wickednesses which spring from these; injustice also, avarice, and a species of rivalry among all vices every where sensibly increases, atheism joining itself with epicurism and libertinism. Thus while Christ is held to, while orthodoxy is presented as a shield, all imitation of Christ, all anxiety for true and spiritual holiness, "without which no one shall see the Lord," nay, all the decorum befitting a Christian, is banished, is exterminated, that it may not disturb the societies of perverse men." Into the state of the clergy he enters more fully in another work. I remember," he says, "that a theologian of no common learning, piety, and practical knowledge, *vũv èv àγίοις*, told me, that a certain monarch, at his suggestion, applied to a university, where there was a large concourse of students of theology, for two candidates for holy orders, who, by the excellence and purity of their doctrine, and by holiness of life, might serve as an example to the congregation committed to their charge; the professors candidly answered that there was no such student of theology among them. Nor is this surprising. I remember that Kortholt used to say with pain, that in the disgraceful strifes, disturbances, and tumults in the universities, which were, alas, but too frequent, it scarcely ever happened that theological students were not found to be accomplices, nay, the chiefs. I remember that another theologian often lamented, that there was such a dearth in the church of such persons as the Apostle would alone think worthy of the ministerial functions, that it was to be regarded as a happiness if, of many applicants, some one of outwardly decent life could at length be found."

With several happy exceptions, and the raising up of a few pious people in some places, and a partial revival of evangelical doctrines, which, however, often ran at length into mysticism and antinomianism, the evil, both doctrinally and morally, continued to increase to our own day; for if any ask what has been the moral effect of the appalling apostasy of the teachers of religion, above described, upon the people of Germany, the answer may be given from one of these rationalizing divines themselves, whose



statement is not therefore likely to be too highly coloured. It is from a pamphlet of Bretschneider, published in 1822, and the substance is, Indifference to religion among all classes; that formerly the Bible used to be in every house, but now the people either do not possess it, or, as formerly, read it; that few attend the churches, which are now too large, though fifty years ago they were too small; that few honour the Sabbath; that there are now few students of theology, compared with those in law and medicine; that if things go on so, there will shortly not be persons to supply the various ecclesiastical offices; that preaching had fallen into contempt; and that distrust and suspicion of the doctrines of Christianity prevailed among all classes." Melancholy as this picture is, nothing in it can surprise any one, except that the very persons who have created the evil should themselves be astonished at its existence, or even affect to be so. But the mercy of God has begun to answer the prayers of the few faithful who are left as the gleanings of grapes after the vintage; and to revive, in some active, learned, and influential men, the spirit of primitive faith and zeal. The effect of the exertions of these excellent men, both from the professor's chair, the pulpit, and the press, has been considerable; and it is remarked by Mr. Rose, that no small degree of disgust at the past follies of the rationalists prevails; that the cold and comfortless nature of their system has been perceived; that a party of truly Christian views has arisen; and that there is a disposition alike in the people, the better part of the divines, and the philosophers, to return to that revealed religion which alone can give them comfort and peace. It is equally clear that some at least of the governments perceive the dangerous tendency of the rationalist opinions, and that they are sincerely desirous of promoting a better state of religious feeling.

We close this article with the excellent remarks of Dr. Tittman of Dresden, on the neological interpreters: What is the interpretation of the Scriptures, if it relies not on words, but things, not on the assistance of languages, but on the decrees of reason that is, of modern philosophy? What is all religion, what the knowledge of divine things, what are faith and hope placed in Christ, what is all Christianity, if human reason and philosophy is the only fountain of divine wisdom, and the supreme judge in the matter of religion? What is the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles more than some philosophical system? But what, then, I pray you, is, to deny, to blaspheme Jesus the Lord, to render his divine mission doubtful, nay vain and useless, to impugn his doctrine, to disfigure it shamefully, to attack it, to expose it to ridicule, and, if possible, to suppress it, to remove all Christianity out of religion, and to bound religion within the narrow limits of reason alone, to deride miracles, and hold them up to derision, to accuse them as vain, to bring them into disrepute, to torture sacred Scripture into seeming agreement with the fancies of human wisdom, to alloy it with human

conjectures, to bring it into contempt, and to break down its divine authority, to undermine, to shake, to overthrow utterly the foundations of Christian faith? What else can be the event than this, as all history, a most weighty witness in this matter, informs us, namely, that when sacred Scripture, its grammatical interpretation and a sound knowledge of languages are, as it were, despised and banished, all religion should be contemned, shaken, corrupted, troubled, undermined, utterly overturned, and should be entirely removed and reduced to natural religion; or that it should end in a mystical theology, than which nothing was ever more pernicious to the Christian doctrine, and be converted into an empty *μυθολογία*, or even into a poetical system, hiding every thing in figures and fictions, to which latter system not a few of the sacred orators and theologians of our time seem chiefly inclined.”

NEOMENIA, *νεομηνία*, new moon, Col. ii, 16, a Greek word, signifying the first day of the moon or month. The Hebrews had a particular veneration for the first day of every month; and Moses appointed peculiar sacrifices for the day, Num. xxviii, 11, 12; but he gave no orders that it should be kept as a holy day, nor can it be proved that the ancients observed it so: it was a festival of merely voluntary devotion. It appears that even from the time of Saul they made, on this day, a sort of family entertainment, since David ought then to have been at the king’s table; and Saul took his absence amiss, 1 Sam. xx, 5, 18. Moses insinuates that, beside the national sacrifices then regularly offered, every private person had his particular sacrifices of devotion, Num. x, 10. The beginning of the month was proclaimed by sound of trumpet, at the offering of the solemn sacrifices. But the most celebrated neomenia was that at the beginning of the civil year, or first day of the month Tizri, Lev. xxiii, 24. This was a sacred day, on which no servile labour was performed; on this they offered public or national burnt-sacrifices, and sounded the trumpets in the temple. In the kingdom of the ten tribes, the serious among the people used to assemble at the houses of the prophets, to hear their instructions. The Shunamite, who entertained Elisha, proposing to visit that prophet, her husband said to her, Why do you go to-day, since it is neither Sabbath nor new moon?” 2 Kings iv, 23. Isaiah declares that the Lord abhors the new moons, the Sabbaths, and other days of festival and assembly of those Jews who in other things neglected his laws, Isaiah i, 13, 14. Ezekiel says that the burnt-offerings offered on the day of the new moon were provided at the king’s expense, and that on this day was to be opened the eastern gate of the court of the priests, Ezek. xiv, 17; xlvi, 1, 2; 1 Chron. xxiii, 31; 2 Chron. viii, 13. Judith kept no fast on festival days, or on the new moon, Judith viii, 6. The modern Jews keep the neomenia only as a feast of devotion, to be observed or not at pleasure. They think it rather belongs to the women than to the men. The women forbear work, and indulge a little more on this day than

on others. In the prayers of the synagogue, they read from Psalm cxiii, to cxviii. They bring forth the roll of the law, and read therein to four persons. They call to remembrance the sacrifice that on this day used to be offered in the temple. On the evening of the Sabbath which follows the new moon, or some other evening following, when the new moon first appears, they assemble and pray to God, as the Creator of the planets, and the restorer of the new moon; raising themselves toward heaven, they entreat of God to be preserved from misfortune; then, after mentioning David, they salute each other, and separate. See Moon.

NEONOMIANISM, so called from the Greek νέος, new, and νόμος, law. This is not the appellation of a separate sect, but of those both among Arminians and Calvinists who regard Christianity as a new law, mitigated in its requisitions for the sake of Christ. This opinion has many modifications, and has been held by persons very greatly differing from each other in the consequences to which they carry it, and in the principles from which they deduce it. One opinion is, that the new covenant of grace which, through the medium of Christ's death, the Father made with men, consists, according to this system, not in our being justified by faith, as it apprehends the righteousness of Christ; but in this, that God, abrogating the exaction of perfect legal obedience, reposes or accepts of faith itself, and the imperfect obedience of faith, instead of the perfect obedience of the law, and graciously accounts them worthy of the reward of eternal life. Toward the close of the seventeenth century, a controversy was agitated among the English Dissenters, in which the one side, who were partial to the writings of Dr. Crisp, were charged with antinomianism, and the other, who favoured those of Mr. Baxter, were accused of neonomianism. Dr. Daniel Williams was a principal writer on what was called the neonomian side.

The following objection, among others, was made by several ministers in 1692, against Dr. Williams's Gospel Truth Stated," &c: "To supply the room of the moral law, vacated by him, he turns the Gospel into a new law, in keeping of which we shall be justified for the sake of Christ's righteousness, making qualifications and acts of ours a disposing subordinate righteousness, whereby we become capable of being justified by Christ's righteousness." To this, among other things, he answers: "The difference is not, 1. Whether the Gospel be a new law in the Socinian, popish, or Arminian sense. This I deny. Nor, 2. Is faith, or any other grace or acts of ours, any atonement for sin, satisfaction to justice, meriting qualification, or any part of that righteousness for which we are justified at God our Creator's bar. This I deny in places innumerable. Nor, 3. Whether the Gospel be a law more new than is implied in the first promise to fallen Adam, proposed to Cain, and obeyed by Abel, to the

differencing him from his unbelieving brother. This I deny. 4. Nor whether the Gospel be a law that allows sin, when it accepts such graces as true, though short of perfection, to be the conditions of our personal interest in the benefits purchased by Christ. This I deny. 5. Nor whether the Gospel be a law, the promises whereof entitle the performers of its conditions to the benefits as of debt. This I deny. The difference is, 1. Is the Gospel a law in this sense; namely, God in Christ thereby commandeth sinners to repent of sin, and receive Christ by a true operative faith, promising that thereupon they shall be united to him, justified by his righteousness, pardoned, and adopted; and that, persevering in faith and true holiness, they shall be finally saved; also threatening that if any shall die impenitent, unbelieving, ungodly, rejecters of his grace, they shall perish without relief, and endure sorer punishments than if these offers had not been made to them? 2. Hath the Gospel a sanction, that is, doth Christ therein enforce his commands of faith, repentance, and perseverance, by the foresaid promises and threatenings, as motives to our obedience? Both these I affirm, and they deny; saying, the Gospel in the largest sense is an absolute promise without precepts and conditions, and a Gospel threat is a bull. 3. Do the Gospel promises of benefits to certain graces, and its threats that those benefits shall be withheld, and the contrary evils inflicted for the neglect of such graces, render these graces the condition of our personal title to those benefits? This they deny, and I affirm," &c.

It does not appear to have been a question in this controversy, whether God in his word commands sinners to repent, and believe in Christ, nor whether he promises life to believers, and threatens death to unbelievers; but whether it be the Gospel under the form of a new law that thus commands or threatens, or the moral law on its behalf, and whether its promises to believing render such believing a condition of the things promised. In another controversy, however, which arose about forty years afterward among the same people, it became a question whether God did by his word, call it law or Gospel, command unregenerate sinners to repent and believe in Christ, or do any thing also, which is spiritually good. Of those who took the affirmative side of this question, one party maintained it on the ground of the Gospel being a new law, consisting of commands, promises, and threatenings, the terms or conditions of which were repentance, faith, and sincere obedience. But those who first engaged in the controversy, though they allowed the encouragement to repent and believe to arise merely from the grace of the Gospel, yet considered the formal obligation to do so as arising merely from the moral law, which, requiring supreme love to God, requires acquiescence in any revelation which he shall at any time make known.

NERO. The Emperor Nero is not named in Scripture; but he is indicated by his title of emperor, and by his surname Cæsar. To him St. Paul appealed after his imprisonment by Felix, and his examination by Festus, who was swayed by the Jews. St. Paul was therefore carried to Rome, where he arrived A. D. 61. Here he continued two years, preaching the Gospel with freedom, till he became famous even in the emperor's court, in which were many Christians; for he salutes the Philippians in the name of the brethren who were of the household of Cæsar, that is, of Nero's court, Phil. i, 12, 13; iv, 22. We have no particular information how he cleared himself from the accusations of the Jews, whether by answering before Nero, or whether his enemies dropped their prosecutions, which seems probable, Acts xxviii, 21. However, it appears that he was liberated in the year 63. Nero is reckoned the first persecutor of the Christian church: his persecution was A. D. 64. Nero, the most cruel and savage of all men, and also the most wicked and depraved, began his persecution against the Christian church, A. D. 64, on pretence of the burning of Rome, of which some have thought himself to be the author. He endeavoured to throw all the odium on the Christians: those were seized first that were known publicly as such, and by their means many others were discovered. They were condemned to death, and were even insulted in their sufferings. Some were sewed up in skins of beasts, and then exposed to dogs to be torn in pieces; some were nailed to crosses; others perished by fire. The latter were sewed up in pitched coverings, which, being set on fire, served as torches to the people, and were lighted up in the night. Nero gave leave to use his own gardens, as the scene of all these cruelties. From this time edicts were published against the Christians, and many martyrs suffered, especially in Italy. St. Peter and St. Paul are thought to have suffered martyrdom, consequent on this persecution, A. D. 65. The revolt of the Jews from the Romans happened about A. D. 65 and 66, in the twelfth and thirteenth of Nero. The city of Jerusalem making an insurrection, A. D. 66, Florus there slew three thousand six hundred persons, and thus began the war. A little while afterward, those of Jerusalem killed the Roman garrison. Cestius on this came to Jerusalem to suppress the sedition; but he was forced to retire, after having besieged it about six weeks, and was routed in his retreat, A. D. 66. About the end of the same year, Nero gave Vespasian the command of his troops against the Jews. This general carried on the war in Galilee and Judea during A. D. 67 and 68, the thirteenth and fourteenth of Nero. But Nero killing himself in the fourteenth year of his reign, Jerusalem was not besieged till after his death, A. D. 70, the first and second of Vespasian.

NESTORIANS, a denomination which arose in the fifth century, from Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople; a man of considerable learning and eloquence, and of an independent spirit. The Catholic clergy were fond of calling the Virgin Mary Mother of God," to which Nestorius objected,

as implying that she was mother of the divine nature, which he very properly denied; and this raised against him, from Cyril and others, the cry of heresy, and perhaps led him into some improper forms of expression and explication. It is generally agreed, however, by the moderns, that Nestorius showed a much better spirit in controversy than his antagonist, St. Cyril. As to the doctrine of the trinity, it does not appear that Nestorius differed from his antagonists, admitting the coequality of the divine Persons; but he was charged with maintaining two distinct persons, as well as natures, in the mysterious character of Christ. This, however, he solemnly and constantly denied; and from this, as a foul reproach, he has been cleared by the moderns, and particularly by Martin Luther, who lays the whole blame of this controversy on the turbulent and angry Cyril. (See Hypostatic Union.) The discordancy not only between the Nestorians and other Christians, but also among themselves, arose, no doubt, in a great measure, from the ambiguity of the Greek terms hypostasis and prosopon. The councils assembled at Seleucia on this occasion decreed that in Christ there were two hypostases. But this word, unhappily, was used both for person and subsistence, or existence; hence the difficulty and ambiguity: and of these hypostases it is said the one was divine, and the other human;--the divine Word, and the man Jesus. Now of these two hypostases it is added, they had only one barsopa, the original term used by Nestorius, and usually translated by the Greeks, person;” but to avoid the appearance of an express contradiction, Dr. Mosheim translates this barbarous word aspect,” as meaning a union of will and affection, rather than of nature or of person. And thus the Nestorians are charged with rejecting the union of two natures in one person, from their peculiar manner of expressing themselves, though they absolutely denied the charge.

In the earliest ages of Nestorianism, the various branches of that numerous and powerful sect were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Catholic patriarch of Babylon,--a vague appellation which has been successively applied to the sees of Seleucia, Ctesiphon, and Bagdad,--but who now resides at Mousul. In the sixteenth century the Nestorians were divided into two sects; for in 1551 a warm dispute arose among them about the creation of a new patriarch, Simeon Barmamas, or Barmana, being proposed by one party, and Sulaka, otherwise named Siud, earnestly desired by the other; when the latter, to support his pretensions the more effectually, repaired to Rome, and was consecrated patriarch in 1553, by Pope Julius III., whose jurisdiction he had acknowledged, and to whose commands he had promised unlimited submission and obedience. Upon this new Chaldean patriarch's return to his own country, Julius sent with him several persons skilled in the Syriac language, to assist him in establishing and extending the papal empire among the Nestorians; and from that time, that unhappy people have been divided into two factions, and have often been involved

in the greatest dangers and difficulties, by the jarring sentiments and perpetual quarrels of their patriarchs. In 1555, Simeon Denha, archbishop of Gelu, adopted the party of the fugitive patriarch, who had embraced the communion of the Latin church; and, being afterward chosen patriarch himself, he fixed his residence in the city of Van, or Ormia, in the mountainous parts of Persia, where his successors still continue, and are all distinguished by the name of Simeon; but they seem of late to have withdrawn themselves from their communion with the church of Rome. The great Nestorian pontiffs who form the opposite party, and who have, since 1559, been distinguished by the general denomination of Elias, and reside constantly at Mousul, look with a hostile eye on this little patriarch; but since 1617 the bishops of Ormus have been in so low and declining a state, both in opulence and credit, that they are no longer in a condition to excite the envy of their brethren at Mousul, whose spiritual dominion is very extensive, taking in great part of Asia, and comprehending within its circuit the Arabian Nestorians, as also the Christians of St. Thomas, who dwell along the coast of Malabar.

**NETHINIMS.** The Nethinims were servants who had been given up to the service of the tabernacle and temple, to perform the meanest and most laborious services therein, in supplying wood and water. At first the Gibeonites were appointed to this service, Joshua ix, 27. Afterward the Canaanites who surrendered themselves, and whose lives were spared, were consigned to the performance of the same duties. We read, Ezra viii, 20, that the Nethinims were slaves devoted by David and the other princes to the ministry of the temple; and elsewhere, that they were slaves given by Solomon; the children of Solomon's servants, Ezra ii, 58; and we see, in 1 Kings ix, 20, 21, that this prince had subdued the remains of the Canaanites, and had constrained them to several servitudes; and, it is very probable, he gave a good number of them to the priests and Levites for the service of the temple. The Nethinims were carried into captivity with the tribe of Judah, and there were great numbers of them near the coast of the Caspian Sea, from whence Ezra brought some of them back, Ezra viii, 17. After the return from the captivity, they dwelt in the cities appointed them, Ezra ii, 17. There were some of them also at Jerusalem, who inhabited that part of the city called Ophel, Neh. iii, 26. Those who returned with Ezra were to the number of two hundred and twenty, Ezra viii, 20; and those who followed Zerubbabel made up three hundred and ninety-two, Ezra ii, 58. This number was but small in regard to the offices that were imposed on them; so that we find them afterward instituting a solemnity called Xylophoria, in which 701 the people carried wood to the temple with great ceremony, to keep up the fire on the altar of burnt sacrifices.

NETTLES. We find this name given to two different words in the original. The first is *הררול*, Job xxx, 7; Proverbs xxiv, 31; Zeph. ii, 9. It is not easy to determine what species of plant is here meant. From the passage in Job, the nettle could not be intended; for a plant is referred to large enough for people to take shelter under. The following extract from Denon's Travels may help to illustrate the text, and show to what an uncomfortable retreat those vagabonds must have resorted. One of the inconveniences of the vegetable thickets of Egypt is, that it is difficult to remain in them; as nine-tenths of the trees and the plants are armed with inexorable thorns, which suffer only an unquiet enjoyment of the shadow which is so constantly desirable, from the precaution necessary to guard against them." The *קימוש*, Prov. xxiv, 31; Isaiah xxxiv, 13; Hosea ix, 6; is by the Vulgate rendered *urtica*," which is well defended by Celsius, and very probably means the nettle."

NICE or NICENE CREED is so denominated, because the greater part of it, namely, as far as the words, Holy Ghost," was drawn up and agreed to at the council of Nice, or Nicæa, in Bithynia, A. D. 325. This council was assembled against Arius, who, though he brought down the Son to the condition of a creature, inferior, for that reason, in nature to the Father, yet acknowledged his personal subsistence before the world, and his superiority in nature to all the things that were created by him. So that there was need of some higher expression in this case than the other, to import his equal dignity of nature with the Father and Creator of all; and nothing was found to answer the purpose so well as the term *ὁμοούσιος*. The rest of this creed was added at the council of Constantinople, A. D. 581, except the words, and the Son," which follow the words, who proceedeth from the Father," and they were inserted A. D. 447. The addition made at Constantinople was caused by the denial of the divinity of the Holy Ghost by Macedonius and his followers; and the creed, thus enlarged, was immediately received by all orthodox Christians. The insertion of the words, and the Son," was made by the Spanish bishops; and they were soon after adopted by the Christians in France. The bishops of Rome for some time refused to admit these words into the creed; but at last, A. D. 883, when Nicholas the First was pope, they were allowed, and from that time they have stood in the Nicene creed, in all the western churches; but the Greek church has never received them. See Arius.

NICODEMUS, a disciple of Jesus Christ, a Jew by nation, and a Pharisee, John iii, 1, &c. At the time when the priests and Pharisees had sent officers to seize Jesus, Nicodemus declared himself openly in his favour, John vii, 45, &c; and still more so when he went with Joseph of Arimathea to pay the last duties to his body, which they took down from the cross, embalmed, and laid in a sepulchre.



NICOLAITANS. St. John says in his Revelation, to the angel of the church of Ephesus, "But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate," Rev. ii, 6; and again, to the angel of the church of Pergamos: "So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate," Rev. ii, 15. These are the only two places where the Nicolaitans are mentioned in the New Testament: and it might appear at first, that little could be inferred from these concerning either their doctrine or their practice. It is asserted, however, by all the fathers, that the Nicolaitans were a branch of the Gnostics: and the epistles, which were addressed by St. John to the seven Asiatic churches, may perhaps lead us to the same conclusion. Thus to the church at Ephesus he writes: "Thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles and are not, and hast found them liars," Rev. ii, 2. This may be understood of the Gnostic teachers, who falsely called themselves Christians, and who would be not unlikely to assume also the title of Apostles. It appears from this and other passages, that they had distinguished themselves at Ephesus; and it is when writing to that church, that St. John mentions the Nicolaitans. Again, when writing to the church at Smyrna, he says: "I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan," Rev. ii, 9. The Gnostics borrowed many doctrines from the Jews, and thought by this means to attract both the Jews and Christians. We might therefore infer, even without the testimony of the fathers, that the Gnostic doctrines were prevalent in these churches, where St. John speaks of the Nicolaitans: and if so, we have a still more specific indication of their doctrine and practice, when we find St. John saying to the church in Pergamos, "I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication," Rev. ii, 14. Then follow the words already quoted, "So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate." There seems here to be some comparison between the doctrine of Balaam and that of the Nicolaitans: and I would also point out, that to the church in Thyatira the Apostle writes, "I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols," Rev. ii, 20. The two passages are very similar, and may enable us to throw some light upon the history of the Nicolaitans. Tertullian has preserved a tradition, that the person here spoken of as Jezebel was a female heretic, who taught what she had learned from the Nicolaitans: and whether the tradition be true or not, it seems certain, that to eat things sacrificed unto 702idols, and to commit fornication, was part of the practice of the Nicolaitans.

These two sins are compared to the doctrine of Balaam: and though the Bible tells us little of Balaam's history, beyond his prophecies and his death, yet we can collect enough to enable us to explain this allusion of St. John. We read, that when Israel abode in Shittim, the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab: and they," that is, the women, called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods," Num. xxv, 1, 2. But we read farther, that when the Midianites were spoiled and Balaam slain, Moses said of the women who were taken, Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor," Num. xxxi, 16. This, then, was the insidious policy and advice of Balaam. When he found that he was prohibited by God from cursing Israel, he advised Balak to seduce the Israelites by the women of Moab, and thus to entice them to the sacrifices of their gods. This is what St. John calls the doctrine of Balaam," or the wicked artifice which he taught the king of Moab: and so he says, that in the church of Pergamos there were some who held the doctrine of the Nicolaitans. We have therefore the testimony of St. John, as well as of the fathers, that the lives of the Nicolaitans were profligate and vicious; to which we may add, that they ate things sacrificed to idols. This is expressly said of Basilides and Valentinus, two celebrated leaders of Gnostic sects: and we perhaps are not going too far, if we infer from St. John, that the Nicolaitans were the first who enticed the Christians to this impious practice, and obtained from thence the distinction of their peculiar celebrity. Their motive for such conduct is very evident. They wished to gain proselytes to their doctrines; and they therefore taught that it was lawful to indulge the passions, and that there was no harm in partaking of an idol sacrifice. This had now become the test to which Christians must submit, if they wished to escape persecution: and the Nicolaitans sought to gain converts by telling them that they might still believe in Jesus though they ate of things sacrificed unto idols." The fear of death would shake the faith of some; others would be gained over by sensual arguments: and thus many unhappy Christians of the Asiatic churches were found by St. John in the ranks of the Nicolaitans.

We might wish perhaps to know at what time the sect of the Nicolaitans began; but we cannot define it accurately. If Irenæus is correct in saying that it preceded by a considerable time the heresy of Cerinthus, and that the Cerinthian heresy was a principal cause of St. John writing his Gospel, it follows, that the Nicolaitans were in existence at least some years before the time of their being mentioned in the Revelation; and the persecution under Domitian, which was the cause of St. John being sent to Patmos, may have been the time which enabled the Nicolaitans to exhibit their principles. Irenæus indeed adds, that St. John directed his Gospel against

the Nicolaitans as well as against Cerinthus: and the comparison which is made between their doctrine and that of Balaam, may perhaps authorize us to refer to this sect what is said in the second Epistle of St. Peter. The whole passage contains marked allusions to Gnostic teachers. There is another question concerning the Nicolaitans, which has excited much discussion. It is a question entirely of evidence and detail; and the two points to be considered are, 1. Whether the Nicolaitans derived their name from Nicolas of Antioch, who was one of the seven deacons: 2. Supposing this to be the fact, whether Nicolas had disgraced himself by sensual indulgence. Those writers who have endeavoured to clear the character of Nicolas have generally tried also to prove that he was not the man whom the Nicolaitans claimed as their head. But the one point may be true without the other: and the evidence is so overwhelming, which states that Nicolas the deacon was at least the person intended by the Nicolaitans, that it is difficult to come to any other conclusion upon the subject. We must not deny that some of the fathers have also charged him with falling into vicious habits, and thus affording too true a support to the heretics who claimed him as their leader. These writers, however, are of a late date; and some, who are much more ancient, have entirely acquitted him, and furnished an explanation of the calumnies which attach to his name. We know that the Gnostics were not ashamed to claim as their founders the Apostles, or friends of the Apostles. The same may have been the case with Nicolas the deacon; and though we allow, that if the Nicolaitans were distinguished as a sect some time before the end of the century, the probability is lessened that his name was thus abused; yet if his career was a short one, his history, like that of the other deacons, would soon be forgotten: and the same fertile invention, which gave rise in the two first centuries to so many apocryphal Gospels, may also have led the Nicolaitans to give a false character to him whose name they had assumed.

NICOPOLIS, a city of Epirus, on the gulf of Ambracia, whither, as some think, St. Paul wrote to Titus, then in Crete, to come to him, Titus iii, 12; but others, with greater probability, are of opinion, that the city of Nicopolis, where St. Paul was, was not that of Epirus, but that of Thrace, on the borders of Macedonia, near the river Nessus. Emmaus in Palestine was also called Nicopolis by the Romans.

NIGHT. The ancient Hebrews began their artificial day in the evening, and ended it the next evening; so that the night preceded the day, whence it is said, evening and morning one day," Gen. i, 5. They allowed twelve hours to the night, and twelve to the day. Night is put for a time of affliction and adversity: Thou hast proved mine heart, thou hast visited me in the night, thou hast tried me," Psalm xvii, 3; that is, by adversity and tribulation. And the morning cometh, and also the night," Isaiah xxi, 12.

Night is also put for the time of death: The night cometh, wherein no man can work," John ix, 4. Children of the day, and children of the night, in a moral and figurative sense, denote good men and wicked men, Christians and Gentiles. The disciples of the Son of God are children of light: they belong to the light, they walk in the light of truth; while the children of the night walk in the darkness of ignorance and infidelity, and perform only works of darkness. Ye are all the children of the light, and the children of the day; we are not of the night, nor of darkness," 1 Thess. v, 5.

NIGHT-HAWK, *סמח*, Lev. xi, 16; Deut. xiv, 15. That this is a voracious bird seems clear from the import of its name; and interpreters are generally agreed to describe it as flying by night. On the whole, it should seem to be the *strix orientalis*, which Hasselquist thus describes: It is of the size of the common owl, and lodges in the large buildings or ruins of Egypt and Syria, and sometimes even in the dwelling houses. The Arabs settled in Egypt call it *massasa*," and the Syrians *banu*." It is extremely voracious in Syria; to such a degree, that if care is not taken to shut the windows at the coming on of night, he enters the houses and kills the children: the women, therefore, are very much afraid of him.

NILE, the river of Egypt, whose fountain is in the Upper Ethiopia. After having watered several kingdoms, the Nile continues its course far into the kingdom of Goiam. Then it winds about again, from the east to the north. Having crossed several kingdoms and provinces, it falls into Egypt at the cataracts, which are waterfalls over steep rocks of the length of two hundred feet. At the bottom of these rocks the Nile returns to its usual pace, and thus flows through the valley of Egypt. Its channel, according to Villamont, is about a league broad. At eight miles below Grand Cairo, it is divided into two arms, which make a triangle, whose base is at the Mediterranean Sea, and which the Greeks call the Delta, because of its figure  $\Delta$ . These two arms are divided into others, which discharge themselves into the Mediterranean, the distance of which from the top of the Delta is about twenty leagues. These branches of the Nile the ancients commonly reckoned to be seven. Ptolemy makes them nine, some only four, some eleven, some fourteen. Homer, Xenophon, and Diodorus Siculus testify, that the ancient name of this river was *Egyptus*; and the latter of these writers says, that it took the name *Nilus* only since the time of a king of Egypt called by that name. The Greeks gave it the name of *Melas*; and Diodorus Siculus observes, that the most ancient name by which the Grecians have known the Nile was *Oceanus*. The Egyptians paid divine honours to this river, and called it *Jupiter Nilus*.

Very little rain ever falls in Egypt, never sufficient to fertilize the land; and but for the provision of this bountiful river, the country would be

condemned to perpetual sterility. As it is, from the joint operation of the regularity of the flood, the deposit of mud from the water of the river and the warmth of the climate, it is the most fertile country in the world; the produce exceeding all calculation. It has in consequence been, in all ages, the granary of the east; and has on more than one occasion, an instance of which is recorded in the history of Joseph, saved the neighbouring countries from starvation. It is probable, that, while in these countries, on the occasion referred to, the seven years' famine was the result of the absence of rain, in Egypt it was brought about by the inundation being withheld: and the consternation of the Egyptians, at witnessing this phenomenon for seven successive years, may easily be conceived. The origin and course of the Nile being unknown to the ancients, its stream was held, and is still held by the natives, in the greatest veneration; and its periodical overflow was viewed with mysterious wonder. But both of these are now, from the discoveries of the moderns, better understood. It is now known, that the sources, or permanent springs, of the Nile are situated in the mountains of Abyssinia, and the unexplored regions to the west and south-west of that country; and that the occasional supplies, or causes of the inundation, are the periodical rains which fall in those districts. For a correct knowledge of these facts, and of the true position of the source of that branch of the river, which has generally been considered to be the continuation of the true Nile, we are indebted to our countryman, the intrepid and indefatigable Bruce. Although the Nile, by way of eminence, has been called the river of Egypt," it must not be confounded with another stream so denominated in Scripture, an insignificant rivulet in comparison, which falls into the Mediterranean below Gaza.

NIMROD. He is generally supposed to have been the immediate son of Cush, and the youngest, or sixth, from the Scriptural phrase, Cush begat Nimrod," after the mention of his five sons, Gen. x, 8. But the phrase is used with considerable latitude, like father" and son," in Scripture. And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar: out of that land he went forth to invade Assyria; and built Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resin, between Nineveh and Calah: the same is a great city," Gen. x, 8–12. Though the main body of the Cushites was miraculously dispersed, and sent by Providence to their destinations along the sea coasts of Asia and Africa, yet Nimrod remained behind, and founded an empire in Babylonia, according to Berosus, by usurping the property of the Arphaxadites in the land of Shinar; where the beginning of his kingdom was Babel," or Babylon, and other towns: and, not satisfied with this, he next invaded Assur, or Assyria, east of the Tigris, where he built Nineveh, and several other towns. 704The marginal reading of our English Bible, He went out into Assyria," or to invade Assyria, is here adopted in preference to that in the text: And out of

that land went forth Ashur, and builded Nineveh," &c. The meaning of the word Nineveh may lead us to his original name, Nin, signifying a son," the most celebrated of the sons of Cush. That of Nimrod, or Rebel," was probably a parody, or nickname, given him by the oppressed Shemites, of which we have several instances in Scripture. Thus nahash, the brazen serpent" in the wilderness, was called by Hezekiah, in contempt, nehustan, a piece of brass," when he broke it in pieces, because it was perverted into an object of idolatrous worship by the Jews, 2 Kings xviii, 4. Nimrod, that arch rebel, who first subverted the patriarchal government, introduced also the Zabian idolatry, or worship of the heavenly host; and, after his death, was deified by his subjects, and supposed to be translated into the constellations of Orion, attended by his hounds, Sirius and Canicula, and still pursuing his favourite game, the great bear; supposed also to be translated into ursa major, near the north pole; as admirably described by Homer,--

Ἄρκτον θ', ἦν καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέουσιν,  
 Ἦ τ' αὐτοῦ ζρέφεται, καὶ τ' Ὠρίωνα δοκεύει.  
 Iliad xviii, 485.

And the bear, surnamed also the wain, by the Egyptians, who is turning herself about there, and watching Orion." Homer also introduces the shade of Orion, as hunting in the Elysian fields,--

Τὸν δὲ μέτ', Ὠρίωνα πελώριον εἰσενόησα  
 Θῆρας ὁμοῦ εἰλεῦντα, κατ' ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα·  
 Τοὺς αὐτὸς κατέπεφνεν ἐν οἰοπόλοισιν ὄρεσσι  
 Χερσὶν ἔχων ῥόπαλον παγχάλκεον, αἰὲν ἀαγές.  
 Odys. xi, 571.

Next, I observed the mighty Orion  
 Chasing wild beasts through an asphodel mead,  
 Which himself had slain on the solitary mountains:  
 Holding in his hands a solid brazen mace, ever unbroken."

The Grecian name of this mighty hunter" may furnish a satisfactory clue to the name given him by the impious adulation of the Babylonians and Assyrians. Ὠρίων nearly resembles, Ὀυρίαν, the oblique case of Ὀυρίας, which is the Septuagint rendering of Uria, a proper name in Scripture, 2 Sam. xi, 6–21. But Uria, signifying the light of the Lord," was an appropriate appellation of that most brilliant constellation. He was also called Baal, Beel, Bel, or Belus, signifying lord," or master," by the Phenicians, Assyrians, and Greeks; and Bala Rama, by the Hindus. At a village called Bala-deva, or Baldeo in the vulgar dialect, thirteen miles east by south from Muttra, in Hindustan, there is a very ancient statue of Bala Rama, in which he is represented with a ploughshare in his left hand, and a thick cudgel in his right, and his shoulders covered with the skin of a

tiger. Captain Wilford supposes that the ploughshare was designed to hook his enemies; but may it not more naturally denote the constellation of the great bear, which strikingly represents the figure of a plough in its seven bright stars; and was probably so denominated by the earliest astronomers, before the introduction of the Zabian idolatry, as a celestial symbol of agriculture? The thick cudgel corresponds to the brazen mace of Homer. And it is highly probable that the Assyrian Nimrod, or Hindu Bala, was also the prototype of the Grecian Hercules, with his club and lion's skin.

Nimrod is said to have been a mighty hunter before the Lord;" which the Jerusalem paraphrast interprets of a sinful hunting after the sons of men to turn them off from the true religion. But it may as well be taken in a more literal sense, for hunting of wild beasts; inasmuch as the circumstance of his being a mighty hunter is mentioned with great propriety to introduce the account of his setting up his kingdom; the exercise of hunting being looked upon in ancient times as a means of acquiring the rudiments of war; for which reason, the principal heroes of Heathen antiquity, as Theseus, Nestor, &c, were, as Xenophon tells us, bred up to hunting. Beside, it may be supposed, that by this practice Nimrod drew together a great company of robust young men to attend him in his sport, and by that means increased his power. And by destroying the wild beasts, which, in the comparatively defenceless state of society in those early ages, were no doubt very dangerous enemies, he might, perhaps, render himself farther popular; thereby engaging numbers to join with him, and to promote his chief design of subduing men, and making himself master of many nations.

NINEVEH. This capital of the Assyrian empire could boast of the remotest antiquity. Tacitus styles it, *Vetustissima sedes Assyriæ;*" [the most ancient seat of Assyria:] and Scripture informs us that Nimrod, after he had built Babel, in the land of Shinar, invaded Assyria, where he built Nineveh, and several other cities, Genesis x, 11. Its name denotes the habitation of Nin," which seems to have been the proper name of that rebel," as Nimrod signifies. And it is uniformly styled by Herodotus, Xenophon, Diodorus, Lucian, &c, *Ἡ Νίνοϋς*, the city of Ninus." And the village of Nunia, opposite Mosul, in its name, and the tradition of the natives, ascertains the site of the ancient city, which was near the castle of Arbela, according to Tacitus, so celebrated for the decisive victory of Alexander the Great over the Persians there; the site of which is ascertained by the village of Arbil, about ten German miles to the east of Nunia, according to Niebuhr's map. Nineveh at first seems only to have been a small city, and less than Resen, in its neighbourhood; which is conjectured by Bochart, and not without reason, to have been the same as Larissa, which Xenophon describes as the ruins of a great city, formerly inhabited by the Medes," and which the natives might have described as belonging to Resen, to Resen." Nineveh

did not rise to greatness for many ages after, until its second founder, Ninus II., about B. C. 1230, enlarged and made it the greatest city in the world. According to Diodorus, it was of an oblong form, a hundred and fifty stadia long, and ninety broad, and, consequently, four hundred and eighty in circuit, or forty-eight miles, reckoning ten stadia to an English mile, with Major Rennel. And its walls were a hundred feet high, and so broad that three chariots could drive on them abreast; and on the walls were fifteen hundred towers, each two hundred feet high. We are not, however, to imagine that all this vast enclosure was built upon: it contained great parks and extensive fields, and detached houses and buildings, like Babylon, and other great cities of the east even at the present day, as Bussorah, &c. And this entirely corresponds with the representations of Scripture. In the days of the Prophet Jonah, about B. C. 800, it seems to have been a "great city, an exceeding great city, of three days' journey," Jonah i, 2; iii, 3; perhaps in circuit. The population of Nineveh, also, at that time was very great. It contained more than sixscore thousand persons that could not discern between their right hand and their left, beside much cattle," Jonah iv, 11. Reckoning the persons to have been infants of two years old and under, and that these were a fifth part of the whole, according to Bochart, the whole population would amount to six hundred thousand souls. The same number Pliny assigns for the population of Seleucia, on the decline of Babylon. This population shows that a great part of the city must have been left open and unbuilt.

The threatened overthrow of Nineveh within three days, was, by the general repentance and humiliation of the inhabitants, from the highest to the lowest, suspended for near two hundred years, until their iniquity came to the full;" and then the prophecy was literally accomplished, in the third year of the siege of the city, by the combined Medes and Babylonians; the king, Sardanapalus, being encouraged to hold out in consequence of an ancient prophecy, that Nineveh should never be taken by assault, till the river became its enemy; when a mighty inundation of the river, swollen by continual rains, came up against a part of the city, and threw down twenty stadia of the wall in length; upon which, the king, conceiving that the oracle was accomplished, burned himself, his concubines, eunuchs, and treasures; and the enemy, entering by the breach, sacked and rased the city, about B. C. 606. Diodorus, also, relates that Belesis, the governor of Babylon, obtained from Arbaces, the king of Media, the ashes of the palace, to erect a mount with them near the temple of Belus at Babylon; and that he forthwith prepared shipping, and, together with the ashes, carried away most of the gold and silver, of which he had private information given him by one of the eunuchs who escaped the fire. Dr. Gillies thinks it incredible that these could be transported from Nineveh to Babylon, three hundred miles distant; but likely enough, if Nineveh was only fifty miles from



Babylon, with a large canal of communication between them, the Nahar Malka, or Royal River. But we learn from Niebuhr, that the conveyance of goods from Nosul to Bagdat by the Tigris is very commodious, in the very large boats called helleks; in which, in spring, when the river is rapid, the voyage may be made in three or four days, which would take fifteen by land. The complete demolition of such immense piles as the walls and towers of Nineveh may seem matter of surprise to those who do not consider the nature of the materials of which they were constructed, that is, of bricks, dried or baked in the sun, and cemented with bitumen, which were apt to be dissolved" by water, or to moulder away by the injuries of the weather. Beside, in the east, the materials of ancient cities have been often employed in the building of new ones in the neighbourhood. Thus Mosul was built with the spoils of Nineveh. Tauk Kesra, or the Palace of Chosroes, appears to have been built of bricks brought from the ruins of Babylon; and so was Hellah, as the dimensions are nearly the same, and the proportions so singular. And when such materials could conveniently be transported by inland navigations, they are to be found at very great distances from their ancient place, much farther, indeed, than are Bagdat and Seleucia, or Ctesiphon, from Babylon.

The book of Nahum was avowedly prophetic of the destruction of Nineveh; and it is there foretold that the gates of the river shall be opened, and the palace shall be dissolved. Nineveh of old, like a pool of water, with an overflowing flood he will make an utter end of the place thereof," Nahum ii, 6; i, 8, 9. The historian describes the facts by which the other predictions of the prophet were as literally fulfilled. He relates that the king of Assyria, elated with his former victories, and ignorant of the revolt of the Bactrians, had abandoned himself to scandalous inaction; had appointed a time of festivity, and supplied his soldiers with abundance of wine; and that the general of the enemy, apprised by deserters, of their negligence and drunkenness, attacked the Assyrian army while the whole of them were fearlessly giving way to indulgence, destroyed great part of them, and drove the rest into the city. The words of the prophet were hereby verified: While they be folden together as thorns, and while they are drunken as drunkards, they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry," Nahum i, 10. The prophet promised much spoil to the enemy: Take the spoil of silver, take the spoil of gold; for there is no end of the store and glory out of all the pleasant furniture," Nahum ii, 9. And the historian affirms that many talents of gold and silver, preserved from the fire, were carried to Ecbatana. According to Nahum, iii, 15, the city was not only to be destroyed by an overflowing flood, but the fire, also, was to devour it; and, as Diodorus relates, partly by water, partly by fire, it was destroyed.

The utter and perpetual destruction and desolation of Nineveh were foretold: The Lord will make an utter end of the place thereof. Affliction shall not rise up the second time. 706She is empty, void, and waste," Nahum i, 8, 9; ii, 10; iii, 17–19. The Lord will stretch out his hand against the north, and destroy Assyria, and will make Nineveh a desolation, and dry like a wilderness. How is she become a desolation, a place for beasts to lie down in," Zeph. ii, 13–15. In the second century, Lucian, a native of a city on the banks of the Euphrates, testified that Nineveh was utterly perished, that there was no vestige of it remaining, and that none could tell where once it was situated. This testimony of Lucian, and the lapse of many ages during which the place was not known where it stood, render it at least somewhat doubtful whether the remains of an ancient city, opposite to Mosul, which have been described as such by travellers, be indeed those of ancient Nineveh. It is, perhaps, probable that they are the remains of the city which succeeded Nineveh, or of a Persian city of the same name, which was built on the banks of the Tigris by the Persians subsequently to A. D. 230, and demolished by the Saracens, A. D. 632. In contrasting the then existing great and increasing population, and the accumulating wealth of the proud inhabitants of the mighty Nineveh, with the utter ruin that awaited it, the word of God by the Prophet Nahum, was, Make thyself many as the canker worm, make thyself many as the locusts. Thou hast multiplied thy merchants above the stars of heaven: the canker worm spoileth and flieth away. Thy crowned are as the locusts, and thy captains as the great grasshoppers which camp in the hedges in the cold day: but when the sun riseth, they flee away; and their place is not known where they are," or were. Whether these words imply that even the site of Nineveh would in future ages be uncertain or unknown; or, as they rather seem to intimate, that every vestige of the palaces of its monarchs, of the greatness of its nobles, and of the wealth of its numerous merchants, would wholly disappear; the truth of the prediction cannot be invalidated under either interpretation. The avowed ignorance respecting Nineveh, and the oblivion which passed over it, for many an age, conjoined with the meagreness of evidence to identify it, still prove that the place where it stood was long unknown, and that, even now, it can scarcely with certainty be determined. And if the only spot that bears its name, or that can be said to be the place where it was, be indeed the site of one of the most extensive of cities on which the sun ever shone, and which continued for many centuries to be the capital of Assyria,--the principal mounds, few in number, which show neither bricks, stones, nor other materials of building,--but are in many places overgrown with grass, and resemble the mounds left by intrenchments and fortifications of ancient Roman camps, and the appearances of other mounds and ruins less marked than even these, extending for ten miles, and widely spread, and seeming to be the wreck of former buildings,--show that Nineveh is left without one monument of

royalty, without any token whatever of its splendour or wealth; that their place is not known where they were; and that it is indeed a desolation, empty, void, and waste," its very ruins perished, and less than the wreck of what it was. Such an utter ruin, in every view, has been made of it; and such is the truth of the divine predictions!

NISAN, a month of the Hebrews, answering to our March, and which sometimes takes from February or April, according to the course of the moon. It was made the first month of the sacred year, at the coming out of Egypt, Exod. xii, 2; and it was the seventh month of the civil year. By Moses it is called Abib. The name Nisan was introduced only since the time of Ezra, and the return from the captivity of Babylon.

NISROCH, a god of the Assyrians. Sennacherib was killed by two of his sons, while he was paying his adorations in the temple of this deity, 2 Kings xix, 37; Isaiah xxxvii, 38. It is uncertain who this god was.

NITRE, נתר, Prov. xxv, 20; Jer. ii, 22. This is not the same that we call nitre, or saltpetre, but a native salt of a different kind, distinguished among naturalists by the name of natrum. The natrum of the ancients was an earthy alkaline salt. It was found in abundance separated from the water of the lake Natron in Egypt. It rises from the bottom of the lake to the top of the water, and is there condensed by the heat of the sun into the hard and dry form in which it is sold. This salt thus scummed off is the same in all respects with the Smyrna soap earth. Pliny, Matthiolus, and Agricola, have described it to us: Hippocrates, Galen, Dioscorides, and others, mention its uses. It is also found in great plenty in Sindy, a province in the inner part of Asia, and in many other parts of the east; and might be had in any quantities. The learned Michaëlis plainly demonstrates, from the nature of the thing and the context, that this fossil and natural alkali must be that which the Hebrews called nether. Solomon must mean the same when he compares the effect which unseasonable mirth has upon a man in affliction to the action of vinegar upon nitre, Prov. xxv, 20; for vinegar has no effect upon what we call nitre, but upon the alkali in question has a great effect, making it rise up in bubbles with much effervescence. It is of a soapy nature, and was used to take spots from clothes, and even from the face. Jeremiah alludes to this use of it, ii, 22.

NO, or NO-AMMON, a city of Egypt, supposed to be Thebes.

NOAH, the son of Lamech. Amidst the general corruption of the human race, Noah only was found righteous, Gen. vi, 9. He therefore found grace in the sight of the Lord," and was directed for his preservation to make an ark, the shape and dimensions of which were prescribed by the Lord. In A.

M. 1656, and in the six hundredth year of his age, Noah, by divine appointment, entered the ark with his family, and all the animals collected for the renewal of the world. (See Deluge.) After the ark had stranded, and the earth was 707 in a measure dried, Noah offered a burnt-sacrifice to the Lord, of the pure animals that were in the ark; and the Lord was pleased to accept of his offering, and to give him assurance that he would no more destroy the world by water, Genesis ix. He gave Noah power over all the brute creation, and permitted him to kill and eat of them, as of the herbs and fruits of the earth, except the blood, the use of which was prohibited. After the deluge Noah lived three hundred and fifty years; and the whole time of his life having been nine hundred and fifty years, he died, A. M. 2006. According to common opinion, he divided the earth among his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. To Shem he gave Asia, to Ham Africa, and to Japheth Europe. Some will have it, that beside these three sons he had several others. St. Peter calls Noah a preacher of righteousness, because before the deluge he was incessantly preaching and declaring to men, not only by his discourses, but by the building of the ark, in which he was employed a hundred and twenty years, that the cloud of divine vengeance was about to burst upon them. But his faithful ministry produced no effect, since, when the deluge came, it found mankind practising their usual enormities, Matt. xxiv, 37. Several learned men have observed that the Heathens confounded Saturn, Deucalion, Ogyges, the god Cœlus or Ouranus, Janus, Protheus, Prometheus, &c, with Noah. The fable of Deucalion and his wife Pyrrha is manifestly drawn from the history of Noah. The rabbins pretend that God gave Noah and his sons certain general precepts, which contain, according to them, the natural duties which are common to all men indifferently, and the observation of which alone will be sufficient to save them. After the law of Moses was given, the Hebrews would not suffer any stranger to dwell in their country, unless he would conform to the precepts of Noah. In war, they put to death without quarter all who were ignorant of them. These precepts are seven in number: the first was against the worship of idols; the second, against blasphemy, and required to bless the name of God; the third, against murder; the fourth, against incest and all uncleanness; the fifth, against theft and rapine; the sixth required the administration of justice; the seventh was against eating flesh with life. But the antiquity of these precepts is doubted, since no mention of them is made in the Scripture, or in the writings of Josephus, or in Philo; and none of the ancient fathers knew any thing of them.

NOD, Land of, the country to which Cain withdrew after the murder of Abel. As the precise situation of this country cannot possibly be known, so it has given rise to much ingenious speculation. All that we are told of it is, that it was on the east of Eden," or, as it may be rendered, before Eden;" which very country of Eden is no sure guide for us, as the situation of that

also is disputed. But, be it on the higher or lower Euphrates, (see Eden,) the land of Nod which stood before it with respect to the place where Moses wrote, may still preserve the curse of barrenness passed on it for Cain's sake, namely, in the deserts of Syria or Arabia. The Chaldee interpreters render the word Nod, not as the proper name of a country, but as an appellative applied to Cain himself, signifying a vagabond or fugitive, and read, He dwelt a fugitive in the land." But the Hebrew reads expressly, He dwelt in the land of Nod."

NONCONFORMISTS, dissenters from the church of England; but the term applies more particularly to those ministers who were ejected from their livings by the Act of Uniformity in 1662; the number of whom, according to Dr. Calamy, was nearly two thousand; and to the laity who adhered to them. The celebrated Mr. Locke says, Bartholomew-day (the day fixed by the Act of Uniformity) was fatal to our church and religion, by throwing out a very great number of worthy, learned, pious, and orthodox divines, who could not come up to this and other things in that act. And it is worth your knowledge, that so great was the zeal in carrying on this church affair, and so blind was the obedience required, that if you compare the time of passing the act with the time allowed for the clergy to subscribe the book of Common Prayer thereby established, you shall plainly find, it could not be printed and distributed, so as one man in forty could have seen and read the book before they did so perfectly assent and consent thereto."

By this act, the clergy were required to subscribe, *ex animo*, [sincerely,] their assent and consent to all and every thing contained in the book of Common Prayer," which had never before been insisted on, so rigidly as to deprive them of their livings and livelihood. Several other acts were passed about this time, very oppressive both to the clergy and laity. In the preceding year 1661, the Corporation Act incapacitated all persons from offices of trust and honour in a corporation, who did not receive the sacrament in the established church. The Conventicle Act, in 1663 and 1670, forbade the attendance at conventicles; that is, at places of worship other than the establishment, where more than five adults were present beside the resident family; and that under penalties of fine and imprisonment by the sentence of magistrates without a jury. The Oxford Act of 1665 banished nonconforming ministers five miles from any corporate town sending members to parliament, and prohibited them from keeping or teaching schools. The Test Act of the same year required all persons, accepting any office under government, to receive the sacrament in the established church.

Such were the dreadful consequences of this intolerant spirit, that it is supposed that near eight thousand died in prison in the reign of Charles II. It is said that Mr. Jeremiah White had carefully collected a list of those who had suffered between Charles II. and the revolution, which amounted to sixty thousand. The same persecutions were carried on in Scotland; and there, as well as in England, numbers, to avoid the persecution, left their country. But, notwithstanding all these dreadful and furious attacks upon the dissenters, they were not extirpated. Their very persecution was in their favour. The infamous character of their informers and persecutors; their piety, zeal, and fortitude, no doubt, had influence on considerate minds; and, indeed, they had additions from the established church, which several clergymen in this reign deserted as a persecuting church, and took their lot among them. King William coming to the throne, the famous Toleration Act passed, by which they were exempted from suffering the penalties above mentioned, and permission was given them to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. In the reign of George III., the Act for the Protection of Religious Worship superseded the Act of Toleration, by still more liberal provisions in favour of religious liberty; and in the last reign the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed.

NOPH, Memphis, a celebrated city of Egypt, and, till the time of the Ptolemies, who removed to Alexandria, the residence of the ancient kings of Egypt. It stood above the dividing of the river Nile, where the Delta begins. Toward the south of this city stood the famous pyramids, two of which were esteemed the wonders of the world; and in this city was fed the ox Apis, which Cambyses slew, in contempt of the Egyptians who worshipped it as a deity. The kings of Egypt took much pleasure in adorning this city; and it continued in all its beauty till the Arabians made a conquest of Egypt under the Caliph Omar. The general who took it built another city near it, named Fustal, merely because his tent had been a long time set up in that place; and the Fatimite caliphs, when they became masters of Egypt, added another to it, which is known to us at this day by the name of Grand Cairo. This occasioned the utter decay of Memphis, and led to the fulfilment of the prophecy, that it should be waste and without inhabitant." The prophets often speak of this city, and foretel the miseries it was to suffer from the kings of Chaldea and Persia, Isaiah xix, 13; Jer. xlv, 1; xlv, 14, 19; Hosea ix, 6; Ezek. xxx, 13, 16.

NOVATIANS, the followers of Novatian, a priest of Rome, and of Novatus, a priest of Carthage, in the third century. They were distinguished merely by their discipline; for their religious and doctrinal tenets do not appear to be at all different from those of the church. They condemned second marriages, and for ever excluded from their communion all those who after baptism had fallen into sin. They affected very superior purity;

and, though they conceived that the worst might possibly hope for eternal life, they absolutely refused to readmit into their communion any who had lapsed into sin. They separated from the church of Rome, because the members of it admitted into their communion many who had, during a season of persecution, rejected the Christian faith.

NUMBERS, a canonical book of the Old Testament, being the fourth of the Pentateuch, or five books of Moses; and receives its denomination from the numbering of the families of Israel by Moses and Aaron, who mustered the tribes, and marshalled the army, of the Hebrews in their passage through the wilderness. A great part of this book is historical, relating several remarkable events which happened in that journey, and also mentioning various of their journeyings in the wilderness. This book comprehends the history of about thirty-eight years, though the greater part of the things recorded fell out in the first and last of those years; and it does not appear when those things were done which are recorded in the middle of the book. See Pentateuch.

NURSE. The nurse in an eastern family is always an important personage. Modern travellers inform us, that in Syria she is considered as a sort of second parent, whether she has been foster-mother or otherwise. She always accompanies the bride to her husband's house, and ever remains there an honoured character. Thus it was in ancient Greece. This will serve to explain Genesis xxiv, 59: And they sent away Rebekah their sister, and her nurse." In Hindostan the nurse is not looked upon as a stranger, but becomes one of the family, and passes the remainder of her life in the midst of the children she has suckled, by whom she is honoured and cherished as a second mother. In many parts of Hindostan are mosques and mausoleums, built by the Mohammedan princes, near the sepulchres of their nurses. They are excited by a grateful affection to erect these structures in memory of those who with maternal anxiety watched over their helpless infancy: thus it has been from time immemorial.

OAK. The religious veneration paid to this tree, by the original natives of our island in the time of the Druids, is well known to every reader of British history. We have reason to think that this veneration was brought from the east; and that the Druids did no more than transfer the sentiments their progenitors had received in oriental countries. It should appear that the Patriarch Abraham resided under an oak, or a grove of oaks, which our translators render the plain of Mamre; and that he planted a grove of this tree, Gen. xiii, 18. In fact, since in hot countries nothing is more desirable than shade, nothing more refreshing than the shade of a tree, we may easily suppose the inhabitants would resort for such enjoyment to

Where'er the oak's thick branches spread  
A deeper, darker shade.

Oaks, and groves of oaks, were esteemed proper places for religious services; altars were set up under them, Joshua xxiv, 26; and, probably, in the east as well as in the west, appointments to meet at conspicuous oaks were made, and many affairs were transacted or treated of under their shade, as we read in Homer, Theocritus and other poets. It was common among the Hebrews to sit under oaks, 709 Judges vi, 11; 1 Kings xiii, 14. Jacob buried idolatrous images under an oak, Gen. xxxv, 4; and Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, was buried under one of these trees, Genesis xxxv, 8. See 1 Chron. x, 12. Abimelech was made king under an oak, Judges ix, 6. Idolatry was practised under oaks, Isaiah i, 29; lvii, 5; Hosea iv, 13. Idols were made of oaks, Isa. xlv, 14.

OATH, a solemn invocation of a superior power, admitted to be acquainted with all the secrets of our hearts, with our inward thoughts as well as our outward actions, to witness the truth of what we assert, and to inflict his vengeance upon us if we assert what is not true, or promise what we do not mean to perform. Almost all nations, whether savage or civilized, whether enjoying the light of revelation or led only by the light of reason, knowing the importance of truth, and willing to obtain a barrier against falsehood, have had recourse to oaths, by which they have endeavoured to make men fearful of uttering lies, under the dread of an avenging Deity. Among Christians, an oath is a solemn appeal for the truth of our assertions, the sincerity of our promises, and the fidelity of our engagements, to the one only God, the Judge of the whole earth, who is every where present, and sees, and hears, and knows, whatever is said, or done, or thought in any part of the world. Such is that Being whom Christians, when they take an oath, invoke to bear testimony to the truth of their words, and the integrity of their hearts. Surely, then, if oaths be a matter of so much moment, it well behoves us not to treat them with levity, nor ever to take them without due consideration. Hence we ought, with the utmost vigilance, to abstain from mingling oaths in our ordinary discourse, and from associating the name of God with low or disgusting images, or using it on trivial occasions, as not only a profane levity in itself, but tending to destroy that reverence for the supreme Majesty which ought to prevail in society, and to dwell in our own hearts.

The forms of oaths," says Dr. Paley, like other religious ceremonies, have in all ages been various; consisting, however, for the most part of some bodily action, and of a prescribed form of words." Among the Jews, the juror held up his right hand toward heaven, Psalm cxliv, 8; Rev. x, 5. The same form is retained in Scotland still. Among the Jews, also, an oath of fidelity was taken by the servant's putting his hand under the thigh of his



lord, Genesis xxiv, 2. Among the Greeks and Romans, the form varied with the subject and occasion of the oath: in private contracts, the parties took hold of each other's hands, while they swore to the performance; or they touched the altar of the god by whose divinity they swore: upon more solemn occasions, it was the custom to slay a victim; and the beast being struck down with certain ceremonies and invocations, gave birth to the expression, *ferire pactum*; and to our English phrase, translated from this, of striking a bargain." The form of oaths in Christian countries is also very different; but in no country in the world worse contrived, either to convey the meaning or impress the obligation of an oath, than in our own. The juror with us, after repeating the promise or affirmation which the oath is intended to confirm, adds, "So help me God;" or, more frequently, the substance of the oath is repeated to the juror by the magistrate, who adds in the conclusion, "So help you God." The energy of this sentence resides in the particle *so*: So, that is, *hâc lege*, upon condition of my speaking the truth, or performing this promise, and not otherwise, may God help me! The juror, while he hears or repeats the words of the oath, holds his right hand upon a Bible, or other book containing the Gospels, and at the conclusion kisses the book. This obscure and elliptical form, together with the levity and frequency of them, has brought about a general inadvertency to the obligation of oaths, which, both in a religious and political view, is much to be lamented; and it merits public consideration, whether the requiring of oaths upon so many frivolous occasions, especially in the customs, and in the qualification for petty offices, has any other effect than to make such sanctions cheap in the minds of the people. A pound of tea cannot travel regularly from the ship to the consumer, without costing half a dozen oaths at least; and the same security for the due discharge of their office, namely, that of an oath, is required from a churchwarden and an archbishop; from a petty constable and the chief justice of England. Oaths, however, are lawful; and, whatever be the form, the signification is the same. Historians have justly remarked, that when the reverence for an oath began to diminish among the Romans, and the loose epicurean system, which discarded the belief of providence, was introduced, the Roman honour and prosperity from that period began to decline. The Quakers refuse to swear upon any occasion, founding their scruples concerning the lawfulness of oaths upon our Saviour's prohibition, "Swear not at all," Matt. v, 34. But it seems our Lord there referred to the vicious, wanton, and unauthorized swearing in common discourse, and not to judicial oaths; for he himself answered, when interrogated, upon oath, Matt. xxvi, 63, 64; Mark xiv, 61. The Apostle Paul also makes use of expressions which contain the nature of oaths, Romans i, 9; 1 Cor. xv, 31; 2 Cor. i, 18; Gal. i, 20; Heb. vi, 13–17. The administration of oaths supposes that God will punish false swearing with more severity than a simple lie, or breach of promise; for which belief there are the following reasons: 1. Perjury is a

sin of greater deliberation. 2. It violates a superior confidence. 3. God directed the Israelites to swear by his name, Deut. vi, 13; x, 20; and was pleased to confirm his covenant with that people by an oath; neither of which, it is probable, he would have done, had he not intended to represent oaths as having some meaning and effect beyond the obligation of a bare promise.

710OBADIAH the prophet is thought to have been the same as the governor of Ahab's house, 1 Kings xviii, 3, &c; and some are of opinion, he was that Obadiah whom Josiah made overseer of the works of the temple, 2 Chron. xxxiv, 12. Indeed, the age in which this prophet lived is very uncertain. Some think that he was contemporary with Hosea, Amos, and Joel; while others are of opinion that he lived in the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and that he delivered his prophecy about B. C. 585, soon after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. His book, which consists of a single chapter, is written with great beauty and elegance, and contains predictions of the utter destruction of the Edomites, and of the future restoration and prosperity of the Jews.

OBED-EDOM, son of Jeduthun, a Levite, 1 Chron. xvi, 38, and the father of Shemaiah and others, 1 Chron. xvi, 5. We learn that the Lord blessed this man exceedingly, on account of the ark resting under his roof, 2 Sam. vi, 10, 11. David having removed the ark to the place he had previously prepared for its reception, Obed-Edom and his sons were appointed to be keepers of the doors of the temple, 1 Chron. xv, 18, 21. Obed-Edom is called the Gittite, probably because he was of Gathrimmon, a city of the Levites beyond Jordan, Joshua xxi, 24, 25.

ODED, a prophet of the Lord, who, being at Samaria when the Israelites of the ten tribes returned from the war with their King Pekah, together with two hundred thousand of the people of Judah, whom they had taken captive, went out to meet them; and through his remonstrances the captives were liberated, 2 Chron. xxviii. This circumstance is all that is recorded concerning Oded.

OFFERINGS. Among the Jews, under the Mosaic law, a variety of offerings of different kinds were appointed, which are accurately and fully described in the beginning of the book of Leviticus.

Burnt-offerings, or holocausts, sacrifices in which the victims were wholly consumed, were expiatory, and more ancient than any others, and were, for that reason, held in special honour. It was in consideration of these circumstances that Moses gave precepts in regard to this kind of sacrifices first, Lev. i, 3. Holocausts might be offered by means of the Hebrew priests,

when brought by the Heathen, or those who had originated from another nation; such persons being unable to offer sin or trespass-offerings, since this sort of sacrifices had particular reference to some neglect or violation of the Mosaic law, by whose authority they did not acknowledge themselves bound. Holocausts were expiatory, and we accordingly find that they were offered sometimes for the whole people; for instance, the morning and the evening sacrifices; and sometimes by an individual for himself alone, either from the free impulse of his feelings, or in fulfilment of a vow, Psalm li, 19; lxvi, 13, 14. They were required to be offered under certain combinations of circumstances pointed out in the Mosaic laws; namely, by a Nazarite, who had been unexpectedly rendered unclean, or who had completed the days of his separation, Num. vi, 11–16; by those who had been healed of leprosy; and by women after child-birth, Lev. xii, 6, 8. The victims immolated at a holocaust were bullocks of three years old, goats and lambs of a year old, turtle doves, and young pigeons. Not only the parts which were expressly destined for the altar, but also the other parts of the victims, were burned. A libation of wine was poured out upon the altar. It was the practice among the Gentile nations, (an allusion to which occurs in Phil. ii, 17, and 2 Tim. iv, 6,) to pour the wine out between the horns of the victims which they immolated to their idols. The priest partially wrung or cut off the heads of the turtle doves and young pigeons, sprinkled the blood on the side of the altar, plucked out the feathers and the crop, and cast them to the east of the altar into the place for the reception of ashes, and placed the remainder, after having cleft or broken the wings, upon the fire, Lev. i, 3–17.

Drink-offerings. With a bullock, half a hin of wine, with three-tenth deals of flour, and half a hin of oil. With a ram, one-third of a hin of wine, with two-tenth deals of flour, and one-third of a hin of oil. With a lamb or a kid of the goats, one quarter of a hin of wine, one-tenth deal of flour, and one quarter of a hin of oil. With a sheaf of the first-fruits, one quarter of a hin of wine, one-tenth deal of flour, with oil.

Meat-offerings. These, like the drink-offerings, were appendages to the sacrifices. They were of thin cakes or wafers. In some instances they were offered alone.

Heave-offerings. So called from the sacrifice being lifted up toward heaven, in token of its being devoted to Jehovah.

Peace-offerings. Bullocks, heifers, goats, rams, and sheep, were the only animals sacrificed on these occasions, Lev. iii, 1–17; vii, 23–27. These sacrifices, which were offered as an indication of gratitude, were accompanied with unleavened cakes, covered with oil, by pouring it upon

them; with thin cakes or wafers, likewise unleavened, and besmeared with oil; also with another kind of cakes, made of fine meal, and kneaded with oil. The priest, who sprinkled the blood, presented one of each of these kinds of cakes as an offering, Lev. vii, 11–14, 28–35. The remainder of the animal substance and of the cakes was converted by the person who made the offering into an entertainment, to which widows, orphans, the poor, slaves, and Levites were invited. What was not eaten on the day of the offering might be reserved till the succeeding; but that which remained till the third was to be burned: a regulation which was made in order to prevent the omission or putting off of the season of this benevolence and joy, Lev. vii, 15–21; Deut. xii, 18. This feast could be celebrated beyond the limits of the tabernacle, or temple, but not beyond the city.

Sin-offerings were for expiation of particular sins, or legal imperfections, called therefore sin-offerings: the first sort were for sins of ignorance or surprise, either from the high priest, or body of the community, from the rulers, or any one of the common people. The other sort of sin-offerings were for voluntary sins; but as to the more capital violations of the moral law, as murder, adultery, or the worship of idols, no expiatory sacrifice was admitted.

Trespass-offerings were not required of the people as a body. They were to be offered by individuals, who, through ignorance, mistake, or want of reflection, had neglected some of the ceremonial precepts of Moses, or some of those natural laws, which had been introduced into his code, and sanctioned with the penalty of death; and who were subsequently conscious of their error. The person who, being sworn as a witness, concealed the truth by keeping silent; the man who, having become contaminated without knowing it, had omitted purification, but had afterward become acquainted with the fact; the person who had rashly sworn to do a thing, and had not done it; all these delinquents offered a lamb or kid, or, in case of poverty, two doves or young pigeons, the one for a trespass, the other for a sin-offering. In case the person was unusually poor, he was required to offer merely the tenth part of an ephah of fine meal, without oil or frankincense, Lev. iii, 1–16. Whoever appropriated to himself any thing consecrated, or any thing that was promised, or found, or stolen, or deposited in his possession for keeping; whoever swore falsely, or omitted to restore the goods that belonged to another, or injured him in any other way, presented for his trespass a ram, which had been submitted to the estimation of the priest, and not only made restitution, but allowed an additional amount of a fifth part by way of indemnification. He who had committed fornication with a betrothed bondmaid, previously to her being redeemed from servitude, offered a ram for the trespass, Lev. xix, 20–22. Nazarites, who had been unexpectedly rendered unclean, presented

a lamb of a year old, Num. vi, 11. Finally, lepers, when restored to health, and purified, sacrificed a ram, Lev. xiv, 10–14. The ceremonies were the same as in the sin-offerings.

Wave-offering. It was so called, because it was waved up and down, and toward the east, west, north, and south, to signify, that he to whom it was offered was Lord of the universe, the God who fills all space, and to whom all things of right belong. See Sacrifices>.

OG, a king of Bashan; being a giant of the race of the Rephaim. Moses records the conquest of Og, and his destruction. After which his country was given to the tribe of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, Num. xxi, 33. See Giants.

OIL, שמן. The invention and use of oil is of the highest antiquity. It is said that Jacob poured oil upon the pillar which he erected at Bethel, Gen. xxviii, 18. The earliest kind was that which is extracted from olives. Before the invention of mills, this was obtained by pounding them in a mortar, Exod. xxvii, 20; and sometimes by treading them with the feet in the same manner as were grapes, Deut. xxxiii, 24; Micah vi, 15. The Hebrews used common oil with their food, in their meat-offerings, for burning in their lamps, &c. As vast quantities of oil were made by the ancient Jews, it became an article of exportation. The great demand for it in Egypt led the Jews to send it thither. The Prophet Hosea thus upbraids his degenerate nation with the servility and folly of their conduct: Ephraim feedeth on wind, and followeth after the east wind; he daily increaseth falsehood and vanity: and a league is made with Assyria, and oil carried into Egypt,” Hosea xii, 1. The Israelites, in the decline of their national glory, carried the produce of their olive plantations into Egypt as a tribute to their ancient oppressors, or as a present to conciliate their favour, and obtain their assistance in the sanguinary wars which they were often compelled to wage with the neighbouring states. There was an unguent, very precious and sacred, used in anointing the priests, the tabernacle, and furniture. This was compounded of spicy drugs; namely, myrrh, sweet cinnamon, sweet calamus, and cassia, mixed with oil olive.

OLIVE TREE, זית, ἐλαία, Matt. xxi, 1; Rom. xi, 17, 24; James iii, 12; ἀγριέλαιος, oleaster, the wild olive, Rom. xi, 17, 24. Tournefort mentions eighteen kinds of olives; but in the Scripture we only read of the cultivated and wild olive. The cultivated olive is of a moderate height, and thrives best in a sunny and warm soil. Its trunk is knotty; its bark is smooth, and of an ash colour; its wood is solid, and yellowish; its leaves are oblong, and almost like those of the willow, of a dark green colour on the upper side, and a whitish below. In the month of June it puts forth white flowers,

growing in bunches, each of one piece, and widening toward the top, and dividing into four parts. After this flower succeeds the fruit, which is oblong and plump. It is first green, then pale, and, when quite ripe, becomes black. Within it is enclosed a hard stone, filled with oblong seeds. The wild olives were of a less kind. Canaan much abounded with olives. It seems almost every proprietor, whether kings or subjects, had their olive yards. The olive branch was, from most ancient times, used as the symbol of reconciliation and peace.

OLIVES. The Mount of Olives was situated to the east of Jerusalem, and divided from the city only by the brook Kidron, and by the valley of Jehoshaphat, which stretches out from the north to the south. It was upon this mount that Solomon built temples to the gods of the Ammonites, 1 Kings xi, 7, and the Moabites, out of complaisance to his wives of those nations. Hence it is that the Mount of Olives is called the mountain of corruption, 2 Kings xxiii, 13. The Mount of Olives forms part of a ridge of limestone hills, extending to the north and the south west. Pococke describes it as having four summits. On the 712 lowest and most northerly of these, which, he tells us, is called Sulman Tashy, the stone of Solomon, there is a large domed sepulchre, and several other Mohammedan tombs. The ascent to this point, which is to the north-east of the city, he describes as very gradual, through pleasant corn fields, planted with olive trees. The second summit is that which overlooks the city: the path to it rises from the ruined gardens of Gethsemane, which occupy part of the valley. About half way up the ascent is a ruined monastery, built, as the monks tell us, on the spot where our Saviour wept over Jerusalem. From this point, the spectator enjoys, perhaps, the best view of the holy city. On reaching the summit, an extensive view is obtained toward the east, embracing the fertile plain of Jericho, watered by the Jordan, and the Dead Sea, enclosed by mountains of considerable grandeur. Here there is a small village, surrounded by some tolerable corn land. This summit is not relatively high, and would more properly be termed a hill than a mountain: it is not above two miles distant from Jerusalem. At a short distance from the summit is shown the supposed print of our Saviour's left foot; Chateaubriand says the mark of the right was once visible, and Bernard de Breidenbach saw it in 1483! This is the spot fixed upon by the mother of Constantine, as that from which our Lord ascended, and over which she accordingly erected a church and monastery, the ruins of which still remain. Pococke describes the building which was standing in his time, as a small Gothic chapel, round within, and octagonal without, and tells us that it was converted into a mosque. The Turks, for a stipulated sum, permit the Christian pilgrims to take an impression of the foot print in wax or plaster, to carry home. Twice," says Dr. Richardson, I visited this memorable spot; and each time it was crowded with devout pilgrims, taking casts of the holy vestige. They had to purchase permission

of the Turks; but, had it not been in the possession of the Turks, they would have had to purchase it from the more mercenary and not less merciless Romans or Greeks." On ascension eve, the Christians come and encamp in the court, and that night they perform the offices of the ascension. Here, however, as with regard to Calvary and almost all the supposed sacred places, superstition has blindly followed the blind. That this is not the place of the ascension, is certain from the words of St. Luke, who says that our Lord led out his disciples as far as Bethany, and lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up to heaven," Acts i. Bethany is a small village to the east of the Mount of Olives, on the road to Jericho, not farther from Jerusalem than the pinnacle of the hill. There are two roads to it; one passes over the Mount of Olives; the other, which is the shorter and easier, winds round the eastern end, having the greater part of the hill on the north or left hand, and on the right the elevation called by some writers the Mount of Offence, which is, however, very little above the valley of Jehoshaphat. The village of Bethany is small and poor, and the cultivation of the soil is much neglected; but it is a pleasant and somewhat romantic spot, sheltered by Mount Olivet on the north, and abounding with trees and long grass. The inhabitants are Arabs.

The olive is still found growing in patches at the foot of the mount to which it gives its name; and as a spontaneous produce, uninterruptedly resulting from the original growth of this part of the mountain, it is impossible," says Dr. E. D. Clarke, to view even these trees with indifference." Titus cut down all the wood in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; but there would seem to have been constantly springing up a succession of these hardy trees. It is truly a curious and interesting fact," adds the learned traveller, that, during a period of little more than two thousand years, Hebrews, Assyrians, Romans, Moslems, and Christians, have been successively in possession of the rocky mountains of Palestine; yet, the olive still vindicates its paternal soil, and is found, at this day, upon the same spot which was called by the Hebrew writers Mount Olivet and the Mount of Olives, eleven centuries before the Christian era," 2 Sam. xv, 30; Zech. xiv, 4.

OMEGA, the last letter in the Greek alphabet, Rev. i, 8; a title of Christ.

OMNIPOTENCE. See Almighty.

OMNIPRESENCE, that attribute of God by which he is present in all places. The statement of this doctrine in the inspired records, like that of all the other attributes of God, is made in their own peculiar tone and emphasis of majesty and sublimity. Whither shall I go from thy Spirit, or

whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up to heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord? Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off?" "Thus saith the Lord, Behold, heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool." Behold, heaven, and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee." "Though he dig into hell, thence shall my hand take him; though he climb up into heaven, thence will I bring him down; and though he hide himself in the top of Carmel, I will search and take him out from thence." In him we live, and move, and have our being." "He filleth all things."

Some striking passages on the ubiquity of the divine presence may be found in the writings of some of the Greek philosophers, arising out of this notion, that God was the soul of the world; but their very connection with this speculation, notwithstanding the imposing phrase occasionally adopted, strikingly marks the difference between their most exalted views, and those of the Hebrew prophets on this subject. To a large proportion of those who hold a distinguished rank among the ancient theistical philosophers, the idea of the personality of the Deity was in a great measure unknown. The Deity by them was considered not so much an intelligent Being, as an animating power, diffused throughout the world, and was introduced into their speculative system to account for the motion of that passive mass of matter, which was supposed coëval, and indeed coëxistent, with himself. These defective notions are confessed by Gibbon, a writer not disposed to undervalue their attainments: The philosophers of Greece deduced their morals from the nature of man, rather than from that of God. They meditated, however, on the divine nature, as a very curious and important speculation; and, in the profound inquiry, they displayed the strength and weakness of the human understanding. Of the four most considerable sects, the Stoics and the Platonicians endeavoured to reconcile the jarring interests of reason and piety. They have left us the most sublime proofs of the existence and perfections of the First Cause; but as it was impossible for them to conceive the creation of matter, the workman, in the Stoic philosophy, was not sufficiently distinguished from the work; while, on the contrary, the spiritual god of Plato and his disciples resembled more an idea than a substance."

Similar errors have been revived in the infidel philosophy of modern times, from Spinoza down to the later offspring of the German and French schools. The same remark applies also to the oriental philosophy, which presents at this day a perfect view of the boasted wisdom of ancient Greece, which was brought to nought" by the foolishness" of apostolic preaching.



But in the Scriptures there is nothing confused in the doctrine of the divine ubiquity. God is every where, but he is not every thing. All things have their being in him, but he is distinct from all things; he fills the universe, but is not mingled with it. He is the intelligence which guides, and the power which sustains; but his personality is preserved, and he is independent of the works of his hands, however vast and noble. So far is his presence from being bounded by the universe itself, that, as we are taught in the passage above quoted from the Psalms, were it possible for us to wing our way into the immeasurable depths and breadths of space, God would there surround us, in as absolute a sense as that in which he is said to be about our bed and our path in that part of the world where his will has placed us.

On this, as on all similar subjects, the Scriptures use terms which are taken in their common-sense acceptation among mankind; and though the vanity of the human mind disposes many to seek a philosophy in the doctrine thus announced deeper than that which its popular terms convey, we are bound to conclude, if we would pay but a common respect to an admitted revelation, that, where no manifest figure of speech occurs, the truth of the doctrine lies in the tenor of the terms by which it is expressed. Otherwise there would be no revelation, we do not say of the modus, [manner,] (for that is confessedly incomprehensible,) but of the fact. In the case before us, the terms presence and place are used according to common notions; and must be so taken, if the Scriptures are intelligible. Metaphysical refinements are not Scriptural doctrines, when they give to the terms chosen by the Holy Spirit an acceptation out of their general and proper use, and make them the signs of a perfectly distinct class of ideas; if, indeed, all distinctness of idea is not lost in the attempt. It is therefore in the popular and just, because Scriptural, manner, that we are to conceive of the omnipresence of God. If we reflect upon ourselves, we may observe that we fill but a small space, and that our knowledge or power reaches but a little way. We can act at one time in one place only, and the sphere of our influence is narrow at largest. Would we be witnesses to what is done at any distance from us, or exert there our active powers, we must remove ourselves thither. For this reason we are necessarily ignorant of a thousand things which pass around us, incapable of attending and managing any great variety of affairs, or performing at the same time any number of actions, for our own good, or for the benefit of others. Although we feel this to be the present condition of our being, and the limited state of our intelligent and active powers, yet we can easily conceive there may exist beings more perfect, and whose presence may extend far and wide: any one of whom, present in what are to us various places, at the same time, may know at once what is done in all these, and act in all of them; and thus be able to regard and direct a variety of affairs at the same instant: and who

farther being qualified, by the purity and activity of their nature, to pass from one place to another, with great ease and swiftness, may thus fill a large sphere of action, direct a great variety of affairs, confer a great number of benefits, and observe a multitude of actions at the same time, or in so swift a succession as to us would appear but one instant. Thus perfect we may readily believe the angels of God.

We can farther conceive this extent of presence, and of ability for knowledge and action, to admit of degrees of ascending perfection approaching to infinite. And when we have thus raised our thoughts to the idea of a being, who is not only present throughout a large empire, but throughout our world; and not only in every part of our world, but in every part of all the numberless suns and worlds which roll in the starry heavens,--who is not only able to enliven and actuate the plants, animals, and men who live upon this globe, but countless varieties of creatures every where in an immense universe,--yea, whose presence is not confined to the universe, immeasurable as that is by any finite mind, but who is present every where in infinite space; and who is therefore able to create still new worlds, and fill them with proper inhabitants, attend, supply, and govern them all,--when we have thus gradually raised and enlarged our conceptions, we have the best idea we can form of the universal presence of the great Jehovah, who filleth heaven and earth. There is no part of the universe, no portion of space, uninhabited by God; none wherein this Being of perfect power, wisdom, and benevolence is not essentially present. Could we with the swiftness of a sun beam dart ourselves beyond the limits of the creation, and for ages continue our progress in infinite space, we should still be surrounded with the divine presence; nor ever be able to reach that space where God is not. His presence also penetrates every part of our world; the most solid parts of the earth cannot exclude it; for it pierces as easily the centre of the globe as the empty air. All creatures live and move and have their being in him. And the inmost recesses of the human heart can no more exclude his presence, or conceal a thought from his knowledge, than the deepest caverns of the earth.

The illustrations and confirmatory proofs of this doctrine which the material world furnishes, are numerous and striking. It is a most evident and acknowledged truth that a being cannot act where it is not: if, therefore, actions and effects, which manifest the highest wisdom, power, and goodness in the author of them, are continually produced every where, the author of these actions, or God, must be continually present with us, and wherever he thus acts. The matter which composes the world is evidently lifeless and thoughtless: it must therefore be incapable of moving itself, or designing or producing any effects which require wisdom or power. The

matter of our world, or the small parts which constitute the air, the earth, and the waters, is yet continually moved, so as to produce effects of this kind; such are the innumerable herbs, and trees, and fruits which adorn the earth, and support the countless millions of creatures who inhabit it. There must therefore be constantly present, all over the earth, a most wise, mighty, and good Being, the author and director of these motions.

We cannot, it is true, see him with our bodily eyes, because he is a pure Spirit; yet this is not any proof that he is not present. A judicious discourse, a series of kind actions, convince us of the presence of a friend, a person of prudence and benevolence. We cannot see the present mind, the seat and principle of these qualities; yet the constant regular motion of the tongue, the hand, and the whole body, (which are the instruments of our souls, as the material universe and all the various bodies in it are the instruments of the Deity,) will not suffer us to doubt that there is an intelligent and benevolent principle within the body which produces all these skilful motions and kind actions. The sun, the air, the earth, and the waters, are no more able to move themselves, and produce all that beautiful and useful variety of plants, and fruits, and trees, with which our earth is covered, than the body of a man, when the soul hath left it, is able to move itself, form an instrument, plough a field, or build a house. If the laying out judiciously and well cultivating a small estate, sowing it with proper grain at the best time of the year, watering it in due season and quantities, and gathering in the fruits when ripe, and laying them up in the best manner,--if all these effects prove the estate to have a manager, and the manager possessed of skill and strength,--certainly the enlightening and warming the whole earth by the sun, and so directing its motion and the motion of the earth as to produce in a constant useful succession day and night, summer and winter, seed time and harvest; the watering the earth continually by the clouds, and thus bringing forth immense quantities of herbage, grain, and fruits,--certainly all these effects continually produced, must prove that a Being of the greatest power, wisdom, and benevolence is continually present throughout our world, which he thus supports, moves, actuates, and makes fruitful.

The fire which warms us knows nothing of its serviceableness to this purpose, nor of the wise laws according to which its particles are moved to produce this effect. And that it is placed in such a part of the house, where it may be greatly beneficial and no way hurtful, is ascribed without hesitation to the contrivance and labour of a person who knew its proper place and uses. And if we came daily into a house wherein we saw this was regularly done, though we never saw an inhabitant in it, we could not doubt that the house was occupied by a rational inhabitant. That huge globe of fire in the heavens, which we call the sun, and on the light and influences

of which the fertility of our world, and the life and pleasure of all animals, depend, knows nothing of its serviceableness to these purposes, nor of the wise laws according to which its beams are dispensed, nor what place or motions were requisite for these beneficial purposes. Yet its beams are darted constantly in infinite numbers, every one according to those well chosen laws, and its proper place and motion are maintained. Must not, then, its place be appointed, its motion regulated, and beams darted, by almighty wisdom and goodness, which prevent the sun's ever wandering in the boundless spaces of the heavens, so as to leave us in disconsolate cold and darkness, or coming so near, or emitting his rays in such a manner, as to burn us up? Must not the great Being who enlightens and warms us by the sun, his instrument, who raises and sends down the vapours, brings forth and ripens the grain and fruits, and who is thus ever acting around us for our benefit, be always present in the sun, throughout the air, and all over the earth, which he thus moves and actuates?

This earth is in itself a dead, motionless mass, and void of all counsel; yet proper parts of it are continually raised through the small pipes which compose the bodies of plants and trees, and are made to contribute to their growth, to open and shine in blossoms and leaves, and to swell and harden into fruit. Could blind, thoughtless particles thus continually keep on their way, through numberless windings, without once blundering, if they were not guided by an unerring hand? Can the most perfect human skill from earth and water form one grain, much more a variety of beautiful and relishing fruits? Must not the directing mind, who does all this constantly, be most wise, mighty, and benevolent? Must not the Being who thus continually exerts his skill and energy around us, for our benefit, be confessed to be always present and concerned for our welfare? Can these effects be ascribed to any thing below an all-wise and almighty cause? And must not this cause be present wherever he acts? Were God to speak to us every month from heaven, and with a voice loud as thunder declare that he observes, provides for, and governs us; this would not be a proof, in the judgment of sound reason, by many degrees so valid: since much less wisdom and power are required to form such sounds in the air, than to produce these effects; and to give, not merely verbal declarations, but substantial evidences of his presence and care over us. In every part and place of the universe, with which we are acquainted, we perceive the exertion of a power, which we believe, mediately or immediately, to proceed from the Deity. For instance: in what part or point of space, that has ever been explored, do we not discover attraction? In what regions do we not find light? In what accessible portion of our globe do we not meet with gravity, magnetism, electricity; together with the properties also and powers of organized substances, of vegetable or of animated nature? Nay, farther, what kingdom is there of nature, what corner of space, in which

there is any thing that can be examined by us, where we do not fall upon contrivance and design? The only reflection, perhaps, which arises in our minds from this view of the world around us, is, that the laws of nature every where prevail; that they are uniform and universal. But what do we mean by the laws of nature, or by any law? Effects are produced by power, not by laws. A law cannot execute itself. A law refers us to an agent.

The usual argument a priori, on this attribute of the divine nature, has been stated as follows; but, amidst such a mass of demonstration of a much higher kind, it cannot be of any great value:--The First Cause, the supreme all-perfect Mind, as he could not derive his being from any other cause, must be independent of all other, and therefore unlimited. He exists by an absolute necessity of nature; and as all the parts of infinite space are exactly uniform and alike, for the same reason that he exists in any one part he must exist in all. No reason can be assigned for excluding him from one part, which would not exclude him from all. But that he is present in some parts of space, the evident effects of his wisdom, power, and benevolence continually produced, demonstrate beyond all rational doubt. He must therefore be alike present every where, and fill infinite space with his infinite Being.

Among metaphysicians, it has been matter of dispute, whether God is present every where by an infinite extension of his essence. This is the opinion of Newton, Dr. S. Clarke, and their followers; others have objected to this notion, that it might then be said, God is neither in heaven nor in earth, but only a part of God in each. The former opinion, however, appears most in harmony with the Scriptures; though the term extension, through the inadequacy of language, conveys too material an idea. The objection just stated is wholly grounded on notions taken from material objects, and is therefore of little weight, because it is not applicable to an immaterial substance. It is best to confess with one who had thought deeply on the subject, There is an incomprehensibleness in the manner of every thing about which no controversy can or ought to be concerned." That we cannot comprehend how God is fully, and completely, and undividedly present every where, need not surprise us, when we reflect that the manner in which our own minds are present with our bodies is as incomprehensible as the manner in which the supreme Mind is present with every thing in the universe.

OMNISCIENCE. This attribute of God is constantly connected in Scripture with his omnipresence, and forms a part of almost every description of that attribute; for, as God is a Spirit, and therefore intelligent, if he is every where, if nothing can exclude him, not even the most solid bodies, nor the minds of intelligent beings, then are all things naked and

opened to the eyes of him with whom we have to do. Where he acts, he is; and where he is, he perceives. He understands and considers things absolutely, and as they are in their own natures, powers, properties, differences, together with all the circumstances belonging to them. Known unto him are all his works from the beginning of the world," rather, ἀπ' αἰῶνος, from, all eternity; known, before they were made, in their possible, and known, now they are made, in their actual, existence. Lord, thou hast searched me and known me; thou knowest my down-sitting and mine uprising, thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou compasses my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether. The darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day. The ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and he pondereth all his goings; he searcheth their hearts, and understandeth every imagination of their thoughts." Nor is this perfect knowledge to be confined to men or angels; it reaches into the state of the dead, and penetrates the regions of the damned. Hell," hades, is naked before him; and destruction," the seats of destruction, hath no covering." No limits at all are to be set to this perfection: Great is the Lord, his understanding is infinite."

In Psalm xciv, the knowledge of God is argued from the communication of it to men: Understand, ye brutish among the people; and, ye fools, when will ye be wise? He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see? He that chastiseth the Heathen, shall not he correct? He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?" This argument is as easy as it is conclusive, obliging all who acknowledge a First Cause, to admit his perfect intelligence, or to take refuge in atheism itself. It fetches not the proof from a distance, but refers us to our bosoms for the constant demonstration that the Lord is a God of knowledge, and that by him actions are weighed. We find in ourselves such qualities as thought and intelligence, power and freedom, &c, for which we have the evidence of consciousness as much as for our own existence. Indeed, it is only by our consciousness of these, that our existence is known to ourselves. We know, likewise, that these are perfections, and that to have them is better than to be without them. We find also that they have not been in us from eternity. They must, therefore, have had a beginning, and consequently some cause, for the very same reason that a being beginning to exist in time requires a cause. Now this cause, as it must be superior to its effect, must have those perfections in a superior degree; and if it be the First Cause it must have them in an infinite or unlimited degree, since bounds or limitations, without a limiter, would be an effect without a cause. If God gives wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to men of understanding; if he communicates this perfection to his creatures, the inference must be that he himself is possessed of it in a much more eminent degree than they;

that his knowledge is deep and intimate, reaching to the very essence of things, theirs but slight and superficial; his clear and distinct, theirs confused and dark; his certain and infallible, theirs doubtful and liable to mistake; his easy and permanent, theirs obtained with much pains, and soon lost again by the defects of memory or age; his universal and extending to all objects, theirs short and narrow, reaching only to some few things, while that which is wanting cannot be numbered; and therefore, as the heavens are higher than the earth, so, as the prophet has told us, are his ways above our ways, and his thoughts above our thoughts.

But his understanding is infinite; a doctrine which the sacred writers not only authoritatively announce, but confirm by referring to the wisdom displayed in his works. The only difference between wisdom and knowledge is, that the former always supposes action, and action directed to an end. But wherever there is wisdom there must be knowledge; and as the wisdom of God in the creation consists in the formation of things which, by themselves, or in combination with others, shall produce certain effects, and that in a variety of operation which is to us boundless, the previous knowledge of the possible qualities and effects inevitably supposes a knowledge which can have no limit. For as creation out of nothing argues a power which is omnipotent; so the knowledge of the possibilities of things which are not, (a knowledge which, from the effect, we are sure must exist in God,) argues that such a Being must be omniscient. For all things being not only present to him, but also entirely depending upon him, and having received both their being itself, and all their powers and faculties from him; it is manifest that, as he knows all things that are, so he must likewise know all possibilities of things, that is, all effects that can be. For, being himself alone self-existent, and having alone given to all things all the powers and faculties they are endued with; it is evident he must of necessity know perfectly what all and each of those powers and faculties, which are derived wholly from himself, can possibly produce: and seeing, at one boundless view, all the possible compositions and divisions, variations and changes, circumstances and dependencies of things; all their possible relations one to another, and their dispositions or fitnesses to certain and respective ends, he must, without possibility of error, know exactly what is best and properest in every one of the infinite possible cases or methods of disposing things; and understand perfectly how to order and direct the respective means, to bring about what he so knows to be, in its kind, or in the whole, the best and fittest in the end. This is what we mean by infinite wisdom.

On the subject of the divine omniscience, many fine sentiments are to be found in the writings of Pagans; for an intelligent First Cause being in any sense admitted, it was most natural and obvious to ascribe to him a perfect

knowledge of all things. They acknowledge that nothing is hid from God, who is intimate to our minds, and mingles himself with our very thoughts; nor were they all unaware of the practical tendency of such a doctrine, and of the motive it affords to a cautious and virtuous conduct. But among them it was not held, as by the sacred writers, in connection with other right views of the divine nature, which are essential to give to this its full moral effect. Not only on this subject does the manner in which the Scriptures state the doctrine far transcend that of the wisest Pagan theists; but the moral of the sentiment is infinitely more comprehensive and impressive. With them it is connected with man's state of trial; with a holy law, all the violations of which, in thought, word, and deed, are both infallibly known, and strictly marked; with promises of grace, and of a mild and protecting government as to all who have sought and found the mercy of God in forgiving their sins and admitting them into his family. The wicked are thus reminded, that their hearts are searched, and their sins noted; that the eyes of the Lord are upon their ways; and that their most secret works will be brought to light in the day when God the witness shall become God the judge. But as to the righteous, the eyes of the Lord are said to be over them; that they are kept by him who never slumbers or sleeps; that he is never far from them; that his eyes run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show himself strong in their behalf; that foes, to them invisible, are seen by his eye, and controlled by his arm; and that this great attribute, so appalling to wicked men, affords to them, not only the most influential reason for a perfectly holy temper and conduct, but the strongest motive to trust, and joy, and hope, amidst the changes and afflictions of the present life. Socrates, as well as other philosophers, could express themselves well, so long as they expressed themselves generally, on this subject. The former could say, Let your own frame instruct you. Does the mind inhabiting your body dispose and govern it with ease? Ought you not then to conclude, that the universal Mind with equal ease actuates and governs universal nature; and that, when you can at once consider the interest of the Athenians at home, in Egypt, and in Sicily, it is not too much for the divine wisdom to take care of the universe? These reflections will soon convince you, that the greatness of the divine mind is such, as at once to see all things, hear all things, be present every where, and direct all the affairs of the world." These views are just, but they wanted that connection with others relative both to the divine nature and government, which we see only in the Bible, to render them influential; they neither gave correct moral distinctions nor led to a virtuous practice, no, not in Socrates, who, on some subjects, and especially on the personality of the Deity, and his independence on matter, raised himself far above the rest of his philosophic brethren, but in moral feeling and practice was perhaps as censurable as they. See Prescience.



ON, or AVEN, a city of Egypt, situated in the land of Goshen, on the east of the Nile, and about five miles from the modern Cairo. It was called Heliopolis by the Greeks, and Bethshemeth by the Hebrews, Jer. xliii, 13; both of which names, as well as its Egyptian one of On, imply the city or house of the sun. The inhabitants of this city are represented by Herodotus as the wisest of the Egyptians; and here Moses resided, and received that education which made him learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." But notwithstanding its being the seat of the sciences, such were its egregious idolatries, that it was nicknamed Aven, or Beth-Aven, the house of vanity," or idolatry, by the Jews. A village standing on part of its site, at the present day, is called Matarea; while the spring of excellent water, or fountain of the sun, which is supposed to have given rise to the city, is still called Ain Shems, or fountain of the sun, by the Arabs. This is one of the most ancient cities of the world of which any distinct vestige can now be traced. It was visited eighteen hundred and fifty years ago by Strabo, whose description proves it to have been nearly as desolate then as now. Most of the ruins of this once famous city, described by that geographer, are buried in the accumulation of the soil: but that which marks its site, and is, perhaps, the most ancient work at this time existing in the world, in a perfect state, is a column of red granite, seventy feet high, and covered with hieroglyphics. Dr. E. D. Clarke has given a very good representation of this column; to whom, also, the curious reader is referred for a learned dissertation on the characters engraved upon it.

The city On, according to Josephus, was given to the Israelites to dwell in, when they first went into Egypt; and it was a daughter of a priest of the temple of the sun at this place, who was given in marriage to Joseph by Pharaoh. Here, also, in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, leave was obtained of that king by Onias, high priest of the Jews, to build a temple, when dispossessed of his office by Antiochus; which was long used by the Hellenist Jews. It was predicted by Jeremiah, xliii, 13, and by Ezekiel, xxx, 17, that this place, with its temples and inhabitants, should be destroyed; which was probably fulfilled by Nebuchadnezzar. See Noph.

ONESIMUS was a Phrygian by nation, a slave to Philemon, and a disciple of the Apostle Paul. Onesimus having run away from his master, and also having robbed him, Philemon v, 18, went to Rome while St. Paul was there in prison the first time. As Onesimus knew him by repute, (his master Philemon being a Christian,) he sought him out. St. Paul brought him to a sense of the greatness of his crime, instructed him, baptized him, and sent him back to his master Philemon with a letter, inserted among St. Paul's epistles, which is universally acknowledged as canonical. This letter had all the good success he could desire. Philemon not only received Onesimus as a faithful servant, but rather as a brother and a friend. A little time after,

he sent him back to Rome to St. Paul, that he might continue to be serviceable to him in his prison. And we see that after this Onesimus was employed to carry such epistles as the Apostle wrote at that time. He carried, for example, that which was written to the Colossians, while St. Paul was yet in his bonds.

ONESIPHORUS is mentioned, 2 Tim. i, 16, 17, and highly commended by St. Paul.

ONION, בצל, Num. xi, 5; a well known garden plant with a bulbous root. Onions and garlies were highly esteemed in Egypt; and not without reason, this country being admirably adapted to their culture. The *allium cepa*, called by the Arabs basal, Hasselquist thinks one of the species of onions for which the Israelites longed. He would infer this from the quantities still used in Egypt, and their goodness. Whoever has tasted onions in Egypt," says he, "must allow that none can be had better in any part of the universe. Here they are sweet; in other countries they are nauseous and strong. Here they are soft; whereas in the northern and other parts they are hard, and their coats so compact that they are difficult of digestion. Hence they cannot in any place be eaten with less prejudice, and more satisfaction, than in Egypt." The Egyptians are reproached with swearing by the leeks and onions of their gardens. Juvenal ridicules some of these superstitious people who did not dare to eat leeks, garlic, or onions, for fear of injuring their gods:--

718 *Quis nescit, Volusi Bythynice, qualia demens  
Ægyptus portenta colit?  
Porrum et cepe nefas violare aut frangere morsu;  
O sanctas gentes quibus hæc nascuntur in hortis Numina!*  
Sat. xv.

"How Egypt, mad with superstition grown,  
Makes gods of monsters, but too well is known.  
'Tis mortal sin an onion to devour;  
Each clove of garlic has a sacred power.  
Religious nation, sure! and blest abodes,  
Where ev'ry garden is o'errun with gods!"

So Lucian in his *Jupiter*, where he is giving an account of the different deities worshipped by the several inhabitants of Egypt, says, Πηλουσίωταις δὲ κρόμμυον, those of Pelusium worship the onion." Hence arises a question, how the Israelites durst venture to violate the national worship, by eating those sacred plants. We may answer, in the first place, that whatever might be the case of the Egyptians in later ages, it is not probable that they were arrived at such a pitch of superstition in the time of Moses; for we find no indications of this in Herodotus, the most ancient of the

Greek historians: secondly, the writers here quoted appear to be mistaken in imagining these plants to have been generally the objects of religious worship. The priests, indeed, abstained from the use of them, and several other vegetables; and this might give rise to the opinion of their being revered as divinities: but the use of them was not prohibited to the people, as is plain from the testimonies of ancient authors, particularly of Diodorus Siculus.

ONYX,  $\alpha\omicron\upsilon\chi$ , Gen. ii, 12; Exod. xxv, 7; xxviii, 9, 20; xxxv, 27; xxxix, 6; 1 Chron. xxix, 2; Job xxviii, 16; Ezekiel xxviii, 13. A precious stone, so called from the Greek  $\alpha\omicron\upsilon\chi$ , the nail, to the colour of which it nearly approaches. It is first mentioned with the gold and bdellium of the river Pison in Eden; but the meaning of the Hebrew word is not easily determined. The Septuagint render it, in different places, the sardius, beryl, sapphire, emerald, &c. Such names are often ambiguous, even in Greek and Latin, and no wonder if they are more so in Hebrew. In Exodus xxviii, 9, 10, a direction is given that two onyx stones should be fastened on the ephod of the high priest, on which were to be graven the names of the children of Israel, like the engravings on a signet; six of the names on one stone, and six on the other. In 1 Chron. xxix, 2, onyx stones are among the things prepared by David for the temple. The author of *Scripture Illustrated* observes, upon this passage, that “the word onyx is equivocal; signifying, first, a precious stone or gem; and, secondly, a marble called in Greek onychites, which Pliny mentions as a stone of Caramania. Antiquity gave both these stones this name, because of their resemblance to the nail of the fingers. The onyx of the high priest’s pectoral was, no doubt, the gem onyx; the stone prepared by David was the marble onyx, or rather onychus; for one would hardly think that gems of any kind were used externally in such a building, but variegated marble may readily be admitted.”

OPHIR, a place or country remote from Judea, to which the ships of Solomon traded. There has been much discussion respecting the situation of this place; some supposing it to have been the island of Socotora, without the straits of Babelmandel; others, that anciently called Tabrobana, which is supposed by some to have been Ceylon, and by others Sumatra; while others fix its situation on the continent of India. M. Huet and, after him, Bruce, place Ophir at Sofala, in South Africa, where mines of gold and silver have been found, which show marks of having been very anciently and extensively worked. The latter says, also, that the situation of this place explains the period of three years which the Ophir ships were absent, from the different courses of the monsoons and trade winds, which they would have to encounter going and returning. Ruins of ancient buildings have also been found in the neighbourhood of these mines. In

confirmation of this opinion, Bruce says there was a place called Tarshish near Melinda.

In the same direction with Ophir lay Tarshish; the voyage to both places being accomplished under one, and always, as it would seem, in the same space of time, three years; by which it may be inferred that, notwithstanding the imperfect navigation of the times, they must be at a considerable distance from the ports of Judea. But the true situation of these places must ever remain matter of conjecture; and all that can be considered as certain respecting them is, that from the articles imported from them, namely, gold, silver, ivory, apes, peacocks, and precious stones, they must have been situated in the tropical parts of either Africa or Asia.

ORACLE denotes something delivered by supernatural wisdom; and the term is also used in the Old Testament to signify the most holy place from whence the Lord revealed his will to ancient Israel, 1 Kings vi, 5, 19–21, 23. But when the word occurs in the plural number, as it mostly does, it denotes the revelations contained in the sacred writings of which the nation of Israel were the depositaries. So Moses is said by Stephen to have received the lively oracles” to give unto the Israelites. These oracles contained the law, both moral and ceremonial, with all the types and promises relating to the Messiah which are to be found in the writings of Moses. They also contained all the intimations of the divine mind which he was pleased to communicate by means of the succeeding prophets who prophesied beforehand of the coming and of the sufferings of the Messiah with the glory that should follow. The Jews were a highly privileged people in many and various respects, Rom. ix, 4, 5; but the Apostle Paul mentions it as their chief advantage that unto them were committed the oracles of God,” Romans iii, 2. What nation,” says Moses, is there that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law which I set before you this day?” Deut. iv, 8. The psalmist David enumerates their excellent properties under various epithets; such as the law of the Lord, his testimony, his statutes, his commandments, his judgments, &c. Their properties are extolled as perfect, sure, right, pure, clean, true, and righteous altogether; more to be desired than much fine gold; sweeter than honey and the honey comb. Their salutary effects are all mentioned; such as their converting the soul, making wise the simple, rejoicing the heart, enlightening the eyes; and the keeping of them is connected with a great reward, Psalm xix. The hundred and nineteenth Psalm abounds with praises of the lively oracles, the word of the living God; it abounds with the warmest expressions of love to it, of delight in it, and the most fervent petitions for divine illumination in the knowledge of it. Such was the esteem and veneration which the faithful entertained for the lively oracles under the former dispensation, when they

had only Moses and the prophets; how, then, ought they to be prized by Christians, who have also Christ and his Apostles!

Among the Heathen the term oracle is usually taken to signify an answer, generally couched in very dark and ambiguous terms, supposed to be given by demons of old, either by the mouths of their idols, or by those of their priests, to the people, who consulted them on things to come. Oracle is also used for the demon who gave the answer, and the place where it was given. Seneca defines oracles to be enunciations by the mouths of men of the will of the gods; and Cicero simply calls them, *deorum oratio*, the language of the gods. Among the Pagans they were held in high estimation; and they were consulted on a variety of occasions pertaining to national enterprises and private life. When they made peace or war, enacted laws, reformed states, or changed the constitution, they had in all these cases recourse to the oracle by public authority. Also, in private life, if a man wished to marry, if he proposed to take a journey, or to engage in any business of importance, he repaired to the oracle for counsel. Mankind have had always a propensity to explore futurity; and conceiving that future events were known to their gods, who possessed the gift of prophecy, they sought information and advice from the oracles, which, in their opinion, were supernatural and divine communications. The institution of oracles seemed to gratify the prevalent curiosity of mankind, and proved a source of immense wealth, as well as authority and influence, to those who had the command of them. Accordingly, every nation, in which idolatry has subsisted, had its oracles, by means of which imposture practised on superstition and credulity. The principal oracles of antiquity are, that of Abæ, mentioned by Herodotus; that of Amphiaraus, at Oropus in Macedonia; that of the Branchidæ at Didymeum; that of the camps at Lacedæmon; that of Dodona; that of Jupiter Ammon; that of Nabarca in the country of the Anariaci, near the Caspian Sea; that of Trophonius, mentioned by Herodotus; that of Chrysopolis; that of Claros, in Ionia; that of Amphilocheus at Mallos; that of Petarea; that of Pella in Macedonia; that of Phaselides in Cilicia; that of Sinope in Paphlagonia; that of Orpheus's head at Lesbos, mentioned by Philostratus. But of all oracles, the oracle of Apollo Pythius at Delphi was the most celebrated; this was consulted in the dernier resort by most of the princes of those ages.

Most of the Pagan deities had their appropriate oracles. Apollo had the greatest number: such as those of Claros, of the Branchidæ, of the suburbs of Daphne at Antioch, of Delos, of Argos, of Troas, Æolis, &c, of Baiæ in Italy, and others in Cilicia, in Egypt, in the Alps, in Thrace, at Corinth, in Arcadia, in Laconia, and in many other places enumerated by Van Dale. Jupiter, beside that of Dodona and some others, the honour of which he shared with Apollo, had one in Bœotia under the name of Jupiter the

Thunderer, and another in Elis, one at Thebes and at Meroe, one near Antioch, and several others. Æsculapius was consulted in Cilicia, at Apollonia, in the isle of Cos, at Epidaurus, Pergamos, Rome, and elsewhere. Mercury had oracles at Patras, upon Hæmon, and in other places; Mars, in Thrace, Egypt, and elsewhere; Hercules, at Cadiz, Athens, in Egypt, at Tivoli, in Mesopotamia, where he issued his oracles by dreams, whence he was called Somnialis. Isis, Osiris, and Serapis delivered in like manner their oracles by dreams, as we learn from Pausanias, Tacitus, Arrian, and other writers; that of Amphilochnus was also delivered by dreams; the ox Apis had also his oracle in Egypt. The gods, called Cabiri, had their oracle in Bœotia. Diana, the sister of Apollo, had several oracles in Egypt, Cilicia, Ephesus, &c. Those of fortune at Præneste, and of the lots at Antium are well known. The fountains also delivered oracles, for to each of them a divinity was ascribed: such was the fountain of Castalia at Delphi, another of the same name in the suburbs of Antioch, and the prophetic fountain near the temple of Ceres in Achaia. Juno had several oracles: one near Corinth, one at Nysa, and others at different places. Latona had one at Butis in Egypt; Leucothea had one in Colchis; Memnon in Egypt; Machaon at Gerania in Laconia; Minerva had one in Egypt, in Spain, upon mount Ætna, at Mycenæ and Colchis, and in other places. Those of Neptune were at Delphos, at Calauria, near Neocesarea, and elsewhere. The nymphs had theirs in the cave of Corycia. Pan had several, the most famous of which was that in Arcadia. That of the Palici was in Sicily. Pluto had one at Nysa. Saturn had oracles in several places, but the most famous were those of Cumæ in Italy, and of Alexandria in Egypt. Those of Venus were dispersed in several places, at Gaza, upon Mount Libanus, at Paphos, in Cyprus, &c. Serapis had one at Alexandria, consulted by Vespasian. Venus Aphacite had one at Aphaca between Heliopolis and Byblus. Geryon, the three-headed monster slain by Hercules, had an oracle in Italy near Padua, consulted by Tiberius; that of Hercules was at Tivoli, and was given by lots, like those of Præneste and Antium. The demi-gods and heroes had likewise their oracles, such were those of Castor and Pollux at Lacedæmon, of Amphiarus, of Mopsus in Cilicia, of Ulysses, Amphilochnus, Sarpedon in Troas, Hermione in Macedonia, Pasiphæe in Laconia, Chalcas in Italy, Aristæus in Bœotia, Autolyclus at Sinope, Phryxus among the Colchi, Zamolxis among the Getæ, Hephæstion the minion of Alexander, and Antinous, &c.

The responses of oracles were delivered in a variety of ways: at Delphi, they interpreted and put into verse what the priestess pronounced in the time of her furor. Mr. Bayle observes that at first this oracle gave its answers in verse; and that it fell at length to prose, upon the people's beginning to laugh at the poorness of its versification. The Epicureans made this the subject of their jests, and said, in raillery, it was surprising

enough, that Apollo, the god of poetry, should be a much worse poet than Homer, whom he himself had inspired. By the railleries of these philosophers, and particularly by those of the Cynics and Peripatetics, the priests were at length obliged to desist from the practice of versifying the responses of the Pythia, which, according to Plutarch, was one of the principal causes of the declension of the oracle of Delphos. At the oracle of Ammon, the priests pronounced the response of their god; at Dodona, the response was issued from the hollow of an oak; at the cave of Trophonius, the oracle was inferred from what the suppliant said before he recovered his senses; at Memphis, they drew a good or bad omen, according as the ox Apis received or rejected what was presented to him, which was also the case with the fishes of the fountain of Limyra. The suppliants, who consulted the oracles, were not allowed to enter the sanctuaries where they were given; and, accordingly, care was taken that neither the Epicureans nor Christians should come near them. In several places, the oracles were given by letters sealed up, as in that of Mopsus, and at Mallus in Cilicia. Oracles were frequently given by lot, the mode of doing which was as follows: the lots were a kind of dice, on which were engraven certain characters or words, whose explanations they were to seek on tables made for the purpose. The way of using these dice for knowing futurity, was different, according to the places where they were used. In some temples, the person threw them himself; in others, they were dropped from a box; whence came the proverbial expression, *The lot is fallen.*” This playing with dice was always preceded by sacrifices and other customary ceremonies. The ambiguity of the oracles in their responses, and their double meaning, contributed to their support.

Ablancourt observes, that the study or research of the meaning of oracles was but a fruitless thing; and that they were never understood till after their accomplishment. Historians relate, that Cræsus was tricked by the ambiguity and equivocation of the oracle:

Κροισος Ἄλυν διαβας μεγαλην αρχην καταλυσει.

Thus rendered in Latin:

Cræsus Halym superans magnam pervertet opum vim.”

[If Cræsus cross the Halys he will overthrow a great empire.]

Thus, if the Lydian monarch had conquered Cyrus, he overthrew the Assyrian empire; if he himself was routed, he overturned his own. That delivered to Pyrrhus, which is comprised in this Latin verse,

Credo equidem Æacidas Romanos vincere posse,”

[I believe indeed that the sons of Æacus the Romans will conquer,]

had the same advantage; for, according to the rules of syntax, either of the two accusatives may be governed by the verb, and the verse be explained, either by saying the Romans shall conquer the Æacidæ, of whom Pyrrhus was descended, or those shall conquer the Romans. When Alexander fell sick at Babylon, some of his courtiers who happened to be in Egypt, or who went thither on purpose, passed the night in the temple of Serapis, to inquire if it would not be proper to bring Alexander to be cured by him. The god answered, it was better that Alexander should remain where he was. This in all events was a very prudent and safe answer. If the king recovered his health, what glory must Serapis have gained by saving him the fatigue of the journey! If he died, it was but saying he died in a favourable juncture after so many conquests; which, had he lived, he could neither have enlarged nor preserved. This is actually the construction they put upon the response; whereas had Alexander undertaken the journey, and died in the temple, or by the way, nothing could have been said in favour of Serapis. When Trajan had formed the design of his expedition against the Parthians, he was advised to consult the oracle of Heliopolis, to which he had no more to do but send a note under a seal. That prince, who had no great faith in oracles, sent thither a blank note; and they returned him another of the same kind. By this Trajan was convinced of the divinity of the oracle. He sent back a second note to the god, in which he inquired whether he should return to Rome after finishing the war he had in view. The god, as Macrobius tells the story, ordered a vine, which was among the offerings of his temple, to be divided into pieces, and brought to Trajan. The event justified the oracle; for the emperor dying in that war, his bones were carried to Rome, which had been represented by that broken vine. As the priests of that oracle knew Trajan's design, which was no secret, they happily devised that response, which, in all events, was capable of a favourable interpretation, whether he routed and cut the Parthians in pieces, or if his army met with the same fate. Sometimes the responses of the oracles were mere banter, as in the case of the man who wished to know by what means he might become rich, and who received for answer from the god, that he had only to make himself master of all that lay between Sicyon and Corinth. Another, wanting a cure for the gout, was answered by the oracle, that he was to drink nothing but cold water.

There are two points in dispute on the subject of oracles; namely, whether they were human, or diabolical machines; and whether or not they ceased upon the publication or preaching of the Gospel. Most of the fathers of the church supposed that the devil issued oracles; and looked on it as a pleasure he took to give dubious and equivocal answers, in order to have a handle to laugh at them. Vossius allows that it was the devil who spoke in oracles; but thinks that the obscurity of his answers was owing to his ignorance as to the precise circumstances of events. That artful and studied obscurity in



which the answers were couched, says he, showed the embarrassment the devil was under; as those double meanings they usually bore provided for their accomplishment. Where the thing foretold did not happen accordingly, the oracle, forsooth, was misunderstood. Eusebius has preserved some fragments of a philosopher, called *Ænomaus*; who, out of resentment for his having been so often fooled by the oracles, wrote an ample confutation of all their impertinencies: When we come to consult thee,” says he to Apollo, “if thou seest what is in futurity, why dost thou use expressions that will not be understood? Dost thou not know, that they will not be understood? If thou dost, thou takest pleasure in abusing us; if thou dost not, be informed of us, and learn to speak more clearly. I tell thee, that if thou intendest an equivocal, the Greek word whereby thou affirmedst that *Cræsus* should overthrow a great empire was ill chosen; and that it could signify nothing but *Cræsus*’s conquering *Cyrus*. If things must necessarily come to pass, why dost thou amuse us with thy ambiguities? What dost thou, wretch as thou art, at Delphi? employed in muttering idle prophecies!” But *Ænomaus* is still more out of humour with the oracle, for the answer which Apollo gave the Athenians, when *Xerxes* was about to attack Greece with all the strength of Asia. The Pythian declared, that *Minerva*, the protectress of Athens, had endeavoured in vain to appease the wrath of *Jupiter*; yet that *Jupiter*, in complaisance to his daughter, was willing the Athenians should save themselves within wooden walls; and that *Salamis* should behold the loss of a great many children, dear to their mothers, either when *Ceres* was spread abroad, or gathered together. Here *Ænomaus* loses all patience with the god of Delphi. This contest,” says he, “between father and daughter is very becoming the deities! It is excellent, that there should be contrary inclinations and interests in heaven. Poor wizard, thou art ignorant whose the children are that *Salamis* shall see perish; whether Greeks or Persians. It is certain they must be either one or the other; but thou needest not to have told so openly, that thou knewest not which. Thou concealest the time of the battle under those fine poetical expressions, ‘either when *Ceres* is spread abroad, or gathered together;’ and wouldest thou cajole us with such pompous language? Who knows not, that if there be a sea fight, it must either be in seed time or harvest? It is certain it cannot be in winter. Let things go how they will, thou wilt secure thyself by this *Jupiter*, whom *Minerva* is endeavouring to appease. If the Greeks lose the battle, *Jupiter* proved inexorable to the last; if they gain it, why then *Minerva* at length prevailed.”

It is a very general opinion among the more learned, that oracles were all mere cheats and impostures; either calculated to serve the avaricious ends of the Heathen priests, or the political views of the princes. Bayle says positively, they were mere human artificers, in which the devil had no hand. He was strongly supported by *Van Dale* and *Fontenelle*, who have

written expressly on the subject. Father Balthus, a Jesuit, wrote a treatise in defence of the fathers with regard to the origin of oracles; but without denying the imposture of the priests, often blended with the oracles. He maintains the intervention of the devil in some predictions, which could not be ascribed to the cheats of the priests alone. The Abbé Banier espouses the same side of the question, and objects that oracles would not have lasted so long, and supported themselves with so much splendour and reputation, if they had been merely owing to the forgeries of the priests. Bishop Sherlock, in his Discourses concerning the Use and Intent of Prophecy," expresses his opinion, that it is impious to disbelieve the Heathen oracles, and to deny them to have been given out by the devil; to which assertion, Dr. Middleton, in his Examination," &c, replies, that he is guilty of this impiety, and that he thinks himself warranted to pronounce from the authority of the best and wisest of the Heathens themselves, and the evidence of plain facts, which are recorded of those oracles, as well as from the nature of the thing itself, that they were all mere imposture, wholly invented and supported by human craft, without any supernatural aid or interposition whatsoever. He alleges, that Cicero, speaking of the Delphic oracle, the most revered of any in the Heathen world, declares, that nothing was become more contemptible, not only in his days, but long before him; that Demosthenes, who lived about three hundred years earlier, affirmed of the same oracle, in a public speech to the people of Athens, that it was gained to the interests of King Philip, an enemy to that city; that the Greek historians tell us, how, on several other occasions, it had been corrupted by money, to serve the views of particular persons and parties, and the prophetess sometimes had been deposed for bribery and lewdness; that there were some great sects of philosophers, who, on principle, disavowed the authority of all oracles; agreeably to all which Strabo tells us, that divination in general and oracles had been in high credit among the ancients, but in his days were treated with much contempt; lastly, that Eusebius also, the great historian of the primitive church, declares, that there were six hundred writers among the Heathens themselves who had publicly written against the reality of them. Plutarch has a treatise on the ceasing of some oracles; and Van Dale, a Dutch physician, has a volume to prove they did not cease at the coming of Christ; but that many of them ceased long before, and that others held till the fall of Paganism, under the empire of Theodosius the Great, when Paganism being dissipated, these institutions could no longer subsist. Van Dale was answered by a German, one Mœbius, professor of theology at Leipsic, in 1685. Fontenelle espoused Van Dale's system, and improved upon it in his History of Oracles;" and showed the weakness of the argument used by many writers in behalf of Christianity, drawn from the ceasing of oracles. Cicero says, the oracles became dumb in proportion as people, growing less credulous, began to suspect them for cheats. Plutarch alleges two reasons for the

ceasing of oracles: the one was Apollo's chagrin; who, it seems, took it in dudgeon to be interrogated about so many trifles. The other was, that in proportion as the genii, or demons, who had the management of the oracles, died, and became extinct, the oracles must necessarily cease. He adds a third and more natural cause for the ceasing of oracles; namely, the forlorn state of Greece, ruined and desolated by wars; for, hence, the smallness of the gains let the priests sink into a poverty and contempt too bare to cover the fraud. That the oracles were silenced about or soon after the time of our Saviour's advent, may be proved, says Dr. Leland, in the first volume of his learned work on *The Necessity and Advantage of Revelation*, &c, from express testimonies, not only of Christian but of Heathen authors. Lucan, who wrote his *Pharsalia* in the reign of Nero, scarcely thirty years after our Lord's crucifixion, laments it as one of the greatest misfortunes of that age, that the Delphian oracle, which he represents as one of the choicest gifts of the gods, was become silent.

Non ullo sæcula dono  
Nostra carent majore Deum, quam Delphica sedes  
Quod sileat.

*Pharsal. lib. v, 111.*

Of all the wants with which the age is curst,  
The Delphic silence surely is the worst."

Rowe.

In like manner, Juvenal says,

Delphis oracula cessant,  
Et genus humanum damnat caligo futuri.  
*Sat. vi, 554.*

Since Delphi now, if we may credit fame,  
Gives no responses, and a long dark night  
Conceals the future hour from mortal sight."  
Gifford.

Lucian says, that when he was at Delphi, the oracle gave no answer, nor was the priestess inspired. This likewise appears from Plutarch's treatise, why the oracles cease to give answers, already cited; whence it is also manifest, that the most learned Heathens were very much at a loss how to give a tolerable account of it. Porphyry, in a passage cited from him by Eusebius, says, The city of Rome was overrun with sickness, Æsculapius and the rest of the gods having withdrawn their converse with men; because since Jesus began to be worshipped, no man had received any public help or benefit from the gods." With respect to the origin of oracles, they were probably imitations, first, of the answers given to the holy patriarchs from the divine presence or Shechinah, and secondly, of the responses to the

Jewish high priest from the mercy seat: for all Paganism is a parody of the true religion.

ORDINATION, the act of conferring holy orders, or of initiating a person into the ministry of the Gospel, by prayer and with or without the laying on of hands. In the church of England, ordination has always been esteemed the principal prerogative of bishops; and bishops still retain the function as a mark of their spiritual sovereignty in their diocese. Without ordination no person can receive any benefice, parsonage, vicarage, &c. A person must be twenty-three years of age, or near it, before he can be ordained deacon, or have any share in the ministry; and full twenty-four before he can be ordained priest, and by that means be permitted to administer the holy communion. A bishop, on the ordination of clergymen, is to examine them in the presence of the ministers, who in the ordination of priests, but not of deacons, assist him at the imposition of hands; but this is only done as a mark of assent, not because it is thought necessary. In case any crime, as drunkenness, perjury, forgery, &c, is alleged against any one that is to be ordained, either priest or deacon, the bishop ought to desist from ordaining him. The person to be ordained is to bring a testimonial of his life and doctrine to the bishop, and to give an account of his faith in Latin; and both priests and deacons are obliged to subscribe to the thirty-nine articles. In the ancient discipline there was no such thing as a vague and absolute ordination; but every one was to have a church, whereof he was to be ordained clerk or priest. In the twelfth century the bishops grew more remiss, and ordained without any title or benefice. The council of Trent, however, restored the ancient discipline, and appointed that none should be ordained but those who were provided with a benefice; which practice still obtains in the church of England.

The reformed held the call of the people the only thing essential to the validity of the ministry; and teach, that ordination is only a ceremony, which renders the call more august and authentic. Accordingly the Protestant churches of Scotland, France, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, Poland, Hungary, Denmark, &c, have no episcopal ordination. For Luther, Calvin, Bucer, Melancthon, &c, and all the first reformers and founders of these churches, who ordained ministers among them, were themselves presbyters, and no other. And though in some of these churches there are ministers called superintendents, or bishops, yet these are only *primi inter pares*, the first among equals; not pretending to any superiority of orders. Having themselves no other orders than what either presbyters gave them, or what was given them as presbyters, they can convey no other to those they ordain. 723 On this ground the Protestant Dissenters plead that their ordination, though not episcopal, is the same with that of all the illustrious Protestant churches abroad; and object, that a priest ordained by a popish

bishop should be received into the church of England as a valid minister, rightfully ordained; while the orders of another, ordained by the most learned religious presbyter, which any foreign country can boast, are pronounced not valid, and he is required to submit to be ordained afresh. In opposition to episcopal ordination, they urge that Timothy was ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, 1 Tim. iv, 14; that Paul and Barnabas were ordained by certain prophets and teachers in the church of Antioch, and not by any bishop presiding in that city, Acts xiii, 1–3; and that it is a well known fact, that presbyters in the church of Alexandria ordained even their own bishops for more than two hundred years in the earliest ages of Christianity. They farther argue, that bishops and presbyters are in Scripture the same, and not denominations of distinct orders or offices in the church, referring to Phil. i, 1; Titus i, 5, 7; Acts xx, 27, 28; 1 Peter v, 1, 2. To the same purpose they maintain, that the superiority of bishops to presbyters is not pretended to be of divine, but of human, institution; not grounded on Scripture, but only upon the custom or ordinances of this realm, by the first reformers and founders of the church of England; nor by many of its most learned and eminent doctors since. See Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*, in which the learned author affirms and shows this to be the sentiment of Cranmer, and other chief reformers both in Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth's reign, of Archbishop Whitgift, Bishop Bridges, Lee, Hooker, Sutcliff, Hales, Chillingworth, &c. Moreover, the book entitled, *the Institution of a Christian Man*," subscribed by the clergy in convocation, and confirmed by parliament, owns bishops and presbyters by Scripture to be the same. Beside, the Protestant Dissenters allege, that if episcopal ordination be really necessary to constitute a valid minister, it does not seem to be enjoined by the constitution of the church of England; because the power of ordination which the bishops exercise in this kingdom, is derived entirely and only from the civil magistrate; and he authoritatively prescribes how, and to whom ordination is to be given: that if an ordination should be conducted in other manner and form than that prescribed by him, such ordination would be illegal, and of no authority in the church. Accordingly the bishop at the ordination of the candidate asks, *Are you called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the due order of this realm?"* The constitution and law of England seem to know nothing of uninterrupted lineal descent, but considers the king vested, by act of parliament, or the suffrage of the people, with a fulness of all power ecclesiastical in these realms, as empowering and authorizing bishops to ordain: and this power of ordination was once delegated to Cromwell, a layman, as vicegerent to the king. They farther think it strange, that the validity of orders and ministrations should be derived, as some have contended, from a succession of popish bishops; bishops of a church, which, by the definition of the nineteenth article of the church, can be no part of the true visible church of Christ, and bishops, likewise, who

consider the Protestant clergy, although ordained by Protestant bishops, as mere common unconsecrated laymen.

On reviewing the whole of this controversy, says Dr. Watts, that since there are some texts in the New Testament, wherein single persons, either Apostles, as Paul and Barnabas, ordained ministers in the churches, or evangelists, as Timothy and Titus; and since other missions or ordinations are intimated to be performed by several persons, namely, prophets, teachers, elders, or a presbytery, Acts xiii, 1; 1 Timothy iv, 14; since there is sometimes mention made of the imposition of hands in the mission of a minister, and sometimes no mention is made of it; and since it is evident that in some cases popular ordinations are and must be valid without any bishop or elder,--I think none of these differences should be made a matter of violent contest among Christians; nor ought any words to be pronounced against each other by those of the episcopal, presbyterian, or independent way. Surely all may agree thus far, that various forms or modes, seeming to be used in the mission or ordination of ministers in primitive times, may give a reasonable occasion or colour for sincere and honest searchers after truth to follow different opinions on this head, and do therefore demand our candid and charitable sentiments concerning those who differ from us. Among the Wesleyan Methodists, the ordination of their ministers is in the annual conference, with a president at its head, and is by prayer without imposition of hands. The latter they hold to be a circumstance of ordination, not an essential. They sometimes therefore use it, and at others omit it. The missionaries sent out by that body, if not previously ordained by the conference, are set apart by a few senior ministers; and ordinarily in this case, the service of the church of England, with some alterations, is used, with imposition of the hands of the ministers present.

OSSIFRAGE, פֶּרֶס, Lev. xi, 13; Deut. xiv, 12. Interpreters are not agreed on this bird; some read vulture," others the black eagle," others the falcon." The name peres, by which it is called in Hebrew, denotes to crush, to break;" and this name agrees with our version, which implies the bone-breaker," which name is given to a kind of eagle, from the circumstance of its habit of breaking the bones of its prey, after it has eaten the flesh: some say also, that he even swallows the bones thus broken. Onkelos uses a word which signifies naked," and leads us to the vulture: indeed, if we were to take the classes of birds in any thing like a natural order in the passages here referred to, the vulture should follow the eagle as an unclean bird. The Septuagint interpreter also renders vulture; and 724so do Munster, Schindler, and the Zurick versions.

OSTRICH, יַעֲנָה; in Arabic neamah; in Greek *στρουθία*, the camel bird; and still in the east, says Niebuhr, it is called thar edsjammel, the

camel bird,” Lev. xi, 16; Deut. xiv, 15; Job xxx, 29; Isaiah xiii, 21; xxxiv, 13; xlili, 20; Jer. 1, 39; Lam. iv, 3; Micah i, 8; רננים, Job xxxix, 13. The first name in the places above quoted is, by our own translators, generally rendered owls.” “Now it should be recollected,” says the author of Scripture Illustrated,” “that the owl is not a desert bird, but rather resides in places not far from habitations, and that it is not the companion of serpents; whereas, in several of these passages, the joneh is associated with deserts, dry, extensive, thirsty deserts, and with serpents, which are their natural inhabitants. Our ignorance of the natural history of the countries which the ostrich inhabits has undoubtedly perverted the import of the above passages; but let any one peruse them afresh, and exchange the owl for the ostrich, and he will immediately discover a vigour of description, and an imagery much beyond what he had formerly perceived.” The Hebrew phrase בת היענה, means the daughter בת היענה of vociferation,” and is understood to be the female ostrich, probably so called from the noise which this bird makes. It is affirmed by travellers of good credit, that ostriches make a fearful, screeching, lamentable noise.

Ostriches are inhabitants of the deserts of Arabia, where they live chiefly upon vegetables; lead a social and inoffensive life, the male assorting with the female with connubial fidelity. Their eggs are very large, some of them measuring above five inches in diameter, and weighing twelve or fifteen pounds. These birds are very prolific, laying forty or fifty eggs at a clutch. They will devour leather, grass, hair, stones, metals, or any thing that is given to them; but those substances which the coats of the stomach cannot act upon pass whole. It is so unclean an animal as to eat its own ordure as soon as it voids it. This is a sufficient reason, were others wanting, why such a fowl should be reputed unclean, and its use as an article of diet prohibited. The ostrich,” says M. Buffon, was known in the remotest ages, and mentioned in the most ancient books. How indeed could an animal so remarkably large, and so wonderfully prolific, and peculiarly suited to the climate as is the ostrich, remain unknown in Africa, and part of Asia, countries peopled from the earliest ages, full of deserts indeed, but where there is not a spot which has not been traversed by the foot of man? The family of the ostrich, therefore, is of great antiquity. Nor in the course of ages has it varied or degenerated from its native purity. It has always remained on its paternal estate; and its lustre has been transmitted unsullied by foreign intercourse. In short, it is among the birds what the elephant is among the quadrupeds, a distinct race, widely separated from all the others by characters as striking as they are invariable.” “On the least noise,” says Dr. Shaw, “or trivial occasion, she forsakes her eggs, or her young ones; to which perhaps she never returns; or if she does, it may be too late either to restore life to the one, or to preserve the lives of the others. Agreeably to this account the Arabs meet sometimes with whole nests of these eggs

undisturbed: some of them are sweet and good, others are addle and corrupted; others again have their young ones of different growth, according to the time, it may be presumed, they have been forsaken of the dam. The Arabs often meet with a few of the little ones no bigger than well grown pullets, half starved, straggling and moaning about like so many distressed orphans for their mother. In this manner the ostrich may be said to be hardened against her young ones as though they were not hers; her labour, in hatching and attending them so far, being vain, without fear, or the least concern of what becomes of them afterward. This want of affection is also recorded, Lam. iv, 3, ‘the daughter of my people is become cruel, like ostriches in the wilderness;’ that is, by apparently deserting their own, and receiving others in return.” Natural affection and sagacious instinct are the grand instruments by which providence continues the race of other animals: but no limits can be set to the wisdom and power of God. He preserveth the breed of the ostrich without those means, and even in a penury of all the necessaries of life. Notwithstanding the stupidity of this animal, its Creator hath amply provided for its safety, by endowing it with extraordinary swiftness, and a surprising apparatus for escaping from its enemy. They, when they raise themselves up for flight, laugh at the horse and his rider.” They afford him an opportunity only of admiring at a distance the extraordinary agility and the stateliness likewise of their motions, the richness of their plumage, and the great propriety there was in ascribing to them an expanded quivering wing. Nothing certainly can be more entertaining than such a sight, the wings, by their rapid but unwearied vibrations, equally serving them for sails and oars; while their feet, no less assisting in conveying them out of sight, seem to be insensible of fatigue.

MAP OF  
PALESTINE.  
Illustrating the  
NEW TESTAMENT.

OWL. There are several varieties of this species, all too well known to need a particular description. They are nocturnal birds of prey, and have their eyes better adapted for discerning objects in the evening or twilight than in the glare of day. 1. כֹּס, Lev. xi, 17; Deut. xiv, 16; Psalm cii, 6, is in our version rendered the little owl.” Aquila, Theodotion, Jerom, Kimchi, and most of the older interpreters, are quoted to justify this rendering. Michaëlis, at some length, supports the opinion that it is the horned owl. Bochart, though with some hesitation, suspected it to be the onocrotalus, a kind of pelican, because the Hebrew name signifies cup, and the pelican is remarkable for a pouch or bag under the lower jaw; but there are good reasons for supposing that bird to be the קֹז of the next verse. Dr. Geddes



thinks this bird the cormorant; and as it begins the list of water fowl, and is mentioned always in 725 the same contexts with קאח, confessedly a water bird, his opinion may be adopted. 2. קאח, Lev. xi, 17; Deut. xiv, 16; Isaiah xxxiv, 11. In the two first places our translators render this the great owl," which is strangely placed after the little owl, and among water birds. Our translators," says the author of Scripture Illustrated," "seem to have thought the owl a convenient bird, as we have three owls in two verses." Some critics think it means a species of night bird, because the word may be derived from נשף, which signifies the twilight, the time when owls fly about. But this interpretation, says Parkhurst, seems very forced; and since it is mentioned among water fowls, and the LXX. have, in the first and last of those texts, rendered it by ἰβίς, the ibis, we are disposed to adopt it here, and think the evidence strengthened by this, that in a Coptic version of Lev. xi, 17, it is called ip or hip, which, with a Greek termination, would very easily make ἰβίς. 3. קפון, which occurs only in Isaiah xxxiv, 15, is in our version rendered the great owl." 4. לילית, Isa. xxxiv, 14, in our version the screech owl." The root signifies night; and as undoubtedly a bird frequenting dark places and ruins is referred to, we must admit some kind of owl.

A place of lonely desolation, where  
 The screeching tribe and pelicans abide,  
 And the dun ravens croak mid ruins drear,  
 And moaning owls from man the farthest hide.

OX, בקר, in Arabic bœkerre and bykar, the male of horned cattle of the beeve kind, at full age, when fit for the plough. Younger ones are called bullocks. Michaëlis, in his elaborate work on the laws of Moses, has proved that castration was never practised. The rural economy of the Israelites led them to value the ox as by far the most important of domestic animals, from the consideration of his great use in all the operations of farming. In the patriarchal ages, the ox constituted no inconsiderable portion of their wealth. Thus Abraham is said to be very rich in cattle, Gen. xxiv, 35. Men of every age and country have been much indebted to the labours of this animal. So early as in the days of Job, who was probably contemporary with Isaac, the oxen were ploughing, and the asses were feeding beside them," when the Sabeans fell upon them, and took them away. In times long posterior, when Elijah was commissioned to anoint Elisha, the son of Shaphat, prophet in his stead, he found him ploughing with twelve yoke of oxen, 1 Kings xix, 19. For many ages the hopes of oriental husbandmen depended entirely on their labours. This was so much the case in the time of Solomon, that he observes, in one of his proverbs, Where no oxen are, the crib is clean," or rather empty; but much increase is by the strength of the ox," Prov. xiv, 4. The ass, in the course of ages was compelled to bend his stubborn neck to the yoke, and share the labours of the ox; but still the

preparation of the ground in the time of spring depended chiefly on the more powerful exertions of the latter. When this animal was employed in bringing home the produce of the harvest, he was regaled with a mixture of chaff, chopped straw, and various kinds of grain, moistened with acidulated water. But among the Jews, the ox was best fed when employed in treading out the corn; for the divine law, in many of whose precepts the benevolence of the Deity conspicuously shines, forbade to muzzle him, and, by consequence, to prevent him from eating what he would of the grain he was employed to separate from the husks. The ox was also compelled to the labour of dragging the cart or wagon. The number of oxen commonly yoked to one cart appears to have been two, Num. vii, 3, 7, 8; 1 Sam. vi, 7; 2 Sam. vi, 3, 6.

The wild ox, אַרְיֵה, Deut. xiv, 5, is supposed to be the oryx of the Greeks, which is a species of large stag.

PADAN-ARAM, called also Sedan-Aram in Hosea; both names denoting Aram or Syria the fruitful, or cultivated, and apply to the northern part of Mesopotamia, in which Haran or Charran was situated. See Mesopotamia.

PAGANS, Heathens, and particularly those who worship idols. The term came into use after the establishment of Christianity, the cities and great towns affording the first converts. The Heathens were called Pagans, from pagus, a village," because they were then found chiefly in remote country places; but we use the term commonly for all who do not receive the Jewish, Christian, or Mohammedan religions.

PAINTING THE FACE, 2 Kings ix, 30. See Eyes.

PALESTINE, taken in a limited sense, denotes the country of the Philistines or Palestines, including that part of the land of promise which extended along the Mediterranean Sea, from Gaza south to Lydda north. The LXX. were of opinion that the word Philistiim, which they generally translate Allophyli, signified strangers," or men of another tribe. Palestine, taken in a more general sense, signifies the whole country of Canaan, the whole land of promise, as well beyond as on this side Jordan, though pretty frequently it is restrained to the country on this side that river; so that in later times the words Judea and Palestine were synonymous. We find, also, the name of Syria Palestina given to the land of promise, and even sometimes this province is comprehended in Cælo-Syria, or the Lower Syria. Herodotus is the most ancient writer we know that speaks of Syria Palestina. He places it between Phenicia and Egypt. See Canaan.

PALM TREE, תמר, Exodus xv, 27, &c. This tree, sometimes called the date tree, grows plentifully in the east. It rises to a great height. The stalks are generally full of rugged knots, which are the vestiges of the decayed leaves; for the trunk of this tree is not solid, like other trees, but its centre is filled with pith, round which is a tough bark full of strong fibres when young, which, as the tree grows old, hardens and becomes ligneous. 726 To this bark the leaves are closely joined, which in the centre rise erect; but, after they are advanced above the vagina which surrounds them, they expand very wide on every side the stem; and, as the older leaves decay, the stalk advances in height. The leaves, when the tree has grown to a size for bearing fruit, are six or eight feet long, are very broad when spread out, and are used for covering the tops of houses, &c. The fruit, which is called date, grows below the leaves in clusters and is of a sweet and agreeable taste. The learned Kæmpfer, as a botanist, an antiquary, and a traveller, has exhausted the whole subject of palm trees. The diligent natives," says Mr. Gibbon, celebrated, either in verse or prose, the three hundred and sixty uses to which the trunk, the branches, the leaves, the juice, and the fruit, were skilfully applied." "The extensive importance of the date tree," says Dr. E. D. Clarke, is one of the most curious subjects to which a traveller can direct his attention. A considerable part of the inhabitants of Egypt, of Arabia, and Persia, subsist almost entirely upon its fruit. They boast also of its medicinal virtues. Their camels feed upon the date stone. From the leaves they make couches, baskets, bags, mats, and brushes; from the branches, cages for their poultry, and fences for their gardens; from the fibres of the boughs, thread, ropes, and rigging; from the sap is prepared a spirituous liquor; and the body of the tree furnishes fuel. It is even said that from one variety of the palm tree, the phoenix farinifera, meal has been extracted, which is found among the fibres of the trunk, and has been used for food."

In the temple of Solomon were pilasters made in the form of palm trees, 1 Kings vi, 29. It was under a tree of this kind that Deborah dwelt between Ramah and Bethel, Judges iv, 5. To the fair, flourishing, and fruitful condition of this tree, the psalmist very aptly compares the votary of virtue, Psalm xcii, 12, 13, 14:--

The righteous shall flourish like a palm tree.  
 Those that are planted in the house of Jehovah,  
 In the courts of our God, shall flourish;  
 In old age they shall still put forth buds,  
 They shall be full of sap and vigorous.

The palm tree is crowned at its top with a large tuft of spiring leaves about four feet long, which never fall off, but always continue in the same flourishing verdure. The tree, as Dr. Shaw was informed, is in its greatest

vigour about thirty years after it is planted, and continues in full vigour seventy years longer; bearing all this while, every year, about three or four hundred pounds' weight of dates. The trunk of the tree is remarkably straight and lofty. Jeremiah, speaking of the idols that were carried in procession, says they were upright as the palm tree, Jer. x, 5. And for erect stature and slenderness of form, the spouse, in Canticles vii, 7, is compared to this tree:--

How framed, O my love, for delights!

Lo, thy stature is like a palm tree,

And thy bosom like clusters of dates.

On this passage Mr. Good observes, that "the very word tamar, here used for the palm tree, and whose radical meaning is 'straight,' or 'upright,' (whence it was afterward applied to pillars or columns, as well as to the palm,) was also a general name among the ladies of Palestine, and unquestionably adopted in honour of the stature they had already acquired, or gave a fair promise of attaining."

A branch of palm was a signal of victory, and was carried before conquerors in the triumphs. To this, allusion is made, Rev. vii, 9: and for this purpose were they borne before Christ in his way to Jerusalem, John xii, 13. From the inspissated sap of the tree, a kind of honey, or dispse, as it is called, is produced, little inferior to that of bees. The same juice, after fermentation, makes a sort of wine much used in the east. It is once mentioned as wine, Num. xxviii, 7; Exodus xxix, 40; and by it is intended the strong drink, Isaiah v, 11; xxiv, 9. Theodoret and Chrysostom, on these places, both Syrians, and unexceptionable witnesses in what belongs to their own country, confirm this declaration. This liquor," says Dr. Shaw, which has a more luscious sweetness than honey, is of the consistence of a thin syrup, but quickly grows tart and ropy, acquiring an intoxicating quality, and giving by distillation an agreeable spirit, or arâky, according to the general name of these people for all hot liquors, extracted by the alembic." Its Hebrew name is שכר, the σικερα of the Greeks; and from its sweetness, probably, the saccharum of the Romans. Jerom informs us that in Hebrew any inebriating liquor is called sicera, whether made of grain, the juice of apples, honey, dates, or any other fruit."

This tree was formerly of great value and esteem among the Israelites, and so very much cultivated in Judea, that, in after times, it became the emblem of that country, as may be seen in a medal of the Emperor Vespasian upon the conquest of Judea. It represents a captive woman sitting under a palm tree, with this inscription, Judea capta;" [Judea captivated;] and upon a Greek coin, likewise, of his son Titus, struck upon the like occasion, we see a shield suspended upon a palm tree, with a Victory writing upon it.

Pliny also calls Judea *palmis incluta*, renowned for palms.” Jericho, in particular, was called the city of palms,” Deut. xxxiv, 3; 2 Chron. xxviii, 15; because, as Josephus, Strabo, and Pliny, have remarked, it anciently abounded in palm trees. And so Dr. Shaw remarks, that, though these trees are not now either plentiful or fruitful in other parts of the holy land, yet there are several of them at Jericho, where there is the conveniency they require of being often watered; where, likewise, the climate is warm, and the soil sandy, such as they thrive and delight in. Tamar, a city built in the desert by Solomon, 1 Kings ix, 18; Ezekiel xlvii, 19; xlviii, 28, was probably so named from the palm trees growing about it; as it was afterward by the Romans called Palmyra, or rather Palmira, on the same account, from *palma*, a palm tree.”

727PALMER WORM, גור, Joel i, 4; Amos iv, 9. Bochart says that it is a kind of locust, furnished with very sharp teeth, with which it gnaws off grass, corn, leaves of trees, and even their bark. The Jews support this idea by deriving the word from גר or גרן, to cut, to shear, or mince. Notwithstanding the unanimous sentiments of the Jews that this is a locust, yet the LXX. read κάμπη, and the Vulgate *eruca*, a caterpillar;” which rendering is supported by Fuller. Michaëlis agrees with this opinion, and thinks that the sharp cutting teeth of the caterpillar, which, like a sickle, clear away all before them, might give name to this insect. Caterpillars also begin their ravages before the locust, which seems to coincide with the nature of the creature here intended.

PALSY. See Diseases.

PAMPHYLIA, a province of Asia Minor which gives name to that part of the Mediterranean Sea which washes its coast, Acts xxvii, 5. To the south it is bounded by the Mediterranean, and to the north by Pisidia; having Lycia to the west, and Cilicia to the east. Paul and Barnabas preached at Perga, in Pamphylia, Acts xiii, 13; xiv, 24.

PANTHEISM, a doctrine into which some of the sages of antiquity fell by revolting at the monstrous absurdities of Polytheism. Not knowing the true God as an infinite and personal subsistence, a cause above and distinct from all effects, they believed that God was every thing, and every thing God. This monstrous, and in its effects immoral, notion, is still held by the Brahmins of India.

PAPER REED, אגג, Exod. ii, 3; Job viii, 11; Isaiah xviii, 2; xxxv, 7. When the outer skin, or bark, is taken off, there are several films, or inner pellicles, one within another. These, when separated from the stalk, were laid on a table artfully matched and flatted together, and moistened with

the water of the Nile, which, dissolving the glutinous juices of the plant, caused them to adhere closely together. They were afterward pressed, and then dried in the sun, and thus were prepared sheets or leaves for writing upon in characters marked by a coloured liquid passing through a hollow reed. The best papyrus was called ἱερατικὴ, or paper of the priests. On this the sacred documents of Egypt were written. Ancient books were written on papyrus, and those of the New Testament among the rest. In the fourth century however these sacred writings are found on skins. This was preferred for durability; and many decayed copies of the New Testament, belonging to libraries, were early transferred to parchment. Finally came paper, the name of which was taken from the Egyptian reed; but the materials of which it was fabricated were cotton and linen. See Bulrush and Book.

PAPHOS, a celebrated city of Cyprus, lying on the western coast of the island, where Venus (who from hence took the name of Paphia) had her most ancient and most famous temple; and here the Roman proconsul, Sergius Paulus, resided, whom St. Paul converted to Christianity, Acts xiii, 6.

PARABLE, παραβολή, formed from παραβάλλειν, to oppose or compare, an allegorical instruction, founded on something real or apparent in nature or history, from which a moral is drawn, by comparing it with some other thing in which the people are more immediately concerned. (See Allegory.) Aristotle defines parable, a similitude drawn from form to form. Cicero calls it a collation; others, a simile. F. de Colonia calls it a rational fable; but it may be founded on real occurrences, as many parables of our Saviour were. The Hebrews call it משל, from a word which signifies either to predominate or to assimilate; the Proverbs of Solomon are by them also called משלים, parables, or proverbs.

Parable, according to the eminently learned Bishop Lowth, is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of a fictitious or accommodated event, applied to the illustration of some important truth. The Greeks call these αἶνοι, allegories, or apologues; the Latins, fabulæ, or fables;” and the writings of the Phrygian sage, or those composed in imitation of him, have acquired the greatest celebrity. Nor has our Saviour himself disdained to adopt the same method of instruction; of whose parables it is doubtful whether they excel most in wisdom and utility, or in sweetness, elegance, and perspicuity. As the appellation of parable has been applied to his discourses of this kind, the term is now restricted from its former extensive signification to a more confined sense. But this species of composition occurs very frequently in the prophetic poetry, and particularly in that of Ezekiel. If to us they should sometimes appear

obscure, we must remember, that, in those early times when the prophetic writings were indited, it was universally the mode throughout all the eastern nations to convey sacred truths under mysterious figures and representations. In order to our forming a more certain judgment upon this subject, Dr. Lowth has briefly explained some of the primary qualities of the poetic parables; so that, by considering the general nature of them, we may decide more accurately on the merits of particular examples.

It is the first excellence of a parable to turn upon an image well known and applicable to the subject, the meaning of which is clear and definite; for this circumstance will give it perspicuity, which is essential to every species of allegory. If the parables of the sacred prophets are examined by this rule, they will not be found deficient. They are in general founded upon such imagery as is frequently used, and similarly applied by way of metaphor and comparison in the Hebrew poetry. Examples of this kind occur in the parable of the deceitful vineyard, Isaiah v, 1–7, and of the useless vine, Ezek. xv; xix, 10–14; for under this imagery the ungrateful people of God are more than once described; Ezek. xix, 1–9; xxxi; xvi; xxiii. Moreover, the image must not only be apt and familiar, but it must be also elegant and beautiful in itself; since it is the purpose of a poetic parable, not only to explain more perfectly some proposition, but frequently to give it some animation and splendour. As the imagery from natural objects is in this respect superior to all others, the parables of the sacred poets consist chiefly of this kind of imagery. It is also essential to the elegance of a parable, that the imagery should not only be apt and beautiful, but that all its parts and appendages should be perspicuous and pertinent. Of all these excellencies, there cannot be more perfect examples than the parables that have been just specified; to which we may add the well known parable of Nathan, 2 Sam. xii, 1–4, although written in prose, as well as that of Jotham, Judges ix, 7–15, which appears to be the most ancient extant, and approaches somewhat nearer to the poetical form. It is also the criterion of a parable, that it be consistent throughout, and that the literal be never confounded with the figurative sense; and in this respect it materially differs from that species of allegory, called the continued metaphor, Isaiah v, 1–7. It should be considered, that the continued metaphor and the parable have a very different view. The sole intention of the former is to embellish a subject, to represent it more magnificently, or at the most to illustrate it, that, by describing it in more elevated language, it may strike the mind more forcibly; but the intent of the latter is to withdraw the truth for a moment from our sight, in order to conceal whatever it may contain ungrateful or reproofing, and to enable it secretly to insinuate itself, and obtain an ascendancy as it were by stealth. There is, however, a species of parable, the intent of which is only to illustrate the subject; such is that remarkable one of the cedar of Lebanon, Ezek. xxxi;

than which, if we consider the imagery itself, none was ever more apt or more beautiful; or the description and colouring, none was ever more elegant or splendid; in which, however, the poet has occasionally allowed himself to blend the figurative with the literal description, verses 11, 14–17; whether he has done this because the peculiar nature of this kind of parable required it, or whether his own fervid imagination alone, which disdained the stricter rules of composition, was his guide, our learned author can scarcely presume to determine.

In the New Testament, the word parable is used variously: in Luke iv, 23, for a proverb, or adage; in Matt. xv, 15, for a thing darkly and figuratively expressed; in Heb. ix, 9, &c, for a type; in Luke xiv, 7, &c, for a special instruction; in Matt. xxiv, 32, for a similitude or comparison.

PARADISE, according to the original meaning of the term, whether it be of Hebrew, Chaldee, or Persian derivation, signifies, a place enclosed for pleasure and delight.” The LXX., or Greek translators of the Old Testament, make use of the word paradise, when they speak of the garden of Eden, which Jehovah planted at the creation, and in which he placed our first parents. There are three places in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament where this word is found, namely, Neh. ii, 8; Cant. iv, 13; Eccles. ii, 5. The term paradise is obviously used in the New Testament, as another word for heaven; by our Lord, Luke xxiii, 43; by the Apostle Paul, 2 Cor. xii, 4; and in the Apocalypse, ii, 7. See Eden.

PARAN, Desert of, a great and terrible wilderness” which the children of Israel entered after leaving Mount Sinai, Num. x, 12; Deut. i, 19; and in which thirty-eight of their forty years of wandering were spent. It extended from Mount Sinai on the south, to the southern border of the land of Canaan on the north; having the desert of Shur, with its subdivisions, the deserts of Etham and Sin, on the west, and the eastern branch of the Red Sea, the desert of Zin and Mount Seir, on the east. Burckhardt represents this desert, which he entered from that of Zin, or valley of El Araba, about the parallel of Suez, as a dreary expanse of calcareous soil, covered with black flints.

PARTRIDGE, 1 ,אָרְטֵר Samuel xxvi, 20; Jer. xvii, 11; ὄρνις, Ecclus. xi, 30. In the first of these places David says, The king of Israel is come out to hunt a partridge on the mountains;” and in the second, The partridge sitteth,” on eggs, and produceth,” or hatcheth, not; so he that getteth riches, and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his days, and at his end shall be contemptible.” This passage does not necessarily imply that the partridge hatches the eggs of a stranger, but only that she often fails in her attempts to bring forth her young. To such disappointments she is greatly exposed from the position of her nest on the ground, where her eggs are



often spoiled by the wet, or crushed by the foot. So he that broods over his ill-gotten gains will often find them unproductive; or, if he leaves them, as a bird occasionally driven from her nest, may be despoiled of their possession. As to the hunting of the partridge, which, Dr. Shaw observes, is the greater, or red-legged kind, the traveller says: The Arabs have another, though a more laborious, method of catching these birds; for, observing that they become languid and fatigued after they have been hastily put up twice or thrice, they immediately run in upon them, and knock them down with their zerwattys, or bludgeons as we should call them." Precisely in this manner Saul hunted David, coming hastily upon him, putting him up incessantly, in hopes that at length his strength and resources would fail, and he would become an easy prey to his pursuer. Forskal mentions a partridge whose name in Arabic is kurr; and Latham says, that, in the province of Andalusia in Spain, the name of the partridge is churr; both taken, no doubt, like the Hebrew, from its note.

Map of the  
COUNTRIES  
Travelled by the  
APOSTLES  
with the  
ROUTES OF ST. PAUL  
through  
Asia & Europe

PASSOVER, פסח, signifies leap, passage. The passover was a solemn festival of the Jews, instituted in commemoration of their coming out of Egypt; because the night before their departure the destroying angel that slew the first-born of the Egyptians passed over the 729 houses of the Hebrews without entering them, because they were marked with the blood of the lamb, which, for this reason, was called the paschal lamb. The following is what God ordained concerning the passover: the month of the coming out of Egypt was after this to be the first month of the sacred or ecclesiastical year; and the fourteenth day of this month, between the two evenings, that is, between the sun's decline and its setting, or rather, according to our reckoning, between three o'clock in the afternoon and six in the evening, at the equinox, they were to kill the paschal lamb, and to abstain from leavened bread. The day following, being the fifteenth, reckoned from six o'clock of the preceding evening, was the grand feast of the passover, which continued seven days; but only the first and seventh days were peculiarly solemn. The slain lamb was to be without defect, a male, and of that year. If no lamb could be found, they might take a kid. They killed a lamb or a kid in each family; and if the number of the family

was not sufficient to eat the lamb, they might associate two families together. With the blood of the lamb they sprinkled the door posts and lintel of every house, that the destroying angel at the sight of the blood might pass over them. They were to eat the lamb the same night, roasted, with unleavened bread, and a sallad of wild lettuces, or bitter herbs. It was forbid to eat any part of it raw, or boiled; nor were they to break a bone; but it was to be eaten entire, even with the head, the feet, and the bowels. If any thing remained to the day following it was thrown into the fire, Exod. xii, 46; Num. ix, 12; John xix, 36. They who ate it were to be in the posture of travellers, having their reins girt, shoes on their feet, staves in their hands, and eating in a hurry. This last part of the ceremony was but little observed; at least, it was of no obligation after that night when they came out of Egypt. During the whole eight days of the passover no leavened bread was to be used. They kept the first and last day of the feast; yet it was allowed to dress victuals, which was forbidden on the Sabbath day. The obligation of keeping the passover was so strict, that whoever should neglect it was condemned to death, Num. ix, 13. But those who had any lawful impediment, as a journey, sickness, or uncleanness, voluntary or involuntary, for example, those who had been present at a funeral, &c, were to defer the celebration of the passover till the second month of the ecclesiastical year, the fourteenth day of the month Jair, which answers to April and May. We see an example of this postponed passover under Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxx, 2, 3, &c.

The modern Jews observe in general the ceremonies practised by their ancestors in the celebration of the passover. While the temple was in existence, the Jews brought their lambs thither, and there sacrificed them; and they offered their blood to the priest, who poured it out at the foot of the altar. The paschal lamb was an illustrious type of Christ, who became a sacrifice for the redemption of a lost world from sin and misery; but resemblances between the type and antitype have been strained by many writers into a great number of fanciful particulars. It is enough for us to be assured, that as Christ is called our passover;” and the Lamb of God,” without spot,” by the sprinkling of whose blood” we are delivered from guilt and punishment; and as faith in him is represented to us as eating the flesh of Christ,” with evident allusion to the eating of the paschal sacrifice; so, in these leading particulars, the mystery of our redemption was set forth. The paschal lamb therefore prefigured the offering of the spotless Son of God, the appointed propitiation for the sins of the whole world; by virtue of which, when received by faith, we are delivered from the bondage of guilt and misery; and nourished with strength for our heavenly journey to that land of rest, of which Canaan, as early as the days of Abraham, became the divinely instituted figure.

PATMOS, a small rocky island in the Ægean Sea, about eighteen miles in circumference; which, on account of its dreary and desolate character, was used by the Roman emperors as a place of confinement for criminals. To this island St. John was banished by the Emperor Domitian; and here he had his revelation, recorded in the Apocalypse.

PATRIARCHS. This name is given to the ancient fathers, chiefly those who lived before Moses, as Adam, Lamech, Noah, Shem, &c, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the sons of Jacob, and heads of the tribes. The Hebrews call them princes of the tribes, or heads of the fathers. The name patriarch is derived from the Greek patriarcha, head of a family.”

PAUL was born at Tarsus, the principal city of Cilicia, and was by birth both a Jew and a citizen of Rome, Acts xxi, 39; xxii, 25. He was of the tribe of Benjamin, and of the sect of the Pharisees, Phil. iii, 5. In his youth he appears to have been taught the art of tent making, Acts xviii, 3; but we must remember that among the Jews of those days a liberal education was often accompanied by instruction in some mechanical trade. It is probable that St. Paul laid the foundation of those literary attainments, for which he was so eminent in the future part of his life, at his native city of Tarsus; and he afterward studied the law of Moses, and the traditions of the elders, at Jerusalem, under Gamaliel, a celebrated rabbi, Acts xxii, 4. St. Paul is not mentioned in the Gospels; nor is it known whether he ever heard our Saviour preach, or saw him perform any miracle. His name first occurs in the account given in the Acts of the martyrdom of St. Stephen, A. D. 34, to which he is said to have consented, Acts viii, 1: he is upon that occasion called a young man; but we are no where informed what was then his precise age. The death of St. Stephen was followed by a severe persecution of the church at Jerusalem, and St. Paul became distinguished among its enemies by his activity and violence, Acts viii, 3. Not contented with displaying his hatred to the Gospel in Judea, he obtained authority from the high priest to go to Damascus, 730 and to bring back with him bound any Christians whom he might find in that city. As he was upon his journey thither, A. D. 35, his miraculous conversion took place, the circumstances of which are recorded in Acts ix, and are frequently alluded to in his epistles, 1 Cor. xv, 9; Gal. i, 13; 1 Tim. i, 12, 13.

Soon after St. Paul was baptized at Damascus, he went into Arabia; but we are not informed how long he remained there. He returned to Damascus; and being supernaturally qualified to be a preacher of the Gospel, he immediately entered upon his ministry in that city. The boldness and success with which he enforced the truths of Christianity so irritated the unbelieving Jews, that they resolved to put him to death, Acts ix, 23; but, this design being known, the disciples conveyed him privately out of

Damascus, and he went to Jerusalem, A. D. 38. The Christians of Jerusalem, remembering St. Paul's former hostility to the Gospel, and having no authentic account of any change in his sentiments or conduct, at first refused to receive him; but being assured by Barnabas of St. Paul's real conversion, and of his exertions at Damascus, they acknowledged him as a disciple, Acts ix, 27. He remained only fifteen days among them, Gal. i, 18; and he saw none of the Apostles except St. Peter and St. James. It is probable that the other Apostles were at this time absent from Jerusalem, exercising their ministry at different places. The zeal with which St. Paul preached at Jerusalem had the same effect as at Damascus: he became so obnoxious to the Hellenistic Jews, that they began to consider how they might kill him, Acts ix, 29; which when the brethren knew, they thought it right that he should leave the city. They accompanied him to Cæsarea, and thence he went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia, where he preached the faith which once he destroyed, Gal. i, 21, 23.

Hitherto the preaching of St. Paul, as well as of the other Apostles and teachers, had been confined to the Jews; but the conversion of Cornelius, the first Gentile convert, A. D. 40, having convinced all the Apostles that to the Gentiles, also, God had granted repentance unto life," St. Paul was soon after conducted by Barnabas from Tarsus, which had probably been the principal place of his residence since he left Jerusalem, and they both began to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles at Antioch, A. D. 42, Acts xi, 25. Their preaching was attended with great success. The first Gentile church was now established at Antioch; and in that city, and at this time, the disciples were first called Christians, Acts xi, 26. When these two Apostles had been thus employed about a year, a prophet called Agabus predicted an approaching famine, which would affect the whole land of Judea. Upon the prospect of this calamity, the Christians of Antioch made a contribution for their brethren in Judea, and sent the money to the elders at Jerusalem by St. Paul and Barnabas, A. D. 44, Acts xi, 28, &c. This famine happened soon after, in the fourth or fifth year of the Emperor Claudius. It is supposed that St. Paul had the vision, mentioned in Acts xxii, 17, while he was now at Jerusalem this second time after his conversion.

St. Paul and Barnabas, having executed their commission, returned to Antioch; and soon after their arrival in that city they were separated, by the express direction of the Holy Ghost, from the other Christian teachers and prophets, for the purpose of carrying the glad tidings of the Gospel to the Gentiles of various countries, Acts xiii, 1. Thus divinely appointed to this important office, they set out from Antioch, A. D. 45, and preached the Gospel successively at Salamis and Paphos, two cities of the isle of Cyprus, at Perga in Pamphylia, Antioch in Pisidia, and at Iconium, Lystra, and

Derbe, three cities of Lycaonia. They returned to Antioch in Syria, A. D. 47, nearly by the same route. This first apostolical journey of St. Paul, in which he was accompanied and assisted by Barnabas, is supposed to have occupied about two years; and in the course of it many, both Jews and Gentiles, were converted to the Gospel.

Paul and Barnabas continued at Antioch a considerable time; and while they were there, a dispute arose between them and some Jewish Christians of Judea. These men asserted, that the Gentile converts could not obtain salvation through the Gospel, unless they were circumcised; Paul and Barnabas maintained the contrary opinion, Acts xv, 1, 2. This dispute was carried on for some time with great earnestness; and it being a question in which not only the present but all future Gentile converts were concerned, it was thought right that St. Paul and Barnabas, with some others, should go up to Jerusalem to consult the Apostles and elders concerning it. They passed through Phenicia and Samaria, and upon their arrival at Jerusalem, A. D. 49, a council was assembled for the purpose of discussing this important point, Gal. ii, 1. St. Peter and St. James the less were present, and delivered their sentiments, which coincided with those of St. Paul and Barnabas; and after much deliberation it was agreed, that neither circumcision, nor conformity to any part of the ritual law of Moses, was necessary in Gentile converts; but that it should be recommended to them to abstain from certain specified things prohibited by that law, lest their indulgence in them should give offence to their brethren of the circumcision, who were still very zealous for the observance of the ceremonial part of their ancient religion. This decision which was declared to have the sanction of the Holy Ghost, was communicated to the Gentile Christians of Syria and Cilicia by a letter written in the name of the Apostles, elders, and whole church at Jerusalem, and conveyed by Judas and Silas, who accompanied St. Paul and Barnabas to Antioch for that purpose.

St. Paul, having preached a short time at Antioch, proposed to Barnabas that they should visit the churches which they had founded in different cities, Acts xv, 36. Barnabas readily consented; but while they were preparing for the journey, there arose a disagreement between them, which ended in their separation. In consequence of this dispute with Barnabas, St. Paul chose Silas for his companion, and they set out together from Antioch, A. D. 50. They travelled through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches, and then came to Derbe and Lystra, Acts xvi. Thence they went through Phrygia and Galatia; and, being desirous of going into Asia Propria, or the Proconsular Asia, they were forbidden by the Holy Ghost. They therefore went into Mysia; and, not being permitted by the Holy Ghost to go into Bithynia as they had intended, they went to

Troas. While St. Paul was there, a vision appeared to him in the night: There stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us." St. Paul knew this vision to be a command from Heaven, and in obedience to it immediately sailed from Troas to Samothracia, and the next day to Neapolis, a city of Thrace; and thence he went to Philippi, the principal city of that part of Macedonia. St. Paul remained some time at Philippi, preaching the Gospel; and several occurrences which took place in that city, are recorded in Acts xvii. Thence he went through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, Acts xvii, where he preached in the synagogues of the Jews on three successive Sabbath days. Some of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles of both sexes, embraced the Gospel; but the unbelieving Jews, moved with envy and indignation at the success of St. Paul's preaching, excited a great disturbance in the city, and irritated the populace so much against him, that the brethren, anxious for his safety, thought it prudent to send him to Berea, where he met with a better reception than he had experienced at Thessalonica. The Bereans heard his instructions with attention and candour, and having compared his doctrines with the ancient Scriptures, and being satisfied that Jesus, whom he preached, was the promised Messiah, they embraced the Gospel; but his enemies at Thessalonica, being informed of his success at Berea, came thither, and, by their endeavours to stir up the people against him, compelled him to leave that city also. He went thence to Athens, where he delivered that discourse recorded in Acts xvii. From Athens, Paul went to Corinth, Acts xviii, A. D. 51, and lived in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, two Jews, who, being compelled to leave Rome in consequence of Claudius's edict against the Jews, had lately settled at Corinth. St. Paul was induced to take up his residence with them, because, like himself, they were tent makers. At first he preached to the Jews in their synagogue; but upon their violently opposing his doctrine, he declared that from that time he would preach to the Gentiles only; and, accordingly, he afterward delivered his instructions in the house of one Justus, who lived near the synagogue. Among the few Jews who embraced the Gospel, were Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, and his family; and many of the Gentile Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." St. Paul was encouraged in a vision to persevere in his exertions to convert the inhabitants of Corinth; and although he met with great opposition and disturbance from the unbelieving Jews, and was accused by them before Gallio, the Roman governor of Achaia, he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God." During this time he supported himself by working at his trade of tent making, that he might not be burdensome to the disciples. From Corinth St. Paul sailed into Syria, and thence he went to Ephesus: thence to Cæsarea; and is supposed to have arrived at Jerusalem just before the feast of pentecost. After the feast he went to Antioch, A. D. 53; and this was the conclusion of his second apostolical

journey, in which he was accompanied by Silas; and in part of it, Luke and Timothy were also with him.

Having made a short stay at Antioch, St. Paul set out upon his third apostolical journey. He passed through Galatia, and Phrygia, A. D. 54, confirming the Christians of those countries; and thence, according to his promise, he went to Ephesus, Acts xix. He found there some disciples, who had only been baptized with John's baptism: he directed that they should be baptized in the name of Jesus, and then he communicated to them the Holy Ghost. He preached for the space of three months in the synagogue; but the Jews being hardened beyond conviction, and speaking reproachfully of the Christian religion before the multitude, he left them; and from that time he delivered his instructions in the school of a person called Tyrannus, who was probably a Gentile. St. Paul continued to preach in this place about two years, so that all the inhabitants of that part of Asia Minor heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks." He also performed many miracles at Ephesus; and not only great numbers of people were converted to Christianity, but many also of those who in this superstitious city used incantations and magical arts, professed their belief in the Gospel, and renounced their former practices by publicly burning their books. Previous to the disturbance raised by Demetrius, Paul had intended to continue at Ephesus till Titus should return, whom he had sent to inquire into the state of the church at Corinth, 2 Cor. xii, 18. He now thought it prudent to go from Ephesus immediately, Acts xx, A. D. 56; and having taken an affectionate leave of the disciples, he set out for Troas, 2 Cor. ii, 12, 13, where he expected to meet Titus. Titus, however, from some cause which is not known, did not come to Troas; and Paul was encouraged to pass over into Macedonia, with the hope of making converts. St. Paul, after preaching in Macedonia, receiving from the Christians of that country liberal contributions for their poor brethren in Judea, 2 Cor. viii, 1, went to Corinth, A. D. 57, and remained there about three months. The Christians also of Corinth, and of the rest of Achaia, contributed to the relief of their brethren in Judea. St. Paul's intention was to have sailed from Corinth into Syria; but being informed that some unbelieving Jews, who had discovered his intention, lay in wait for him, he changed his plan, passed through Macedonia, and sailed from Philippi to Troas in five days, A. D. 58. He stayed at Troas seven days, and preached to the Christians on the first day of the week, the day on which they were accustomed to meet for the purpose of religious worship. From Troas he went by land to Assos; and thence he sailed to Mitylene; and from Mitylene to Miletus. Being desirous of reaching Jerusalem before the feast of pentecost, he would not allow time to go to Ephesus, and therefore he sent for the elders of the Ephesian church to Miletus, and gave them instructions, and prayed with them. He told them that he should see them no more, which impressed them

with the deepest sorrow. From Miletus he sailed by Cos, Rhodes, and Patara in Lycia, to Tyre, Acts xxi. Finding some disciples at Tyre, he stayed with them several days, and then went to Ptolemais, and thence to Cæsarea. While St. Paul was at Cæsarea, the Prophet Agabus foretold by the Holy Ghost, that St. Paul, if he went to Jerusalem, would suffer much from the Jews. This prediction caused great uneasiness to St. Paul's friends, and they endeavoured to dissuade him from his intention of going thither. St. Paul, however, would not listen to their entreaties, but declared that he was ready to die at Jerusalem, if it were necessary, for the name of the Lord Jesus. Seeing him thus resolute, they desisted from their importunities, and accompanied him to Jerusalem, where he is supposed to have arrived just before the feast of pentecost, A. D. 58. This may be considered as the end of St. Paul's third apostolical journey.

St. Paul was received by the Apostles and other Christians at Jerusalem with great joy and affection; and his account of the success of his ministry, and of the collections which he had made among the Christians of Macedonia and Achaia, for the relief of their brethren in Judea, afforded them much satisfaction; but not long after his arrival at Jerusalem, some Jews of Asia, who had probably in their own country witnessed St. Paul's zeal in spreading Christianity among the Gentiles, seeing him one day in the temple, endeavoured to excite a tumult, by crying out that he was the man who was aiming to destroy all distinction between Jew and Gentile; who taught things contrary to the law of Moses; and who had polluted the holy temple, by bringing into it uncircumcised Heathens. This representation did not fail to enrage the multitude against St. Paul; they seized him, dragged him out of the temple, beat him, and were upon the point of putting him to death, when he was rescued out of their hands by Lysias, a Roman tribune, and the principal military officer then at Jerusalem. What followed,—his defence before Felix and Agrippa,—his long detention at Cæsarea, and his appeal to the emperor, which occasioned his voyage to Rome, are all circumstantially stated in the latter chapters of the Acts. Upon his arrival at Rome, St. Paul was committed to the care of the captain of the guard, A. D. 61. The Scriptures do not inform us whether he was ever tried before Nero, who was at this time emperor of Rome; and the learned are much divided in their opinion upon that point. St. Luke only says, Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him. And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him." During his confinement he converted some Jews resident at Rome, and many Gentiles, and, among the rest, several persons belonging to the emperor's household, Phil. iv, 22.



The Scripture history ends with the release of St. Paul from his two years' imprisonment at Rome, A. D. 63; and no ancient author has left us any particulars of the remaining part of this Apostle's life. It seems probable, that, immediately after he recovered his liberty, he went to Jerusalem; and that afterward he travelled through Asia Minor, Crete, Macedonia, and Greece, confirming his converts, and regulating the affairs of the different churches which he had planted in those countries. Whether at this time he also preached the Gospel in Spain, as some have imagined, is very uncertain. It was the unanimous tradition of the church, that St. Paul returned to Rome, that he underwent a second imprisonment there, and at last was put to death by the Emperor Nero. Tacitus and Suetonius have mentioned a dreadful fire which happened at Rome in the time of Nero. It was believed, though probably without any reason, that the emperor himself was the author of that fire; but to remove the odium from himself, he chose to attribute it to the Christians; and, to give some colour to that unjust imputation, he persecuted them with the utmost cruelty. In this persecution St. Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom, probably, A. D. 65; and if we may credit Sulpitius Severus, a writer of the fifth century, the former was crucified, and the latter beheaded.

St. Paul was a person of great natural abilities, of quick apprehension, strong feelings, firm resolution, and irreproachable life. He was conversant with Grecian and Jewish literature; and gave early proofs of an active and zealous disposition. If we may be allowed to consider his character independent of his supernatural endowments, we may pronounce that he was well qualified to have risen to distinction and eminence, and that he was by nature peculiarly adapted to the high office to which it pleased God to call him. As a minister of the Gospel, he displayed the most unwearied perseverance and undaunted courage. He was deterred by no difficulty or danger, and endured a great variety of persecutions with patience and cheerfulness. He gloried in being thought worthy of suffering for the name of Jesus, and continued with unabated zeal to maintain the truth of Christianity against its bitterest and most powerful enemies. He was the principal instrument under Providence of spreading the Gospel among the Gentiles; and we have seen that 733his labours lasted through many years, and reached over a considerable extent of country. Though emphatically styled the great Apostle of the Gentiles, he began his ministry, in almost every city, by preaching in the synagogue of the Jews; and though he owed by far the greater part of his persecutions to the opposition and malice of that proud and obstinate people, whose resentment he particularly incurred by maintaining that the Gentiles were to be admitted to an indiscriminate participation of the benefits of the new dispensation, yet it rarely happened in any place, that some of the Jews did not yield to his arguments, and embrace the Gospel. He watched with paternal care over the churches

which he had founded; and was always ready to strengthen the faith, and regulate the conduct of his converts, by such directions and advice as their circumstances might require.

The exertions of St. Paul in the cause of Christianity were not confined to personal instruction: he also wrote fourteen epistles to individuals or churches which are now extant, and form a part of our canon. These letters furnish evidence of the soundness and sobriety of his judgment. His caution in distinguishing between the occasional suggestions of inspiration, and the ordinary exertions of his natural understanding, is without example in the history of enthusiasm. His morality is every where calm, pure, and rational; adapted to the condition, the activity, and the business of social life, and of its various relations; free from the overscrupulousness and austerities of superstition, and from, what was more perhaps to be apprehended, the abstractions of quietism, and the soarings or extravagancies of fanaticism. His judgment concerning a hesitating conscience, his opinion of the moral indifferency of many actions, yet of the prudence and even the duty of compliance, where non-compliance would produce evil effects upon the minds of the persons who observed it, are all in proof of the calm and discriminating character of his mind; and the universal applicability of his precepts affords strong presumption of his inspiration. What Lord Lyttleton has remarked of the preference ascribed by St. Paul to rectitude of principle above every other religious accomplishment, is weighty: Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal," &c, 1 Cor. xiii, 1–3. Did ever enthusiast prefer that universal benevolence, meant by charity here, (which, we may add, is attainable by every man,) to faith, and to miracles, to those religious opinions which he had embraced, and to those supernatural graces and gifts which he imagined he had acquired, nay, even to the merit of martyrdom? Is it not the genius of enthusiasm to set moral virtues infinitely below the merit of faith; and of all moral virtues to value that least which is most particularly enforced by St. Paul, a spirit of candour, moderation, and peace? Certainly, neither the temper nor the opinions of a man subject to fanatic delusions are to be found in this passage. His letters, indeed, every where discover great zeal and earnestness in the cause in which he was engaged; that is to say, he was convinced of the truth of what he taught; he was deeply impressed, but not more so than the occasion merited, with a sense of its importance. This produces a corresponding animation and solicitude in the exercise of his ministry. But would not these considerations, supposing them to have been well founded, have holden the same place, and produced the same effect, in a mind the strongest and the most sedate? Here, then, we have a man of liberal attainments, and in other respects of sound judgment, who had addicted his life to the service

of the Gospel. We see him in the prosecution of his purpose, travelling from country to country, enduring every species of hardship, encountering every extremity of danger, assaulted by the populace, punished by the magistrates, scourged, beaten, stoned, left for dead; expecting, wherever he came, a renewal of the same treatment, and the same dangers; yet, when driven from one city, preaching in the next; spending his whole time in the employment; sacrificing to it his pleasures, his ease, his safety; persisting in this course to old age, unaltered by the experience of perverseness, ingratitude, prejudice, desertion; unsubdued by anxiety, want, labour, persecutions; unwearied by long confinement; undismayed by the prospect of death. Such was St. Paul; and such were the proofs of Apostleship found in him.”

The following remarks of Hug on the character of this Apostle are equally just and eloquent: This most violent man, having such terrible propensities, whose turbulent impulses rendered him of a most enterprising character, would have become nothing better than a John of Gishala, a blood-intoxicated zealot, *εμπνεων απειλης και φονου*, breathing out threatenings and slaughter, Acts ix, 1, had not his whole soul been changed. The harsh tone of his mind inclined him to the principles of Pharisaism, which had all the appearance of severity, and was the predominant party among the Jews. Nature had not withholden from him the external endowments of eloquence, although he afterward spoke very modestly of them. At Lystra he was deemed the tutelar god of eloquence. This character, qualified for great things, but, not master of himself from excess of internal power, was an extreme of human dispositions, and, according to the natural course, was prone to absolute extremities. His religion was a destructive zeal, his anger was fierceness, his fury required victims. A ferocity so boisterous did not psychologically qualify him for a Christian nor a philanthropist; but, least of all, for a quietly enduring man. He, nevertheless, became all this on his conversion to Christianity, and each bursting emotion of his mind subsided directly into a well regulated and noble character. Formerly hasty and irritable, now only spirited and resolved; formerly violent, now full of energy and enterprising; once ungovernably refractory <sup>73</sup>against every thing which obstructed him, now only persevering; once fanatical and morose, now only serious; once cruel, now only firm; once a harsh zealot, now fearing God; formerly unrelenting, deaf to sympathy and commiseration, now himself acquainted with tears, which he had seen without effect in others. Formerly the friend of none, now the brother of mankind, benevolent, compassionate, sympathizing; yet never weak, always great; in the midst of sadness and sorrow manly and noble; so he showed himself at his deeply moving departure from Miletus, Acts xx: it is like the departure of Moses, like the resignation of Samuel, sincere and heart-felt, full of self-recollection, and in the midst of pain full of dignity.

His writings are a true expression of this character, with regard to the tone predominant in them. Severity, manly seriousness, and sentiments which ennoble the heart, are interchanged with mildness, affability, and sympathy: and their transitions are such as nature begets in the heart of a man penetrated by his subject, noble and discerning. He exhorts, reproaches, and consoles again; he attacks with energy, urges with impetuosity, then again he speaks kindly to the soul; he displays his finer feelings for the welfare of others, his forbearance and his fear of afflicting any body: all as the subject, time, opposite dispositions, and circumstances require. There prevails throughout in them an importuning language, an earnest and lively communication. Rom. i, 26–32, is a comprehensive and vigorous description of morals. His antithesis, Rom. ii, 21–24; 2 Cor. iv, 8–12; vi, 9–11; ix, 22–30; his enumerations, 1 Cor. xiii, 4–10; 2 Cor. vi, 4–7; 2 Tim. iii, 1–5; Eph. iv, 4–7; v, 3–6; his gradations, Romans viii, 29, 30; Titus iii, 3, 4; the interrogations, exclamations, and comparisons, sometimes animate his language even so as to give a visible existence to it. That, however, which we principally perceive in Paul, and from which his whole actions and operations become intelligible, is the peculiar impression which the idea of a universal religion has wrought upon his mind. This idea of establishing a religion for the world had not so profoundly engrossed any soul, no where kindled so much vigour, and projected it into such a constant energy. In this he was no man's scholar; this he had immediately received from the Spirit of his Master; it was a spark of the divine light which enkindled him. It was this which never allowed him to remain in Palestine and in Syria, which so powerfully impelled him to foreign parts. The portion of some others was Judea and its environs: but his mission was directed to the nations, and his allotment was the whole of the Heathen world. Thus he began his career among the different nations of Asia Minor, and when this limit also became too confined for him, he went with equal confidence to Europe, among other nations, ordinances, sciences, and customs; and here likewise he finally with the same indefatigable spirit circulated his plans, even to the pillars of Hercules. In this manner Paul prepared the overthrow of two religions, that of his ancestors, and that of the Heathens.

PEACOCK, 1 תורכיים, Kings x, 22; 2 Chron. ix, 21; a bird distinguished by the length of its tail, and the brilliant spots with which it is adorned; which displays all that dazzles in the sparkling lustre of gems, and all that astonishes in the rainbow. The peacock is a bird originally of India; thence brought into Persia and Media. Aristophanes mentions Persian peacocks; and Suidas calls the peacock the Median bird. From Persia it was gradually dispersed into Judea, Egypt, Greece, and Europe. If the fleet of Solomon visited India, they might easily procure this bird, whether from India itself, or from Persia; and certainly the bird by its beauty was likely to attract

attention, and to be brought among other rarities of natural history by Solomon's servants, who would be instructed to collect every curiosity in the countries they visited.

PEARL, a hard, white, shining body, usually roundish, found in a shell fish resembling an oyster. The oriental pearls have a fine polished gloss, and are tinged with an elegant blush of red. They are esteemed in the east beyond all other jewels.

PELAGIANS, a sect that arose in the fifth century. Pelagius was a British monk, of some rank, and very exalted reputation. He, with his friend Celestius, travelled to Rome, where they resided very early in the fifth century, and opposed with warmth certain received notions respecting original sin, and the necessity of divine grace. What reception their doctrines met with at Rome does not appear; but their virtue excited general approbation. On the approach of the Goths, they retired to Africa, where Celestius remained, with a view of gaining admittance as a presbyter into the church of Carthage. Pelagius proceeded to Palestine, where he enjoyed the favour and protection of John, bishop of Jerusalem. But his friend and his opinions met with a very different reception from St. Augustine, the celebrated bishop of Hippo. Whatever parts were visited by these unorthodox friends, they still asserted their peculiar opinions; and they were gradually engaged in a warm contest, in the course of which they were probably led to advance more than had originally occurred to them. In contending for the truth of their doctrines, they are said to have asserted, that mankind derived no injury from the sin of Adam; that we are now as capable of obedience to the will of God as he was; that, otherwise, it would have been cruel and absurd to propose to mankind the performance of certain duties, with the sanction of rewards, and the denunciation of punishments; and that, consequently, men are born without vice, as well as without virtue." Pelagius is charged also with having maintained, that it is possible for men, provided they fully employ the powers and faculties with which they are endued, to live without sin;" and though he did not deny that external grace, or the doctrines and motives of the Gospel, are necessary, yet <sup>735</sup>he is said to have rejected the necessity of internal grace, or the aids of the divine Spirit. He acknowledged, that the power we possess of obeying the will of God, is a divine gift;" but asserted, that the direction of this power depends upon ourselves; that natural death is not a consequence of the sin of Adam, but of the frame of man; and that Adam would have died, though he had not sinned." Isidore, Chrysostom, and Augustine strenuously opposed these opinions; and the latter procured their condemnation in a synod held at Carthage in 412. They were, however, favourably received at Rome, and Pope Zozimus was at the head of the Pelagian party: but his decision against the African bishops, who had

opposed Pelagianism, was disregarded by them, and the pontiff yielded at length to their reasonings and remonstrances, and condemned the men whom he had before honoured with his approbation. The council of Ephesus likewise condemned the opinions of Pelagius and Celestius; and the Emperor Honorius, in 418, published an edict, which ordained that the leaders of the sect should be expelled from Rome, and their followers exiled. Some of the Pelagians taught that Christ was a mere man, and that men might lead sinless lives, because Christ did so; that Jesus became Christ after his baptism, and God after his resurrection; the one arising from his unction, the other from the merit of his passion. The Pelagian controversy, which began with the doctrines of grace and original sin, was extended to predestination, and excited continual discord and division in the church. It must however be recollected, that we are acquainted with the sentiments of Pelagius only through the medium of his opponents; and that it is probable that they were much misrepresented. See Augustine.

The followers of the truly evangelical Arminius, or those who hold the tenet of general redemption with its concomitants, have often been greatly traduced, by the ignorant among their doctrinal opponents, as Pelagians, or at least as Semi-Pelagians. It may therefore serve the cause of truth to exhibit the appropriate reply which the Dutch Arminians gave to this charge when urged against them at the synod of Dort, and which they verified and maintained by arguments and authorities that were unanswerable. In their concluding observations they say, “From all these remarks a judgment may easily be formed at what an immense distance our sentiments stand from the dogmatical assertions of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians on the grace of God in the conversion of man. Pelagius, in the first instance, attributed all things to nature: but we acknowledge nothing but grace. When Pelagius was blamed for not acknowledging grace, he began indeed to speak of it, but it is evident that by grace he understood the power of nature as created by God, that is, the rational will: but by grace we understand a supernatural gift. Pelagius, when afterward pressed with passages of Scripture, also admitted this supernatural grace; but he placed it solely in the external teaching of the law: though we affirm that God offers his word to men, yet we likewise affirm that he inwardly causes the understanding to believe. Subsequently Pelagius joined to this external grace that by which sins are pardoned: we acknowledge not only the grace by which sins are forgiven, but also that by which men are assisted to refrain from the commission of sin. In addition to his previous concessions Pelagius granted, that the grace of Christ was requisite beside the two kinds which he had enumerated; but he attributed it entirely to the doctrine and example of Christ that we are aided in our endeavours not to commit sin: we likewise admit that the doctrine and example of Christ afford us some aid in refraining from sin, but in addition to their influence we also place

the gift of the Holy Spirit with which God endues us, and which enlightens our understandings, and confers strength and power upon our will to abstain from sinning. When Pelagius afterward owned the assistance of divine power inwardly working in man by the Holy Spirit, he placed it solely in the enlightening of the understanding: but we believe, that it is not only necessary for us to know or understand what we ought to do, but that it is also requisite for us to implore the aid of the Holy Spirit that we may be rendered capable of performing, and may delight in the performance of, that which it is our duty to do. Pelagius admitted grace,--but it has been a question with some whether he meant only illumination, or, beside this, a power communicated to the will;--he admitted grace, but he did this only to show that by means of it man can with greater ease act aright: we, on the contrary, affirm that grace is bestowed, not that we may be able with greater ease to act aright, (which is as though we can do this even without grace,) but that grace is absolutely necessary to enable us to act at all aright. Pelagius asserted, that man, so far from requiring the aid of grace for the performance of good actions, is, through the powers implanted in him at the time of his creation, capable of fulfilling the whole law, of loving God, and of overcoming all temptations: we, on the contrary, assert that the grace of God is required for the performance of every act of piety. Pelagius declared, that by the works of nature man renders himself worthy of grace: but we, in common with the church universal, condemn this dogma. When Pelagius afterward himself condemned this tenet, he understood by grace, partly natural grace, which is antecedent to all merit, and partly remission of sins, which he acknowledged to be gratuitous; but he added, that through works performed by the powers of nature alone, at least through the desire of good and the imperfect longing after it, men merit that spiritual grace by which they are assisted in good works: but we declare, that men will that which is good on account of God's prevenience or going before them by his grace, and exciting within them a longing after good; otherwise grace would no longer be grace, because it would not be gratuitously bestowed, but only on account of the merit of man." That many who have held some tenets in common with the true Arminians have been, in different degrees, followers of Pelagius is well known; but the original Arminians were in truth as far from Pelagian or Semi-Pelagian errors, granting the opinions of Pelagius to be fairly reported by his adversaries, as the Calvinists themselves. This is also the case with the whole body of Wesleyan Methodists, and of the cognate societies to which they have given rise, both in Great Britain and America.

PELICAN,  $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}$ , Lev. xi, 18; Deut. xiv, 17; Psa. cii, 7; Isa. xxxiv, 11; Zeph. ii, 14; a very remarkable aquatic bird, of the size of a large goose. Its colour is a grayish white, except that the neck looks a little yellowish, and the middle of the back feathers are blackish. The bill is long, and hooked at the

end, and has under it a lax membrane, extended to the throat, which makes a bag or sack, capable of holding a very large quantity. Feeding her young from this bag has so much the appearance of feeding them with her own blood, that it caused this fabulous opinion to be propagated, and made the pelican an emblem of paternal, as the stork had been before chosen, more justly, of filial affection. The voice of this bird is harsh and dissonant, which some say resembles that of a man grievously complaining. David compares his groaning to it, Psalm cii, 7.

PENTATEUCH. This word, which is derived from the Greek Πεντάτευχος, from πέντε, five, and τεύχος, a volume, signifies the collection of the five books of Moses, which are Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. That the Jews have acknowledged the authenticity of the Pentateuch, from the present time back to the era of their return from the Babylonish captivity, a period of more than two thousand three hundred years, admits not a possibility of doubt. The five books of Moses have been during that period constantly placed at the head of the Jewish sacred volume, and divided into fixed portions, one of which was read and explained in their synagogues, not only every Sabbath with the other Scriptures, but in many places twice a week, and not unfrequently every evening, when they alone were read. They have been received as divinely inspired by every Jewish sect, even by the Sadducees, who questioned the divinity of the remaining works of the Old Testament. In truth, the veneration of the Jews for their Scriptures, and above all for the Pentateuch, seems to have risen almost to a superstitious reverence. Extracts from the Mosaic law were written on pieces of parchment, and placed on the borders of their garments, or round their wrists and foreheads: nay, they at a later period counted, with the minutest exactness, not only the chapters and paragraphs, but the words and letters, which each book of their Scriptures contains. Thus also the translation, first of the Pentateuch, and afterward of the remaining works of the Old Testament, into Greek, for the use of the Alexandrian Jews, disseminated this sacred volume over a great part of the civilized world, in the language most universally understood, and rendered it accessible to the learned and inquisitive in every country; so as to preclude all suspicion that it could be materially altered by either Jews or Christians, to support their respective opinions as to the person and character of the Messiah; the substance of the text being, by this translation, fixed and authenticated at least two hundred and seventy years before the appearance of our Lord.

But, long previous to the captivity, two particular examples, deserving peculiar attention, occur in the Jewish history, of the public and solemn homage paid to the sacredness of the Mosaic law as promulgated in the Pentateuch; and which, by consequence, afford the fullest testimony to the



authenticity of the Pentateuch itself: the one in the reign of Hezekiah, while the separate kingdoms of Judah and Israel still subsisted; and the other in the reign of his great grandson Josiah, subsequent to the captivity of Israel. In the former we see the pious monarch of Judah assembling the priests and Levites and the rulers of the people; to deplore with him the trespasses of their fathers against the divine law, to acknowledge the justice of those chastisements which, according to the prophetic warnings of that law, had been inflicted upon them; to open the house of God which his father had impiously shut, and restore the true worship therein according to the Mosaic ritual, 2 Kings xviii; 2 Chron. xxix; xxx; with the minutest particulars of which he complied, in the sin-offerings and the peace-offerings which, in conjunction with his people, he offered for the kingdom and the sanctuary and the people, to make atonement to God for them and for all Israel; restoring the service of God as it had been performed in the purest times. And Hezekiah," says the sacred narrative, rejoiced, and all the people, that God had prepared the people; for the thing was done suddenly," 2 Chron. xxix, 36; immediately on the king's accession to the throne, on the first declaration of his pious resolution. How clear a proof does this exhibit of the previous existence and clearly acknowledged authority of those laws which the Pentateuch contains!

But a yet more remarkable part of this transaction still remains. At this time Hoshea was king of Israel, and so far disposed to countenance the worship of the true God, that he appears to have made no opposition to the pious zeal of Hezekiah; who, with the concurrence of the whole congregation which he had assembled, sent out letters and made a proclamation, not only to his own people of Judah, 2 Chron. xxx, 1, but to Ephraim and Manasseh and all Israel, from Beersheba even unto Dan, that they should come to the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, to keep the passover unto the Lord God of Israel; saying, Ye children of Israel, turn again to the Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and he will return to the remnant of you who are escaped out of the hands of the kings of Assyria; and be not ye like your fathers and your brethren, which trespassed against the Lord God of their fathers, who therefore gave them up to desolation as ye see. Now be ye not stiff-necked, as your fathers were; but yield yourselves unto the Lord, and enter into his sanctuary which he hath sanctified for ever, and serve the Lord your God, that the fierceness of his wrath may turn away from you. So the posts passed from city to city through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh even unto Zebulun," 2 Chron. xxx, 6, &c.

Now, can we conceive that such an attempt as this could have been made, if the Pentateuch containing the Mosaic code had not been as certainly recognized through the ten tribes of Israel as in the kingdom of Judah? The success was exactly such as we might reasonably expect if it were so

acknowledged; for, though many of the ten tribes laughed to scorn and mocked the messengers of Hezekiah, who invited them to the solemnity of the passover, from the impious contempt which through long disuse they had conceived for it; Nevertheless," says the sacred narrative, divers of Asher and Manasseh and of Zebulun humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem; and there assembled at Jerusalem much people, to keep the feast of unleavened bread in the second month, a very great congregation; and they killed the passover, and the priests and Levites stood in their places after their manner, according to the law of Moses, the man of God. So there was great joy in Jerusalem; for since the time of Solomon, the son of David, king of Israel, there was not the like at Jerusalem: and when all this was finished, all Israel that were present went out to the cities of Judah, and brake the images in pieces, and cut down the groves, and threw down the high places and the altars out of all Judah and Benjamin, in Ephraim also and Manasseh, until they had utterly destroyed them all," 2 Chronicles xxx, 11; xxxi. Can any clearer proof than this be desired of the constant and universal acknowledgment of the divine authority of the Pentateuch throughout the entire nation of the Jews, notwithstanding the idolatries and corruptions which so often prevented its receiving such obedience as that acknowledgment ought to have produced? The argument from this certain antiquity of the Pentateuch, a copy of which existed in the old Samaritan character as well as in the modern Hebrew, is most conclusive as to the numerous prophecies of Christ, and the future and present condition of the Jews which it contains. These are proved to have been delivered many ages before they were accomplished; they could be only the result of divine prescience, and the uttering of them by Moses proves therefore the inspiration and the authority of his writings. See Law and Moses.

PENTECOST, Πεντεκοστή, a solemn festival of the Jews; so called, because it was celebrated on the fiftieth day after the sixteenth of Nisan, which was the second day of the passover. The Hebrews call it the feast of weeks, because it was kept seven weeks after the passover. They then offered the first fruits of the wheat harvest, which was then completed; beside which, they presented at the temple seven lambs of that year, one calf, and two rams for a burnt-offering; two lambs for a peace-offering; and a goat for a sin-offering, Lev. xxiii, 15, 16; Exod. xxxiv, 22; Deut. xvi, 9, 10. The feast of pentecost was instituted among the Israelites, first, to oblige them to repair to the temple of the Lord, there to acknowledge his absolute dominion over the whole country, by offering him the first fruits of the harvest; and, secondly, to commemorate and give thanks to God for the law which he had given them from Sinai, on the fiftieth day after their coming out of Egypt. The modern Jews celebrate the pentecost for two days. They deck the synagogues, where the law is read, and their own houses, with garlands of flowers. They hear an oration in praise of the law, and read

from the Pentateuch and prophets lessons which have a relation to this festival, and accommodate their prayers to the same occasion. It was on the feast of pentecost that the Holy Ghost descended in the miraculous manner related, Acts ii.

PERGAMUS, a city of Troas, very considerable in the time of John the evangelist, Rev. ii, 12, 13. This city was, for the space of one hundred and fifty years, the capital of a kingdom of the same name founded by Philetærus, B. C. 283; who treacherously made use of the treasures committed to his care by Lysimachus after the battle of Ipsus, and, seizing on Pergamus, established an independent kingdom. After Philetærus were five kings of the same race; the last of whom, Attalus Philopater, left his kingdom, which comprehended Mysia, Æolis, Ionia, Lydia, and Caria, to the Roman empire; to which it belonged when the first Christian church was established there. This church early became corrupted by the Nicolaitans, for which it was reprov'd by St. John, and charged quickly to repent, Rev. ii, 14–16. Pergamus, now called Bergamo, like most other places which have been cursed by the presence of the Turks, is reduced to comparative decay, containing a poor population, who are too indolent or too oppressed to profit by the richness of their soil and the beauty of the climate. The number of inhabitants, however, is still said to amount to thirty thousand, of whom three thousand are Greek Christians. Many remains of former magnificence are still to be found; among which are those of several Christian churches. It is about sixty miles north of Smyrna. The celebrated physician Galen was a native of this place.

PERIZZITES. The ancient inhabitants of Palestine, mingled with the Canaanites. There is also a great probability that they themselves were Canaanites, but, having no fixed habitations, were wandering about here and there, and scattered over all the country. Thus, in the time of Abraham and Lot, the 738Canaanite and Perizzite were in the land, Gen. xiii, 7; Josh. xvii, 15. Solomon subdued the remains of the Canaanites and Perizzites, which the children of Israel had not rooted out, and made them tributary to him, 1 Kings ix, 20, 21; 2 Chron. viii, 7. There still remained some of this people as late as the time of Ezra, ix, 1.

PERSECUTION is any pain or affliction which a person designedly inflicts upon another; and, in a more restrained sense, the sufferings of Christians on account of their religion. The establishment of Christianity was opposed by the powers of the world, and occasioned several severe persecutions against Christians, during the reigns of several Roman emperors. Though the absurdities of polytheism were openly derided and exposed by the Apostles and their successors, yet it does not appear that any public laws were enacted against Christianity till the reign of Nero, A. D. 64, by which

time it had acquired considerable stability and extent. As far the greater number of the first converts to Christianity were of the Jewish nation, one secondary cause for their being so long preserved from persecution may probably be deduced from their appearing to the Roman governors only as a sect of Jews, who had seceded from the rest of their brethren on account of some opinion, trifling in its importance, and perhaps difficult to be understood. Nor, when their brethren were fully discovered to have cast off the religion of the synagogue, did the Jews find it easy to infuse into the breasts of the Roman magistrates that rancour and malice which they themselves experienced. But the steady and uniform opposition made by the Christians to Heathen superstition could not long pass unnoticed. Their open attacks upon Paganism made them extremely obnoxious to the populace, by whom they were represented as a society of atheists, who, by attacking the religious constitution of the empire, merited the severest animadversion of the civil magistrate. Horrid tales of their abominations were circulated throughout the empire; and the minds of the Pagans were, from all these circumstances, prepared to regard with pleasure or indifference every cruelty which could be inflicted upon this despised sect. Historians usually reckon ten general persecutions.

First general persecution.--Nero selected the Christians as a grateful sacrifice to the Roman people, and endeavoured to transfer to this hated sect the guilt of which he was strongly suspected; that of having caused and enjoyed the fire which had nearly desolated the city. (See Nero.) This persecution was not confined to Rome: the emperor issued edicts against the Christians throughout most of the provinces of the empire. He was far, however, from obtaining the object of his hopes and expectations; and the virtues of the Christians, their zeal for the truth, and their constancy in suffering, must have considerably contributed to make their tenets more generally known.

Second general persecution.--From the death of Nero to the reign of Domitian, the Christians remained unmolested and daily increasing; but toward the close of the first century, they were again involved in all the horrors of persecution. In this persecution many eminent Christians suffered; but the death of Domitian soon delivered them from this calamity.

Third general persecution.--This persecution began in the third year of the Emperor Trajan, A. D. 100. Many things contributed toward it; as the laws of the empire, the emperor's zeal for his religion, and aversion to Christianity, and the prejudices of the Pagans, supported by falsehoods and calumnies against the Christians. Under the plausible pretence of their holding illegal meetings and societies, they were severely persecuted by the governors and other officers; in which persecution great numbers fell

by the rage of popular tumult, as well as by laws and processes. This persecution continued several years, with different degrees of severity in many parts of the empire; and was so much the more afflicting, because the Christians generally suffered under the notion of malefactors and traitors, and under an emperor famed for his singular justice and moderation. The most noted martyr in this persecution was Clement, bishop of Rome. After some time the fury of this persecution was abated, but did not cease during the whole reign of Trajan. In the eighth year of his successor Adrian, it broke out with new rage. This is by some called the fourth general persecution; but is more commonly considered as a revival or continuance of the third.

Fourth general persecution.--This took place under Antoninus the philosopher; and at different places, with several intermissions, and different degrees of severity, it continued the greater part of his reign. Antoninus himself has been much excused as to this persecution. As the character of the virtuous Trajan, however, is sullied by the martyrdom of Ignatius, so the reign of the philosophic Marcus is for ever disgraced by the sacrifice of the venerable Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, the friend and companion of St. John. A few days previous to his death, he is said to have dreamed that his pillow was on fire. When urged by the proconsul to renounce Christ, he replied, Fourscore and six years have I served him, and he has never done me an injury: can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour?" Several miracles are reported to have happened at his death. The flames, as if unwilling to injure his sacred person, are said to have arched over his head; and it is added, that at length, being despatched with a sword, a dove flew out of the wound; and that from the pile proceeded a most fragrant smell. It is obvious that the arching of the flames might be an accidental effect, which the enthusiastic veneration of his disciples might convert into a miracle; and as to the story of the dove, &c, Eusebius himself apparently did not credit it; since he has omitted it in his narrative of the transaction. Among 739 many other victims of persecution in this philosophic reign, we must also record that of the excellent and learned Justin. But it was at Lyons and Vienne in Gaul, that the most shocking scenes were acted. Among many nameless sufferers, history has preserved from oblivion Pothinus, the respectable bishop of Lyons, who was then more than ninety years of age; Sanctus, a deacon of Vienne; Attalus, a native of Pergamus; Maturus, and Alexander; some of whom were devoured by wild beasts, and some of them tortured in an iron chair made red hot. Some females, also, and particularly Biblias and Blandina, reflected honour both upon their sex and religion by their constancy and courage.

Fifth general persecution.--A considerable part of the reign of Severus proved so far favourable to the Christians, that no additions were made to the severe edicts already in force against them. For this lenity they were probably indebted to Proculus, a Christian, who, in a very extraordinary manner, cured the emperor of a dangerous distemper by the application of oil. But this degree of peace, precarious as it was, and frequently interrupted by the partial execution of severe laws, was terminated by an edict, A. D. 197, which prohibited every subject of the empire, under severe penalties, from embracing the Jewish or Christian faith. This law appears, upon a first view, designed merely to impede the farther progress of Christianity; but it incited the magistracy to enforce the laws of former emperors, which were still existing, against the Christians; and during seven years they were exposed to a rigorous persecution in Palestine, Egypt, the rest of Africa, Italy, Gaul, and other parts. In this persecution Leonidas, the father of Origen, and Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, suffered martyrdom. On this occasion Tertullian composed his Apology." The violence of Pagan intolerance was most severely felt in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria.

Sixth general persecution.--This persecution began with the reign of the Emperor Maximinus, A. D. 235, and seems to have arisen from that prince's hatred to his predecessor, Alexander, in whose family many Christians had found shelter and patronage. Though this persecution was very severe in some places, yet we have the names of only a few martyrs. Origen at this time was very industrious in supporting the Christians under these fiery trials.

Seventh general persecution.--This was the most dreadful persecution that ever had been known in the church. During the short reign of Decius, the Christians were exposed to greater calamities than any they had hitherto suffered. It has been said, and with some probability, that the Christians were involved in this persecution by their attachment to the family of the Emperor Philip. Considerable numbers were publicly destroyed; several purchased safety by bribes, or secured it by flight; and many deserted from the faith, and willingly consented to burn incense on the altars of the gods. The city of Alexandria, the great theatre of persecution, had even anticipated the edicts of the emperor, and had put to death a number of innocent persons, among whom were some women. The imperial edict for persecuting the Christians was published A. D. 249; and shortly after, Fabianus, bishop of Rome, with a number of his followers, was put to death. The venerable bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch died in prison, the most cruel tortures were employed, and the numbers that perished are by all parties confessed to have been very considerable.

Eighth general persecution.--The Emperor Valerian, in the fourth year of his reign, A. D. 257, listening to the suggestions of Macrinus, a magician of Egypt, was prevailed upon to persecute the Christians, on pretence that by their wicked and execrable charms they hindered the prosperity of the emperor. Macrinus advised him to perform many impious rites, sacrifices, and incantations; to cut the throats of infants, &c; and edicts were published in all places against the Christians, who were exposed without protection to the common rage. We have the names of several martyrs, among whom were the famous St. Laurence, archdeacon of Rome, and the great St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage.

Ninth general persecution.--This persecution took place under the Emperor Aurelian, A. D. 274; but it was so small and inconsiderable, that it gave little interruption to the peace of the church.

Tenth general persecution.--The tenth and last general persecution of the Christians began in the nineteenth year of the Emperor Diocletian, A. D. 303. The most violent promoters of it were Hierocles the philosopher, who wrote against the Christian religion, and Galerius, whom Diocletian had declared Cæsar. This latter was excited not only by his own cruelty and superstition, but likewise by his mother, who was a zealous Pagan. Diocletian, contrary to his inclination, was prevailed upon to authorize the persecution by his edicts. Accordingly, it began in the city of Nicomedia, whence it spread into other cities and provinces, and became at last universal. Great numbers of Christians suffered the severest tortures in this persecution, though the accounts given of it by succeeding historians are probably exaggerated. There is, however, sufficient of well authenticated facts to assure us amply of the cruel and intolerant disposition of the professors of Pagan philosophy. The human imagination was, indeed, almost exhausted in inventing a variety of tortures. Some were impaled alive; some had their limbs broken, and in that condition were left to expire. Some were roasted by slow fires; and some suspended by their feet with their heads downward, and, a fire being placed under them, were suffocated by the smoke. Some had melted lead poured down their throats, and the flesh of some was torn off with shells, and others had splinters of reeds thrust under the nails of their fingers and toes. The few who were not capitally punished had their limbs and their features mutilated. It would be endless to enumerate the victims of superstition. The bishops of Nicomedia, of Tyre, of Sidon, of Emesa, several matrons and virgins of the purest character, and a nameless number of plebians, arrived at immortality through the flames of martyrdom. At last it pleased God that the Emperor Constantine, who himself afterward became a Christian, openly declared for the Christians, and published the first law in favour of them. The death of Maximin, emperor of the east, soon after put a period to all their

troubles; and this was the great epoch when Christianity triumphantly got possession of the thrones of princes.

The guilt of persecution has, however, been attached to professing Christians. Had men been guided solely by the spirit and the precepts of the Gospel, the conduct of its blessed Author, and the writings and example of his immediate disciples, we might have boldly affirmed that among Christians there could be no tendency to encroach upon freedom of discussion, and no approach to persecution. The Gospel, in every page of it, inculcates tenderness and mercy; it exhibits the most unwearied indulgence to the frailties and errors of men; and it represents charity as the badge of those who in sincerity profess it. In St. Paul's inimitable description of this grace he has drawn a picture of mutual forbearance and kindness and toleration, upon which it is scarcely possible to dwell, without being raised superior to every contracted sentiment, and glowing with the most diffusive benevolence. In the churches which he planted he had often to counteract the efforts of teachers who had laboured to subvert the foundation which he had laid, to misrepresent his motives, and to inculcate doctrines which, through the inspiration that was imparted to him, he discerned to proceed from the most perverted views, and to be inconsistent with the great designs of the Gospel. These teachers he strenuously and conscientiously opposed; he endeavoured to show the great importance of those to whom he wrote being on their guard against them; and he evinced the most ardent zeal in resisting their insidious purposes: but he never, in the most distant manner, insinuated that they should be persecuted, adhering always to the maxim which he had laid down, that the weapons of a Christian's warfare are not carnal but spiritual. He does, indeed, sometimes speak of heretics; and he even exhorts that, after expostulation with him, a heretic should be rejected, and not acknowledged to be a member of the church to which he had once belonged. But that precept of the Apostle has no reference to the persecution which it has sometimes been conceived to sanction, and which has been generally directed against men quite sincere in their belief, however erroneous that belief may be esteemed.

Upon a subject thus enforced by precept and example, it is not to be supposed that the first converts, deriving their notions of Christianity immediately from our Lord or his Apostles, could have any opinion different in theory, at least, from that which has been now established. Accordingly, we find that the primitive fathers, although, in many respects, they erred, unequivocally express themselves in favour of the most ample liberty as to religious sentiment, and highly disapprove of every attempt to control it. Passages from many of these writers might be quoted to establish that this was almost the universal sentiment till the age of Constantine.



Lactantius in particular has, with great force and beauty, delivered his opinion against persecution: There is no need of compulsion and violence, because religion cannot be forced; and men must be made willing, not by stripes, but by arguments. Slaughter and piety are quite opposite to each other; nor can truth consist with violence, or justice with cruelty. They are convinced that nothing is more excellent than religion, and therefore think that it ought to be defended with force; but they are mistaken, both in the nature of religion, and in proper methods to support it; for religion is to be defended, not by murder, but by persuasion; not by cruelty, but by patience; not by wickedness, but by faith. If you attempt to defend religion by blood, and torments, and evil, this is not to defend, but to violate and pollute it; for there is nothing that should be more free than the choice of religion, in which, if consent be wanting, it becomes entirely void and ineffectual.”

The general conduct of Christians during the first three centuries was in conformity with the admirable maxims now quoted. Eusebius has recorded that Polycarp, after in vain endeavouring to persuade Anicetus, who was bishop of Rome, to embrace his opinion as to some point with respect to which they differed, gave him, notwithstanding, the kiss of peace, while Anicetus communicated with the martyr; and Irenæus mentions that although Polycarp was much offended with the Gnostic heretics, who abounded in his days, he converted numbers of them, not by the application of constraint or violence, but by the facts and arguments which he calmly submitted for their consideration. It must be admitted, however, that even during the second century some traces of persecution are to be found. Victor, one of the early pontiffs, because the Asiatic bishops differed from him about the rule for the observation of Easter, excommunicated them as guilty of heresy; and he acted in the same manner toward a person who held what he considered as erroneous notions respecting the trinity. This stretch of authority was, indeed, reprobated by the generality of Christians, and remonstrances against it were accordingly presented. There was, however, in this proceeding of Victor, too clear a proof that the church was beginning to deviate from the perfect charity by which it had been adorned, and too sure an indication that the example of one who held so high an office, when it was in harmony with the corruption or with the worst passions of our nature, would be extensively followed. But still there was, in the excommunication rashly pronounced 741 by the pope, merely an exertion of ecclesiastical power, not interfering with the personal security, with the property, or with the lives of those against whom it was directed; and we may, notwithstanding this slight exception, consider the first three centuries as marked by the candour and the benevolence implied in the charity which judgeth not, and thinketh no evil.

It was after Christianity had been established as the religion of the empire, and after wealth and honour had been conferred on its ministers, that the monstrous evil of persecution acquired gigantic strength, and threw its blasting influence over the religion of the Gospel. The causes of this are apparent. Men exalted in the scale of society were eager to extend the power which had been intrusted to them; and they sought to do so by exacting from the people acquiescence in the peculiar interpretations of tenets and doctrines which they chose to publish as articles of faith. The moment that this was attempted, the foundation was laid for the most inflexible intolerance; because reluctance to submit was no longer regarded solely as a matter of conscience, but as interfering with the interest and the dominion of the ruling party. It was therefore proceeded against with all the eagerness which men so unequivocally display when the temporal blessings that gratify their ambition or add to their comfort are attempted to be wrested from them. To other dictates than those of the word of God the members of the church now listened; and opinions were viewed, not in reference to that word, but to the effect which they might produce upon the worldly advancement or prosperity of those by whom they were avowed. From the era, then, of the conversion of Constantine we may date, if not altogether the introduction, at least the decisive influence of persecution.

PERSIA, an ancient kingdom of Asia, bounded on the north by Media, on the west by Susiana, on the east by Carmania, and on the south by the Persian Gulf. The Persians became very famous from the time of Cyrus, the founder of the Persian monarchy. Their ancient name was Elamites, and in the time of the Roman emperors they went by the name of Parthians; but now Persians. See Cyrus; and for the religion of the ancient Persians, Magi.

PESTILENCE, or plague, generally is used by the Hebrews for all epidemic or contagious diseases. The prophets usually connect together sword, pestilence, and famine, being three of the most grievous inflictions of the Almighty upon a guilty people. See Diseases.

PETER, the great Apostle of the circumcision, was the son of Jona, and born at Bethsaida, a town situated on the western shore of the lake of Gennesareth, but in what particular year we are not informed, John i, 42, 43. His original name was Simon or Simeon, which his divine Master, when he called him to the Apostleship, changed for that of Cephas, a Syriac word signifying a stone or rock; in Latin, *petra*, from whence is derived the term Peter. He was a married man, and had his house, his mother-in-law, and his wife, at Capernaum, on the lake of Gennesareth, Matt. viii, 14; Mark i, 29; Luke iv, 38. He had also a brother of the name of Andrew, who had been a disciple of John the Baptist, and was called to the knowledge of the Saviour prior to himself. Andrew was present when the venerable

Baptist pointed his disciples to Jesus, and added, Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;" and, meeting Simon shortly afterward, said, We have found the Messiah," and then brought him to Jesus, John i, 41. When the two brothers had passed one day with the Lord Jesus, they took their leave of him, and returned to their ordinary occupation of fishing. This appears to have taken place in the thirtieth year of the Christian era. Toward the end of the same year, as Jesus was one morning standing on the shore of the lake of Gennesareth, he saw Andrew and Peter engaged about their employment. They had been fishing during the whole night, but without the smallest success; and, after this fruitless expedition, were in the act of washing their nets, Luke v, 1–3. Jesus entered into their boat, and bade Peter throw out his net into the sea, which he did; and now, to his astonishment, the multitude of fishes was so immense that their own vessel, and that of the sons of Zebedee, were filled with them. Peter evidently saw there was something supernatural in this, and, throwing himself at the feet of Jesus, he exclaimed, Depart from me, O Lord, for I am a sinful man." The miracle was no doubt intended for a sign to the four disciples of what success should afterward follow their ministry in preaching the doctrine of his kingdom; and therefore Jesus said unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men;" on which they quitted their boats and nets, and thenceforth became the constant associates of the Saviour, during the whole of his public ministry, Luke xviii, 28.

From the instant of his entering upon the apostolic office, we find St. Peter on almost every occasion evincing the strength of his faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and the most extraordinary zeal in his service, of which many examples are extant in the Gospels. When Jesus in private asked his disciples, first, what opinion the people entertained of him; next, what was their own opinion: Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Matt. xvi, 16. Having received this answer, Jesus declared Peter blessed on account of his faith; and in allusion to the signification of his name, added, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth," &c. Many think these things were spoken to St. Peter alone, for the purpose of conferring on him privileges and powers not granted to the rest of the Apostles. But others, with more reason, suppose that, though Jesus directed his discourse to St. Peter, it was intended for them all; and that the honours and powers granted to St. Peter by name were conferred on them all equally. For no one will say that Christ's church was built upon St. Peter singly: it was built on the foundation of all the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. As little can any one say that the power of binding and loosing was confined to St. Peter, seeing it was declared afterward to belong to all the Apostles, Matt. xviii, 18; John xx, 23. To

these things add this, that as St. Peter made his confession in answer to a question which Jesus put to all the Apostles, that confession was certainly made in the name of the whole; and, therefore, what Jesus said to him in reply was designed for the whole without distinction; excepting this, which was peculiar to him, that he was to be the first who, after the descent of the Holy Ghost, should preach the Gospel to the Jews, and then to the Gentiles: an honour which was conferred on St. Peter in the expression, I will give thee the keys," &c.

St. Peter was one of the three Apostles whom Jesus admitted to witness the resurrection of Jairus's daughter, and before whom he was transfigured, and with whom he retired to pray in the garden the night before he suffered. He was the person who in the fervour of his zeal for his Master cut off the ear of the high priest's slave, when the armed band came to apprehend him. Yet this same Peter, a few hours after that, denied his Master three different times in the high priest's palace, and that with oaths. In the awful defection of the Apostle on this occasion we have melancholy proof of the power of human depravity even in regenerate men, and of the weakness of human resolutions when left to ourselves. St. Peter was fully warned by his divine Master of his approaching danger; but confident in his own strength, he declared himself ready to accompany his Lord to prison and even to judgment. After the third denial Jesus turned and looked upon Peter;" that look pierced him to the heart; and, stung with deep remorse, he went out, and wept bitterly." St. Peter, however, obtained forgiveness; and, when Jesus had risen from the dead, he ordered the glad tidings of his resurrection to be conveyed to St. Peter by name: Go tell my disciples and Peter," Mark xvi, 8. He afterward received repeated assurances of his Saviour's love, and from that time uniformly showed the greatest zeal and fortitude in his Master's service.

Soon after our Lord's ascension, in a numerous assembly of the Apostles and brethren, St. Peter gave it as his opinion, that one should be chosen to be an Apostle in the room of Judas. To this they all agreed; and, by lot, chose Matthias, whom on that occasion they numbered with the eleven Apostles. On the day of pentecost following, when the Holy Spirit fell on the Apostles and disciples, St. Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice; that is, St. Peter, rising up, spake with a loud voice, in the name of the Apostles, as he had done on various occasions in his Master's lifetime, and gave the multitude an account of that great miracle, Acts ii, 14. St. Peter now began to experience the fulfilment of Christ's promise to make him a fisher of men, and also that he would give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven. His sermon on this occasion produced an abundant harvest of converts to Christ. Three thousand of his audience were pricked to the heart, and cried out, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" St. Peter

proclaimed to them the riches of pardoning mercy through the divine blood of the Son of God; and they that gladly received his doctrine were baptized and added to the church, Acts ii, 37–43. The effects produced on the mind of this great Apostle of the circumcision by the resurrection of his divine Master, and the consequent effusion of the Holy Spirit, were evidently of the most extraordinary kind, and such as it is impossible to account for upon natural principles. He was raised superior to all considerations of personal danger and the fear of man. And though all the Apostles could now say, God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind;” yet an attentive reader of the Acts of the Apostles cannot fail to perceive that upon almost every occasion of difficulty St. Peter is exhibited to our view as standing foremost in the rank of Apostles. When St. Peter and John were brought before the council to be examined concerning the miracle wrought on the impotent man, St. Peter spake. It was St. Peter who questioned Ananias and Sapphira about the price of their lands; and, for their lying in that matter, punished them miraculously with death. It is remarkable, also, that although by the hands of the Apostles many signs and wonders were wrought, it was by St. Peter’s shadow alone that the sick, who were laid in the streets of Jerusalem, were healed as he passed by. Lastly: It was St. Peter who replied to the council in the name of the Apostles, not obeying their command to preach no more in the name of Jesus.

St. Peter’s fame was now become so great, that the brethren of Joppa, hearing of his being in Lydda, and of his having cured Eneas miraculously of a palsy, sent, desiring him to come and restore a disciple to life, named Tabitha, which he did. During his abode in Joppa, the Roman centurion, Cornelius, directed by an angel, sent for him to come and preach to him. On that occasion the Holy Ghost fell on Cornelius and his company, while St. Peter spake. St. Peter, by his zeal and success in preaching the Gospel, having attracted the notice of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Herod Agrippa, who, to please the Jews, had killed St. James, the brother of St. John, still farther to gratify them, cast St. Peter into prison. But an angel brought him out; after which he concealed himself in the city, or in some neighbouring town, till Herod’s death, which happened about the end of the year. Some learned men think St. Peter at that time went to Antioch or to Rome. But if he had gone to any celebrated city, St. Luke, as L’Enfant observes, would probably have mentioned it. Beside, we find him in the council of Jerusalem, which met not long after this to determine the famous question concerning the circumcision of the Gentiles. The council being ended, St. Peter went to Antioch, where he gave great offence, by refusing to eat with the converted Gentiles. But St. Paul withstood him to the face, rebuking him before the whole church for his pusillanimity and hypocrisy, Gal. ii, 11–21.

In the Acts of the Apostles, no mention is made of St. Peter after the council of Jerusalem. But from Gal. ii, 11, it appears that after that council he was with St. Paul at Antioch. He is likewise mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. i, 12; iii, 22. It is generally supposed that after St. Peter was at Antioch with St. Paul, he returned to Jerusalem. What happened to him after that is not told in the Scriptures. But Eusebius informs us that Origen wrote to this purpose: St. Peter is supposed to have preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia; and at length, coming to Rome, was crucified with his head downward.

We are indebted to this Apostle for two epistles, which constitute a valuable part of the inspired writings. The first epistle of St. Peter has always been considered as canonical; and in proof of its genuineness we may observe that it is referred to by Clement of Rome, Hermas, and Polycarp; that, we are assured by Eusebius, that it was quoted by Papias; and that it is expressly mentioned by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and most of the later fathers. The authority of the second epistle of St. Peter was for some time disputed, as we learn from Origen, Eusebius, and Jerom; but since the fourth century it has been universally received, except by the Syriac Christians. It is addressed to the same persons as the former epistle, and the design of it was to encourage them to adhere to the genuine faith and practice of the Gospel.

PETHOR, a city of Mesopotamia, of which the Prophet Balaam was a native. The Hebrews call this city Pethura. Ptolemy calls it Pachora; and Eusebius, Pathara. He places it in the Upper Mesopotamia.

PHARAOH, a common name of the kings of Egypt. We meet with it as early as Gen. xii, 15. Josephus says, that all the kings of Egypt, from Minæus, the founder of Memphis, who lived several ages before Abraham, always had the name of Pharaoh, down to the time of Solomon, for more than three thousand three hundred years. He adds, that, in the Egyptian language, the word Pharaoh means king, and that these princes did not assume the name until they ascended the throne, at which time they quitted their former name.

PHARISEES, a sect of the Jews. The earliest mention of them is by Josephus, who tells us that they were a sect of considerable weight when John Hyrcanus was high priest, B. C. 108. They were the most numerous, distinguished, and popular sect among the Jews. The time when they first appeared is not known, but it is supposed to have been not long after the institution of the Sadducees, if, indeed the two sects did not gradually spring up together. They derived their name from the Hebrew word

pharash, which signifies separated," or set apart;" because they separated themselves from the rest of the Jews to superior strictness in religious observances. They boasted that, from their accurate knowledge of religion, they were the favourites of Heaven; and thus, trusting in themselves that they were righteous, despised others, Luke xi, 52; xviii, 9, 11. Among the tenets inculcated by this sect, we may enumerate the following: namely, they ascribed all things to fate or providence; yet not so absolutely as to take away the free will of man; for fate does not coöperate in every action, Acts v, 38, 39. They also believed in the existence of angels and spirits, and in the resurrection of the dead; Acts xxiii, 8. Lastly: the Pharisees contended that God stood engaged to bless the Jews, to make them all partakers of the terrestrial kingdom of the Messiah, to justify them, and make them eternally happy. The cause of their justification they derived from the merits of Abraham, from their knowledge of God, from their practising the rite of circumcision, and from the sacrifices they offered. And as they conceived works to be meritorious, they had invented a great number of supererogatory ones, to which they attached greater merit than to the observance of the law itself. To this notion St. Paul has some allusions in those parts of his Epistle to the Romans, in which he combats the erroneous suppositions of the Jews, Rom. i-xi.

The Pharisees were the strictest of the three principal sects that divided the Jewish nation, Acts xxvi, 5, and affected a singular probity of manners according to their system; which, however, was, for the most part, both lax and corrupt. Thus many things which Moses had tolerated in civil life, in order to avoid a greater evil, the Pharisees determined to be morally right: for instance, the law of divorce from a wife for any cause, Matt. v, 31, &c; xix, 3-12. (See Divorce.) Farther: they interpreted certain of the Mosaic laws most literally, and distorted their meaning so as to favour their own selfish system. Thus, the law of loving their neighbour, they expounded solely of the love of their friends, that is, of the whole Jewish race; all other persons being considered by them as natural enemies, whom they were in no respect bound to assist, Matt. v, 43; Luke x, 31-33. They also trifled with oaths. Dr. Lightfoot has cited a striking illustration of this from Maimonides. An oath, in which the name of God was not distinctly specified, they taught was not binding, Matt. v, 33; maintaining that a man might even swear with his lips, and at the same time annul it in his heart! And yet so rigorously did they understand the command of observing the Sabbath day, that they accounted it unlawful to pluck ears of corn, and heal the sick, &c, Matt. xii; Luke 7:44vi, 6, &c; xiv. Many moral rules they accounted inferior to the ceremonial laws, to the total neglect of mercy and fidelity, Matt. v, 19; xv, 4; xxiii, 23. Hence they accounted causeless anger and impure desires as trifles of no moment, Matt. v, 21, 22, 27-30; they compassed sea and land to make proselytes to the Jewish religion from

among the Gentiles, that they might rule over their consciences and wealth; and these proselytes, through the influence of their own scandalous examples and characters, they soon rendered more profligate and abandoned than ever they were before their conversion, Matt. xxiii, 15. Esteeming temporal happiness and riches as the highest good, they scrupled not to accumulate wealth by every means, legal or illegal, Matt. v, 1–12; xxiii, 5; Luke xvi, 14; James ii, 1–8; vain and ambitious of popular applause, they offered up long prayers in public places, but not without self-complacency in their own holiness, Matt. vi, 2–5; Luke xviii, 11; under a sanctimonious appearance of respect for the memories of the prophets whom their ancestors had slain, they repaired and beautified their sepulchres, Matt. xxiii, 29; and such was their idea of their own sanctity, that they thought themselves defiled if they but touched or conversed with sinners, that is, with publicans or tax-gatherers, and persons of loose and irregular lives, Luke vii, 39; xv, 1.

But, above all their other tenets, the Pharisees were conspicuous for their reverential observance of the traditions or decrees of the elders: these traditions, they pretended, had been handed down from Moses through every generation, but were not committed to writing; and they were not merely considered as of equal authority with the divine law, but even preferable to it. The words of the scribes,” said they, are lovely above the words of the law; for the words of the law are weighty and light, but the words of the scribes are all weighty.” Among the traditions thus sanctimoniously observed by the Pharisees, we may briefly notice the following: the washing of hands up to the wrist before and after meat, Matthew xv, 2; Mark vii, 3; which they accounted not merely a religious duty, but considered its omission as a crime equal to fornication, and punishable by excommunication: the purification of the cups, vessels, and couches used at their meals by ablutions or washings, Mark vii, 4; for which purpose the six large water pots mentioned by St. John, ii, 6, were destined: their fasting twice a week with great appearance of austerity, Luke xviii, 12; Matt. vi, 16; thus converting that exercise into religion which is only a help toward the performance of its hallowed duties: their punctilious payment of tithes, (temple-offerings,) even of the most trifling things, Luke xviii, 12; Matt. xxiii, 23. And their wearing broader phylacteries and larger fringes to their garments than the rest of the Jews, Matt. xxiii, 5. See Phylacteries.

With all their pretensions to piety, the Pharisees entertained the most sovereign contempt for the people; whom, being ignorant of the law, they pronounced to be accursed, John vii, 49. Yet such was the esteem and veneration in which they were held by the populace, that they may almost be said to have given what direction they pleased to public affairs; and



hence the great men dreaded their power and authority. It is unquestionable, as Mosheim has well remarked, that the religion of the Pharisees was, for the most part, founded in consummate hypocrisy; and that, at the bottom, they were generally the slaves of every vicious appetite, proud, arrogant, and avaricious, consulting only the gratification of their lusts, even at the very moment when they professed themselves to be engaged in the service of their Maker. These odious features in the character of the Pharisees caused them to be reprehended by our Saviour with the utmost severity, even more so than the Sadducees; who, although they had departed widely from the genuine principles of religion, yet did not impose on mankind by a pretended sanctity, or devote themselves with insatiate greediness to the acquisition of honours and riches. A few, and a few only of the sect of the Pharisees in those times, might be of better character,--men who, though self-righteous and deluded and bigoted, were not like the rest, hypocritical. Of this number was Saul of Tarsus; but as a body their attachment to traditions; their passionate expectation of deliverance from the Roman yoke by the Messiah, and the splendour of his civil reign, their pride, and above all their vices, sufficiently account for that unconquerable unbelief which had possessed their minds as to the claims of Christ, and their resistance to the evidence of his miracles. The sect of the Pharisees was not extinguished by the ruin of the Jewish commonwealth. The greater part of the Jews are still Pharisees, being as much devoted to traditions, or the oral law, as their ancestors were.

PHARPAR. See Abana.

PHEBE, a deaconess of the port of Corinth, called Cenchrea. St. Paul had a particular esteem for this holy woman; and Theodoret thinks the Apostle lodged at her house for some time, while he continued in or near Corinth. It is thought she carried the epistle to Rome, which he wrote to the church of that city, in which she is so highly commended, Rom. xvi, 1, 2. It is thought that, in quality of deaconess, she was employed by the church in some ministrations suitable to her sex and condition; as to visit and instruct the Christian women, and attend them in their sickness, and distribute alms to them in their necessities.

PHENICIA, a province of Syria, the limits of which have been differently represented. Sometimes it has been defined as extending from north to south, from Orthosia as far as Pelusium. At other times its southern limit is said to have been Mount Carmel and Ptolemais. It is certain that, from the conquest of Palestine by the Hebrews, its limits were narrow, containing no part of the country of the Philistines, which occupied all the coast from 745Mount Carmel along the Mediterranean, as far as the borders of Egypt. It had also very little extent on the land side, because the Israelites, who

possessed all Galilee, confined it to the coast of the Mediterranean Sea. The chief cities of Phenicia were Sidon, Tyre, Ptolemais, Ecdippe, Sarepta, Berythe, Biblos, Tripoli, Orthosia, Simira, Aradus. They formerly had possession of some cities in Libanus: and sometimes the Greek authors comprehend all Judea under the name of Phenicia. Phenicia may be considered as the birthplace of commerce, if not also of letters and the arts. It was a Phenician who introduced into Greece the knowledge and the use of letters. Phenician workmen built the temple of Solomon; Phenician sailors navigated his ships; Phenician pilots directed them; and before other nations had ventured to lose sight of their own shores, colonies of Phenicians were established in the most distant parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa. These early advantages were owing, doubtless, in part to their own enterprising character, and in part also to their central situation, which enabled them to draw into their own narrow territory all the commerce between the east and the west. Bochart has laboured to show that they sent colonies to almost all the isles and coasts of the Mediterranean Sea; but the most famous of all their colonies was that of Carthage.

PHILADELPHIA, a city of Lydia, in Asia Minor, and one of the seven churches of Asia. It derived its name from Attalus Philadelphus, its founder; and was seated on a branch of Mount Tmolus, about twenty-five miles south-east of Sardis, and seventy, in nearly the same direction, from Smyrna. It suffered greatly, in common with all this part of Asia, in the terrible earthquake during the reign of Tiberius, and in the seventeenth year of the Christian era. It has, however, retained a better fate than most of its neighbours; for under the name of Alahsher, or the city of God, it is still a place of some repute, chiefly supported by trade, it being in the route of the caravans to Smyrna. Among the Greek colonies and churches of Asia," says Gibbon, Philadelphia is still erect, a column in a scene of ruins." Although this city is now in the possession of the Turks, it has about a thousand Christian inhabitants, chiefly Greeks; who have five churches with a resident bishop, and inferior clergy.

PHILEMON was an inhabitant of Colosse; and from the manner in which he is addressed by St. Paul in his epistle to him, it is probable that he was a person of some consideration in that city. St. Paul seems to have been the means of converting him to the belief of the Gospel, Philemon 19. He calls him his fellow-labourer; and from that expression some have thought that he was bishop or deacon of the church at Colosse; but others have been of opinion, that he was only a private Christian, who had shown a zealous and active disposition in the cause of Christianity, without holding any ecclesiastical office. We learn from this epistle itself, that it was written when St. Paul was a prisoner, and when he had hope of soon recovering his liberty, Philemon 1, 22; and thence we conclude that it was written toward

the end of his first confinement at Rome. This epistle has always been deservedly admired for the delicacy and address with which it is written; and it places St. Paul's character in a very amiable point of view. He had converted a fugitive slave to the Christian faith; and he here intercedes with his master in the most earnest and affectionate manner for his pardon; he speaks of Onesimus in terms calculated to soften Philemon's resentment, engages to make full compensation for any injury which he might have sustained from him, and conjures him to reconciliation and forgiveness by the now endearing connection of Christian brotherhood. See Onesimus.

PHILIP, the Apostle, was a native of Bethsaida in Galilee. Jesus Christ having seen him, said to him, Follow me," John i, 43, 44. Philip followed him; he was present at the marriage of Cana in Galilee. Philip was called at the beginning of our Saviour's mission. He is mentioned, Luke vi, 13; Matt. x, 3; John vi, 5-7. Some Gentiles having a curiosity to see Jesus, a little before his passion, addressed themselves to Philip, John xii, 21, 22, who mentioned it to Andrew, and these two to Christ. At the last supper Philip desired the Saviour to show them the Father, John xiv, 8-10. This is all that we find concerning Philip in the Gospel.

2. Philip, the second of the seven deacons, Acts vi, 5, was, some say, of Cæsarea in Palestine. It is certain his daughters lived in that city, Acts xxi, 8, 9. After the death of Stephen all the Christians, except the Apostles, having left Jerusalem, and being dispersed in several places, Philip went to preach at Sebaste or Samaria, where he performed several miracles, and converted many persons, Acts viii, 1-3, &c. He baptized them; but informed the Apostles at Jerusalem that Samaria had received the word of God, that they might come and communicate the Holy Ghost to them. Peter and John came thither for that purpose. Philip was, probably, at Samaria, when an angel commanded him to go on the road that leads from Jerusalem to old Gaza. Philip obeyed, and there met with an Ethiopian eunuch, belonging to Candace, queen of Ethiopia, whom he converted and baptized, Acts viii, 26. Being come out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord took away Philip, and the eunuch saw him no more.

PHILIPPI, one of the chief cities of Macedonia, lying on the north-west of Neapolis, and formerly called Datum or Datos, but afterward taking its name from Philip, the celebrated king of Macedon, by whom it was repaired and beautified. In process of time, it became a Roman colony. It was the first place at which St. Paul preached the Gospel upon the continent of Europe, A. D. 51. He made many converts there, who soon afterward gave strong proofs of their attachment to him, 746Phil. iv, 15. He was at Philippi a second time, but nothing which then occurred is recorded. The Philippian Christians having heard of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome,

with their accustomed zeal, sent Epaphroditus to assure him of the continuance of their regard, and to offer him a supply of money. His epistle was written in consequence of that act of kindness; and it is remarkable for its strong expressions of affection. As the Apostle tells the Philippians that he hoped to see them shortly, Phil. ii, 24, and there are plain intimations in this epistle of his having been some time at Rome, Phil. i, 12; ii, 26, it is probable that it was written A. D. 62, toward the end of his confinement.

It is a strong proof," says Chrysostom, of the virtuous conduct of the Philippians, that they did not afford the Apostle a single subject of complaint; for, in the whole epistle which he wrote to them, there is nothing but exhortation and encouragement, without the mixture of any censure whatever."

PHILISTIM, or PHILISTINES, a people who are commonly said to have descended from Casluhim, the son of Mizraim or Mizr, who peopled Egypt. The Philistines, it is probable, continued with their progenitors in Egypt until they were sufficiently numerous and powerful to stretch themselves along the coast of Canaan; doubtless by driving out that portion of the family of Ham. It is certain that, in the time of Abraham, the Canaanites were in possession of the rest of the land, to which they gave their name: but the extreme south of Philistia, or Palestine, was even then possessed by the Philistines, whose king, Abimelech, reigned at Gerar. After this, in the time of Joshua, we find their country divided into five lordships or principalities; namely, Gaza, Askelon, Ashdod, Gath, and Ekron; giving sometimes also, as it appears, the title of king to their respective rulers; Achish being termed king of Gath, I Sam. xxi, 10. The time of their coming to Palestine is unknown; but they had been long in Canaan when Abraham came thither, in the year of the world 2083. The name Philistine is not Hebrew. The Septuagint generally translate it Ἀλλόφυλοι, strangers. The Pelethites and Cherethites were also Philistines; and the Septuagint sometimes translate Cherethim, Κρηῖται, Cretes. They were not of the cursed seed of Canaan. However, Joshua did not forbear to give their land to the Hebrews, and to attack them by command from the Lord, because they possessed a country promised to Israel. But these conquests of Joshua must have been ill maintained, since, under the Judges, under Saul, and at the beginning of the reign of King David, the Philistines had their kings, and their lords, whom they called Sazenim; since their state was divided into five little kingdoms, or satrapies; and since they oppressed the Israelites during the government of the high priest Eli, and of Samuel, and during the reign of Saul, for about a hundred and twenty years, from A. M. 2848 to A. M. 2960. True it is, that Shamgar, Samson, Samuel, and Saul, opposed them, and killed some of their people, but did not reduce

their power. They continued independent till the time of David, who subdued them, 2 Sam. v, 17; viii, 1, 2, &c.

They continued in subjection to the kings of Judah down to the reign of Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, about two hundred and forty-six years, when they revolted from Jehoram, 2 Chron. xxi, 16. Jehoram made war against them, and probably reduced them to his obedience again; because it is observed in Scripture, that they revolted again from Uzziah, who kept them to their duty during his whole reign, 2 Chron. xxvi, 6, 7. Uzziah began to reign A. M. 3194. During the unfortunate reign of Ahaz, the Philistines made great havoc in the territory of Judah; but his son and successor Hezekiah subdued them again, 2 Chron. xxviii, 18; 2 Kings xviii, 8. Lastly, they regained their full liberty under the later kings of Judah; and we may see, by the menaces made against them by the Prophets Isaiah, Amos, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, that they brought a thousand hardships and calamities on the children of Israel, for which God threatened to punish them with great misfortunes.

Esar-haddon, successor to Sennacherib, besieged Ashdod, or Azoth, and took it by the arms of his general, Thasthan, or Tartan. Psammetichus, king of Egypt, took the same city after a siege of twenty-nine years, according to Herodotus. During the siege of Tyre, which held out thirteen years, Nebuchadnezzar used part of his army to subdue the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and other nations bordering on the Jews. There is great probability that the Philistines could not withstand him, but were reduced to his obedience, as well as the other people of Syria, Phenicia, and Palestine. Afterward they fell under the dominion of the Persians; then under that of Alexander the Great, who destroyed the city of Gaza, the only city of the Phenicians that dared to oppose him. After the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Asmoneans took by degrees several cities from the country of the Philistines, which they subjected. Tryphon, regent of the kingdom of Syria, gave to Jonathan, the Asmonean, the government of the whole coast of the Mediterranean, from Tyre to Egypt; consequently, all the country of the Philistines.

The land of the Philistines bordered on the west and south-west of Judea, and lies on the south-east point of the Mediterranean Sea. The country to the north of Gaza is very fertile; and, long after the Christian era, it possessed a very numerous population, and strongly fortified cities. No human probability, says Keith, could have existed, in the time of the prophets, or at a much more recent date, of its eventual desolation. But it has belied, for many ages, every promise which the fertility of its soil, and the excellence both of its climate and situation, gave for many preceding centuries of its permanency as a rich and well cultivated region. And the

voice of prophecy, which was not silent respecting it, 747 proclaimed the fate that awaited it, in terms as contradictory, at the time, to every natural suggestion, as they are descriptive of what Philistia now actually is. I will stretch out my hand upon the Philistines, and destroy the remnant of the sea coasts," Ezek. xxv, 16. Baldness is come upon Gaza; Ashkelon is cut off with the remnant of their valley," Jer. xlvii, 5. Thus saith the Lord, For three transgressions of Gaza, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof. I will send a fire upon the wall of Gaza, which shall devour the palaces thereof. And I will cut off the inhabitant from Ashdod, and him that holdeth the sceptre from Ashkelon; and I will turn my hand against Ekron; and the remnant of the Philistines shall perish, saith the Lord God," Amos i, 6, 7, 8. For Ashkelon shall be a desolation;" it shall be cut off with the remnant of the valley; and Ekron shall be rooted up.--O Canaan, the land of the Philistines, I will even destroy thee, that there shall be no inhabitant; and the sea coast shall be dwellings and cottages for shepherds, and folds for flocks," Zeph. ii, 4, 5, 6. The king shall perish from Gaza, and Ashkelon shall not be inhabited," Zech. ix, 5.

The land of the Philistines was to be destroyed. It partakes of the general desolation common to it with Judea and other neighbouring states. While ruins are to be found in all Syria, they are particularly abundant along the sea coast, which formed, on the south, the realm of the Philistines. But its aspect presents some existing peculiarities, which travellers fail not to particularize, and which, in reference both to the state of the country and the fate of its different cities, the prophets failed not to discriminate as justly as if their description had been drawn both with all the accuracy which ocular observation, and all the certainty which authenticated history, could give. Volney, (though, like one who in ancient times was instrumental to the fulfilment of a special prediction, he meant not so, neither did his heart think so,) from the manner in which he generalizes his observations, and marks the peculiar features of the different districts of Syria, with greater acuteness and perspicuity than any other traveller whatever, is the ever ready purveyor of evidence in all the cases which came within the range of his topographical description of the wide field of prophecy: while, at the same time, from his known, open, and zealous hostility to the Christian cause, his testimony is alike decisive and unquestionable: and the vindication of the truth of the following predictions may safely be committed to this redoubted champion of infidelity. In the plain between Ramla and Gaza," the very plain of the Philistines along the sea coast, we met with a number of villages badly built, of dried mud, and which, like the inhabitants, exhibit every mark of poverty and wretchedness. The houses, on a nearer view, are only so many huts, (cottages,) sometimes detached, at others ranged in the form of cells, around a court yard, enclosed by a mud wall. In winter, they and their cattle

may be said to live together; the part of the dwelling allotted to themselves being only raised two feet above that in which they lodge their beasts:"-- "dwellings and cottages for shepherds, and folds for flocks."--"Except the environs of these villages, all the rest of the country is a desert, and abandoned to the Bedouin Arabs, who feed their flocks on it."--Thus accomplishing the words of prophecy, The remnant shall perish; the land of the Philistines shall be destroyed, that there shall be no inhabitant; and the sea coast shall be dwellings and cottages for shepherds, and folds for flocks." "The ruins of white marble, sometimes found at Gaza, prove that it was formerly the abode of luxury and opulence. It has shared in the general destruction; and, notwithstanding its proud title of the capital of Palestine, it is now no more than a defenceless village," (baldness has come upon it,) peopled by, at most, only two thousand inhabitants."--"It is forsaken," says the prophet, and bereaved of its king." "The sea coast, by which it was formerly washed, is every day removing farther from the deserted ruins of Ashkelon." Amidst the various successive ruins, those of Edzoud," Ashdod, so powerful under the Philistines, are now remarkable for their scorpions."--Here again we are reminded of the words of inspiration: The inhabitants shall be cut off from Ashdod."

Thus Volney becomes an unconscious commentator upon prophecy. But let us hear a Christian traveller. Ashkelon," says Richardson, "was one of the proudest satrapies of the lords of the Philistines: now there is not an inhabitant within its walls; and the prophecy of Zechariah is fulfilled: 'The king shall perish from Gaza, and Ashkelon shall not be inhabited.' When the prophecy was uttered, both cities were in an equally flourishing condition; and nothing but the prescience of Heaven could pronounce on which of the two, and in what manner, the vial of its wrath should be poured out. Gaza is truly without a king. The lofty towers of Ashkelon lie scattered on the ground, and the ruins within its walls do not shelter a human being. How is the wrath of man made to praise his Creator! Hath he not said, and shall he not do it? The oracle was delivered by the mouth of the prophet more than five hundred years before the Christian era, and we beheld its accomplishment eighteen hundred years after that event." There is yet another city which was noted by the prophets, the very want of any information respecting which, and the absence of its name from several modern maps of Palestine, while the sites of other ruined cities are marked, are really the best confirmation of the truth of the prophecy that could possibly be given. Ekron shall be rooted up." It is rooted up. It was one of the chief cities of the Philistines; but, though Gaza still subsists, and while Ashkelon and Ashdod retain their names in their ruins, the very name of Ekron is missing.

PHILOSOPHY, in general, is defined, the knowledge and study of nature and morality, founded on reason and experience.” Philosophy 748 owes its name to the modesty of Pythagoras, who refused the high title of σοφός, wise, given to his predecessors, Thales, Pherecydes, &c, as too assuming; and contented himself with the simple appellation of φιλόσοφος, quasi φίλος τῆς σοφίας, a friend or lover of wisdom: but Chauvin rather chooses to derive the name from φιλία, desire to study, and σοφία, studium sapientiæ; and says that Pythagoras, conceiving that the application of the human mind ought rather to be called study than science, set aside the appellation of wise, and, in lieu thereof, took that of philosopher.

A knowledge of the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, or the science of natural history, was always an object of interest. We are informed that Solomon himself had given a description of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, 1 Kings iv, 33. Traces of philosophy, strictly so called, that is, the system of prevailing moral opinions, may be found in the book of Job, in the thirty-seventh, thirty-ninth, and seventy-third Psalms; also in the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, but chiefly in the apocryphal book of Wisdom, and the writings of the son of Sirach. During the captivity, the Jews acquired many new notions, particularly from the Mahestani, and appropriated them, as occasion offered, to their own purposes. They at length became acquainted with the philosophy of the Greeks, which makes its appearance abundantly in the book of Wisdom. After the captivity, the language in which the sacred books were written was no longer vernacular. Hence arose the need of an interpreter on the sabbatic year, a time when the whole law was read, and also on the Sabbath in the synagogues, which some think had been recently erected, in order to make the people understand what was read. These interpreters learned the Hebrew language at the schools. The teachers of these schools, who, for the two generations preceding the time of Christ, had maintained some acquaintance with the Greek philosophy, were not satisfied with a simple interpretation of the Hebrew idiom, as it stood, but shaped the interpretation so as to render it conformable to their philosophy. Thus arose contentions, which gave occasion for the various sects of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. In the time of our Saviour, divisions had arisen among the Pharisees themselves. No less than eighteen nice questions, if we may believe the Jewish rabbins, were contested at that period between the schools of Hillel and Shammai; one of which questions was an inquiry, what cause was sufficient for a bill of divorce. If the Shammai and Hillel of the Talmud are the same with the learned men mentioned in Josephus, namely, Sameas and Pollio, who flourished thirty-four years before Christ, then Shammai or Sameas is undoubtedly the same with the Simeon who is mentioned, Luke ii, 25–35; and his son Gamaliel, so celebrated in the Talmud, is the same with the Gamaliel mentioned, Acts v, 34; xxii, 3.



Anciently, learned men were denominated among the Hebrews חכמים, as among the Greeks they were called σοφοί, wise men. In the time of Christ, the common appellative for men of that description was γραμματεὺς, in the Hebrew סופר, a scribe. They were addressed by the honorary title of rabbi, רבי, great," or master." The Jews, in imitation of the Greeks, had their seven wise men, who were called rabboni. Gamaliel was one of the number. They called themselves the children of wisdom; expressions which correspond very nearly to the Greek φιλόσοφος, Matthew xi, 19; Luke vii, 35. The heads of sects were called fathers;" the disciples were denominated sons," or children," Matt. xii, 27; xxiii, 1–9. The Jewish teachers, at least some of them, had private lecture rooms; but they also taught and disputed in synagogues, in temples, and, in fact, wherever they could find an audience. The method of these teachers was the same with that which prevailed among the Greeks. Any disciple who chose might propose questions, upon which it was the duty of the teachers to remark and give their opinions, Luke ii, 46. The teachers were not invested with their functions by any formal act of the church, or of the civil authority: they were self-constituted. They received no other salary than some voluntary present from the disciples, which was called an honorary," τιμὴ, honorarium, 1 Tim. v, 17. They acquired a subsistence, in the main, by the exercise of some art or handicraft. That they took a higher seat than their auditors, although it was probably the case, does not follow, as is sometimes supposed, from Luke ii, 46. According to the Talmudists, they were bound to hold no conversation with women, and to refuse to sit at table with the lower class of people, Matt. ix, 11; John iv, 27. The subjects on which they taught were numerous, commonly intricate, and of no great consequence; of which there are abundant examples in the Talmud.

St. Paul bids the Colossians beware lest any man should spoil them through philosophy and vain deceit;" that is, a vain and deceitful philosophy, such as was popular in that day, and had been compounded out of all preceding systems, Grecian and oriental. An explanation of this philosophy is given under Gnostics, and Cabbala.

On these ancient systems of pretended wisdom, Dr. Burton justly remarks: "Philosophy is indeed the noblest stretch of intellect which God has vouchsafed to man; and it is only when man forgets that he received his reasoning powers from God, that he is in danger of losing himself in darkness when he sought for light. To measure that which is infinite, is as impossible in metaphysics as in physics. If it had not been for revelation, we should have known no more of the Deity than the Heathen philosophers knew before: and to what did their knowledge amount? They felt the necessity of a First Cause, and they saw that that Cause must be

intrinsically good; but when they came to systems, they never went farther than the point from which they first set out, that evil is not good, and good is not evil. 749The Gnostics thought to secure the triumph of their scheme by veiling its weaker points in mystery, and by borrowing a part from almost every system. But popular, and even successful, as this attempt may have been, we may say with truth, that the scheme which flattered the vanity of human wisdom, and which strove to conciliate all opinions, has died away, and is forgotten; while the Gospel, the unpresuming, the uncompromising doctrine of the Gospel, aided by no human wisdom, and addressing itself not merely to the head, but to the heart, has triumphed over all systems and all philosophers; and still leads its followers to that true knowledge which some have endeavoured to teach ‘after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.’”

PHINEHAS, son of Eleazar, and grandson of Aaron, third high priest of the Jews, A. M. 2571 to about A. M. 2590, B. C. 1414. He is particularly commended in Scripture for zeal in vindicating the glory of God, when the Midianites had sent their daughters into the camp of Israel, to tempt the Hebrews to fornication and idolatry, Num. xxv, 7. On this account the Lord promised the priesthood to Phinehas by perpetual covenant; evidently including this tacit condition, that his children should continue faithful and obedient: for we know the priesthood passed out of the family of Eleazar and Phinehas to that of Ithamar, and that it returned not to the posterity of Eleazar until after about a hundred and fifty years.

PHUT or PUT, the posterity of Phut, the son of Ham, Gen. x, 6. Calmet is of opinion that Phut, the third son of Ham, peopled either the canton of Phtemphu, Phtemphti, Phtembuti, of Pliny and Ptolemy, whose capital was Thara, in Lower Egypt, inclining toward Libya; or the canton called Phtenotes, of which Buthas was the capital. The prophets often speak of Phut. In the time of Jeremiah, xlvi, 9, Phut was under the obedience of Necho, king of Egypt. Nahum, iii, 9, reckons this people in the number of those who ought to come to the assistance of No-Ammon, or Diospolis.

PHYLACTERIES, called by the Jews תפלין, are little scrolls of parchment, in which are written certain sentences of the law, enclosed in leather cases, and bound with thongs on the forehead and on the left arm. They are called in Greek φυλακτήρια, from φυλάττω, custodio, either because they were supposed to preserve the law in memory, or rather because they were looked upon as a kind of amulets or charms to keep them from danger. The making and wearing these phylacteries, as the Jews still do in their private devotions, is owing to a misinterpretation of those texts, on which they ground the practice, namely, God’s commanding them to bind the law for a sign on their hands, and to let it be as frontlets between their eyes,” &c,

Deut. vi, 8. The command ought doubtless to be understood metaphorically, as a charge to remember it, to meditate upon it, to have it as it were continually before their eyes, and to conduct their lives by it; as when Solomon says, concerning the commandments of God in general, Bind them about thy neck, write them upon the table of thy heart," Prov. iii, 1, 3; vi, 21. However, the Jews understanding the precept literally, wrote out the several passages wherever it occurs, and to which it seems to refer, and bound them upon their foreheads and upon their arms. It seems the Pharisees used to make broad their phylacteries." This some understand of the knots of the thongs by which they were fastened, which were tied very artificially in the form of Hebrew letters; and that the pride of the Pharisees induced them to have these knots larger than ordinary, as a peculiar ornament. The Pharisees are farther said to enlarge the borders of their garments," τὰ κράσπεδα τῶν ἱματίων, Matt. xxiii, 5. These κράσπεδα were the ציצית, the fringes which the Jews are commanded to wear upon the borders of their garments, Num. xv, 38, 39. The Targum of Onkelos calls them כרספדין, which has so near an affinity with the Greek word κράσπεδον, that there is no doubt but it signifies the same thing; which is, therefore, an evidence that the κράσπεδα were the ציצית. These were worn by our Saviour, as appears from the following passage: Behold, a woman, which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and touched the hem of his garment," κράσπεδον του ἱματιου, Matt. ix, 20. Again: the inhabitants of Gennesaret are said to have brought unto him their diseased, and to have besought him, that they might only touch the hem of his garment," κρασπεδον τοῦ ἱματίου, Matt. xiv, 36. Κράσπεδον τοῦ ἱματίου is, in both these passages, very improperly translated the hem of his garment." It should have been rendered the fringe." The Pharisees are censured by our Saviour for enlarging these fringes of their garments, which we may suppose they did partly from pride, and partly from hypocrisy, as pretending thereby an extraordinary regard for the precepts of the law. It is reported by Jerom, as quoted by Godwin, that they used to have fringes extravagantly long; sticking thorns in them, that, by pricking their legs as they walked, they might put them in mind of the law. See Frontlets.

PIETISTS, Protestant, a denomination in the seventeenth century, which owed its origin to the pious and learned Spener," as Dr. Mosheim calls him, who formed private devotional societies at Frankfort, in order to cultivate vital and practical religion; and published a book entitled Pious Desires," which greatly promoted this object. His followers laid it down as an essential maxim, that none should be admitted into the ministry but those who not only had received a proper education, but were also distinguished by their wisdom and sanctity of manners, and had hearts filled with divine love. Hence they proposed an alteration in the schools of divinity, which

embraced the following points: 1. That the scholastic theology, which reigned in the academies, 750 and was composed of intricate and disputable doctrines, and obscure and unusual forms of expression, should be totally abolished. 2. That polemical divinity, which comprehended the controversies subsisting between Christians of different communions, should be less eagerly studied, and less frequently treated, though not entirely neglected. 3. That all mixture of philosophy and human science with divine wisdom, was to be most carefully avoided; that is, that Pagan philosophy and classical learning should be kept distinct from, and by no means supersede, Biblical theology. But, 4. That, on the contrary, all those students, who were designed for the ministry, should be accustomed from their early youth to the perusal and study of the Holy Scriptures, and be taught a plain system of theology, drawn from these unerring sources of truth. 5. That the whole course of their education was to be so directed as to render them useful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine, and the commanding influence of their example. Such, in substance, is Mosheim's account of the meditated reforms in the public schools. But it was not intended to confine these reforms to students and the clergy. Religious persons of every class and rank were encouraged to meet in what were called Biblical colleges, or colleges of piety, (we might call them prayer meetings,) where some exercised in reading the Scriptures, singing, and prayer, and others engaged in the exposition of the Scriptures; not in a dry and critical way, but in a strain of practical and experimental piety, by which they mutually edified each other. This practice, which always more or less obtains where religion flourishes, as, for instance, at the Reformation, raised the same sort of outcry as at the rise of Methodism; and those who entered not into the spirit of the design, were eager to catch at every instance of weakness or imprudence, to bring disgrace on that which, in fact, brought disgrace upon themselves, as lukewarm and formal Christians. In so saying, Master, thou reproachest us also." This work began about 1670. In 1691 Dr. Spener removed from Dresden to Berlin, where he propagated the same principles, which widely spread, and were well supported in many parts of Germany by the excellent Professor Francke and others, until the general decline of religion which has unhappily prevailed in Germany for the last half century. See Neology.

PI-HAHIROTH. The Hebrew pi answers to the modern Arabic word *fum*, signifying mouth;" and is generally applied to the passes in the mountains. In the English and Septuagint versions, Hahiroth is taken as a proper name; and the whole word would imply the mouth or pass of Hahiroth or Hiroth, whatever particular origin or signification may belong to that word. The name, however, sufficiently explains the situation of the children of Israel; who were hemmed in at this place, between the sea in front, and a narrow mountain pass behind; which no doubt encouraged Pharaoh to make his

attack upon them in so disadvantageous a position; thinking that they must inevitably fall an easy prey into his hands, or be cut to pieces: when their deliverance, and his own destruction, were unexpectedly wrought by the parting of the waters of the sea. The place where this miracle is supposed to have happened, is still called Bahral-Kolsum, or the Sea of Destruction; and just opposite to the situation which answers to the opening called Pihahiroth, is a bay, where the north cape is called Ras Musa, or the Cape of Moses. That part of the western or Heroopolitan branch of the Red Sea where, from these coincidences, the passage most probably took place, is described by Bruce as about three leagues over, with fourteen fathoms of water in the channel, nine at the sides, and good anchorage every where. The farther side is also represented as a low sandy coast, and an easy landing place. See Red Sea.

PILATE. It is not known of what country or family Pontius Pilate was, but it is believed that he was of Rome, or, at least, of Italy. He was sent to govern Judea in the room of Gratus, A. D. 26, or 27. He presided over this province for ten years, from the twelfth or thirteenth year of Tiberius, to the twenty-second of the same emperor. He is represented, both by Philo and Josephus, as a man of an impetuous and obstinate temper, and, as a judge, one who used to sell justice, and, for money, to pronounce any sentence that was desired. The same authors make mention of his rapines, his injuries, his murders, the torments that he inflicted upon the innocent, and the persons he put to death without any form of process. Philo, in particular, describes him as a man that exercised an excessive cruelty during the whole time of his government; who disturbed the repose of Judea; and was the occasion of the troubles and revolt that followed. St. Luke acquaints us, that Pilate had mingled the blood of the Galileans with their sacrifices; and that the matter, having been related to Jesus Christ, he introduced the subject into his discourse, Luke xiii. The reason why Pilate treated them in this manner, while sacrificing in the temple, is not known. At the time of our Saviour's passion, Pilate made some attempts to deliver him out of the hands of the Jews. He knew the reasons of their enmity against him, Matthew xxvii, 18. His wife, also, having had a dream that alarmed her, requested he would not stain his hands with the blood of that just person, verse 19. He therefore attempted to appease the wrath of the Jews by scourging Jesus, John xix, 1; Matt. xxvii, 26; and also tried to take him out of their hands by proposing to deliver him or Barabbas on the day of the passover. Lastly, he thought to discharge himself from pronouncing judgment against him, by sending him to Herod, king of Galilee, Luke xxiii, 7, 8. When he saw all this would not satisfy the Jews, and that they even threatened him in some manner, saying, he could be no friend to the emperor if he suffered Jesus to be set at liberty, John xix, 12–15, he caused water to be brought, and washed his hands before all the people, and

publicly declared himself innocent of the blood of that just person, Matthew xxvii, 23, 24. Yet at the same time he delivered him to his soldiers that they might crucify him. This was enough to justify Jesus Christ, as Calmet observes, and to prove that he held him as innocent; but it was not enough to vindicate the conscience and integrity of a judge, whose duty it was as well to assert the cause of oppressed innocence, as to punish the guilty. He ordered the inscription to be placed over the head of our Saviour, John xix, 19; and when requested by the Jews to alter it, peremptorily refused. He also gave leave for the removal of our Lord's body, and to place a guard over the sepulchre, Matthew xxvii, 65. These are all the particulars that we learn concerning Pilate from the writers of the Gospels.

The extreme reluctance of Pilate to condemn Christ, considering his merciless character, is signally remarkable, and still more his repeated protestations of the innocence of his prisoner; although, on occasions of massacre, he made no scruple of confounding the innocent with the guilty. But he was unquestionably influenced by the overruling providence of God, to make the righteousness of his Son appear as clear as the noon day, even when condemned and executed as a malefactor, by the fullest, the most authentic, and the most public evidence: 1. By the testimony even of his judges, Pilate and Herod, after examination of evidence. 2. By the message of Pilate's wife, delivered to him on the tribunal. 3. By the testimony of the traitor Judas, who hanged himself in despair, for betraying the innocent blood. 4. By the testimony of the Roman centurion and guard, at his crucifixion, to his divinity and righteousness. And, 5. Of his fellow sufferer on the cross. Never was innocence so attested as his innocence.

Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Eusebius, and after them several others, both ancient and modern, assure us that it was formerly the custom for Roman magistrates to prepare copies of all verbal processes and judicial acts, which they passed in their several provinces, and to send them to the emperor. And Pilate, in compliance with the custom, having sent word to Tiberius of what had passed relating to Jesus Christ, the emperor wrote an account of it to the senate, in a manner that gave reason to judge that he thought favourably of the religion of Jesus Christ, and showed that he should be willing for them to confer divine honours upon him; but the senate was not of the same opinion, and so the matter dropped. It appears by what Justin says of these acts, that the miracles of Christ were mentioned there, and even that the soldiers had divided his garments among them. Eusebius insinuates that they spoke of his resurrection and ascension. Tertullian and Justin refer to these acts with so much confidence, as would make one believe they had read and handled them. However, neither Eusebius nor Jerom, who were both inquisitive and understanding persons, nor any other author who wrote afterward, seems to have seen them, at least not the true

and original acts. For as to what we have now in great number, they are not authentic, being neither ancient nor uniform. There are also some pretended letters of Pilate to Tiberius, giving a history of our Saviour; but they are universally allowed to be spurious. Pilate being a man who, by his excessive cruelties and rapine, had disturbed the repose of Judea, during the whole time of his government, was at length deposed by Vitellius, the proconsul of Syria, A. D. 36, and sent to Rome to give an account of his conduct to the emperor. But, though Tiberius died before Pilate arrived at Rome, yet his successor Caligula banished him to Vienne in Gaul, where he was reduced to such extremity that he laid violent hands upon himself. The evangelists call him governor, though in reality he was nothing more than procurator of Judea, not only because governor was a name of general use, but because Pilate, in effect, acted as one, by taking upon him to judge in criminal matters, as his predecessors had done, and as other procurators in the small provinces of the empire, where there was no proconsul, constantly did.

PILLAR properly means a column raised to support a building; but in Scripture the term mostly occurs in a metaphorical or figurative sense. Thus we have a pillar of cloud, a pillar of fire, a pillar of smoke, &c; signifying a cloud, a fire, a smoke raised up toward heaven in the form or shape of a pillar, Exod. xiii, 21; Judges xx, 40. Job speaks of the pillars of heaven and the pillars of the earth, Job ix, 6; xxvi, 11; which are strong metaphorical expressions, that suppose the heavens and the earth to be an edifice raised by the hand of the almighty Creator, and founded upon its basis. St. Paul speaks of the Christian church under the similitude of a pillar or column on which the truth, or doctrine of the glorious Gospel is inscribed, 1 Tim. iii, 15.

PILLOWS. The prophet speaks of sewing pillows to arm holes." There is here, probably, an allusion to the easy indulgence of the great. To this day in the east they cover the floors of their houses with carpets: and along the sides of the wall or floor, a range of narrow beds or mattresses is often placed upon these carpets; and, for their farther ease and convenience, several velvet or damask bolsters are placed upon these carpets or mattresses,--indulgences that seem to be alluded to by the stretching of themselves upon couches, and by the sewing of pillows to arm holes," Ezekiel xiii, 18; Amos vi, 4.

PINE TREE. The pine appears in our translation three times, Neh. viii, 15; Isaiah xli, 19; lx, 13. Nehemiah, viii, 15, giving directions for observing the feast of tabernacles, says, "Fetch olive branches, pine branches, myrtle branches, and branches of thick trees, to make booths." The Hebrew phrase  $\eta\omega\psi$ , means literally "branches of oily or gummy plants." The LXX. say

cypress. Scheuchzer says the Turks call the cypress zemin. The author of *Scripture Illustrated* 752 says, I should prefer the whole species called jasmin, on account of its verdure, its fragrance, and its flowers, which are highly esteemed. The word jasmin and jasemin of the Turks, resembles strongly the shemen of the Hebrew original here. The Persians also name this plant semen and simsyk." The authority, however, of the Septuagint must prevail. In Isa. xli, 19; lx, 13, the Hebrew word is תדרה; a tree, says Parkhurst, so called from the springiness or elasticity of its wood. Luther thought it the elm, which is a lofty and spreading tree; and Dr. Stock renders it the ash. After all, it may be thought advisable to retain the pine. La Roche, describing, a valley near to Mount Lebanon, has this observation: "La continuelle verdure des pins et des chênes verts fait toujours sa beauté." [The perpetual verdure of the pines and the live oaks makes it ever beautiful.]

PISGAH, a part of Mount Nebo, so called, being, in all probability, a distinct, and most likely the highest, summit of that mountain. Here Moses climbed to view the land of Canaan; and here he died.

PISIDIA, a province of Asia Minor, having Lycaonia to the north, Pamphylia to the south, Cilicia and Cappadocia to the east, and the province of Asia to the west. St. Paul preached at Antioch in Pisidia, Acts xiii, 14; xiv, 24.

PITCH, רַפָּח, Exod. ii, 3; Isaiah xxxiv, 9; Septuagint ἄσφαλτος; a fat, combustible, oily matter, sometimes called asphaltos, from the lake Asphaltites, or Dead Sea, in Judea, on the surface of which it rises in the nature of liquid pitch, and floats like other oleaginous bodies; but is condensed by degrees, through the heat of the sun, and grows dry and hard. The word which our translators have rendered pitch in Gen. vi, 14, and חֶמֶר, slime, Gen. xi, 3; xiv, 10, is generally supposed to be bitumen. In the first of these places it is mentioned as used for smearing the ark, and closing its interstices. It was peculiarly adapted to this purpose. Being at first soft, viscous, and pliable, it might be thrust into every chasm and crevice with the greatest ease; but would soon acquire a tenacity and hardness superior to those of our pitch. A coat of it spread over both the inside and outside of the ark would make it perfectly water proof. The longer it was kept in the water, the harder and stronger it would grow. The Arabs still use it for careening their vessels. In the second passage it is described as applied for cement in building the tower of Babel. It was much used in ancient buildings in that region; and, in the ruins of Babylon, large masses of brick work cemented with it are discovered. It is known that the plain of Shinar did abound with it, both in its liquid and solid state; that there was there a cave and fountain which was continually casting it out; and that the famous



tower and no less famous walls of Babylon were built by this kind of cement, is confirmed by the testimony of several ancient authors. The slime pits of Siddim, Gen. xiv, 10, were holes out of which issued this liquid bitumen, or naphtha. Bitumen was formerly much used by the Egyptians and Jews in embalming the bodies of their dead.

PITHOM, one of the cities that the Israelites built for Pharaoh in Egypt, during the time of their servitude, Exod. i, 11.

PLAGUES OF EGYPT. The design of these visitations, growing more awful and tremendous in their progress, was to make Pharaoh know, and confess, that the God of the Hebrews was the supreme Lord, and to exhibit his power and his justice in the strongest light to all the nations of the earth, Exod. ix, 16; 1 Sam. iv, 8, &c; to execute judgment upon the Egyptians and upon all their gods, inanimate and bestial, for their cruelty to the Israelites, and for their grovelling polytheism and idolatry, Exod. vii, 14–17; xii, 12. The Nile was the principal divinity of the Egyptians. According to Heliodorus, they paid divine honours to this river, and revered it as the first of their gods. They declared him to be the rival of heaven, since he watered the country without the aid of the clouds and rain. His principal festival was at the summer solstice, when the inundation commenced; at which season, in the dog days, by a cruel idolatrous rite, they sacrificed red-haired persons, principally foreigners, to Typhon, or the power that presided over tempests, at Busiris, Heliopolis, &c, by burning them alive, and scattering their ashes in the air, for the good of the people, as we learn from Plutarch. Hence Bryant infers the probability, that these victims were chosen from among the Israelites, during their residence in Egypt. The judgment then inflicted upon the river, and all the waters of Egypt, in the presence of Pharaoh and of his servants, as foretold,—when, as soon as Aaron had smitten the waters of the river, they were turned into blood, and continued in that state for seven days, so that all the fish died, and the Egyptians could not drink of the waters of the river, in which they delighted as the most wholesome of all waters, but were forced to dig wells for pure water to drink—was a significant sign of God’s displeasure for their senseless idolatry in worshipping the river and its fish, and also a manifest reproof of that bloody edict whereby the infants were slain,” Wisdom xi, 7.

In the plague of frogs, their sacred river itself was made an active instrument of their punishment, together with another of their gods. The frog was one of their sacred animals, consecrated to the sun, and considered as an emblem of divine inspiration in its inflations.

The plague of lice, which was produced without any previous intimation to Pharaoh, was peculiarly offensive to a people so superstitiously nice and

cleanly as the Egyptians; and, above all, to their priests, who used to shave their whole body every third day, that neither louse, nor any other vermin, might be found upon them while they were employed in serving their gods, as we learn from Herodotus; and Plutarch informs us, that they never wore woollen garments, but linen only, because linen is least apt to produce lice. This plague, therefore, was particularly disgraceful to the magicians themselves; and when they tried to imitate it, but failed, on account of the minuteness of the objects, (not like serpents, water, or frogs, of a sensible bulk that could be handled,) they were forced to confess that this was no human feat of legerdemain, but rather the finger of God." Thus were the illusions of their magic put down, and their vaunting in wisdom reproved with disgrace," Wisdom xvii, 7. Their folly was manifest unto all men," in absurdly and wickedly attempting at first to place the feats of human art on a level with the stupendous operations of divine power, in the first two plagues; and being foiled in the third, by shamefully miscarrying, they exposed themselves to the contempt of their admirers. Philo, the Jew, has a fine observation on the plagues of Egypt: Some, perhaps, may inquire, Why did God punish the country by such minute and contemptible animals as frogs, lice, flies, rather than by bears, lions, leopards, or other kinds of savage beasts which prey on human flesh? Or, if not by these, why not by the Egyptian asp, whose bite is instant death? But let him learn, if he be ignorant, first, that God chose rather to correct than to destroy the inhabitants; for, if he desired to annihilate them utterly, he had no need to have made use of animals as his auxiliaries, but of the divinely inflicted evils of famine and pestilence. Next, let him farther learn that lesson so necessary for every state of life, namely, that men, when they war, seek the most powerful aid to supply their own weakness; but God, the highest and the greatest power, who stands in need of nothing, if at any time he chooses to employ instruments, as it were, to inflict chastisement, chooses not the strongest and greatest, disregarding their strength, but rather the mean and the minute, whom he endues with invincible and irresistible power to chastise offenders." The first three plagues were common to the Egyptians and the Israelites, to convince both that "there was none like the Lord;" and to wean the latter from their Egyptian idolatries, and induce them to return to the Lord their God. And when this end was answered, the Israelites were exempted from the ensuing plagues; for the Lord severed the land of Goshen from the rest of Egypt; whence the ensuing plagues, confined to the latter, more plainly appeared to have been inflicted by the God of the Hebrews, Exodus viii, 20–23, to convince both more clearly of "the goodness and severity of God," Rom. xi, 22; that great plagues remain for the ungodly, but mercy embraceth the righteous on every side," Psalm xxxii, 10.

The visitation of flies, of the gad fly, or hornet, was more intolerable than any of the preceding. By this, his minute, but mighty army, God afterward drove out some of the devoted nations of Canaan before Joshua, *Exod. xxiii, 28; Deut. vii, 20; Josh. xxiv, 12*. This insect was worshipped in Palestine and elsewhere under the title of Baal-zebul, lord of the gad fly," *2 Kings i, 1, 2*. Egypt, we learn from Herodotus, abounded with prodigious swarms of flies, or gnats; but this was in the heat of summer, during the dog days; whence this fly is called by the Septuagint *κυνόμυια*, the dog fly. But the appointed time of this plague was in the middle of winter; and, accordingly, this plague extorted Pharaoh's partial consent, Go ye, sacrifice to your God, but in the land;" and when Moses and Aaron objected the offence they would give to the Egyptians, who would stone them for sacrificing the abomination of the Egyptians," namely, animal sacrifices, he reluctantly consented, only ye shall not go very far away;" for he was apprehensive of their flight, like his predecessor, who first enslaved the Israelites, *Exod. i, 10*; and he again desired them to entreat for him." But he again dealt deceitfully; and after the flies were removed so effectually that not one was left, when Moses entreated the Lord, Pharaoh hardened his heart this fifth time also, neither would he let the people go."

This second breach of promise on the part of Pharaoh drew down a plague of a more deadly description than the preceding. The fifth plague of murrain destroyed all the cattle of Egypt, but of the cattle of the Israelites died not one." It was immediately inflicted by God himself, after previous notification, and without the agency of Moses and Aaron, to manifest the divine indignation at Pharaoh's falsehood. And though the king sent and found that not one of the Israelites was dead, yet his heart was hardened this sixth time also, and he would not let the people go, *Exod. ix, 1-7*.

At length, after Pharaoh had repeatedly abused the gracious respites and warnings vouchsafed to him and his servants, a sorer set of plagues, affecting themselves, began to be inflicted; and Moses now, for the first time, appears as the executioner of divine vengeance; for in the presence of Pharaoh, by the divine command, he sprinkled ashes of the furnace toward heaven, and it became a boil, breaking forth with blains upon man and upon beast. And the magicians could not stand before Moses because of the boil, which affected them and all the Egyptians, *Exod. ix, 8-11*. This was a very significant plague: the furnace from which the ashes were taken aptly represented the iron furnace" of Egyptian bondage, *Deut. iv, 20*, and the scattering of the ashes in the air might have referred to the usage of the Egyptians in their Typhonian sacrifices of human victims; while it converted another of the elements, and of their gods, the air, or ether, into an instrument of their chastisement. And now the Lord," for the first time, hardened the heart of Pharaoh," after he had so repeatedly hardened it

himself, and he hearkened not unto them, as the Lord had foretold unto Moses,” Exod. ix, 12. Though Pharaoh probably felt, the scourge of the boil, as well as his people, it did not soften nor humble his heart; and when he wilfully and obstinately turned away from the light, and shut his eyes against the luminous evidences vouchsafed to him of the supremacy of the God of the Hebrews, and had twice broken his promise when he was indulged with a respite, and dealt deceitfully, he became a just object of punishment; and God now began to increase the hardness or obduracy of his heart. And such is the usual and the righteous course of his providence; when nations or individuals despise the warnings of Heaven, abuse their best gifts, and resist the means of grace, God then delivers them over to a reprobate or undiscerning mind, to work all uncleanness with greediness,” Rom. i, 28.

In the tremendous plague of hail, the united elements of air, water, and fire, were employed to terrify and punish the Egyptians by their principal divinities. This plague was formally announced to Pharaoh and his people: I will at this season send all my plagues upon thine heart, and upon thy servants, and upon thy people, that thou mayest know that there is none like me in all the earth. For now I could stretch out my hand, and smite thee and thy people with pestilence,” or destroy thee at once, like thy cattle with the murrain, and thou shouldest be cut off from the earth; but, in truth, for this cause have I sustained thee, that I might manifest in thee my power, and that my name might be declared throughout the whole earth,” Exod. ix, 13–16. This rendering of the passage is more conformable to the context, the Chaldee paraphrase, and to Philo, than the received translation, For now I will stretch out my hand, that I may smite thee and thy people with pestilence;” for surely Pharaoh and his people were not smitten with pestilence; and they were preserved” or kept from immediate destruction, according to the Septuagint, διετηρήθης, to manifest the divine power,” by the number and variety of their plagues. Still, however, in the midst of judgment, God remembered mercy; he gave a gracious warning to the Egyptians, to avoid, if they chose, the threatened calamity: Send, therefore, now, and gather thy cattle, and all that thou hast in the field; every man and beast that shall be found in the field, and shall not be brought home, the hail shall come down upon them, and they shall die.” And this warning had some effect: He that feared the word of the Lord among the servants of Pharaoh, made his servants and his cattle flee into the houses; and he that regarded not the word of the Lord, left his servants and his cattle in the field,” Exod. ix, 17–21. But it may be asked, If all the cattle of the Egyptians were destroyed by the foregoing plague of murrain, as asserted Exod. ix, 6, how came there to be any cattle left? Surely the Egyptians might have recruited their stock from the land of Goshen, where not one of the cattle of the Israelites died.” And this justifies the supposition, that there

was some respite, or interval, between the several plagues, and confirms the conjecture of the duration of the whole, about a quarter of a year. And that the warning, in this case, was respected by many of the Egyptians, we may infer from the number of chariots and horsemen that went in pursuit of the Israelites afterward. This was foretold to be a very grievous hail, such as had not been in Egypt since the foundation thereof: and the Lord sent thunder and hail, and the fire ran along the ground; and the hail smote throughout all the land of Egypt all that was in the field, both man and beast; and the hail smote every herb of the field, and brake every tree of the field. Only in the land of Goshen, where the children of Israel were, there was no hail." Pharaoh sent and called for Moses and Aaron, and said unto them, I have sinned this time; the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked: entreat the Lord," for it is enough, that there might be no more mighty thunderings and hail; and I will let you go, and ye shall stay no longer." But when there was respite, Pharaoh sinned yet more, and hardened his heart, he and his servants; neither would he let the people go," Exod. ix, 27–35. In this instance, there is a remarkable suspension of the judicial infatuation. Pharaoh had humbled himself, and acknowledged his own and his people's guilt, and the justice of the divine plague: the Lord, therefore, forbore this time to harden his heart. But he abused the long sufferance of God, and this additional respite; he sinned yet more, because he now sinned wilfully, after he had received information of the truth; he relapsed, and hardened his own heart a seventh time. He became, therefore, a vessel of wrath, fitted to destruction," Heb. x, 26; Rom. ix, 22.

The design of the eighth and the ensuing plagues, was to confirm the faith of the Israelites: "That thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son, and of thy son's son, what I have wrought in Egypt, and my signs which I have done among them; that ye may know how that I am the Lord." This plague of locusts, inflicted on the now devoted Egyptians and their king, completed the havoc begun by the hail; by this the wheat and rye were destroyed, and every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left: and there remained not any verdure in the trees, nor in the herbs of the field, throughout the land of Egypt. Very grievous were they; before them were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall there be such," Exod. x, 3–15.

The awful plague of darkness over all the land of Egypt, for three days, a thick darkness which might be felt," in the emphatic language of Scripture, was inflicted on the Egyptians, and their chief god, the sun; and was, indeed, a most significant sign of the divine displeasure, and of that mental darkness under which they now laboured. Their consternation thereat is strongly represented by their total inaction; neither rose any from his place for three days, petrified, as they were, with horror. They were also scared

with strange apparitions and visions, while a heavy night was spread over them, an image of that darkness which should afterward receive them. But yet, they were unto themselves more grievous than that darkness," Wisdom xvii, 3–21; Psalm lxxviii, 49. This terrific and horrible plague compelled Pharaoh to relax; he offered to let the men and their families go; but he wished to keep the flocks and herds as security for their return; but Moses peremptorily declared, that not a hoof should be left behind. Again "the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, so that he would not let them go," Exod. x, 21–27. And the Lord said unto Moses, Pharaoh shall not hearken unto you, that my wonders may be multiplied in the land of Egypt. And Moses and Aaron did all these wonders before Pharaoh; and the Lord" ultimately "hardened Pharaoh's heart, so that he would not let the children of Israel go out of his land," Exod. xi, 9, 10. This passage forms the conclusion to the nine plagues, and should properly follow the preceding; for the result of the tenth and last plague was foretold, that Pharaoh should not only let them go, but surely thrust them out altogether, Exod. xi, 1.

The tenth plague was announced to Pharaoh with much solemnity: Thus saith the Lord, About midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt, and all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even to the first-born of the maid-servant that is behind the mill; and all the first-born of cattle. And there shall be a great cry throughout the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be any more. But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast; that ye may know, how that the Lord doth make a difference between the Egyptians and Israel. And all these thy servants shall come down unto me, and bow themselves unto me, saying, Get thee out, and all the people that follow thee. And after that I will go out," Exod. xi, 4–8. Such a threat, delivered in so high a tone, both in the name of the God of Israel and of Moses, did not fail to exasperate the infatuated Pharaoh, and he said, Get thee from me; take heed to thyself; see my face no more: for in the day thou seest my face thou shalt die. And Moses said, Be it so as thou hast spoken; I will see thy face again no more. And he went out from Pharaoh in great anger," Exod. x, 28, 29; xi, 8. And at midnight the Lord smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt; and there was a great cry in Egypt, for there was not a house in which there was not one dead," Exod. xii, 1–30. This last tremendous judgment is described with much sublimity in the book of Wisdom, xviii, 14–18.

For when all things were wrapt in still silence,  
And night, in her proper speed, holding her mid course,  
Thy all powerful oracle leapt down from heaven,  
Out of the royal throne, a fierce warrior,  
Into the midst of the land of destruction,

Wielding a sharp sword, thine unfeigned command,  
And standing up, he filled the whole with death,  
He touched the heavens, indeed, but trod upon the earth!"

And Pharaoh rose up in the night, he and all his servants, and all the Egyptians; and he called for," or sent to, Moses and Aaron by night, and said, Get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel; and go, serve the Lord, as ye said; take also your flocks and your herds, and be gone; and bless me also. And the Egyptians also were urgent upon the people, to send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We shall all be dead." It is evident from the extreme urgency of the occasion, when all the Egyptians apprehended total destruction, if the departure of the Israelites was delayed any longer, that Pharaoh had no personal interview with Moses and Aaron, which would have wasted time, and was quite unnecessary; he only sent them a peremptory mandate to be gone on their own terms. And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they asked of the Egyptians jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment. And the Lord gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they freely gave what they required, and they spoiled the Egyptians," Exod. xii, 31–36, as originally foretold to Abraham, Gen. xv, 14; and to Moses before the plagues began. This was an act of perfect retributive justice, to make the Egyptians pay for the long and laborious services of the Israelites, whom they had unjustly enslaved, in violation of their charter.

The Israelites were thrust out of Egypt on the fifteenth day of the first month, about six hundred thousand men on foot, beside women and children. And a mixed multitude went up also with them; and flocks and herds, even very much cattle," Exod. xii, 37–38; Num. xi, 4; xxxiii, 3. And they went out with a high hand; for the Lord went before them by day, in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day and night. He took not away the pillar of the cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night, from before the people," Exod. xiii, 22; Num. ix, 15–23. And the motion or rest of this divine guide regulated their marches, and their stations or encampments during the whole of their route, Num. x, 33–36. See Red Sea.

**PLATONISTS.** The Platonic philosophy is denominated from Plato, who was born about B. C. 426. He founded the old academy on the opinions of Heraclitus, Pythagoras, and Socrates; and by adding the information he had acquired to their discoveries, he established a sect of philosophers, who were esteemed more perfect than any who had before appeared in the world. The outlines of Plato's philosophical system were as follows:--that there is one God, eternal, immutable, and immaterial; perfect in wisdom and goodness, omniscient, and omnipresent: that this all-perfect Being

formed the universe out of a mass of eternally preëxisting matter, to which he gave form and arrangement: that there is in matter a necessary, but blind and refractory force, which resists the will of the supreme Artificer, so that he cannot perfectly execute his designs; and this is the cause of the mixture of good and evil which is found in the material world: that the soul of man was derived by emanation 756 from God; but that this emanation was not immediate, but through the intervention of the soul of the world, which was itself debased by some material admixture: that the relation which the human soul, in its original constitution, bears to matter, is the source of moral evil; that when God formed the universe, he separated from the soul of the world inferior souls, equal in number to the stars, and assigned to each its proper celestial abode: that these souls were sent down to earth to be imprisoned in mortal bodies; hence arose the depravity and misery to which human nature is liable: that the soul is immortal; and by disengaging itself from all animal passions, and rising above sensible objects to the contemplation of the world of intelligence, it may be prepared to return to its original habitation: that matter never suffers annihilation, but that the world will remain for ever; and that by the action of its animating principle it accomplishes certain periods, within which every thing returns to its ancient place and state. This periodical revolution of nature is called the Platonic, or great year.

The Platonic system makes the perfection of morality to consist in living in conformity to the will of God, the only standard of truth, and teaches that our highest good consists in the contemplation and knowledge of the supreme Being. In this divine Being Plato admitted a sort of trinity of three hypostases. The first he considered as self-existent, calling him, by way of eminence, τὸ ἕν, the Being, or τὸ ἓν, the One. The only attribute which he acknowledged in this person was goodness; and therefore he frequently styles him, τὸ ἀγαθὸν, the good. The second he considered as, νοῦς, the mind, or, λογὸς, the wisdom or reason of the former, and the δημιουργός, maker of the world. The third he always speaks of as, ψυχή, the soul of the world. He taught that the second is a necessary emanation from the first, and the third from the second, or perhaps from both; comparing these emanations to those of light and heat from the sun. From the above use of Logos for the second person of the Platonic trinity, it has been thought that St. John borrowed the term from Plato; but it is not likely that this Apostle was conversant with his writings, and therefore both Le Clerc and Dr. Campbell think it more probable that he took it from the Old Testament. The end of all knowledge, or philosophy, according to Plato, was to make us resemble the Deity as much as is compatible with human nature. This likeness consists in the possession and practice of all the moral virtues. After the death of Plato, many of his disciples deviated from his doctrines. His school was then divided into the old, the middle, and the new academy.



The old academy strictly adhered to his tenets. The middle academy partially receded from his system, without entirely deserting it. The new academy almost entirely relinquished the original doctrines of Plato, and verged toward the skeptical philosophy. An infusion of Platonism, though in a perverted form, is seen in the philosophy most prevalent in the times of the Apostles. It was Judaized by the contemplative Hellenists, and, through them, their native Judaism was Platonized. The eclectic philosophy added other ingredients to the compound, from the oriental systems. All however issued in pride, and the domination of bewildering and monstrous imaginations.

PLOUGH. The Syrian plough, which was probably used in all the regions around, is a very simple frame, and commonly so light, that a man of moderate strength might carry it in one hand. Volney states that in Syria it is often nothing else than the branch of a tree cut below a bifurcation, and used without wheels. It is drawn by asses and cows, seldom by oxen. And Dr. Russel informs us, the ploughing of Syria is performed often by a little cow, at most with two, and sometimes only by an ass. In Persia it is for the most part drawn by one ox only, and not unfrequently even by an ass, although it is more ponderous than in Palestine. With such an imperfect instrument, the Syrian husbandman can do little more than scratch the surface of his field, or clear away the stones or weeds that encumber it, and prevent the seed from reaching the soil. The ploughshare is a piece of iron, broad, but not large, which tips the end of the shaft." So much does it resemble the short sword used by the ancient warriors, that it may with very little trouble, be converted into that deadly weapon; and when the work of destruction is over, reduced again into its former shape, and applied to the purposes of agriculture. In allusion to the first operation, the Prophet Joel summons the nations to leave their peaceful employments in the cultivated field, and buckle on their armour: Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears," Joel iii, 10. This beautiful image the Prophet Isaiah has reversed, and applied to the establishment of that profound and lasting peace which is to bless the church of Christ in the latter days: And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," Isaiah ii, 4. The plough used in Syria is so light and simple in its construction, that the husbandman is under the necessity of guiding it with great care, bending over it, and loading it with his own weight, else the share would glide along the surface without making any incision. His mind should be wholly intent on his work, at once to press the plough into the ground, and direct it in a straight line. Let the ploughman," said Hesiod, attend to his charge, and look before him; not turn aside to look on his associates, but make straight furrows, and have his mind attentive to his work." And Pliny: Unless the

ploughman stoop forward,” to press his plough into the soil, and conduct it properly, he will turn it aside.” To such careful and incessant exertion, our Lord alludes in that declaration, No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of heaven,” Luke ix, 62.

757POETRY OF THE HEBREWS. Among the books of the Old Testament, says Bishop Lowth, there is such an apparent diversity in style, as sufficiently discovers which of them are to be considered as poetical, and which as prose. While the historical books and legislative writings of Moses are evidently prosaic compositions, the book of Job, the Psalms of David, the Song of Solomon, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, a great part of the prophetic writings, and several passages scattered occasionally through the historical books, carry the most plain and distinguishing marks of poetical writing. There is not the least reason for doubting that originally these were written in verse, or some kind of measured numbers; though, as the ancient pronunciation of the Hebrew language is now lost, we are not able to ascertain the nature of the Hebrew verse, or at most can ascertain it but imperfectly. Let any person read the historical introduction to the book of Job, contained in the first and second chapters, and then go on to Job’s speech in the beginning of the third chapter, and he cannot avoid being sensible that he passes all at once from the region of prose to that of poetry. From the earliest times music and poetry were cultivated among the Hebrews. In the days of the judges mention is made of the schools or colleges of the prophets, where one part of the employment of the persons trained in such schools was to sing the praises of God, accompanied with various instruments. But in the days of King David music and poetry were carried to the greatest height. In 1 Chron. xxv, an account is given of David’s institutions relating to the sacred music and poetry, which were certainly more costly, more splendid and magnificent, than ever obtained in the public service of any other nation. See Psalms.

The general construction of the Hebrew poetry is of a singular nature, and peculiar to itself. It consists in dividing every period into correspondent, for the most part into equal, members, which answer to one another both in sense and sound. In the first member of the period a sentiment is expressed; and in the second member the same sentiment is amplified, or is repeated in different terms, or sometimes contrasted with its opposite; but in such a manner, that the same structure, and nearly the same number of words, is preserved. This is the general strain of all the Hebrew poetry. Instances of it occur every where on opening the Old Testament. Thus, in Psalm xcvi:--

Sing unto the Lord a new song.  
Sing unto the Lord, all the earth.

Sing unto the Lord, and bless his name.  
Show forth his salvation from day to day.  
Declare his glory among the Heathen,  
His wonders among all the people.  
For the Lord is great, and greatly to be praised.  
He is to be feared above all the gods.  
Honour and majesty are before him;  
Strength and beauty are in his sanctuary.”

It is owing in a great measure to this form of composition, that our version, though in prose, retains so much of a poetical cast: for, the version being strictly word for word after the original, the form and order of the original sentence are preserved; which, by this artificial structure, this regular alternation and correspondence of parts, makes the ear sensible of a departure from the common style and tone of prose. The origin of this form of poetical composition among the Hebrews is clearly to be deduced from the manner in which their sacred hymns were wont to be sung. They were accompanied with music, and they were performed by choirs or bands of singers and musicians, who answered alternately to each other. When, for instance, one band began the hymn thus: The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice;” the chorus, or semi-chorus, took up the corresponding versicle, Let the multitude of the isles be glad thereof.” “Clouds and darkness are round about him,” sung the one; the other replied, Judgment and righteousness are the habitation of his throne.” And in this manner their poetry, when set to music, naturally divided itself into a succession of strophes and antistrophes correspondent to each other; whence it is probable the antiphon, or responsory, in the public religious service of so many Christian churches, derived its origin. The twenty-fourth Psalm, in particular, which is thought to have been composed on the great and solemn occasion of the ark of the covenant being brought back to Mount Zion, must have had a noble effect when performed after this manner, as Dr. Lowth has illustrated it. The whole people are supposed to be attending the procession. The Levites and singers, divided into their several courses, and accompanied with all their musical instruments, led the way. After the introduction to the Psalm, in the two first verses, when the procession begins to ascend the sacred mount, the question is put, as by a semi-chorus, Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord, and who shall stand in his holy place?” The response is made by the full chorus with the greatest dignity: He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul to vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.” As the procession approaches to the doors of the tabernacle, the chorus, with all their instruments, join in this exclamation: Lift up your heads, ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in.” Here the semi-chorus plainly breaks in, as with a lower voice, Who is this King of glory?” And at the moment when the ark is introduced into the tabernacle, the

response is made by the burst of the whole chorus: The Lord, strong and mighty; the Lord, mighty in battle.”

The method of composition which has been explained, by correspondent versicles being universally introduced into the hymns or musical poetry of the Jews, easily spread itself through their other poetical writings, which were not designed to be sung in alternate portions, and which, therefore, did not so much require this mode of composition. But the mode became familiar to their ears, and <sup>758</sup>carried with it a certain solemn majesty of style, particularly suited to sacred subjects. Hence, throughout the prophetic writings, we find it prevailing as much as in the Psalms of David. This form of writing is one of the great characteristics of the ancient Hebrew poetry; very different from, and even opposite to, the style of the Greek and Roman poets. Independently of this peculiar mode of construction, the sacred poetry is distinguished by the highest beauties of strong, concise, bold, and figurative expression. Conciseness and strength are two of its most remarkable characters. One might, indeed, imagine that the practice of the Hebrew poets, of always amplifying the same thought, by repetition or contrast, might tend to enfeeble their style. But they conduct themselves so as not to produce this effect. Their sentences are always short. Few superfluous words are used. The same thought is never dwelt upon long. To their conciseness and sobriety of expression their poetry is indebted for much of its sublimity; and all writers who attempt the sublime might profit much by imitating, in this respect, the style of the Old Testament.

No writings whatever abound so much with the most bold and animated figures as the sacred books. In order to do justice to these, it is necessary that we transport ourselves as much as we can into the land of Judea, and place before our eyes that scenery and those objects with which the Hebrew writers were conversant. Natural objects are in some measure common to them with poets of all ages and countries. Light and darkness, trees and flowers, the forest and the cultivated field, suggest to them many beautiful figures. But, in order to relish their figures of this kind, we must take notice that several of them arise from the particular circumstances of the land of Judea. During the summer months little or no rain falls throughout all that region. While the heats continued, the country was intolerably parched; want of water was a great distress; and a plentiful shower falling, or a rivulet breaking forth, altered the whole face of nature, and introduced much higher ideas of refreshment and pleasure than the like causes can suggest to us. Hence, to represent distress, such frequent allusions among them, to a dry and thirsty land where no water is;” and hence, to describe a change from distress to prosperity, their metaphors are founded on the falling of showers, and the bursting out of springs in the desert. Thus: The

wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. For in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert; and the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land, springs of water; in the habitation of dragons there shall be grass, with rushes and reeds," Isaiah xxxv, 1, 6, 7. Images of this nature are very familiar to Isaiah, and occur in many parts of his book. Again: as Judea was a hilly country, it was, during the rainy months, exposed to frequent inundations by the rushing of torrents, which came down suddenly from the mountains, and carried every thing before them; and Jordan, their only great river, annually overflowed its banks. Hence the frequent allusions to the noise, and to the rushings of many waters;" and hence great calamities so often compared to the overflowing torrent, which, in such a country, must have been images particularly striking: Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy water spouts; all thy waves and thy billows are gone over me," Psalm xlii, 7. The two most remarkable mountains of the country were Lebanon and Carmel; the former noted for its height, and the woods of lofty cedars that covered it; the latter, for its beauty and fertility, the richness of its vines and olives. Hence, with the greatest propriety, Lebanon is employed as an image of whatever is great, strong, or magnificent; Carmel, of what is smiling and beautiful. The glory of Lebanon shall be given to it, and the excellency of Carmel," Isaiah xxxv, 2. Lebanon is often put metaphorically for the whole state or people of Israel, for the temple, for the king of Assyria; Carmel, for the blessings of peace and prosperity. His countenance is as Lebanon," says Solomon, speaking of the dignity of a man's appearance; but when he describes female beauty, Thine head is like Mount Carmel," Cant. v, 15; vii, 5. It is farther to be remarked under this head, that, in the images of the awful and terrible kind, with which the sacred poets abound, they plainly draw their descriptions from that violence of the elements, and those great concussions of nature, with which their climate rendered them acquainted. Earthquakes were not unfrequent; and the tempests of hail, thunder, and lightning, in Judea and Arabia, accompanied with whirlwinds and darkness, far exceed any thing of that sort which happens in more temperate regions. Isaiah, xxiv, 20, describes, with great majesty, the earth, reeling to and fro like a drunkard, and removed like a cottage." And in those circumstances of terror, with which an appearance of the Almighty is described, in Psalm xviii, when his pavilion round about him was darkness; when hail stones and coals of fire were his voice; and when, at his rebuke, the channels of the waters are said to be seen, and the foundations of the hills discovered; though there may be some reference, as Dr. Lowth thinks, to the history of God's descent upon Mount Sinai; yet it seems more probable that the figures were taken directly from those commotions of nature with which the author was acquainted, and which suggested stronger and nobler images than those which now occur to us.

Beside the natural objects of their own country, we find the rites of their religion, and the arts and employments of their common life, frequently employed as grounds of imagery among the Hebrews. Hence flowed, of course, the many allusions to pastoral life, to the green pastures and the still waters," and to the care and watchfulness of a shepherd over his flock, which carry to this day so much beauty and tenderness in them, in Psalm xxiii, and in many other passages of the poetical writings of Scripture. Hence all the images founded upon rural employments, upon the wine press, the threshing floor, the stubble and the chaff. To disrelish all such images is the effect of false delicacy. Homer is at least as frequent, and much more minute and particular, in his similes, founded on what we now call low life; but, in his management of them, far inferior to the sacred writers, who generally mix with their comparisons of this kind somewhat of dignity and grandeur to ennoble them. What inexpressible grandeur does the following rural image in Isaiah, for instance, receive from the intervention of the Deity!--"The nations shall rush like the rushings of many waters; but God shall rebuke them, and they shall fly far off; and they shall be chased as the chaff of the mountain before the wind, and like the down of the thistle before the whirlwind." Figurative allusions, too, we frequently find to the rites and ceremonies of their religion, to the legal distinctions of things clean and unclean, to the mode of their temple service, to the dress of their priests, and to the most noted incidents recorded in their sacred history; as, to the destruction of Sodom, the descent of God upon Mount Sinai, and the miraculous passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea. The religion of the Hebrews included the whole of their laws and civil constitution. It was full of splendid external rites, that occupied their senses; it was connected with every part of their national history and establishment; and hence, all ideas founded on religion possessed in this nation a dignity and importance peculiar to themselves, and were uncommonly suited to impress the imagination.

From all this it results that the imagery of the sacred poets is, in a high degree, expressive and natural; it is copied directly from real objects that were before their eyes; it has this advantage, of being more complete within itself, more entirely founded on national ideas and manners, than that of the most of other poets. In reading their works we find ourselves continually in the land of Judea. The palm trees, and the cedars of Lebanon, are ever rising in our view. The face of their territory, the circumstances of their climate, the manners of the people, and the august ceremonies of their religion, constantly pass under different forms before us. The comparisons employed by the sacred poets are generally short, touching on one point only of resemblance, rather than branching out into little episodes. In this respect they have an advantage over the Greek and Roman authors; whose

comparisons, by the length to which they are extended, sometimes interrupt the narration too much, and carry too visible marks of study and labour; whereas, in the Hebrew poets, they appear more like the glowings of a lively fancy, just glancing aside to some resembling object, and presently returning to its track. Such is the following fine comparison, introduced to describe the happy influence of good government upon a people, in what are called the last words of David: He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God; and he shall be as the light of the morning when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth, by clear shining after rain," 2 Sam. xxiii, 3. This is one of the most regular and formal comparisons in the sacred books.

Allegory, likewise, is a figure frequently found in them. But the poetical figure which, beyond all others, elevates the style of Scripture, and gives it a peculiar boldness and sublimity, is prosopopœia, or personification. No personifications employed by any poets are so magnificent and striking as those of the inspired writers. On great occasions they animate every part of nature, especially when any appearance or operation of the Almighty is concerned. Before him went the pestilence." "The waters saw thee, O God, and were afraid." The mountains saw thee, and they trembled." "The overflowing of the water passed by." The deep uttered his voice, and lifted up his hands on high." When inquiry is made about the place of wisdom, Job introduces the deep, saying, It is not in me; and the sea saith, It is not in me. Destruction and death say, We have heard the fame thereof with our ears." That noted sublime passage in the book of Isaiah, which describes the fall of the king of Assyria, is full of personified objects; the fir trees and cedars of Lebanon breaking forth into exultation on the fall of the tyrant; hell from beneath stirring up all the dead to meet him at his coming; and the dead kings introduced as speaking and joining in the triumph. In the same strain are those many lively and passionate apostrophes to cities and countries, to persons and things, with which the prophetic writings every where abound. O thou sword of the Lord, how long will it be ere thou be quiet? Put thyself up into the scabbard, rest, and be still. How can it be quiet," as the reply is instantly made, seeing the Lord hath given it a charge against Askelon, and the sea shore? there hath he appointed it," Jer. xlvi, 6. In general, for it would carry us too far to enlarge upon all the instances, the style of the poetical books of the Old Testament is, beyond the style of all other poetical works, fervid, bold, and animated. It is extremely different from that regular correct expression to which our ears are accustomed in modern poetry. It is the burst of inspiration. The scenes are not coolly described, but represented as passing before our eyes. Every object and every person is addressed and spoken to, as if present. The transition is often abrupt; the connection often obscure; the persons are

often changed; figures crowded, and heaped upon one another. Bold sublimity, not correct elegance, is its character. We see the spirit of the writer raised beyond himself, and labouring to find vent for ideas too mighty for his utterance.

The several kinds of poetical composition which we find in Scripture are chiefly the 760didactic, elegiac, pastoral, and lyric. Of the didactic species of poetry, the book of Proverbs is the principal instance. The first nine chapters of that book are highly poetical, adorned with many distinguished graces, and figures of expression. The book of Ecclesiastes comes, likewise, under this head; and some of the Psalms, as the hundred and nineteenth in particular. Of elegiac poetry, many very beautiful specimens occur in Scripture; such as the lamentation of David over his friend Jonathan; several passages in the prophetic books; and several of David's Psalms, composed on occasions of distress and mourning. The forty-second Psalm, in particular, is, in the highest degree, tender and plaintive. But the most regular and perfect elegiac composition in the Scripture, perhaps in the whole world, is the Lamentations of Jeremiah. As the prophet mourns, in that book, over the destruction of the temple and the holy city, and the overthrow of the whole state, he assembles all the affecting images which a subject so melancholy could suggest. The Song of Solomon affords us a high exemplification of pastoral poetry. Considered with respect to its spiritual meaning, it is undoubtedly a mystical allegory; in its form it is a dramatic pastoral, or a perpetual dialogue between personages in the character of shepherds; and, suitably to that form, it is full of rural and pastoral images from beginning to end. Of lyric poetry, or that which is intended to be accompanied with music, the Old Testament is full. Beside a great number of hymns and songs, which we find scattered in the historical and prophetic books, such as the song of Moses, the song of Deborah, and many others of like nature, the whole book of Psalms is to be considered as a collection of sacred odes. In these we find the ode exhibited in all the varieties of its form, and supported with the highest spirit of lyric poetry; sometimes sprightly, cheerful, and triumphant; sometimes solemn and magnificent; sometimes tender and soft. From these instances it clearly appears, that there are contained in the Holy Scriptures full exemplifications of several of the chief kinds of poetical writing.

POLLUX, a tutelar deity of mariners in ancient times, Acts xxviii, 11, whose image was placed either at the prow or stern of the ship.

POMEGRANATE, רמון, Numbers xiii, 23; xx, 5; 1 Sam. xiv, 2, &c, a low tree growing very common in Palestine, and in other parts of the east. Its branches are very thick and bushy; some of them are armed with sharp



thorns. They are garnished with narrow spear-shaped leaves. Its flowers are of an elegant red colour, resembling a rose. It is chiefly valued for the fruit, which is as big as a large apple, is quite round, and has the general qualities of other summer fruits, allaying heat and quenching thirst. The high estimation in which it was held by the people of Israel, may be inferred from its being one of the three kinds of fruit brought by the spies from Eshcol to Moses and the congregation in the wilderness, Num. xiii, 23; xx, 5; and from its being specified by that rebellious people as one of the greatest luxuries which they enjoyed in Egypt, the want of which they felt so severely in the sandy desert. The pomegranate, classed by Moses with wheat and barley, vines and figs, oil olive and honey, was, in his account, one principal recommendation of the promised land, Deut. viii, 8. The form of this fruit was so beautiful, as to be honoured with a place at the bottom of the high priest's robe, Exodus xxviii, 33; Ecclus. xlv, 9; and was the principal ornament of the stately columns of Solomon's temple. The inside is full of small kernels, replenished with a generous liquor. In short there is scarcely any part of the pomegranate which does not delight and recreate the senses.

**PORTERS OF THE TEMPLE.** The Levites discharged the office of porters of the temple both day and night, and had the care both of the treasure and offerings. The office of porter was in some sort military; properly speaking, they were the soldiers of the Lord, and the guards of his house, to whose charge the several gates of the courts of the sanctuary were appointed by lot, 1 Chronicles xxvi, 1, 13, 19. They waited at every gate; and were not permitted to depart from their service," 2 Chron. xxxv, 15; and they attended by turns in their courses, as the other Levites did, 2 Chron. viii, 14. Their proper business was to open and shut the gates, and to attend at them by day, as a sort of peace officers, in order to prevent any tumult among the people; to keep strangers and the excommunicated and unclean persons, from entering into the holy court; and, in short, to prevent whatever might be prejudicial to the safety, peace, and purity of the holy place and service. They also kept guard by night about the temple and its courts; and they are said to have been twenty-four, including three priests, who stood sentry at so many different places. There was a superior officer over the whole guard, called by Maimonides, the man of the mountain of the house;" he walked the round as often as he pleased; when he passed a sentinel that was standing, he said, Peace be unto you;" but if he found one asleep, he struck him, and he had liberty to set fire to his garment. This custom may, perhaps, be alluded to in the following passage: Behold, I come as a thief," that is, unawares; blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments," Rev. xvi, 15. Psalm cxxxiv, seems to be addressed to these watchmen of the temple, who by night stand in the house of the Lord;" in

which they are exhorted to employ their waking hours in acts of praise and devotion.

POST, a messenger or regulated courier, appointed to carry with expedition the despatches of princes, or the letters of private persons in general, Job ix, 25; Jer. li, 31; 2 Chron. xxx, 6; Esther iii, 13, &c. It is thought that the use of posts is derived from the Persians. Diodorus Siculus observes, that the kings of Persia, in order to have intelligence of what was passed through all the provinces of their vast dominions, placed centinels at eminences, at convenient distances, where towers were 761 built. These centinels gave notice of public occurrences from one to another, with a very loud and shrill voice, by which news was transmitted from one extremity of the kingdom to another with great expedition. But as this could not be practised, except in the case of general news, which it was expedient that the whole nation should be acquainted with, Cyrus, as Xenophon relates, appointed couriers and places for post horses, building on purpose on all the high roads houses for the reception of the couriers, where they were to deliver their packets to the next, and so on. This they did night and day, so that no inclemency of weather was to stop them; and they are represented as moving with astonishing speed. In the judgment of many they went faster than cranes could fly. Herodotus owns, that nothing swifter was known for a journey by land. Xerxes, in his famous expedition against Greece, planted posts from the Ægean Sea to Shushan, or Susa, to send notice thither of what might happen to his army; he placed these messengers from station to station, to convey his packets, at such distances from each other as a horse might easily travel.

POTTER. Frequent mention is made of the potter in Scripture, Jer. xviii, 3; Eccclus. xxxviii, 29, 30. Homer says, that the potter turns his wheel with his hands. But at the present day, the wheel on which the work is formed is turned by another.

POTTER'S FIELD, the land that was bought with the money for which Judas sold our Saviour, Matt. xxvii, 7, 10, and which he returned. See Aeldama.

PRAYER has been well defined, the offering up of our desires unto God, for things agreeable to his will, in the name or through the mediation of Jesus Christ, by the help of the Holy Spirit, with a confession of our sins, and a thankful acknowledgment of his mercies. 1. Prayer is in itself a becoming acknowledgment of the all-sufficiency of God, and of our dependence upon him. It is his appointed means for the obtaining of both temporal and spiritual blessings. He could bless his creatures in another way: but he will be inquired of, to do for them those things of which they

stand in need, Ezek. xxxvi, 37. It is the act of an indigent creature, seeking relief from the fountain of mercy. A sense of want excites desire, and desire is the very essence of prayer. One thing have I desired of the Lord," says David: that will I seek after." Prayer without desire is like an altar without a sacrifice, or without the fire from heaven to consume it. When all our wants are supplied, prayer will be converted into praise; till then Christians must live by prayer, and dwell at the mercy seat. God alone is able to hear and to supply their every want. The revelation which he has given of his goodness lays a foundation for our asking with confidence the blessings we need, and his ability encourages us to hope for their bestowment. O thou that hearest prayer; unto thee shall all flesh come," Psalm lxxv, 2. 2. Prayer is a spiritual exercise, and can only be performed acceptably by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, Rom. viii, 26. The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord, but the prayer of the upright is his delight." The Holy Spirit is the great agent in the world of grace, and without his special influence there is no acceptable prayer. Hence he is called the Spirit of grace and of supplication: for he it is that enables us to draw nigh unto God, filling our mouth with arguments, and teaching us to order our cause before him, Zech. xii, 10. 3. All acceptable prayer must be offered in faith, or a believing frame of mind. If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering--for let not the wavering man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord," James i, 5-7. He that cometh unto God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him," Heb. xi, 6. It must be offered in the name of Christ, believing in him as revealed in the word of God, placing in him all our hope of acceptance, and exercising unfeigned confidence in his atoning sacrifice and prevalent intercession. 4. Prayer is to be offered for things agreeable to the will of God." So the Apostle says: This is the confidence that we have in him, that, if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us; and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him," 1 John v, 14, 15. Our prayers must therefore be regulated by the revealed will of God, and come within the compass of the promises. These are to be the matter and the ground of our supplications. What God has not particularly promised he may nevertheless possibly bestow; but what he has promised he will assuredly perform. Of the good things promised to Israel of old not one failed, but all came to pass; and in due time the same shall be said of all the rest. 5. All this must be accompanied with confession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of God's mercies. These are two necessary ingredients in acceptable prayer. I prayed," says the Prophet Daniel, and made confession." Sin is a burden, of which confession unloads the soul. Father," said the returning prodigal, I have sinned against Heaven and in thy sight." Thanksgiving is also as necessary as confession; by the one we

take shame to ourselves; by the other, we give glory to God. By the one, we abase the creature; by the other we exalt the Creator. In petitioning favours from God, we act like dependent creatures; in confession, like sinners; but in thanksgiving, like angels.

The reason on which this great and efficacious duty rests, has been a subject of some debate. On this point, however, we have nothing stated in the Scriptures. From them we learn only, that God has appointed it; that he enjoins it to be offered in faith, that is, faith in Christ, whose atonement is the meritorious and procuring cause of all the blessings to which our desires can be directed; and that prayer so offered is an indispensable condition of our obtaining the blessings for which we ask. As a matter of inference, however, we may discover some glimpses of the reason in the divine Mind on which its appointment rests. That reason has sometimes been said to be the moral preparation and state of fitness produced in the soul for the reception of the divine mercies which the act and, more especially the habit of prayer must induce. Against this stands the strong, and, in a Scriptural view, fatal objection, that an efficiency is thus ascribed to the mere act of a creature to produce those great, and, in many respects, radical changes in the character of man, which we are taught, by inspired authority, to refer to the direct influences of the Holy Spirit. What is it that fits man for forgiveness, but simply repentance? Yet that is expressly said to be the gift of Christ, and supposes strong operations of the illuminating and convincing Spirit of truth, the Lord and Giver of spiritual life; and if the mere acts and habit of prayer had efficiency enough to produce a Scriptural repentance, then every formalist attending with ordinary seriousness to his devotions must, in consequence, become a penitent. Again: if we pray for spiritual blessings aright, that is, with an earnestness of desire which arises from a due apprehension of their importance, and a preference of them to all earthly good, who does not see that this implies such a deliverance from the earthly and carnal disposition which characterizes our degenerate nature, that an agency far above our own, however we may employ it, must be supposed? or else, if our own prayers could be efficient up to this point, we might, by the continual application of this instrument, complete our regeneration, independent of that grace of God, which, after all, this theory brings in. It may indeed be said, that the grace of God operates by our prayers to produce in us a state of moral fitness to receive the blessings we ask. But this gives up the point contended for, the moral efficiency of prayer; and refers the efficiency to another agent working by our prayers as an instrument. Still, however, it may be affirmed, that the Scriptures nowhere represent prayer as an instrument for improving our moral state, in any other way than as the means of bringing into the soul new supplies of spiritual life and strength. It is therefore more properly to be considered as a condition of our

obtaining that grace by which such effects are wrought, than as the instrument by which it effects them. In fact, all genuine acts of prayer depend upon a grace previously bestowed, and from which alone the disposition and the power to pray proceed. So it was said of Saul of Tarsus, Behold, he prayeth!" He prayed in fact then for the first time; but that was in consequence of the illumination of his mind as to his spiritual danger, effected by the miracle on the way to Damascus, and the grace of God which accompanied the miracle. Nor does the miraculous character of the means by which conviction was produced in his mind, affect the relevancy of this to ordinary cases. By whatever means God may be pleased to fasten the conviction of our spiritual danger upon our minds, and to awaken us out of the long sleep of sin, that conviction must precede real prayer, and comes from the influence of his grace, rendering the means of conviction effectual. Thus it is not the prayer which produces the conviction, but the conviction which gives birth to the prayer; and if we pursue the matter into its subsequent stages, we shall come to the same result. We pray for what we feel we want; that is, for something not in our possession; we obtain this either by impartation from God, to whom we look up as the only Being able to bestow the good for which we ask him; or else we obtain it, according to this theory, by some moral efficiency being given to the exercise of prayer to work it in us. Now, the latter hypothesis is in many cases manifestly absurd. We ask for pardon of sin, for instance; but this is an act of God done for us, quite distinct from any moral change which prayer may be said to produce in us, whatever efficiency we may ascribe to it; for no such change in us can be pardon, since that must proceed from the party offended. We ask for increase of spiritual strength; and prayer is the expression of that want. But if it supply this want by its own moral efficiency, it must supply it in proportion to its intensity and earnestness; which intensity and earnestness can only be called forth by the degree in which the want is felt, so that the case supposed is contradictory and absurd, as it makes the sense of want to be in proportion to the supply which ought to abate or remove it. And if it be urged, that prayer at least produces in us a fitness for the supply of spiritual strength, because it is excited by a sense of our wants, the answer is, that the fitness contended for consists in that sense of want itself which must be produced in us by the previous agency of grace, or we should never pray for supplies. There is, in fact, nothing in prayer simply which appears to have any adaptation, as an instrument, to effect a moral change in man, although it should be supposed to be made use of by the influence of the Holy Spirit. The word of God is properly an instrument, because it contains the doctrine which that Spirit explains and applies, and the motives to faith and obedience which he enforces upon the conscience and affections; and although prayer brings these truths and motives before us, prayer cannot properly be said to be an instrument of our regeneration, because that which is thus brought

by prayer to bear upon our case is the word of God itself introduced into our prayers, which derive their sole influence in that respect from that circumstance. Prayer simply is the application of an insufficient to a sufficient Being for the good which the former cannot otherwise obtain, and which the latter only can supply; and as that supply is dependent upon prayer, and in the nature of the thing consequent, prayer can in no good sense be said to be the instrument of supplying our wants, or fitting us for their supply, except relatively, as a mere condition appointed by the Donor.

If we must inquire into the reason of the appointment of prayer, and it can scarcely be considered as a purely arbitrary institution, that reason seems to be, the preservation in the minds of men of a solemn and impressive sense of God's agency in the world, and the dependence of all creatures upon him. Perfectly pure and glorified beings, no longer in a state of probation, and therefore exposed to no temptations, may not need this institution; but men in their fallen state are constantly prone to forget God; to rest in the agency of second causes; and to build upon a sufficiency in themselves. This is at once a denial to God of the glory which he rightly claims, and a destructive delusion to creatures, who, in forsaking God as the object of their constant affiance, trust but in broken reeds, and attempt to drink from broken cisterns which can hold no water." It is then equally in mercy to us, as in respect to his own honour and acknowledgment, that the divine Being has suspended so many of his blessings, and those of the highest necessity to us, upon the exercise of prayer; an act which acknowledges his uncontrollable agency, and the dependence of all creatures upon him; our insufficiency, and his fulness; and lays the foundation of that habit of gratitude and thanksgiving which is at once so meliorating to our own feelings, and so conducive to a cheerful obedience to the will of God. And if this reason for the injunction of prayer is nowhere in Scripture stated in so many words, it is a principle uniformly supposed as the foundation of the whole scheme of religion which they have revealed.

To this duty objections have been sometimes offered, at which it may be well at least to glance. One has been grounded upon a supposed predestination of all things which come to pass; and the argument is, that as this established predetermination of all things cannot be altered, prayer, which supposes that God will depart from it, is vain and useless. The answer which a pious predestinarian would give to this objection is, that the argument drawn from the predestination of God lies with the same force against every other human effort, as against prayer; and that as God's predetermination to give food to man does not render the cultivation of the earth useless and impertinent, so neither does the predestination of things

shut out the necessity and efficacy of prayer. It would also be urged, that God has ordained the means as well as the end; and although he is an unchangeable Being, it is a part of the unchangeable system which he has established, that prayer shall be heard and accepted. Those who have not these views of predestination will answer the objection differently; for if the premises of such a predestination as is assumed by the objection, and conceded in the answer, be allowed, the answer is unsatisfactory. The Scriptures represent God, for instance, as purposing to inflict a judgment upon an individual or a nation, which purpose is often changed by prayer. In this case either God's purpose must be denied, and then his threatenings are reduced to words without meaning; or the purpose must be allowed; in which case either prayer breaks in upon predestination, if understood absolutely, or it is vain and useless. To the objection so drawn out it is clear that no answer is given by saying that the means as well as the end are predestinated, since prayer in such cases is not a means to the end, but an instrument of thwarting it; or is a means to one end in opposition to another end, which, if equally predestinated with the same absoluteness, is a contradiction. The true answer is, that although God has absolutely predetermined some things, there are others which respect his government of free and accountable agents, which he has but conditionally predetermined. The true immutability of God consists, not in his adherence to his purposes, but in his never changing the principles of his administration; and he may therefore, in perfect accordance with his preordination of things, and the immutability of his nature, purpose to do, under certain conditions dependent upon the free agency of man, what he will not do under others; and for this reason, that an immutable adherence to the principles of a wise, just, and gracious government requires it. Prayer is in Scripture made one of these conditions; and if God has established it as one of the principles of his moral government to accept prayer, in every case in which he has given us authority to ask, he has not, we may be assured, entangled his actual government of the world with the bonds of such an eternal predestination of particular events, as either to reduce prayer to a mere form of words, or not to be able himself, consistently with his decrees, to answer it, whenever it is encouraged by his express engagements.

A second objection is, that as God is infinitely wise and good, his wisdom and justice will lead him to bestow whatever is fit for us without praying; and if any thing be not fit for us, we cannot obtain it by praying." To this Dr. Paley very well replies, that it may be agreeable to perfect wisdom to grant that to our prayers which it would not have been agreeable to the same wisdom to have given us without praying for." This, independent of the question of the authority of the Scriptures which explicitly enjoin prayer, is the best answer which can be given to the objection; and it is no

small confirmation of it, that it is obvious to every reflecting man, that for God to withhold favours till asked for, tends," as the same writer observes, to encourage devotion among his rational creatures, and to keep up and circulate a knowledge and sense of their dependency upon him." But it is urged, God will always do what is best from the moral perfection of his nature, whether we pray or not." This objection, however, supposes that there is but one mode of acting for the best, and that the divine will is necessarily determined to that mode only; both which positions," says Paley, 764presume a knowledge of universal nature, much beyond what we are capable of attaining." It is, indeed, a very unsatisfactory mode of speaking, to say, God will always do what is best; since we can conceive him capable in all cases of doing what is still better for the creature, and also that the creature is capable of receiving more and more from his infinite fulness for ever. All that can be rationally meant by such a phrase is, that, in the circumstances of the case, God will always do what is most consistent with his own wisdom, holiness, and goodness; but then the disposition to pray, and the act of praying, add a new circumstance to every case, and often bring many other new circumstances along with them. It supposes humility, contrition, and trust, on the part of the creature; and an acknowledgment of the power and compassion of God, and of the merit of the atonement of Christ: all which are manifestly new positions, so to speak, of the circumstances of the creature, which, upon the very principle of the objection, rationally understood, must be taken into consideration.

But if the efficacy of prayer as to ourselves be granted, its influence upon the case of others is said to be more difficult to conceive. This may be allowed without at all affecting the duty. Those who bow to the authority of the Scriptures will see, that the duty of praying for ourselves and for others rests upon the same divine appointment; and to those who ask for the reason of such intercession in behalf of others, it is sufficient to reply, that the efficacy of prayer being established in one case, there is the same reason to conclude that our prayers may benefit others, as any other effort we may use. It can only be by divine appointment that one creature is made dependent upon another for any advantage, since it was doubtless in the power of the Creator to have rendered each independent of all but himself. Whatever reason, therefore, might lead him to connect and interweave the interests of one man with the benevolence of another, will be the leading reason for that kind of mutual dependence which is implied in the benefit of mutual prayer. Were it only that a previous sympathy, charity, and good will, are implied in the duty, and must, indeed, be cultivated in order to it, and be strengthened by it, the wisdom and benevolence of the institution would, it is presumed, be apparent to every well constituted mind. That all prayer for others must proceed upon a less perfect knowledge of them than we have of ourselves, is certain; that all our petitions must be, even in our



own mind, more conditional than those which respect ourselves, though many of these must be subjected to the principles of a general administration, which we but partially apprehend; and that all spiritual influences upon others, when they are subject to our prayers, will be understood by us as liable to the control of their free agency, must also be conceded; and, therefore, when others are concerned, our prayers may often be partially or wholly fruitless. He who believes the Scriptures will, however, be encouraged by the declaration that the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man," for his fellow creatures, availeth much;" and he who demands something beyond mere authoritative declaration, as he cannot deny that prayer is one of those instruments by which another may be benefited, must acknowledge that, like the giving of counsel, it may be of great utility in some cases, although it should fail in others; and that as no man can tell how much good counsel may influence another, or in many cases say whether it has ultimately failed or not, so it is with prayer. It is a part of the divine plan, as revealed in his word, to give many blessings to man independent of his own prayers, leaving the subsequent improvement of them to himself. They are given in honour of the intercession of Christ, man's great Advocate;" and they are given, subordinately, in acceptance of the prayers of Christ's church, and of righteous individuals. And when many or few devout individuals become thus the instruments of good to communities, or to whole nations, there is no greater mystery in this than in the obvious fact, that the happiness or misery of large masses of mankind is often greatly affected by the wisdom or the errors, the skill or the incompetence, the good or the bad conduct, of a few persons, and often of one.

PREACHING is the discoursing publicly on any religious subject. From the sacred records, says Robert Robinson, we learn that when men began to associate for the purpose of worshipping the Deity, Enoch prophesied, Jude 14, 15. We have a very short account of this prophet and his doctrine; enough, however, to convince us that he taught the principal truths of natural and revealed religion. Conviction of sin was in his doctrine, and communion with God was exemplified in his conduct, Gen. v, 24; Heb. xi, 5, 6. From the days of Enoch to the time of Moses, each patriarch worshipped God with his family: probably several assembled at new moons, and alternately instructed the whole company. Noah," it is said, was a preacher of righteousness," 1 Peter iii, 19, 20; 2 Peter ii, 5. Abraham commanded his household after him to keep the way of the Lord, and to do justice and judgment, Gen. xviii, 19; and Jacob, when his house lapsed to idolatry, remonstrated against it, and exhorted all them that were with him to put away the strange gods, and go up with him to Bethel, Gen. xxxv, 2, 3. Melchisedec, also, we may consider as the father, the priest, and the

prince, of his people; publishing the glad tidings of peace and salvation, Gen. xiv; Heb. vii.

Moses was a most eminent prophet and preacher, raised up by the authority of God, and by whom, it was said, came the law, John i, 17. This great man had much at heart the promulgation of his doctrine: he directed it to be inscribed on pillars, to be transcribed in books, and to be taught both in public and private by word of mouth, Deut. iv, 9; vi, 9; xvii, 18; xxvii, 8; xxxi, 19; Num. v, 23. He himself set the example of each; and how he and Aaron preached, we may see by several parts of his writings. The first discourse was heard with profound reverence and attention; the last was both uttered and received with raptures, Exod. iv, 31; Deut. xxxiii, 7, 8, &c. Public preaching does not appear under this economy to have been attached to the priesthood: priests were not officially preachers; and we have innumerable instances of discourses delivered in assemblies by men of other tribes beside that of Levi, Psalm lxviii, 11. Joshua was an Ephraimite; but, being full of the spirit of wisdom, he gathered the tribes to Shechem, and harangued the people of God, Deut. xxxiv, 9; Joshua xxiv. Solomon was a prince of the house of Judah; Amos, a herdsman of Tekoa; yet both were preachers, and one at least was a prophet, 1 Kings ii; Amos vii, 14, 15. When the ignorant notions of Pagans, the vices of their practice, and the idolatry of their pretended worship, were in some sad periods incorporated into the Jewish religion by the princes of that nation, the prophets and all the seers protested against this apostasy; and they were persecuted for so doing. Shemaiah preached to Rehoboam, the princes, and all the people at Jerusalem, 2 Chron. xii, 5; Azariah and Hanani preached to Asa and his army, 2 Chron. xv, 1; xvi, 7; Micaiah, to Ahab. Some of them opened schools, or houses of instruction; and there to their disciples they taught the pure religion of Moses. At Naioth, in the suburbs of Ramah, there was one where Samuel dwelt; and there was one at Jericho, and a third at Bethel, to which Elijah and Elisha often resorted. Thither the people went on Sabbath days and at new moons, and received public lessons of piety and morality, 1 Sam. xix, 18; 2 Kings ii, 2, 5; iv, 2, 3. Through all this period, however, there was a dismal confusion of the useful ordinance of public preaching. Sometimes they had no open vision, and the word of the Lord was precious, or scarce; the people heard it only now and then. At other times they were left without a teaching priest, and without law. And at other seasons again, itinerants, both princes, priests, and Levites, were sent through all the country, to carry the book of the law, and to teach in the cities. In a word, preaching flourished when pure religion grew; and when the last decayed, the first was suppressed. Moses had not appropriated preaching to any order of men: persons, places, times, and manners, were all left open and discretionary. Many of the discourses were preached in camps and courts, in streets, schools, cities, villages;

sometimes, with great composure and coolness; at other times, with vehement action and rapturous energy; sometimes, in a plain, blunt style; at other times, in all the magnificent pomp of eastern allegory. On some occasions, the preachers appeared in public with visible signs, with implements of war, with yokes of slavery, or something adapted to their subject. They gave lectures on these, held them up to view, girded them on, broke them in pieces, rent their garments, rolled in the dust, and endeavoured, by all the methods they could devise, agreeably to the customs of their country, to impress the minds of their auditors with the nature and importance of their doctrines. These men were highly esteemed by the pious part of the nation; and princes thought proper to keep seers and others who were scribes, who read and expounded the law, 2 Chron. xxxiv, 29, 30; xxxv, 15. Hence, false prophets, bad men, who found their account in pretending to be good, crowded the courts of princes. Jezebel, an idolatress, had four hundred prophets of Baal; and Ahab, a pretended worshipper of Jehovah, had as many pretended prophets of his own profession, 2 Chron. xviii, 5.

When the Jews were carried captive into Babylon, the prophets who were with them inculcated the principles of religion, and endeavoured to possess their minds with an aversion to idolatry; and, to the success of preaching, we may attribute the re-conversion of the Jews to the belief and worship of one God; a conversion that remains to this day. The Jews have since fallen into horrid crimes; but they have never since this period lapsed into gross idolatry, Hosea ii, iii; Ezekiel ii, iii, xxxiv. There were not wanting, however, multitudes of false prophets among them, whose characters are strikingly delineated by the true prophets, and which the reader may see in Ezek. xiii; Isa. lvi; Jer. xxiii. When the seventy years of the captivity were expired, the good prophets and preachers, Zerubbabel, Joshua, Haggai, and others, having confidence in the word of God, and being concerned to possess their natural, civil, and religious rights, endeavoured, by all means, to extricate themselves and their countrymen from that mortifying state into which the crimes of their ancestors had brought them. They wept, fasted, prayed, preached, prophesied, and at length prevailed. The chief instruments were Nehemiah and Ezra; the former was governor, and reformed the civil state; the latter was a scribe of the law of the God of heaven, and applied himself to ecclesiastical matters, in which he rendered the noblest service to his country, and to all posterity. He collected and collated MSS. of the sacred writings, and arranged and published the books of the holy canon in their present form. To this he added a second work, as necessary as the former: he revised and new modelled public teaching, and exemplified his plan in his own person. The Jews had almost lost, in the seventy years' captivity, their original language; that was now become dead; and they spoke a jargon made up of their own language and that of

the Chaldeans, and other nations, with whom they had been mingled. Formerly, preachers had only explained subjects: now they were obliged to explain words; words which, in the sacred code, were become obsolete, equivocal, or dead. Houses were now opened, not for ceremonial worship, as sacrificing, for this was confined to the temple; but for moral and religious instruction, as praying, preaching, reading the law, divine worship, and social duties. These houses were called synagogues: the people repaired thither for morning and evening prayer; and on Sabbaths and festivals, the law was read and expounded to them. We have a short but beautiful description of the manner of Ezra's first preaching, Neh. viii. Upward of fifty thousand people assembled in a street, or large square, near the water gate. It was early in the morning of a Sabbath day. A pulpit of wood, in the fashion of a small tower, was placed there on purpose for the preacher; and this turret was supported by a scaffold, or temporary gallery, where, in a wing on the right hand of the pulpit, sat six of the principal preachers; and in another on the left, seven. Thirteen other principal teachers, and many Levites, were present also, on scaffolds erected for the purpose, alternately to officiate. When Ezra ascended the pulpit, he produced and opened the book of the law, and the whole congregation instantly rose up from their seats, and stood. Then he offered up prayer and praise to God. The people bowing their heads and worshipping the Lord with their faces to the ground; and at the close of the prayer, with uplifted hands, they solemnly pronounced, Amen! Amen!" Then all standing, Ezra, assisted at times by the Levites, read the law distinctly, gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading. The sermons delivered so affected the hearers, that they wept excessively; and about noon the sorrow became so exuberant and immeasurable, that it was thought necessary by the governor, the preacher, and the Levites, to restrain it. Go your way," said they, eat the fat, and drink the sweet, send portions to them for whom nothing is prepared." The wise and benevolent sentiments of these noble souls were imbibed by the whole congregation, and fifty thousand troubled hearts were calmed in a moment. Home they returned, to eat, to drink, to send portions, and rejoice, because they had understood the words that were declared unto them. Plato was living at this time, teaching dull philosophy to cold academics; but what was he, and what was Xenophon, or Demosthenes, or any of the Pagan orators, in comparison with these men? From this period to that of the appearance of Jesus Christ, public preaching was universal; synagogues were multiplied, vast numbers attended, and elders and rulers were appointed for the purpose of order and instruction.

The most celebrated preacher that arose before the appearance of Jesus Christ was John the Baptist. He was commissioned from heaven to be the harbinger of the Messiah. His subjects were few, plain, and important. His

style was vehement, his images bold, his deportment solemn, his action eager, and his morals strict. But this bright morning star gave way to the illustrious Sun of Righteousness, who now arose on a benighted world. Jesus Christ certainly was the Prince of teachers. Who but can admire the simplicity and majesty of his style, the beauty of his images, the alternate softness and severity of his address, the choice of his subjects, the gracefulness of his deportment, and the indefatigableness of his zeal? Let the reader charm and solace himself in the study and contemplation of the character, excellency, and dignity of this divine teacher, as he will find them delineated in the evangelists.

The Apostles copied their divine Master. They formed multitudes of religious societies, and were abundantly successful in their labours. They confined their attention to religion, and left the schools to dispute, and politicians to intrigue. The doctrines they preached they supported entirely by evidence; and neither had nor required such assistance as human laws or worldly policy, the eloquence of schools or the terror of arms, could afford them.

The Apostles being dead, every thing came to pass as they had foretold; the whole Christian system, in time, underwent a miserable change; preaching shared the fate of other institutions, and the glory of the primitive church gradually degenerated. Those writers whom we call the fathers, however, held up to view by some as models for imitation, do not deserve that indiscriminate praise ascribed to them. Christianity, it is true, is found in their writings; but how sadly incorporated with Pagan philosophy and Jewish allegory! It must, indeed, be allowed, that, in general, the simplicity of Christianity was maintained, though under gradual decay, during the first three centuries. The next five centuries produced many pious and excellent preachers, both in the Latin and Greek church, though the doctrine continued to degenerate. The Greek pulpit was adorned with some eloquent orators. Basil, bishop of Cæsarea, John Chrysostom, preacher at Antioch, and afterward patriarch, as he was called, of Constantinople, and Gregory Nazianzen, who all flourished in the fourth century, seem to have led the fashion of preaching in the Greek church; Jerom and Augustine did the same in the Latin church. The first preachers differed much in pulpit action; the greater part used very moderate and sober gestures. They delivered their sermons all extempore, while there were notaries who took down what they said. Sermons in those days were all in the vulgar tongue: the Greeks preached in Greek, the Latins in Latin. They did not preach by the clock, so to speak, but were short or long as they saw occasion; though an hour was about the usual time. Sermons were generally both preached and heard standing; but sometimes both speaker and auditors sat, especially the aged and the infirm. The fathers were fond of allegory; for Origen, that

everlasting allegorizer, had set them the example. Before preaching, the preacher usually went into a vestry to pray, and afterward to speak to such as came to salute him. He prayed with his eyes shut in the pulpit. The first word the preacher uttered to the people when he ascended the pulpit was, "Peace be with you;" or, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you all;" to whom the assembly first added, "Amen," and in after times they answered, "And with thy spirit." Degenerate, however, as these days were, in comparison of those of the Apostles, yet they were golden ages in comparison with the times that followed, when metaphysical reasoning, mystical divinity, yea, Aristotelian categories, and reading the lives of saints, were substituted in the place of sermons. The pulpit became a stage where ludicrous priests obtained the vulgar laugh by the lowest kind of wit, especially at the festivals of Christmas and Easter.

But the glorious Reformation was the offspring of preaching, by which mankind were reformed; there was a standard, and the religion of the times was put to the trial by it. The avidity of the common people to read the Scriptures, and to hear them expounded, was wonderful; and the papists were so fully convinced of the benefits of frequent public instruction, that they, who were justly called unpreaching prelates, and whose pulpits to use an expression of Latimer, had been bells without clappers" for many a long year, were obliged for shame to set up regular preaching again. The church of Rome has produced some great preachers since the Reformation, but none equal to the reformed preachers. And a question naturally arises here, which it would be unpardonable to pass over in silence, concerning the singular effect of the preaching of the reformed, which was general, national, universal reformation. In the dark times of popery there had arisen now and then some famous popular preachers, who had zealously inveighed against the vices of the times, and whose sermons had produced sudden and amazing effects on their auditors; but all these effects had died away with the preachers who had produced them, and all things had gone back into their old state. Law, learning, commerce, society at large had not been improved. Here a new scene opens; preachers arise less popular, perhaps less indefatigable and exemplary; their sermons produce less striking immediate effects; and yet their auditors go away and agree by whole nations to reform. Jerom Savonarola, Jerom Narni, Capistran, Connecte, and many others, had produced, by their sermons, great immediate effects. When Connecte preached, the ladies lowered their head dresses, and committed quilled caps by hundreds to the flames. When Narni taught the people in lent, from the pulpits of Rome, half the city went from his sermons crying along the streets, "Lord, have mercy upon us;" so that in only one passion week, two thousand crowns' worth of ropes were sold to make scourges with; and when he preached before the pope to the

cardinals and bishops, and painted the sin of non-residence in its own colours, he frightened thirty or forty bishops, who heard him, home to their dioceses. In the pulpit of the university of Salamanca, he induced eight hundred students to quit all worldly prospects of honour, riches, and pleasure, and to become penitents in divers monasteries. We know the fate of Savonarola, and others might be added; but all lamented the momentary duration of the effects produced by their labours. Narni himself was so disgusted with his office, that he renounced preaching, and shut himself up in his cell to mourn over his irreclaimable contemporaries; for bishops went back to the court, and rope makers lay idle again.

Our reformers taught all the good doctrines which had been taught by these men, and they added two or three more, by which they laid the axe to the root of the apostasy, and produced general reformation. Instead of appealing to popes and canons, and founders and fathers, they only quoted them, and referred their auditors to the Holy Scriptures for law. Pope Leo X. did not know this when he told Prierio, who complained of Luther's heresy, Friar Martin has a fine genius." They also taught the people what little they knew of Christian liberty; and so led them into a belief that they might follow their own ideas in religion, without the consent of a confessor, a diocesan, a pope, or a council. They went farther, and laid the stress of all religion on justifying faith.

Since the reformers we have had multitudes who have entered into their views with disinterestedness and success; and in the present times, both in the church and among other religious societies, names might be mentioned which would do honour to any nation; for though there are too many who do not fill up that important station with proportionate piety and talents, yet we have men who are conspicuous for their extent of knowledge, depth of experience, originality of thought, fervency of zeal, consistency of deportment, and great usefulness in the Christian church.

The preceding sketch will show how mighty an agent preaching has been in all ages, in raising, and maintaining, and reviving the spirit of religion. Wherever it has had this power, let it however be remarked, it has consisted in the declaration, the proclamation, of the truth of God, as contained in his early revelations to man, and afterward embodied in the Holy Scriptures. The effect too has been produced by preachers living themselves under the influence of this truth, and filled with faith and the Holy Ghost," depending wholly upon God's blessing for success, and going forth in his name, with ardent longing to win souls," and to build up the church in knowledge and holiness. For preaching is not a profession; but a work of divine appointment, to be rightly discharged only by him who receives a

commission from God, and fulfils it as under his eye, and in dependence upon his promise, Lo, I am with you alway.”

PREDESTINATION, according to some, is a judgment, or decree of God, by which he has resolved, from all eternity, to save a certain number of persons, hence named elect. Others define it, a decree to give faith in Jesus Christ to a certain number of men, and to leave the rest to their own malice and hardness of heart. A third, more Scripturally, God’s eternal purpose to save all that truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel,”--according to the Apostle Paul, Whom he did foreknow” as believers them he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son;” to his moral image here, and to the image of his glorified humanity in heaven. According to the Calvinistical scheme, the reason of God’s predestinating some to everlasting life is not founded in a foresight of their faith and obedience; nevertheless, it is also maintained on this scheme, that the means are decreed as well as the end, and that God purposes to save none but such as by his grace he shall prepare for salvation by sanctification. The Remonstrants define predestination to be God’s decree to save believers, and condemn unbelievers. Some represent the election and predestination spoken of in Scripture, as belonging only to nations, or, at least, bodies of men, and not to particular persons. The greatest difficulties with which the modern theology is clogged turn on predestination; both the Romish and Reformed churches are divided about it; the Lutherans speak of it with horror; the Calvinists contend for it with the greatest zeal; the Molinists and Jesuits preach it down as a most dangerous doctrine; the Jansenists assert it as an article of faith; the Arminians, Remonstrants, and many others, are all avowed enemies of absolute predestination. Those strenuous patrons of Jansenism, the Port-royalists, taught, that God predestinates those whom he foresees will coöperate with his grace to the end. Dupin adds, that men do not fall into sin because not predestinated to life, but they are not predestinated because God foresaw their sins. See Calvinism.

This doctrine has been already treated of. We shall here therefore merely subjoin a sketch of its history previous to the Reformation. The apostolic fathers, men little accustomed to the intricacy of metaphysical disquisition, deeply impressed with the truth of the Gospel, powerfully influenced by its spirit, and from their particular situation naturally dwelling much upon it as a system of direction and consolation, do not, in their writings, at all advert to the origin of evil, or to predestination, so closely allied to it. They press, with much earnestness, upon those in whom they were interested the vast importance of practical holiness, exhibit the motives which appeared to them calculated to secure it, and represent the blessedness which awaits good men, and the condemnation reserved for the wicked; but they do not



once attempt to determine whether the sin which they were solicitous to remove could be accounted for, in consistency with the essential holiness and the unbounded mercy of the Deity. In short, they just took that view of this subject which every man takes when he is not seeking to enter into philosophical disquisition; never for one moment doubting that whatever is wrong was ultimately to be referred to man, and that the economy of grace proceeding from God was the most convincing proof of the tenderness of his compassion for mankind.

When, however, the church received within its communion those who had been educated in the schools of philosophy, and to whom the question as to the origin of evil must, while they frequented these schools, have become familiar, it was not to be supposed that, even although they were convinced that we should be chiefly solicitous about the formation of the Christian character, there would be no allusion to what had formerly interested them, or that they would refrain from delivering their sentiments upon it. Agreeably to this, we find, in the works of Justin Martyr, Tatian, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen, sufficient intimations that they had directed their attention to the difficulty now under review; and that, whether upon adequate grounds or not, they had come to a decision as to the way in which it should be explained consistently with the divine perfections. It is evident that they did not investigate the subject to the depth to which it is requisite for the full discussion of it to go; and that various questions which must be put before it can be brought completely before us, they either did not put, or hastily regarded as of very little moment: but it is enough to dwell upon the fact, that they did employ their thoughts upon it, and have so expressed themselves as to leave no doubt of the light in which it was contemplated by them. Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho, remarks that “they who were foreknown as to become wicked, whether angels or men, did so not from any fault of God, ἀτιμία τοῦ Θεοῦ, but from their own blame;” by which observation he shows it to have been his opinion that God foresaw in what manner his intelligent creatures would act; but that this did not affect their liberty, and did not diminish their guilt. A little after he says more fully, that God created angels and men free to the practice of righteousness, having planted in them reason, through which they knew by whom they were created and through whom they existed, when before they were not, and who prescribed to them a law by which they were to be judged, if they acted contrary to right reason. Wherefore, we, angels and men, are through ourselves convicted as being wicked, if we do not lay hold of repentance. But if the Logos of God foretels that some angels and men would go to be punished, he does so because he foreknew that they would certainly become wicked by no means, however, because God made them such.” Justin thus admits that man is wholly dependent upon God, deriving existence and every thing

which he has from the Almighty; but he is persuaded that we were perfectly able to retain our integrity, and that, although it was foreseen that we should not do so, this did not abridge our moral power, or fix any imputation on the Deity in consequence of our transgression. Tatian, in his oration against the Greeks, an excellent work which, although composed after the death of Justin, was written, in all probability, before its author had adopted the wild opinions which he defended toward the conclusion of his life, expresses very much the same sentiments avowed by Justin. He says, Both men and angels were created free, so that man becoming wicked through his own fault may be deservedly punished, while a good man, who, from the right exercise of his free will, does not transgress the law of God, is entitled to praise; that the power of the divine Logos having in himself the knowledge of what was to happen, not through fate or unavoidable necessity, but from free choice, predicted future things, condemning the wicked and praising the righteous.”

Irenæus, in the third book of his work against heresies, has taken an opportunity to state his notions about the origin of evil. The seventy-first chapter of that book is entitled, A proof that man is free, and has power to this extent, that of himself he can choose what is good or the contrary.” In illustration of this he remarks, God gave to man the power of election as he did to the angels. They, therefore, who do not obey are justly not found with the good, and receive deserved punishment, because God having given them what was good, they did not keep it, but despised the riches of the divine mercy.” The next chapter is entitled, A proof that some men are not good by nature, and others wicked, and that what is good is within the choice of man.” In treating on this subject, Irenæus observes, that if the reverse were the case, the good would not merit praise nor the wicked blame, because being merely what, without any will of theirs, they had been made, they could not be considered as voluntary agents. But,” he adds, since all have the same nature, and are able to retain and to do what is good, and may, on the other hand, lose it and not do it, some are, even in the sight of men, and much more in that of God, deservedly praised and others blamed.” In support of this he introduces a great variety of passages from Scripture. It appears, however, that the real difficulty attending the subject had suggested itself to his mind; for he inquires in the seventy-third chapter, why God had not from the beginning made man perfect, all things being possible to him. He gives to this question a metaphysical and unsatisfactory answer, but which so far satisfied himself as to convince him that there could not, on this ground, be any imputation justly cast on the perfections of the Almighty, and that, consequently, a sufficient explanation of the origin of evil and of the justice of punishing it, was to be found in the nature of man as a free agent, or in the abuse of that liberty with which man had been endowed. Tertullian had also speculated upon

the moral condition of man, and has recorded his sentiments with respect to it. He explicitly asserts the freedom of the will; lays down the position, that, if this be denied, there can be neither reward nor punishment; and, in answer to an objection, that since free will has been productive of such melancholy consequences, it would have been better that it had not been bestowed, he enters into a formal vindication of this part of our constitution. In reply to another suggestion, that God might have interposed to prevent the choice which was to be productive of sin and misery, he maintains that this could not have been done without destroying that admirable constitution by which alone the interests of virtue can be really promoted. He thus thought that sin was to be imputed wholly to man, and that it was perfectly consistent with the attributes of God, or rather illustrated these attributes, that there should be a system under which sin was possible, because without this possibility there could have been no accountable agents.

From what has been stated on this subject, it seems unquestionable that the apostolic fathers did not at all enter upon the subject of the origin of evil; that the writers by whom they were succeeded were satisfied that, in the sense in which the term is now most commonly used, there was no such thing as predestination; that they uniformly represented the destiny of man as regulated by the use or abuse of his free will; that, with the exception of Irenæus, they did not attempt to explain why such a creature as man, who was to fall into sin, was created by a Being of infinite goodness; that the sole objection to their doctrine seemed to them to be, that prescience was incompatible with liberty, and that, when they answered this, they considered that nothing more was requisite for receiving, without hesitation, the view of man upon which they often and fondly dwelt, as a free and accountable agent, who might have held fast his integrity, and whose fall from that integrity was to be ascribed solely to himself, as it did not at all result from any appointment of the supreme Being.

Although opinions respecting original sin, directly tending to a very different view of the subject than had been previously taken, had been stated by Cyprian, yet a thorough investigation of it, and the sentiments which afterward were widely received in the Christian church, took their rise from the discussions to which the Pelagian controversy gave occasion. Previous to the part which Augustine took in that controversy, he seems to have been very much of the same sentiments with Origen and the other early fathers. But, either from what he considered as a more deliberate and complete examination of Scripture, or from perceiving the necessity imposed on him, in consequence of some of the positions which he had laid down in his writings against Pelagius, he soon changed his opinion, and advanced a notion more in harmony with these positions. Having to

show the absolute necessity of divine grace, he inculcated that, in consequence of original sin, man was infallibly determined to evil, and was therefore in a state of condemnation, and he thus took away the foundation upon which the prevailing tenets rested; because it was impossible that men could be predestined to life, or the reverse, from prescience of their actions, when, without the special grace of God, they were absolutely incapacitated for obedience to the divine law. To get rid of this difficulty, Augustine, in some degree, transferred the search for the origin of sin from the state of man to the purposes of God, asserting that from all eternity the Almighty had determined to choose from the mass of mankind, lost in guilt and corruption, a certain number to be transformed to holiness, and to be admitted after this life to eternal happiness; that he did this to promote his own glory; and that, by the operation of his Spirit, granted of his own free and undeserved mercy, he produced in the elect or chosen the fruits of righteousness, and qualified them for the enjoyment of heaven. The whole of the remainder of the human race were, according to this system, left in their condition by nature, or in other words, were given up to endless misery. There immediately arose out of this view of the subject, the formidable and heart-rending objection, that God was really the author of sin; that, having so created mankind that of themselves they could not be holy, there was on the part of those delivered no virtue, as there was on the other part no blame; the case being quite different from what it would have been had God interposed with respect to creatures who had not received from himself their physical and moral constitution. Accordingly, it has been asserted that a sect did arise, which, carrying out, as the members of it affirmed, the principles of Augustine, maintained that God not only predestinated the wicked to eternal punishment, but also to the guilt and transgression for which they were punished; that the human race was thus wholly passive, the good and bad actions of men, or what were commonly termed such, being determined from all eternity by a divine decree, or fixed by hopeless, irresistible necessity. These opinions it is said that the venerable and enlightened bishop of Hippo zealously opposed, labouring to show that they were not fairly deduced from what he had taught, making a distinction probably between his account of free will and the necessity here confounded with it, and perhaps reluctant to push his tenets so far as apparently they might be carried. The fact is, that although the doctrine of absolute predestination is occasionally clearly taught by Augustine, and obviously follows from his other principles, yet he does not always write consistently with regard to it; or, at least, there is sometimes so much vagueness in his assertions and illustrations, that his authority has been claimed in support of their peculiar tenets both by the Jansenists and the Jesuits, opposite to each other as the sentiments of these two orders are upon the subject of which we are treating. Still it is beyond a question that this celebrated theologian did fix the attention of the church upon that

subject much more closely than before his age had been the case, and gave rise to those discussions in relation to it which have so often agitated Christians, and tended much more to destroy the mild and tolerant spirit of the Gospel, than to throw light upon its momentous truths. The subject of predestination, however, was long regarded as one which it was not esteemed requisite absolutely to define, and which might be very much left open to speculation; for although in different countries decrees were passed, guarding against what were viewed as errors resulting from it, it is plain, from what took place upon the revival of the controversy in an after age, that there had not been formed any standard to which ecclesiastical authority required that all who were esteemed orthodox should strictly conform. See Augustine.

In the ninth century, Godeschalchus, a man of illustrious birth, who had, contrary to his inclinations, been devoted by his parents to a monastic life, and who had, with unwearied diligence, studied the science of theology, inflamed by an unhappy desire to unravel all the difficulties with which that science abounds, occupied his mind with the consideration of the question of predestination, and finally adopted, with regard to it, the doctrine of Augustine. Not satisfied with having convinced himself, he conceived it to be his duty to labour for the conviction of others; and he accordingly openly and zealously inculcated that the elect were predestinated to life, and the rest of mankind to everlasting misery. Rabanus, archbishop of Mentz, who had for some reason before this been inspired with enmity to Godeschalchus, having been informed of the tenets which he was publishing, and, as has too often been the case, veiling private antipathy under the cloak of anxiety for the purity of divine truth, opposed him with the utmost vehemence; and, having assembled a council in his own metropolitan city, procured the condemnation of the views which he reprobated. The matter was afterward taken up by Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, who was the zealous friend of Rabanus; and he also having procured the meeting of a council, confirmed the sentence that had been already passed. Not satisfied with this, he degraded Godeschalchus from the priesthood; and, with an inhumanity infinitely more detestable than heresy, he put the unfortunate monk to the torture. The fortitude of Godeschalchus was for a moment overpowered, and he consented to commit to the flames a justification of his opinions which he had presented to his execrable tormentors. It was not to be supposed that by atrocious violence like this sincere conviction could be produced in the person against whom it was directed, or that others would be disposed universally to submit to it. The controversy, accordingly, soon was renewed; writers on both sides of the question contended with the utmost warmth, and eagerly displayed the extent of their erudition. New councils were summoned, by which the decrees of former councils were reversed, and the tenets of

Godeschalchus were confirmed; and the whole agitation terminated by leaving the subject in the same undefined state on the part of the church in which it had been before it was thus intemperately and cruelly discussed.

To the schoolmen, who delighted much more in losing themselves amidst inextricable difficulties and endless distinctions, than in opening the sources of knowledge and removing the difficulties with which these were surrounded, this subject, from its intricate or inexplicable nature, was admirably adapted; and they did not fail to exercise upon it their diligence and their ingenuity. Thomas Aquinas, who flourished during the thirteenth century, was a man who in more enlightened times would have really merited the high reputation which he enjoyed, and which procured for him from his contemporaries the appellation of the Angelic Doctor. He was capable of vast mental exertion, and, amidst all his avocations, produced works so voluminous that in modern days even students would shrink from the perusal of them as an overwhelming task. He wrote largely upon the nature of grace, and predestination, so intimately connected with it. His opinions upon these subjects were nearly the same with those of Augustine; and so much, indeed, was he conceived to resemble in genius and understanding that distinguished prelate, that it was asserted the soul of Augustine had been sent into the body of Aquinas. He taught that God had, from all eternity, and without any regard to their works, predestinated a certain number to life and happiness; but he found great delight in endeavouring to reconcile this position with the freedom of the human will. His celebrated antagonist, John Duns Scotus, an inhabitant of Britain, surnamed, from the acuteness and bent of his mind, the Subtile Doctor, also directed his attention, in the subsequent century, to the same thorny speculations, taking a different view of them from Aquinas; and we find in the works of these two brilliant lights of the schoolmen all that the most learned in the dark ages thought upon them.

It is unnecessary to trace the various shades of opinion which existed in the church as to predestination from this era till the Reformation: it is enough to remark, that, after all which had been written upon it, it does not appear that any peculiar sentiments with respect to it were, by the reformers, judged essential to orthodoxy. It was more wisely considered that, upon a point involved in impenetrable difficulties, and raised far above human comprehension, men might be allowed to differ, while their attachment to the best interests of pure religion could not be called in question. See Calvinism and Lutherans.

The seventeenth article of the church of England is often adduced by Calvinists as favourable to their peculiar views of absolute predestination; but such a representation of it is rendered plausible only by adding to its

various clauses qualifying expressions to suit that purpose. Under the articles Church of England, Confessions, and Calvinism, have been exhibited the just and liberal views of Cranmer and the principal English reformers on this subject,--the sources from which they drew the articles of religion and the public formularies of devotion,--and some of the futile attempts of the high predestinarians in the church to inoculate the public creed with their dogmas. Cartwright and his followers, in their second Admonition to the Parliament” in 1572, complained that the articles speak dangerously of falling from grace;” and in 1587 they preferred a similar complaint. The labours of the Westminster Assembly at a subsequent period, and their abortive result, in relation to this subject, are well known. Long before Arminius had turned his thoughts to the consideration of general redemption, a great number of the English clergy had publicly taught and defended the same doctrine. It was about 1571 when Dr. Peter Baroe, a zealous Anti-Calvinian,” as one of our church historians observes, was made Margaret Professor of Divinity in the university of Cambridge; and “he went on teaching in his lectures, preaching in his sermons, determining in the schools, and printing in several books, divers points contrary to Calvinism. And this he did for several years, without any manner of disturbance or interruption. The heads of the university, in a letter to the Lord Burleigh, dated March 8, 1595, say, he had done it for fourteen or fifteen years preceding and they might have said twenty; for he printed some of his lectures in 1574, and the prosecution he was at last under, which will be considered hereafter, was not till 1595. In 1584, Mr. Harsnet, afterward archbishop of York, preached against absolute reprobation at St. Paul’s Cross, the greatest audience then in the kingdom; as did the judicious Mr. Hooker at the Temple in the year following. In the year 1594, Mr. Barret preached at St. Mary’s in Cambridge against Calvinism, with very smart reflections upon Calvin himself, Beza, Zanchy, and several others of the most noted writers in that scheme. In the same year, Dr. Baroe preached at the same place to the same purpose. By this time Calvinism had gained considerable ground, being much promoted by the learned Whitaker and Mr. Perkins; and several of the heads of the university being in that scheme, they complained of the two sermons above mentioned to the Lord Burleigh their chancellor. Their heads endeavoured to bring Barret to a retraction, to which whether he ever submitted according to the form they drew up, may reasonably be doubted. At length the matter was laid before Archbishop Whitgift, who was offended at their proceedings, and writes to the Lord Burleigh, that some of the points which the heads had enjoined Barret to retract were such as the most learned Protestants, then living, varied in judgment upon; and that the most ancient and best divines in the land were in the chiefest points in opinion against the heads and their resolutions. Another letter he sent to the heads themselves, telling them that they had enjoined Barret to affirm that which

was contrary to the doctrine holden and expressed by many sound and learned divines in the church of England, and in other churches likewise men of best account; and that which for his own part he thought to be false and contrary to the Scriptures; for the Scriptures are plain, that God by his absolute will did not hate and reject any man. There might be impiety in believing the one, there could be none in believing the other; neither was it contrary to any article of religion established by authority in this church of England, but rather agreeable thereto. This testimony of the archbishop is very remarkable; and though he afterward countenanced the Lambeth articles, that is of little or no weight in the case. The question is not about any man's private opinion, but about the doctrine of the church; and supposing the archbishop to be a Calvinist, as he seems to have been at least in some points, this only adds the greater weight to his testimony, that our church has no where declared in favour of that scheme. The archbishop descended to the particulars charged against Barret, asking the heads what article of the church was contradicted by this or that notion of his; and Whitaker in his reply does not appeal to one of the articles, as against Barret, but forms his plea upon the doctrines which then generally obtained in pulpits. His words are, 'We are fully persuaded that Mr. Barret hath taught untruth, if not against the articles, yet against the religion, of our church, publicly received, and always held in her majesty's reign, and maintained in all sermons, disputations, and lectures.' And even this pretence of his, weak as it would have been though true, is utterly false, directly contrary, not only to what has been already shown to be the facts of the case, but also to what the archbishop affirmed, and that too, as must be supposed, upon his own knowledge. As to Dr. Baroe, he met with many friends, who espoused his cause. Mr. Strype particularly mentions four, Mr. Overall, Dr. Clayton, Mr. Harsnet, Dr. Andrews; all of them great and learned men, men of renown, and famous in their generation. How many more there were, nobody can tell. The heads in their letter to the Lord Burleigh do not pretend that the preaching against Calvinism gave a general offence, but that it offended many; which implies that there were many others on the opposite side; and they expressly say there were divers in the Anti-Calvinian scheme, whom they represent as maintaining it with great boldness. But what put a stop to this prosecution against Baroe was, a reprimand from their chancellor, the Lord Burleigh, who wrote to the heads, that as good and as ancient were of another judgment, and that they might punish him, but it would be for well doing."

But Dr. Whitaker, Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, could not endure the farther prevalence of the doctrines of general redemption in that university; he therefore, in 1595, drew up nine affirmations, elucidatory of his views of predestination, and obtained for them the sanction of several Calvinian heads of houses, with whom he repaired to Archbishop Whitgift.



Having heard their *ex parte* statement, his grace summoned Bishops Flecher and Vaughan, and Dr. Tyndal, dean of Ely, to meet Dr. Whitaker and the Cambridge deputation at his palace in Lambeth, on the tenth of November, 1595; where, after much polishing and altering, they produced Whitaker's affirmation in the following form, called the Lambeth Articles," from the place in which their secret sittings had been held:--"1. God from eternity hath predestinated certain men unto life; certain men he hath reprobated. 2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life is not the foresight of faith or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing that is in the person predestinated; but it is only the good will and pleasure of God. 3. A certain number of the predestinate is predetermined, which can neither be augmented nor diminished. 4. Those who are not predestinated to salvation shall be necessarily damned for their sins. 5. A true, living, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, doth not fall off, or vanish away, in the elect, either totally or finally. 6. A man who is a true believer, that is, one who is endued with a justifying faith, is assured with a plerophory, or firm persuasion, of faith concerning the remission of his sins, and his eternal salvation through Christ. 7. Saving grace is neither given, communicated, nor granted to all men, by which they can be saved if they will. 8. No one is able to come unto Christ unless it shall be given unto him, and unless the Father shall draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come unto the Son. 9. It is not placed in the choice, will, or capacity of every one to be saved." Dr. Whitaker died a few days after his return from Lambeth, with the nine articles to which he had procured the patronage of the primate. After his demise, two competitors appeared for the vacant King's Professorship, Dr. Wotton, of King's College, a professed Calvinian, and Dr. Overal of Trinity College, almost as far," says Heylin, from the Calvinian doctrine in the main platform of predestination as Baroe, Harsnet, or Barret are conceived to be. But when it came to the vote of the university, the place was carried for Overal by the major part; which plainly shows, that though the doctrines of Calvin were so hotly stickled here by most of the heads, yet the greater part of the learned body entertained them not." "The Lambeth articles," it is well observed, are no part of the doctrine of the church of England, having never had any the least sanction either from the parliament or the convocation. They were drawn up by Professor Whitaker; and though they were afterward approved by Archbishop Whitgift, and six or eight of the inferior clergy, in a meeting they had at Lambeth, yet this meeting was only in a private manner, and without any authority from the queen; who was so far from approving of their proceedings, that she not only ordered the articles to be suppressed, but was resolutely bent for some time to bring the archbishop and his associates under a premunire, for presuming to make them without any warrant or legal authority." Such, in brief, was the origin and such the fate of the

Lambeth articles, without the countenance of which the defenders of Calvinism in the church of England could find no semblance of support for their manifold affirmations on 773predestination and its kindred topics. These articles afford another instructive instance of the extreme ignorance of the real sentiments of their opponents, which often betrays itself in the conduct of many eminent men, when they rashly begin to fence off the reputed heterodoxy of their brethren from the sacred precincts of their own orthodoxy. Two of the ablest and most consistent Arminians of the old English school, Baroe and Plaifere, have lucidly shown how every one of these nine assertions may, without difficulty, be interpreted in accordance with their individual belief. Baroe's clever dissertation on this subject will be found in *Strype's Life of Whitgift*;" and that of Plaifere, in his own unanswerable *Apello Evangelium*."

PRE-EXISTENCE OF JESUS CHRIST is his existence before he was born of the Virgin Mary. That he really did exist, is plain from John iii, 13; vi, 50, &c; viii, 58; xvii, 5, 24; 1 John i, 2; but there are various opinions respecting this existence. Some acknowledging, with the orthodox, that in Jesus Christ there is a divine nature, a rational soul, and a human body, go into an opinion peculiar to themselves. His body was formed in the virgin's womb; but his human soul, they suppose, was the first and most excellent of all the works of God; was brought into existence before the creation of the world, and subsisted in happy union in heaven with the second person of the Godhead, till his incarnation. These divines differ from those called Arians, for the latter ascribe to Christ only a created deity, whereas the former hold his true and proper divinity. They differ from the Socinians, who believe no existence of Jesus Christ before his incarnation: they differ from the Sabellians, who only own a trinity of names: they differ also from the generally received opinion, which is, that Christ's human soul began to exist in the womb of his mother, in exact conformity to that likeness unto his brethren of which St. Paul speaks, Heb. ii, 17. The writers in favour of the preëxistence of Christ's human soul recommend their opinion by these arguments: 1. Christ is represented as his Father's messenger, or angel, being distinct from his Father, sent by his Father, long before his incarnation, to perform actions which seem to be too low for the dignity of pure Godhead. The appearances of Christ to the patriarchs are described like the appearance of an angel, or man really distinct from God; yet one, in whom God, or Jehovah, had a peculiar indwelling, or with whom the divine nature had a personal union. 2. Christ, when he came into the world, is said, in several passages of Scripture, to have divested himself of some glory which he had before his incarnation. Now if there had existed before this time nothing but his divine nature, this divine nature, it is argued, could not properly have divested itself of any glory, John xvii, 4, 5; 2 Cor. viii, 9. It cannot be said of God that he became poor: he is infinitely self-sufficient;

he is necessarily and eternally rich in perfections and glories. Nor can it be said of Christ, as man, that he was rich, if he were never in a richer state before than while he was on earth. 3. It seems needful, say those who embrace this opinion, that the soul of Jesus Christ should preëxist, that it might have an opportunity to give its previous actual consent to the great and painful undertaking of making atonement for our sins. On the other side, it is affirmed that the doctrine of the preëxistence of the human soul of Christ weakens and subverts that of his divine personality. 1. A pure intelligent spirit, the first, the most ancient, and the most excellent of creatures, created before the foundation of the world, so exactly resembles the second person of the Arian trinity, that it is impossible to show the least difference except in name. 2. This preëxistent intelligence, supposed in this doctrine, is so confounded with those other intelligences called angels, that there is great danger of mistaking this human soul for an angel, and so of making the person of Christ to consist of three natures. 3. If Jesus Christ had nothing in common like the rest of mankind except a body, how could this semi-conformity make him a real man? 4. The passages quoted in proof of the preëxistence of the human soul of Jesus Christ, are of the same sort with those which others allege in proof of the preëxistence of all human souls. 5. This opinion, by ascribing the dignity of the work of redemption to this sublime human soul, detracts from the deity of Christ, and renders the last as passive as the first is active. 6. This notion is contrary to the Scripture. St. Paul says, In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren," Heb. ii, 17: he partook of all our infirmities, except sin. St. Luke says, He increased in stature and wisdom," Luke ii, 52. Upon the whole, this scheme, adopted to relieve the difficulties which must always surround mysteries so great, only creates new ones. This is the usual fate of similar speculations, and shows the wisdom of resting in the plain interpretation of the word of God.

PRESBYTERIANS are those that affirm there is no order in the church, as established by Christ and his Apostles, superior to that of presbyters; that all ministers, being ambassadors, are equal by their commission; and that elder, or presbyter, and bishop, are the same in name and office, and the terms synonymous. Their arguments against the Episcopalians are as follows:--With respect to the successors of the Apostles, they seem to have been placed on a footing of perfect equality, the *διάκονοι*, or deacons, not being included among the teachers. They were inferior officers, whose province it originally was to care for the poor, and to discharge those secular duties arising out of the formation of Christian communities, which could not be discharged by the ministers without interfering with the much higher duties which they had to perform. These ministers are sometimes in the New Testament styled *πρεσβύτεροι*, or presbyters, at other times *ἐπίσκοποι*, or bishops; but the two appellations were indiscriminately

applied to all the pastors who were the instructors of the different 774 churches. Of this various examples may be given from the sacred writings. The Apostle Paul, upon a very affecting occasion, when he was convinced that he could never again have an opportunity of addressing them, sent for the elders or presbyters of Ephesus, the persons to whom the ministry in that church had been committed; and after mentioning all that he had done, and intimating to them the sufferings which awaited him, he addressed to them what may be considered as his dying advice, and as comprehending in it all that he judged it most essential for them to do. Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops or overseers, to feed the church of God," Acts xx, 17, 28. Here they whose duty it was to feed the church of God, as having been set apart through the Holy Spirit for that interesting work, are termed by the Apostle presbyters and bishops, and there is not the slightest allusion to the existence of any other ἐπίσκοπος, or bishop, superior to those ἐπίσκοποι, or bishops, to whom he gives the moving charge now recorded. In his epistle to Titus, St. Paul thus writes: For this purpose I left thee in Crete," where, as yet, it is probable that no teachers had been appointed, that thou shouldest ordain elders, or presbyters, in every city." He then points out the class of men from which the presbyters were to be selected, adding, as the reason of this, for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God," Titus i, 5, 7. It is quite plain that the epithet bishop is here applicable to the same persons who were a little before styled elders, and both are declared to be the stewards of God, the guardians and instructors of his church. The Apostle Peter, in his first epistle addressed to the Jewish converts, has these words: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight of it, ἐπισκοποῦντες, being bishops of it, not by constraint but willingly," 1 Peter v, 1, 2. This passage is a very strong one. The Apostle speaks of himself in his extraordinary capacity, a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and in his ordinary capacity as a teacher; showing, by the use of a very significant term, that as to it he was on a footing of equality with the other pastors or presbyters. He gives it in charge to them to feed the flock of God; the charge which, under most particular and affecting circumstances, he had received from the Lord after the resurrection, and which includes in it the performance of every thing requisite for the comfort and the edification of Christians; and he accordingly expresses this by the word ἐπισκοποῦντες, being bishops over them. It cannot, with any shadow of reason, be supposed that the Apostle would exhort the elders or presbyters to take to themselves the office, and to perform the duties, of a bishop, if that term really marked out a distinct and higher order; or that he would have considered the presbyters as fitted for the discharge of the

whole ministerial office, if there were parts of that office which he knew that it was not lawful for them to exercise.

It seems, by the passages that have been quoted, to be placed beyond a doubt, that, in what the Apostles said respecting the ministers of Christ's religion, they taught that the ἐπίσκοποι and the πρεσβύτεροι were the same class of instructors; and that there were, in fact, only two orders pointed out by them, bishops or presbyters, and deacons. This being the case, even although it should appear that there were bishops, in the common sense of that term, recognized in the apostolic age, all that could be deduced from the fact would be, that the equality at first instituted among the teachers, had, for prudential reasons, or under peculiar circumstances, been interrupted; but it would not follow either that the positive and general declarations on the subject by the inspired writers were not true, or that it was incumbent at all times, and upon all Christians, to disregard them. It has been strenuously contended that there were such bishops in the infancy of the church, and that allusion is made to them in Scripture; but without directly opposing the assertion, this much must be admitted, that the proof of it is less clear than that bishops and presbyters were represented as the same in rank and in authority. Indeed, there does not appear to have been any occasion for this higher order. To presbyters was actually committed the most important charge of feeding the church of God, that is, of promoting the spiritual improvement of mankind; and it is remarkable that their privilege of separating from the people by ordination the ministers of religion, is explicitly acknowledged in the case of Timothy, whom the Apostle admonishes not to neglect the gift that was in him, and which had been given by prophecy, and by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery; by which can be meant only the laying on of the hands of those who were denominated presbyters or bishops. But although all the parts of the ministerial duty had been intrusted to presbyters, it is still contended that the New Testament indicates the existence of bishops as a higher order. There has, however, been much diversity of opinion in relation to this point by those who contend for the divine institution of episcopacy. Some of them maintain that the Apostles, while they lived, were the bishops of the Christian church; but this, and upon irrefragable grounds, is denied by others. Some urge that Timothy and Titus were, in what they call the true sense of the term, bishops; but many deny that, founding their denial upon these evangelists not having resided within the bounds, or been limited to the administration of any one church, being sent wherever it was resolved to bring men to the knowledge of divine truth. Many conceive that the question is settled by the epistles in the book of Revelation being addressed to the angels of the respective churches named by the Apostle. But it is far from being obvious what is implied under the appellation angel; there has been much dispute about this point, and it is certainly a deviation from

all the usual rules by which we are guided in interpreting Scripture, to bring an obscure and doubtful passage in illustration of one, about the import of which, if we attend to the language used, there can be no doubt. It may, therefore, be safely affirmed that there is nothing clear and specific in the writings of the New Testament which qualifies the positive declarations that bishops and presbyters were the same officers; that the ground upon which the distinction between them is placed, is, at least, far from obviously supporting it; and that there is not the slightest intimation that the observance of such a distinction is at all important, much less absolutely essential to a true Christian church, insomuch that, where it is disregarded, the ordinances of divine appointment cannot be properly dispensed. If therefore it be established,--and some of the most learned and zealous advocates for the hierarchy which afterward arose have been compelled to admit it,--that Scripture has not recognized any difference of rank or order between the ordinary teachers of the Gospel, all other means of maintaining this difference should be with Protestants of no force. It may be shown that the admission of the distinction is not incompatible with the great ends for which a ministry was appointed, and even in particular cases may tend to promote them; but still it is merely a matter of human regulation, not binding upon Christians, and not in any way connected with the vital influence of the Gospel dispensation. The whole of the writers of antiquity may be urged in support of it, if that could be done; and, after all, every private Christian would be entitled to judge for himself, and to be directed by his own judgment, unless it be maintained that where Scripture has affirmed the existence of equality, this is to be counteracted and set at nought by the testimonies and assertions of a set of writers, who, although honoured with the name of fathers, are very far, indeed, from being infallible, and who have, in fact, often delivered sentiments which even they who, upon a particular emergency, cling to them, must confess to be directly at variance with all that is sound in reason, or venerable and sublime in religion. It also follows, from the Scriptural identity of bishops and presbyters, that no church in which this identity is preserved, can on that account be considered as having departed from the apostolic model, or its ministers be viewed, at least with any good reason, as having less ground to hope for the blessing of God upon their spiritual labours; because if we admit the contrary, we must also admit that the inspired writers, instead of properly regulating the church, betrayed it into error, by omitting to make a distinction closely allied with the essence of religion. What is this but to say that it is safer to follow the erring direction of frail mortals, than to follow the admonitions of those who, it is universally allowed, were inspired by the Holy Spirit, or commissioned by him to be the instructors of the world?

It is to be observed, however, that although bishops and presbyters were the same when the epistles of the New Testament were written, it would be going too far to contend that no departure from this should ever take place; because, to justify such a position, it would be requisite that a positive injunction should have been given that equality must at all times be carefully preserved. There is, however, no such injunction. Unlike the Old Testament, which specified every thing, even the most minute, in relation to the priesthood, the New only alludes in general terms, and very seldom, to the ministry; and the reason probably is, that, being intended for all nations, it left Christians at liberty to make such modifications in the ecclesiastical constitution as in their peculiar situation appeared best adapted for religious edification. The simple test to be applied to the varying or varied forms of church government is that indicated by our Lord himself: "By their fruits ye shall know them." Wherever the regulations respecting the ministry are such as to divert it from the purposes for which it was destined, to separate those who form it from the flock of Christ, to relax their diligence in teaching, and to destroy the connection between them and their people, so as to render their exertions of little or of no use, there we find a church not apostolical. But wherever the blessed fruits of Gospel teaching are in abundance produced, where the people and the ministers are cordially united, and where every regulation is calculated to give efficacy to the labours of those who have entered into the vineyard, we have an apostolical church, or, to speak more properly, a church of Christ, built upon a rock, because devoted to the beneficent objects for which our Saviour came into the world.

The form of church government among the Scotch Presbyterians is as follows:--The kirk session, consisting of the minister and lay elders of the congregation, is the lowest ecclesiastical judicature. The next is the presbytery, which consists of all the pastors within a certain district, and one ruling elder from each parish. The provincial synods, of which there are fifteen, meet twice in the year, and are composed of the members of the several presbyteries within the respective provinces. From the kirk sessions appeal lies to the presbyteries, from these to the synods, and from them to the general assembly, which meets annually, and is the highest ecclesiastical authority in the kingdom. This is composed of delegates from each presbytery, from every royal borough, and from each of the Scotch universities; and the king presides by a commission of his own appointment. The Scotch ordain by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," before which persons may be licensed to preach as probationers, but cannot administer the sacraments. The clergy are maintained by the state, and nominated to livings by patrons, as in other establishments. Those properly called the English Presbyterians, have no connection with the Scotch kirk. They are now indeed broken into separate

churches, and follow the same form of church government as the Congregationalists 776or Independents. The name Presbyterian, therefore, is now inapplicable to them although retained. So Dr. Doddridge: Those who hold every pastor to be so a bishop or overseer of his own congregation, as that no other person or body of men have, by divine institution, a power to exercise any superior or pastoral office in it, may, properly speaking, be called, so far at least, congregational; and it is by a vulgar mistake that any such are called Presbyterians.” See Episcopalians.

PRESCIENCE, or foreknowledge, an attribute of God. (See Omniscience.) On this subject three leading theories have been resorted to, in order to evade the difficulties which are supposed to be involved in the opinion commonly received. The Chevalier Ramsay, among his other speculations, holds it a matter of choice in God, to think of finite ideas; and similar opinions, though variously worded, have been occasionally adopted. In substance these opinions are, that though the knowledge of God be infinite as his power is infinite, there is no more reason to conclude, that his knowledge should be always exerted to the full extent of its capacity, than that his power should be employed to the extent of his omnipotence; and that if we suppose him to choose not to know some contingencies, the infiniteness of his knowledge is not thereby impugned. To this it may be answered, that the infinite power of God is in Scripture represented, as in the nature of things it must be, as an infinite capacity, and not as infinite in act; but that the knowledge of God is on the contrary never represented there to us as a capacity to acquire knowledge, but as actually comprehending all things that are, and all things that can be. 2. That the notion of God’s choosing to know some things, and not to know others, supposes a reason why he refuses to know any class of things or events; which reason, it would seem, can only arise out of their nature and circumstances, and therefore supposes at least a partial knowledge of them, from which the reason for his not choosing to know them arises. The doctrine is therefore somewhat contradictory. But, 3. It is fatal to this opinion that it does not at all meet the difficulty arising out of the question of the consistency of divine prescience, and the free actions of men; since some contingent actions, for which men have been made accountable, we are sure, have been foreknown by God, because by his Spirit in the prophets they were foretold; and if the freedom of man can in these cases be reconciled to the prescience of God, there is no greater difficulty in any other case which can possibly occur.

A second theory is, that the foreknowledge of contingent events, being in its own nature impossible, because it implies a contradiction, it does no dishonour to the divine Being to affirm, that of such events he has, and can have, no prescience whatever; and thus the prescience of God, as to moral



actions, being wholly denied, the difficulty in question is got rid of. To this the same answer must be given as to the former. It does not meet the case, so long as the Scriptures are allowed to contain prophecies of rewardable and punishable actions. The great fallacy in the argument, that the certain prescience of a moral action destroys its contingent nature, lies in supposing that contingency and certainty are the opposites of each other. It is, perhaps, unfortunate, that a word which is of figurative etymology, and which consequently can only have an ideal application to such subjects, should have grown into common use in this discussion, because it is more liable, on that account, to present itself to different minds under different shades of meaning. If, however, the term contingent in this controversy has any definite meaning at all, as applied to the moral actions of men, it must mean their freedom, and stands opposed, not to certainty, but to necessity. A free action is a voluntary one; and an action which results from the choice of the agent, is distinguished from a necessary one in this, that it might not have been, or have been otherwise, according to the self-determining power of the agent. It is with reference to this specific quality of a free action, that the term contingency is used; it might have been otherwise, in other words, it was not necessitated. Contingency in moral actions is, therefore, their freedom, and is opposed, not to certainty, but to constraint. The very nature of this controversy fixes this as the precise meaning of the term. The question is not, in point of fact, about the certainty of moral actions, that is, whether they will happen or not; but about the nature of them, whether free or constrained, whether they must happen or not. Those who advocate this theory care not about the certainty of actions, simply considered, that is, whether they will take place or not; the reason why they object to a certain prescience of moral actions, is this,—they conclude, that such a prescience renders them necessary. It is the quality of the action for which they contend, not whether it will happen or not. If contingency meant uncertainty, the sense in which such theorists take it, the dispute would be at an end. But though an uncertain action cannot be foreseen as certain, a free, unnecessitated action may; for there is nothing in the knowledge of the action, in the least, to affect its nature. Simple knowledge is, in no sense, a cause of action, nor can it be conceived to be causal, unconnected with exerted power: for mere knowledge, therefore, an action remains free or necessitated as the case may be. A necessitated action is not made a voluntary one by its being foreknown; a free action is not made a necessary one. Free actions foreknown will not, therefore, cease to be contingent. But how stands the case as to their certainty? Precisely on the same ground. The certainty of a necessary action foreknown, does not result from the knowledge of the action, but from the operation of the necessitating cause; and, in like manner, the certainty of a free action does not result from the knowledge of it, which is no cause at all, but from the voluntary cause, that is, the determination of the will. It alters not 777the

case in the least, to say that the voluntary action might have been otherwise. Had it been otherwise, the knowledge of it would have been otherwise; but as the will which gives birth to the action, is not dependent upon the previous knowledge of God, but the knowledge of the action upon foresight of the choice of the will, neither the will nor the act is controlled by the knowledge; and the action, though foreseen, is still free or contingent. The foreknowledge of God has then no influence upon either the freedom or the certainty of actions, for this plain reason, that it is knowledge, and not influence; and actions may be certainly foreknown, without their being rendered necessary by that foreknowledge. But here it is said, If the result of an absolute contingency be certainly foreknown, it can have no other result, it cannot happen otherwise." This is not the true inference. It will not happen otherwise; but it may be asked, Why can it not happen otherwise? Can an expression of potentiality, it denotes power or possibility. The objection is, that it is not possible that the action should otherwise happen. But why not? What deprives it of that power? If a necessary action were in question, it could not otherwise happen than as the necessitating cause shall compel; but then that would arise from the necessitating cause solely, and not from the prescience of the action which is not causal. But if the action be free, and it enter into the very nature of a voluntary action to be unconstrained, then it might have happened in a thousand other ways, or not have happened at all; the foreknowledge of it no more affects its nature in this case than in the other. All its potentiality, so to speak, still remains, independent of foreknowledge, which neither adds to its power of happening otherwise, nor diminishes it. But then we are told, that the prescience of it, in that case, must be uncertain." Not unless any person can prove, that the divine prescience is unable to dart through all the workings of the human mind, all its comparison of things in the judgment, all the influences of motives on the affections, all the hesitations and haltings of the will, to its final choice. Such knowledge is too wonderful for us," but it is the knowledge of Him who understandeth the thoughts of man afar off." "But if a contingency will have a given result, to that result it must be determined." Not in the least. We have seen that it cannot be determined to a given result by mere precognition; for we have evidence in our own minds that mere knowledge is not causal to the actions of another. It is determined to its result by the will of the agent; but even in that case, it cannot be said, that it must be determined to that result, because it is of the nature of freedom to be unconstrained: so that here we have an instance in the case of a free agent that he will act in some particular manner; but it by no means follows from what will be, whether foreseen or not, that it must be.

The third theory amounts, in brief, to this, that the foreknowledge of God must be supposed to differ so much from any thing of the kind which we

perceive in ourselves, and from any ideas which we can possibly form of that property of the divine nature, that no argument respecting it can be grounded upon our imperfect notions; and that all controversy on subjects connected with it, is idle and fruitless. But though foreknowledge in God should be admitted to be something of a very different nature” to the same quality in man, yet as it is represented as something equivalent to foreknowledge, whatever that something may be, since in consequence of it, prophecies have actually been uttered and fulfilled, and of such a kind, too, as relate to actions for which men have in fact been held accountable; all the original difficulty of reconciling contingent events to this something, of which human foreknowledge is a kind of shadow,” as a map of China is to China itself,” remains in full force. The difficulty is shifted, but not removed. It may, therefore, be certainly concluded, if at least the Holy Scriptures are to be our guide, that the omniscience of God comprehends his certain prescience of all events however contingent; and if any thing more were necessary to strengthen the argument above given, it might be drawn from the irrational, and, above all, the unscriptural consequences, which would follow from the denial of this doctrine. These are forcibly stated by President Edwards:--“It would follow from this notion, (namely, that the Almighty doth not foreknow what will be the result of future contingencies,) that as God is liable to be continually repenting what he has done; so he must be exposed to be constantly changing his mind and intentions as to his future conduct; altering his measures, relinquishing his old designs, and forming new schemes and projections. For his purposes, even as to the main parts of his scheme, namely, such as belong to the state of his moral kingdom, must be always liable to be broken, through want of foresight; and he must be continually putting his system to rights, as it gets out of order, through the contingency of the actions of moral agents: he must be a Being who, instead of being absolutely immutable, must necessarily be the subject of infinitely the most numerous acts of repentance, and changes of intention, of any being whatsoever; for this plain reason, that his vastly extensive charge comprehends an infinitely greater number of those things which are to him contingent and uncertain. In such a situation he must have little else to do, but to mend broken links as well as he can, and be rectifying his disjointed frame and disordered movements, in the best manner the case will allow. The supreme Lord of all things must needs be under great and miserable disadvantages, in governing the world which he has made, and has the care of, through his being utterly unable to find out things of chief importance, which hereafter shall befall his system; which, if he did but know, he might make seasonable provision for. In many cases, there may be very great necessity that he should make provision, in the manner of his ordering and disposing things, for some great events which are to happen, of vast and extensive influence, and endless consequence to the universe; which

he may see afterward, when it is too late, and may wish in vain that he had known beforehand, that he might have ordered his affairs accordingly. And it is in the power of man, on these principles, by his devices, purposes, and actions, thus to disappoint God, break his measures, make him continually to change his mind, subject him to vexation, and bring him into confusion.”

Socinus and his early followers would not allow that God possesses any knowledge of future contingencies. The schoolmen, in reference to this species of knowledge in God, invented that called *scientia media*, and which they define as that by which God knows *sub conditione*, what men or angels will do according to the liberty which they have, when they are placed in these or those circumstances, or in this or in that order of things.” When Gomarus, the opponent of Arminius, found that his opinion concerning the object of reprobation was clogged with this absurdity--that it made God to be the author of Adam’s sin, he very astutely took refuge in this conditionate foreknowledge, and, in his corrected theses on predestination, published after the death of Arminius, he describes it as that by which God, through the infinite light of his own knowledge, foreknows some future things, not absolutely, but as placed under a certain condition.” Walæus, the celebrated antagonist of Episcopius, had recourse to the same expedient. This distinction has been adopted by very few of those who espouse the doctrines of general redemption; and who believe that every event, how contingent soever to the creature, is, with respect to God, certainly foreknown. An old English divine thinks, that, “in the sacred Scriptures certain not obscure vestiges are apparent of this kind of knowledge, of things that will happen thus or otherwise, on the supposition of the occurrence of this or that circumstance. Omitting the well known example of David in Keilah, 1 Sam. xxii, 12, and of Chorazin and Bethsaida, Matt. xi, 21; Luke x, 13, consult, among other sayings of the same description, the answer of our Saviour to the chief priests and scribes, who had asked, ‘Art thou the Christ? Tell us.’ And he said unto them, ‘If I tell you, ye will not believe.’ In the subsequent verse he adds, ‘If I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go,’ Luke xxii, 67, 68. You have here three events specified, which yet will not occur even on the supposition of Christ our Lord himself.” This kind of knowledge might very well be included in that of *scientia visionis*, because the latter ought to include, not what God will do and what his creatures will do under his appointment, but what they will do by his permission as free agents, and what he will do, as a consequence of this, in his character of Governor and Lord. But since the predestinarians had confounded *scientia visionis* with a predestinating decree, the *scientia media* well expressed what they had left quite unaccounted for, and which they had assumed did not really exist,--the actions of creatures endowed with free will, and the acts of Deity which from eternity were consequent upon them. If such actions do not

take place, then men are not free; and if the rectoral acts of God are not consequent upon the actions of the creature in the order of the divine intention, and the conduct of the creature is consequent upon the foreordained rectoral acts of God, then we reach a necessitating eternal decree, which in fact, the predestinarian contends for; but it unfortunately brings after it consequences which no subtleties have ever been able to shake off,--that the only actor in the universe is God himself; and that the only distinction among events is, that one class is brought to pass by God directly, and the other indirectly, not by the agency, but by the mere instrumentality, of his creatures.

PRIEST, a general name for the minister of religion. The priest under the law was, among the Hebrews, a person consecrated and ordained of God to offer up sacrifices for his own sins and those of the people, Lev. iv, 5, 6. The priesthood was not annexed to a certain family till after the promulgation of the law of Moses. Before that time the first-born of every family, the fathers, the princes, the kings were priests. Cain and Abel, Noah, Abraham, Job, Abimelech and Laban, Isaac and Jacob, offered themselves their own sacrifices. In the solemnity of the covenant that the Lord made with his people at the foot of Mount Sinai, Moses performed the office of mediator, Exod. xxiv, 5, 6; and young men were chosen from among the children of Israel to perform the office of priests. But after the Lord had chosen the tribe of Levi to serve him in his tabernacle, and the priesthood was annexed to the family of Aaron, then the right of offering sacrifices to God was reserved to the priests alone of this family. The Lord ordained, Num. xvi, 40, that no stranger, which was not of the seed of Aaron, should come near to offer incense unto the Lord, that he might not be as Korah and his company. The punishment of Uzziah is well known, 2 Chron. xxvi, 19, who, having presumed to offer incense to the Lord, was suddenly smitten with a leprosy, put out of his palace, and excluded from the administration of affairs to the day of his death. However, it seems that, on certain occasions, the judges and the kings of the Hebrews offered sacrifices unto the Lord, especially before a constant place of worship was fixed at Jerusalem; for in 1 Sam. vii, 8, we are told that Samuel, who was no priest, offered a lamb for a burnt-sacrifice to the Lord; and in 1 Sam. ix, 13, it is said that this prophet was to bless the offering of the people, which should seem to be a function appropriated to the priests; lastly, 1 Sam. xvi, 5, he goes to Bethlehem, where he offers a sacrifice at the inauguration or anointing of David. Saul himself offered a burnt-offering to the Lord, perhaps as being king of Israel, 1 Sam. xiii, 9, 10. Elijah also offered a burnt-offering upon Mount 779Carmel, 1 Kings xviii, 33. David himself sacrificed, (at least the text expresses it so,) at the ceremony of bringing the ark to Jerusalem, and at the floor of Araunah, 2 Sam. vi, 13. Solomon went up to the brazen altar that was at Gibeon, and there offered sacrifices,

2 Chron. i, 5. It is true the above passages are commonly explained by supposing that these princes offered their sacrifices by the hands of the priests; but the sacred text will by no means favour such explanations; and it is very natural to imagine, that in the quality of kings and heads of the people, they had the privilege of performing some sacerdotal functions, upon some extraordinary occasions; thus we see David clothed with the priestly ephod, and consulting the Lord; and upon another occasion we find David and Solomon pronounce solemn benedictions on the people, 2 Sam. vi, 18; 1 Kings viii, 55. God having reserved to himself the first-born of all Israel, because he had preserved them from the hand of the destroying angel in Egypt, by way of exchange or compensation accepted of the tribe of Levi for the service of the tabernacle, Numbers iii, 41. Of the three sons of Levi, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, the Lord chose the family of Kohath, and out of this the house of Aaron, to exercise the functions of the priesthood. All the rest of the family of Kohath, even the children of Moses and their descendants, remained of the order of mere Levites. See Levites.

The posterity of the sons of Aaron, namely, Eleazar and Ithamar, Lev. x, 1–5; 1 Chron. xxiv, 1, 2, had so increased in number in the time of David, that they were divided into twenty-four classes, which officiated a week at a time alternately. Sixteen classes were of the family of Eleazar, and eight of the family of Ithamar. Each class obeyed its own prefect or ruler. The class Jojarib was the first in order, and the class Abia was the eighth, 1 Mac. ii, 1; Luke i, 5; 1 Chron. xxiv, 3–19. This division of the priesthood was continued as a permanent arrangement after the time of David, 2 Chron. viii, 14; xxxi, 2; xxxv, 4, 5. Indeed, although only four classes returned from the captivity, the distinction between them, and also the ancient names, were still retained, Ezra ii, 36–39; Neh. vii, 39–42; xii, 1.

Aaron, the high priest was set apart to his office by the same ceremonies with which his sons the priests were, with this exception, that the former was clothed in his robes, and the sacred oil was poured upon his head, Exod. xxix, 5–9; Lev. viii, 2. The other ceremonies were as follows. The priests, all of them with their bodies washed, and clad in their appropriate dress, assembled before the altar, where a bullock, two rams, unleavened bread, and wafers of two kinds in baskets, were in readiness. When they had placed their hands upon the head of the bullock, he was slain by Moses as a sin-offering. He touched the horns of the altar with the blood, poured the remainder of it round its base, and placed the parts which were to compose the sacrifice on its top. The remaining parts of the animal were all burned without the camp, Exod. xxix, 10–14; Lev. viii, 2, 3, 14–17. They in like manner placed their hands on the head of one of the rams, which was also slain by Moses for a whole burnt-offering, the blood was sprinkled around the altar, and the parts of the ram were separated and

burned upon it, Exod. xxix, 15–18; Lev. viii, 18–21. The other ram, when the priests had laid their hands upon him, was likewise slain by Moses for the sacrifice of consecration. He touched with the blood the tip of the right ear of the priests, the thumb of the right hand, and the great toe of the right foot. The rest of the blood he sprinkled in part upon the bottom of the altar, and a part he mingled with the consecrated oil, and sprinkled on the priests and their garments. He anointed the high priest by pouring a profusion of oil upon his head; whence he is called the anointed, Lev. v, 3, 5, 16; vi, 15; Psalm cxxxiii, 2. Certain parts of the sacrifice, namely, the fat, the kidneys, the haunches, the caul above the liver, and the right shoulder, also one cake of unleavened bread, a cake of oiled bread, and a wafer, were placed by Moses upon the hands of the priests, that they might offer them to God. This ceremony was called “filling the hands,” expressions which accordingly in a number of passages mean the same as consecrating, Exod. xxxii, 29; Leviticus xvi, 32; 1 Chronicles xxix, 5. All the parts which have been mentioned as being placed in the hands of the priests, were at last burned upon the altar. This ceremony, which continued for eight days, forever separated the priests from all the other Israelites, not excepting the Levites; so that there was subsequently no need of any farther consecration, neither for themselves nor their posterity, Exodus xxix, 35–37; Lev. x, 7; Rom. i, 1; Eph. iii, 3; Acts xiii, 2, 3. That the ceremonies of inauguration or consecration, however, were practised at every new accession of a high priest to his office, seems to be hinted in the following passages, Exod. xxix, 29; Lev. xvi, 32; xxi, 10; Num. xx, 26–28; xxxv, 25.

It was not customary for the priests to wear the sacerdotal dress except when performing their official duties, Exod. xxviii, 4, 43; Ezek. xlii, 14; xliv, 19. The description of the dress of the priests which is given in Exodus xxviii, is by some thought defective, as many things are passed in silence, apparently for the reason that they were at that time sufficiently well known, without being expressly stated. Some additional information is communicated to us by Josephus; but the dress of the priests, as he describes it, may have been in some respects of recent origin. It was as follows: 1. A sort of hose, made of cotton or linen, which was fastened round the loins, and extended down so as to cover the thighs, Lev. vi, 10; Ezek. xliv, 18. 2. A tunic of cotton which extended, in the days of Josephus, down to the ankles. It was furnished with sleeves, and was fabricated all of one piece without being sewn, Exod. xxviii, 39, 41; xxix, 5; John xix, 23. 3. The girdle. According to Josephus it was a hand’s breadth in width, woven 780in such a manner as to exhibit the appearance of scales, and ornamented with embroidered flowers in purple, dark blue, scarlet, and white. It was worn a little below the breast, encircled the body twice, and was tied in a knot before. The extremities of the girdle hung down nearly to the ankle. The priest, when engaged in his sacred functions, in order to

prevent his being impeded by them, threw them over his left shoulder, Exod. xxxix, 27–29. 4. The mitre or turban was originally acuminated in its shape, was lofty, and was bound upon the head, Exod. xxviii, 8, 40; xxix, 9; Lev. viii, 13. In the time of Josephus the shape of the mitre had become somewhat altered; it was circular, was covered with a piece of fine linen, and sat so closely on the upper part of the head, (for it did not cover the whole of the head,) that it would not fall off when the body was bent down. The Hebrew priests, like those of Egypt and other nations, performed their sacred duties with naked feet; a symbol of reverence and veneration, Exod. iii, 5; Josh. v, 15.

The ordinary priests served immediately at the altar, offered sacrifices, killed and flayed them, and poured the blood at the foot of the altar, 2 Chron. xxix, 34; xxxv, 11. They kept a perpetual fire burning upon the altar of burnt-sacrifices, and in the lamps of the golden candlestick that was in the sanctuary; they prepared the loaves of shew bread, baked them, and changed them every Sabbath day. Every day, night, and morning, a priest appointed by casting lots at the beginning of the week, brought into the sanctuary a smoking censer, and set it upon the golden table, otherwise called the altar of perfumes, Luke i, 9. The priests were not suffered to offer incense to the Lord with strange fire, Lev. x, 1, 2; that is, with any other fire than what should be taken from the altar of burnt-sacrifices. It is well known with what severity God chastised Nadab and Abihu for having failed in this. Those that would dedicate themselves to perpetual service in the temple were well received, and were maintained by the constant and daily offerings, Deut. xviii, 6–8. The Lord had given no lands of inheritance to the tribe of Levi in the distribution of the land of promise. He designed that they should be supported by the tithes, the first fruits, the offerings that were made in the temple, by their share of the sin-offerings, and thanksgiving-offerings that were sacrificed in the temple, of which certain parts were appropriated to the priests. They had also a share in the wool when the sheep were shorn. All the first-born, both of man and beast, belonged to the Lord, that is, to his priests. The men were redeemed for the sum of five shekels, Num. xviii, 15, 16. The first-born of impure animals were redeemed or exchanged, but the clean animals were not redeemed; they were sacrificed to the Lord, their blood was sprinkled about the altar, and all the rest belonged to the priest, Num. xviii, 17–19. The first fruits of trees, Lev. xix, 23, 24, that is, those that came on the fourth year, belonged also to the priest. They gave also to the priests and Levites an allowance out of the dough that they kneaded. They had the tithes of all the fruits of the land, and of all animals which were fed under the shepherd's crook, Lev. xxvii, 31, 32. God also provided them with houses and accommodations, by appointing them forty-eight cities for their habitations, Num. xxxv, 1–3. In the precincts of these cities they possessed



as far as a thousand cubits beyond the walls. Of these forty-eight cities six were appointed to be cities of refuge, for the sake of those who should commit any casual or involuntary manslaughter; the priests had thirteen of these for their share, and all the others belonged to the Levites, Josh. xxi, 19. One of the chief employments of the priests, next to attending upon the sacrifices and the service of the tabernacle or temple, was the instruction of the people and the deciding controversies, distinguishing the several sorts of leprosy, the causes of divorce, the waters of jealousy, vows, all causes relating to the law, the uncleannesses that were contracted several ways; all these things were brought before the priests, Hosea iv, 6; Mal. ii, 7, &c; Lev. xiii, 14; Num. v, 14, 15. They publicly blessed the people in the name of the Lord. In time of war their business was to carry the ark of the covenant, to consult the Lord, to sound the holy trumpets, and encourage and harangue the army.

The term priest is most properly given to Christ, of whom the high priests under the law were types and figures, he being the high priest especially ordained of God, who, by the sacrifice of himself, and by his intercession, opens the way to reconciliation with God, Heb. viii, 17; ix, 11–25. The word is also applied to every true believer who is enabled to offer up himself “a spiritual sacrifice acceptable to God through Christ,” 1 Pet. ii, 5; Rev. i, 6. But it is likewise improperly applied to Christian ministers, who have no sacrifices to offer; unless, indeed, when it is considered as contracted from presbyter, which signifies an elder, and is the name given in the New Testament to those who were appointed to the office of teaching and ruling in the church of God. See Aaron.

PRISCILLA, a Christian woman, well known in the Acts, and in St. Paul’s epistles; sometimes placed before her husband Aquila. From Ephesus this pious pair went to Rome, where they were when St. Paul wrote his epistle to the Romans, A. D. 58. He salutes them the first of all, with great commendations, Rom. xvi, 3. They returned into Asia some time afterward; and St. Paul, writing to Timothy, desires him to salute them on his behalf, 2 Tim. iv, 19, A. D. 65.

PROFANE, an epithet applied to those who abuse and contemn holy things. The Scripture calls Esau profane, because he sold his birthright, which was considered a holy thing, not only because the priesthood was annexed to it, but also because it was a privilege relating to Christ, and a type of the title of believers to the heavenly inheritance, Heb. xii, 16. The priests of the race of Aaron were enjoined to distinguish between sacred and profane, between pure and polluted, Lev. x, 10; xix, 7, 8. Hence they were prohibited the use of wine during their attendance on the temple service, that their spirits might not be discomposed by excitement. To

profane the temple, to profane the Sabbath, to profane the altar, are common expressions to denote the violation of the rest of the Sabbath, the entering of foreigners into the temple, or the want of reverence in those that entered it, and the impious sacrifices that were offered on the altar of the Lord.

PROMISE, an assurance given by God, in his word, of bestowing blessings upon his people, 2 Pet. i, 4. The word in the New Testament is usually taken for the promises that God heretofore made to Abraham, and the other patriarchs, of sending the Messiah, and conferring his Holy Spirit and eternal life on those that should believe on him. It is in this sense that the Apostle Paul commonly uses the word promise, Rom. iv, 13, 14; Gal. iii, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 29. The promises of the new covenant are called better than those of the old, Heb. viii, 6, because they are more spiritual, clear, comprehensive, and universal than those of the Mosaic covenant. The time of the promise, Acts vii, 17, is the time of fulfilling the promise. The "children of the promise" are, 1. The Israelites descended from Isaac, in opposition to the Ishmaelites descended from Ishmael and Hagar. 2. The Jews converted to Christianity, in opposition to the obstinate Jews, who would not believe in Christ. 3. All true believers who are born again by the supernatural power of God, and who by faith lay hold on the promise of salvation in Jesus Christ.

PROPHECY, the prediction of future events; it is especially understood of those predictions which are contained in the Holy Scriptures; all of which claim divine inspiration, and by their wonderful fulfilment are proved to have proceeded from God, who only with certainty can know the future. Prophecy is one great branch of the external evidence of the truth of the Scriptures; and the nature and force of this kind of evidence may here be properly pointed out. No argument *à priori* against the possibility of prophecy can be attempted by any one who believes in the existence and infinitely perfect nature of God. The infidel author of "The Moral Philosopher," indeed, rather insinuates than attempts fully to establish a dilemma with which to perplex those who regard prophecy as one of the proofs of a divine revelation. He thinks that either prophecy must respect events necessary, as depending upon necessary causes, which might be certainly foreknown and predicted; or that, if human actions are free, and effects contingent, the possibility of prophecy must be given up, as it implies foreknowledge, which, if granted, would render them necessary. The first part of this objection might be allowed, were there no predictions to be adduced in favour of a professed revelation, except such as related to events which human experience has taught to be dependent upon some cause, the existence and necessary operation of which are within the compass of human knowledge. But to foretel such events would not be to

prophecy, any more than to say that it will be light to-morrow at noon, or that on a certain day and hour next year there will occur an eclipse of the sun or moon, when that event has been previously ascertained by astronomical calculation. If, however, it were allowed that all events depended upon a chain of necessary causes, yet, in a variety of instances, the argument from prophecy would not be at all affected; for the foretelling of necessary results in certain circumstances is beyond human intelligence, because they can only be known to him by whose power those necessary causes on which they depend have been arranged, and who has prescribed the times of their operation. To borrow a case, for the sake of illustration, from the Scriptures, though the claims of their predictions are not now in question; let us allow that such a prophecy as that of Isaiah respecting the taking of Babylon by Cyrus was uttered, as it purports to be, more than a century before Cyrus was born, and that all the actions of Cyrus and his army, and those of the Babylonian; monarch and his people, were necessitated is it to be maintained that the chain of necessitating causes running through more than a century could be traced by a human mind, so as to describe the precise manner in which that fatality would unfold itself, even to the turning of the river, the drunken carousal of the inhabitants, and the neglect of shutting the gates of the city? This being by uniform and universal experience known to be above all human apprehension, would therefore prove that the prediction was made in consequence of a communication from a superior and divine Intelligence. Were events, therefore, subjected to invincible fate and necessity, there might nevertheless be prophecy.

The other branch of the dilemma is founded on the notion that if we allow the moral freedom of human actions, prophecy is impossible, because certain foreknowledge is contrary to that freedom, and fixes and renders the event necessary. To this the reply is, that the objection is founded on a false assumption, the divine foreknowledge having no more influence in effectuating or making certain any event than human foreknowledge in the degree in which it may exist, there being no moral causality at all in knowledge. This lies in the will, which is the determining acting principle in every agent; or, as Dr. Samuel Clarke has expressed it, in answer to another kind of objector, "God's infallible judgment concerning contingent truths does no more alter the nature of the things, and cause them to be necessary, than our judging right at any time concerning a contingent truth makes it cease to be contingent; or than our science of a present truth is any cause of its being either true or present. Here, therefore, lies the fallacy of our author's argument. Because, from God's foreknowing the existence of things depending upon a chain 782of necessary causes, it follows that the existence of the things must needs be necessary; therefore, from God's judging infallibly concerning things which depend not on necessary but

free causes, he concludes that these things also depend not upon free but necessary causes. Contrary, I say, to the supposition in the argument; for it must not be first supposed that things are in their own nature necessary; but from the power of judging infallibly concerning free events, it must be proved that things, otherwise supposed free, will thereby unavoidably become necessary." The whole question lies in this, Is the simple knowledge of an action a necessitating cause of the action? And the answer must be in the negative, as every man's consciousness will assure him. If the causality of influence, either immediate, or by the arrangement of compelling events, be mixed up with this, the ground is shifted; and it is no longer a question which respects simple prescience. (See Prescience.) This metaphysical objection having no foundation in truth, the force of the evidence arising from predictions of events, distant, and beyond the power of human sagacity to anticipate, and uttered as authentications of a divine commission, is apparent. "Such predictions, whether in the form of declaration, description, or representation of things future," as Mr. Boyle justly observes, "are supernatural things, and may properly be ranked among miracles." For when, for instance, the events are distant many years or ages from the uttering of the prediction itself, depending on causes not so much as existing when the prophecy was spoken and recorded, and likewise upon various circumstances and a long arbitrary series of things, and the fluctuating uncertainties of human volitions, and especially when they depend not at all upon any external circumstances nor upon any created being, but arise merely from the counsels and appointment of God himself,--such events can be foreknown only by that Being, one of whose attributes is omniscience, and can be foretold by him only to whom the "Father of lights" shall reveal them; so that whoever is manifestly endued with that predictive power must, in that instance, speak and act by divine inspiration, and what he pronounces of that kind must be received as the word of God; nothing more being necessary to assure us of this than credible testimony that such predictions were uttered before the event, or conclusive evidence that the records which contain them are of the antiquity to which they pretend.

The distinction between the prophecies of Scripture and the oracles of Heathenism is marked and essential. In the Heathen oracles we cannot discern any clear and unequivocal tokens of genuine prophecy. They were destitute of dignity and importance, had no connection with each other, tended to no object of general concern, and never looked into times remote from their own. We read only of some few predictions and prognostications, scattered among the writings of poets and philosophers, most of which, beside being very weakly authenticated, appear to have been answers to questions of merely local, personal, and temporary concern, relating to the issue of affairs then actually in hand, and to events

speedily to be determined. Far from attempting to form any chain of prophecies, respecting things far distant as to time or place, or matters contrary to human probability, and requiring supernatural agency to effect them, the Heathen priests and soothsayers did not even pretend to a systematic and connected plan. They hardly dared, indeed, to assume the prophetic character in its full force, but stood trembling, as it were, on the brink of futurity, conscious of their inability to venture beyond the depths of human conjecture. Hence their predictions became so fleeting, so futile, so uninteresting, that, though they were collected together as worthy of preservation, they soon fell into disrepute and almost total oblivion. (See Oracles.) The Scripture prophecies, on the other hand, constitute a series of divine predictions, relating principally to one grand object, of universal importance, the work of man's redemption, and carried on in regular progression through the patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations, with a harmony and uniformity of design, clearly indicating one and the same divine Author. They speak of the agents to be employed in it, and especially of the great agent, the Redeemer himself; and of those mighty and awful proceedings of Providence as to the nations of the earth, by which judgment and mercy are exercised with reference both to the ordinary principles of moral government, and especially to this restoring economy, to its struggles, its oppositions, and its triumphs. They all meet in Christ, as in their proper centre, and in him only; however many of the single lines, when considered apart, may be imagined to have another direction, and though they may pass through intermediate events. If we look, says Bishop Hurd, into the prophetic writings, we find that prophecy is of a prodigious extent; that it commenced from the fall of man, and reaches to the consummation of all things; that for many ages it was delivered darkly to a few persons, and with large intervals from the date of one prophecy to that of another; but, at length, became more clear, more frequent, and was uniformly carried on in the line of one people, separated from the rest of the world,—among other reasons assigned, for this principally, to be the repository of the divine oracles; that, with some intermission, the spirit of prophecy subsisted among that people to the coming of Christ; that he himself and his Apostles exercised this power in the most conspicuous manner, and left behind them many predictions, recorded in the books of the New Testament, which profess to respect very distant events, and even run out to the end of time, or, in St. John's expression, to that period "when the mystery of God shall be perfected." Farther, beside the extent of this prophetic scheme, the dignity of the Person whom it concerns deserves our consideration. He is described in terms which excite the most august and magnificent ideas. He is spoken of, indeed, sometimes as being "the seed of the woman," and as "the Son of man;" yet so as being at the same time of more than mortal extraction. He is even represented to us as being superior to men and angels; as far

above all principality and power; above all that is accounted great, whether in heaven or in earth; as the word and wisdom of God; as the eternal Son of the Father; as the Heir of all things, by whom he made the worlds; as the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person. We have no words to denote greater ideas than these; the mind of man cannot elevate itself to nobler conceptions. Of such transcendent worth and excellence is that Jesus said to be, to whom all the prophets bear witness! Lastly, the declared purpose for which the Messiah, prefigured by so long a train of prophecy, came into the world, corresponds to all the rest of the representation. It was not to deliver an oppressed nation from civil tyranny, or to erect a great civil empire, that is, to achieve one of those acts which history accounts most heroic. No: it was not a mighty state, a victor people,

Non res Romanæ perituraque regna,

[Not the empire of Rome and kingdoms about to perish,]

that was worthy to enter into the contemplation of this divine Person. It was another and far sublimer purpose, which he came to accomplish; a purpose, in comparison of which all our policies are poor and little, and all the performances of man as nothing. It was to deliver a world from ruin; to abolish sin and death; to purify and immortalize human nature; and thus, in the most exalted sense of the words, to be the Saviour of men and the blessing of all nations. There is no exaggeration in this account: a spirit of prophecy pervading all time, characterizing one Person of the highest dignity, and proclaiming the accomplishment of one purpose, the most beneficent, the most divine, the imagination itself can project. Such is the Scriptural delineation of that economy which we call prophetic.

The advantage of this species of evidence belongs then exclusively to our revelation. Heathenism never made any clear and well founded pretensions to it. Mohammedanism, though it stands itself as a proof of the truth of Scripture prophecy, is unsupported by a single prediction of its own.

The objection which has been raised to Scripture prophecy, from its supposed obscurity, has no solid foundation. There is, it is true, a prophetic language of symbol and emblem; but it is a language which is definite and not equivocal in its meaning, and as easily mastered as the language of poetry, by attentive persons. This, however, is not always used. The style of the prophecies of Scripture very often differs in nothing from the ordinary style of the Hebrew poets; and, in not a few cases, and those too on which the Christian builds most in the argument, it sinks into the plainness of historical narrative. Some degree of obscurity is essential to prophecy: for the end of it was not to gratify human curiosity, by a detail of future events and circumstances; and too great clearness and speciality might have led to many artful attempts to fulfil the predictions, and so far

the evidence of their accomplishment would have been weakened. The two great ends of prophecy are, to excite expectation before the event, and then to confirm the truth by a striking and unequivocal fulfilment; and it is a sufficient answer to the allegation of the obscurity of the prophecies of Scripture, that they have abundantly accomplished those objects, among the most intelligent and investigating, as well as among the simple and unlearned, in all ages. It cannot be denied, for instance, leaving out particular cases which might be given, that by means of these predictions the expectation of the incarnation and appearance of a divine Restorer was kept up among the people to whom they were given, and spread even to the neighbouring nations; that as these prophecies multiplied, the hope became more intense; and that at the time of our Lord's coming, the expectation of the birth of a very extraordinary person prevailed, not only among the Jews, but among other nations. This purpose was then sufficiently answered, and an answer is given to the objection. In like manner prophecy serves as the basis of our hope in things yet to come; in the final triumph of truth and righteousness on earth, the universal establishment of the kingdom of our Lord, and the rewards of eternal life to be bestowed at his second appearing. In these all true Christians agree; and their hope could not have been so uniformly supported in all ages and under all circumstances, had not the prophecies and predictive promises conveyed with sufficient clearness the general knowledge of the good for which they looked, though many of its particulars be unrevealed. The second end of prophecy is, to confirm the truth by the subsequent event. Here the question of the actual fulfilment of Scripture prophecy is involved; and it is no argument against the unequivocal fulfilment of several prophecies, that many have doubted or denied what the believers in revelation have on this subject so strenuously contended for. How few of mankind have read the Scriptures with serious attention, or been at the pains to compare their prophecies with the statements in history. How few, especially of the objectors to the Bible, have read it in this manner! How many of them have confessed unblushingly their unacquaintance with its contents, or have proved what they have not confessed by the mistakes and misrepresentations into which they have fallen! As for the Jews, the evident dominion of their prejudices, their general averseness to discussion, and the extravagant principles of interpretation they have adopted for many ages, which set all sober criticism at defiance, render nugatory any authority which might be ascribed to their denial of the fulfilment of certain prophecies in the sense adopted by Christians. We may add to this, that among Christian critics themselves there may be much disagreement. Eccentricities and absurdities are found among the learned in every department of knowledge, and much of this waywardness and affectation of singularity has infected interpreters of Scripture. But, after all, there is a truth and reason in every subject, which the understandings

of the generality of men will apprehend and acknowledge whenever it is fully understood and impartially considered; to this in all such cases the appeal can only be made, and here it may be made with confidence. Instances of the signal fulfilment of numerous prophecies are scattered through various articles in this volume; so that it is not necessary to repeat them here. A few words on the double sense of prophecy may, however, be added.

For want of a right apprehension of the true meaning of this somewhat unfortunate term which has obtained in theology, an objection of another kind has been raised, as though no definite meaning could be assigned to the prophecies of Scripture. Nothing can be more unfounded. The double sense of many prophecies in the Old Testament, says an able writer, has been made a pretext by ill disposed men, for representing them as of uncertain meaning, and resembling the ambiguity of the Pagan oracles. But whoever considers the subject with due attention, will perceive how little ground there is for such an accusation. The equivocations of the Heathen oracles manifestly arose from their ignorance of future events, and from their endeavours to conceal that ignorance by such indefinite expressions, as might be equally applicable to two or more events of a contrary description. But the double sense of the Scripture prophecies, far from originating in any doubt or uncertainty, as to the fulfilment of them in either sense, springs from a foreknowledge of their accomplishment in both; whence the prediction is purposely so framed as to include both events, which, so far from being contrary to each other, are typical the one of the other, and are thus connected together by a mutual dependency or relation. This has often been satisfactorily proved, with respect to those prophecies which referred, in their primary sense, to the events of the Old Testament, and, in their farther and more complex signification, to those of the New: and on this double accomplishment of some prophecies is grounded our firm expectation of the completion of others, which remain yet unfulfilled in their secondary sense, but which we justly consider as equally uncertain in their issue as those which are already past. So far, then, from any valid objection lying against the credibility of the Scripture prophecies, from these seeming ambiguities of meaning, we may urge them as additional proofs of their coming from God. For, who but the Being that is infinite in knowledge and in counsel could so construct predictions as to give them a twofold application, to events distant from, and, to human foresight, unconnected with, each other? What power less than divine could so frame them as to make the accomplishment of them in one instance a solemn pledge and assurance of their completion in another instance, of still higher and more universal importance? Where will the scoffer find any thing like this in the artifices of Heathen oracles, to conceal their ignorance, and to impose on the credulity of mankind? See Oracles.



On this subject it may be observed, by way of general illustration, that the remarkable personages under the old dispensation were sometimes in the description of their characters, and in the events of their lives, the representatives of the future dispensers of evangelical blessings, as Moses and David were unquestionably types of Christ, Ezek. xxxiv, 23; Matt. xi, 14; Heb. vi, 20; vii, 1–3. Persons likewise were sometimes descriptive of things, as Sarah and Hagar were allegorical figures of the two covenants, Gal. iv, 22–31; Rom. ix, 8–13. And, on the other hand, things were used to symbolize persons, as the brazen serpent and the paschal lamb were signs of our healing and spotless Redeemer, Exodus xii, 46; John iii, 14; xix, 36. And so, lastly, ceremonial appointments and legal circumstances were preordained as significant of Gospel institutions, 1 Cor. x, 1–11; Heb. viii, 5; ix, x; 1 Pet. iii, 20, 22. Hence it was that many of the descriptions of the prophets had a twofold character; bearing often an immediate reference to present circumstances, and yet being in their nature predictive of future occurrences. What they reported of the type was often in a more signal manner applicable to the thing typified, Psalm xxi, 4–6; xl, 1, 7–10; xii, 4; Lam. xiii, 1–30; John xiii, 18; Dan. xi, 36, 37; what they spoke literally of present, was figuratively descriptive of future particulars; and what was applied in a figurative sense to existing persons, was often actually characteristic of their distant archetypes, Psalm xxii, 16–18, &c. Many passages then in the Old Testament, which in their first aspect appear to be historical, are in fact prophetic, and they are so cited in the New Testament, not by way of ordinary accommodation, or casual coincidence, but as intentionally predictive, as having a double sense, a literal and a mystical interpretation, Hosea xi, 1; Matt. ii, 15.

Beside these historical passages, of which the covert allusions were explained by the interpretation of the Gospel writers, who were enlightened by the Spirit to unfold the mysteries of Scripture, the prophets often uttered positive predictions which, in consequence of the correspondence established between the two dispensations, were descriptive of a double event, however they might be themselves ignorant of the full extent of those prophecies which they delivered. For instance, their promises of present success and deliverances were often significant of distant benefits, and secular consolations conveyed assurances of evangelical blessings, 2 Sam. vii, 13, 14; Heb. i, 5. Thus their prophecies received completion in a first and secondary view. As being in part signs to excite confidence, they had an immediate accomplishment, but were afterward fulfilled in a more illustrious sense, 7851 Kings xiii, 2, 3; Isaiah vii, 14; Matt. i, 22; Dan. ix, 27; xii, 7; 1 Macc. i, 54; Matt. xxiv, 15; the prophets being inspired, by the suggestions of the Spirit, to use expressions magnificent enough to include the substance in the description of the figure. That many of the prophecies

in the Old Testament were direct, and singly and exclusively applicable to, and accomplished in, our Saviour, is certain, Gen. xlix, 10; Psalm xlii, xlv; Isaiah lii, liii; Daniel vii, 13, 14; Micah v, 2; Zech. ix, 9; Mal. iii, 1.

It requires much attention to comprehend the full import and extent of this typical dispensation, and the chief obscurities which prevail in the sacred writings are to be attributed to the double character of prophecy. To unravel this is, however, an interesting and instructive study; though an admiration of the spiritual meaning should never lead us to disregard or undervalue the first and evident signification; for many great men have been so dazzled by their discoveries in this mode of explication, as to be hurried into wild and extravagant excess; as is evident from the writings of Origen and Jerom; as also from the Commentaries of Austin, who acknowledges that he had too far indulged in the fancies of an exuberant imagination, declaring that the other parts of Scripture are the best commentaries. The Apostles and the evangelists are, indeed, the best expositors; and where those infallible guides have led the way, we need not hesitate to follow their steps by the light of clear reason and just analogy.

It is this double character of prophecy which occasions those unexpected transitions and sudden interchanges of circumstance so observable in the prophetic books. Hence different predictions are sometimes blended and mixed together; temporal and spiritual deliverances are foretold in one prophecy; and greater and smaller events are combined in one point of view. Hence, likewise, one chain of connected design runs through the whole scheme of prophecy, and a continuation of events successively fulfilling, and successively branching out into new predictions, continued to confirm the faith, and to keep alive the expectations, of the Jews. Hence was it the character of the prophetic spirit to be rapid in its description, and regardless of the order of history; to pass with quick and unexpected celerity from subject to subject, and from period to period. "And we must allow," says Lord Bacon, "for that latitude that is agreeable and familiar to prophecy, which is of the nature of its Author, with whom a thousand years are but as one day." The whole of the great scheme must have been at once present to the divine Mind; but God described its parts in detail to mankind, in such measures and in such proportions, that the connection of every link was obvious, and its relations apparent in every point of view, till the harmony and entire consistency of the plan were displayed to those who witnessed its perfection in the advent of Christ.

**PROPHETS.** A prophet, in the strict and proper sense, was one to whom the knowledge of secret things was revealed, that he might declare them to others, whether they were things past, or present, or to come. The woman of Samaria perceived our Saviour was a prophet, by his telling her the

secrets of her past life, John iv, 19. The Prophet Elisha had the present conduct of his servant Gehazi revealed to him, 2 Kings v, 26. And most of the prophets had revelations concerning future events; above all, concerning the coming and kingdom of the Messiah: "He has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began," Luke i, 69, 70. Nevertheless, in a more lax or analogical sense, the title prophet is sometimes given to persons who had no such revelation, nor were properly inspired. Thus Aaron is said to be Moses's prophet: "The Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet," Exod. vii, 1: because Aaron received the divine messages, which he carried immediately from Moses; whereas other prophets receive their messages immediately from God himself. In this respect, as Moses stood in the place of God to Pharaoh, so Aaron acted in the character of his prophet. The title of prophets is given also to the sacred musicians, who sung the praises of God, or who accompanied the song with musical instruments. Thus "the sons of Asaph, and of Heman, and of Jeduthun," are said to "prophesy with harps, with psalteries, and with cymbals," 1 Chron. xxv, 1; and they prophesied, it is said, "according to the order of the king." Perhaps Miriam, the sister of Aaron, may be called a prophetess only on this account, that she led the concert of the women, who sung the song of Moses with timbrels and with dances, Exodus xv, 20, 21. Thus the Heathen poets, who sung or composed verses in praise of their gods, were called by the Romans vates, or prophets; which is of the same import with the Greek *προφήτης*, a title which St. Paul gives to Epimenides, a Cretan poet, Titus i, 12.

Godwin observes, that, for the propagation of learning, colleges and schools were in divers places erected for the prophets. The first intimation we have in Scripture of these schools is in 1 Sam. x, 5, where we read of "a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, a tabret, a pipe, and a harp before them, and they did prophesy." They are supposed to be the students in a college of prophets at *גבעת*, or "the hill," as we render it, "of God." Our translators elsewhere retain the same Hebrew word, as supposing it to be the proper name of a place, "Jonathan smote the garrison of the Philistines that was in Geba," 1 Sam. xiii, 3. Some persons have imagined that the ark, or at least a synagogue, or some place of public worship, was at this time at Geba, and that this is the reason of its being styled in the former passage *גבעת האלהים*, the hill of God. We read afterward of such another company of prophets 786at Naioth in Ramah, "prophesying, and Samuel standing as appointed over them," 1 Sam. xix, 19, 20. The students in these colleges were called sons of the prophets, who are frequently mentioned in after ages, even in the most degenerate times. Thus we read of the sons of the prophets that were at Bethel; and of another

school at Jericho; and of the sons of the prophets at Gilgal, 2 Kings ii, 3, 5; iv, 38. It should seem, that these sons of the prophets were very numerous; for of this sort were probably the prophets of the Lord, whom Jezebel cut off; "but Obadiah took a hundred of them, and hid them by fifty in a cave," 1 Kings xviii, 4. In these schools young men were educated under a proper master, who was commonly, if not always, an inspired prophet, in the knowledge of religion, and in sacred music, 1 Sam. x, 5; xix, 20, and were thereby qualified to be public preachers, which seems to have been part of the business of the prophets on the Sabbath days and festivals, 2 Kings iv, 23. It should seem, that God generally chose the prophets, whom he inspired, out of these schools. Amos, therefore, speaks of it as an extraordinary case, that though he was not one of the sons of the prophets, but a herdsman, "yet the Lord took him as he followed the flock, and said unto him, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel," Amos vii, 14, 15. That it was usual for some of these schools, or at least for their tutors, to be endued with a prophetic spirit, appears from the relation of the prophecies concerning the ascent of Elijah, delivered to Elisha by the sons of the prophets, both at Jericho and at Bethel, 2 Kings ii, 3, 5.

The Hebrew prophets present a succession of men at once the most singular and the most venerable that ever appeared, in so long a line of time, in the world. They had special communion with God; they laid open the scenes of the future; they were ministers of the promised Christ. They upheld religion and piety in the worst times, and at the greatest risks; and their disinterestedness was only equalled by their patriotism. The houses in which they lived were generally mean, and of their own building, 2 Kings vi, 2–4. Their food was chiefly pottage of herbs, unless when the people sent them some better provision, as bread, parched corn, honey, dried fruits, and the like, 1 Kings xiv, 3; 2 Kings iv, 38, 39, 42. Their dress was plain and coarse, tied about with a leathern girdle, Zech. xiii, 4; 2 Kings i, 8. Riches were no temptation to them; therefore Elisha not only refused Naaman's presents, but punished his servant Gehazi very severely for clandestinely obtaining a small share of them, 2 Kings v, 15, &c. To succeeding ages they have left a character consecrated by holiness, and "visions of the Holy One," which still unveil to the church his most glorious attributes, and his deepest designs. "Prophecy," says the Apostle Peter, "came not of old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," 2 Pet. i, 21. They flourished in a continued succession during a period of more than a thousand years, reckoning from Moses to Malachi, all coöperating in the same designs, uniting in one spirit to deliver the same doctrines, and to predict the same blessings to mankind. Their claims to a divine commission were demonstrated by the intrinsic excellency of their doctrine; by the disinterested zeal and undaunted courage with which they prosecuted their

ministry, and persevered in their great design, and by the unimpeachable integrity of their conduct. But even those credentials of a divine mission were still farther confirmed by the exercise of miraculous powers, and by the completion of many less important predictions which they uttered, Deut. xiii, 1–3; xviii, 22; Joshua x, 13; 1 Sam. xii, 8; 2 Kings i, 10; Isa. xxxviii, 8; xlii, 9; 1 Sam. ix, 6; 1 Kings xiii, 3; Jer. xxviii, 9; Ezek. xxxiii, 33. When not immediately employed in the discharge of their sacred office, they lived sequestered from the world, in religious communities, or wandered “in deserts, in mountains, and in caves of the earth;” distinguished by their apparel, and by the general simplicity of their style of life, 2 Kings i, 8; iv, 10, 38; vi, 1; Isa. xx, 2; Matt. iii, 4; Heb. xi, 38; Rev. xi, 3. They were the established oracles of their country, and consulted upon all occasions when it was necessary to collect the divine will on any civil or religious question. These illustrious personages were likewise as well the types as the harbingers of that greater Prophet whom they foretold; and in the general outline of their character, as well as in particular events of their lives, they prefigured to the Jews the future Teacher of mankind. Like him, also, they laboured by every exertion to instruct and reclaim; reproving and threatening the sinful, however exalted in rank, or encircled by power, with such fearless confidence and sincerity as often excited respect. The most intemperate princes were sometimes compelled unwillingly to hear and to obey their directions, 1 Kings xii, 21–24; xiii, 2–6; xx, 42, 43; xxi, 27; 2 Chron. xxviii, 9–14; though often so incensed by their rebuke, as to resent it by the severest persecutions. Then it was that the prophets exhibited the integrity of their characters, by zealously encountering oppression, hatred, and death, in the cause of religion. Then it was that they firmly supported “trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment. They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about, destitute, afflicted, tormented,” evil intreated for those virtues of which the memorial should flourish to posterity, and martyred for righteousness, which, whenever resentment should subside, it would be deemed honourable to reverence, Matthew xxiii, 27–29.

The manner in which the prophets published their predictions was, either by uttering them aloud in some public place, or by affixing them on the gates of the temple, Jer. vii, 2; Ezek. iii, 10, where they might be generally seen and read. Upon some important occasions, <sup>787</sup>when it was necessary to rouse the fears of a disobedient people, and to recall them to repentance, the prophets, as objects of universal attention, appear to have walked about publicly in sackcloth, and with every external mark of humiliation and sorrow. They then adopted extraordinary modes of expressing their convictions of impending wrath, and endeavoured to awaken the apprehensions of their country, by the most striking illustration of

threatened punishment. Thus Jeremiah made bonds and yokes, and put them upon his neck, Jer. xxvii, strongly to intimate the subjection that God would bring on the nations whom Nebuchadnezzar should subdue. Isaiah likewise walked naked, that is, without the rough garment of the prophet, and barefoot, as a sign of the distress that awaited the Egyptians, Isa. xx. So Jeremiah broke the potter's vessel, Jer. xix; and Ezekiel publicly removed his household goods from the city, 2 Kings xxv, 4, 5; Ezek. xii, 7; more forcibly to represent by these actions some correspondent calamities ready to fall on nations obnoxious to God's wrath; this mode of expressing important circumstances by action, being customary and familiar among all eastern nations. The great object of prophecy was, as has been before observed, a description of the Messiah, and of his kingdom, Matt. xxvi, 56; Luke i, 70; xviii, 31; xxiv, 44; John i, 45; Acts iii, 18, 24; x, 43; xiii, 29; xv, 15; xxviii, 23; 1 Pet. i, 10–12. These were gradually unfolded by successive prophets in predictions more and more distinct. They were at first held forth in general promises; they were afterward described by figures, and shadowed out under types and allusive institutions, and finally foretold in the full lustre of descriptive prophecy. The Hebrew prophets were chosen of God to testify beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. See Prophecy.

PROPITIATION. To propitiate is to appease, to atone, to turn away the wrath of an offended person. In the case before us, the wrath turned away is the wrath of God; the person making the propitiation is Christ; the propitiating offering or sacrifice is his blood. All this is expressed in most explicit terms in the following passages: "And he is the propitiation for our sins," 1 John ii, 2. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 John iv, 10. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," Rom. iii, 25. The word used in the two former passages is ἵλασμός; in the last ἵλαστήριον. Both are from the verb ἰλάσκω, so often used by Greek writers to express the action of a person who, in some appointed way, turned away the wrath of a deity; and therefore cannot bear the sense which Socinus would put upon it,—the destruction of sin. This is not supported by a single example. With all Greek authorities, whether poets, historians, or others, the word means to propitiate, and is, for the most part, construed with an accusative case, designating the person whose displeasure is averted. As this could not be denied, Crellius comes to the aid of Socinus, and contends that the sense of this word was not to be taken from its common use in the Greek tongue, but from the Hellenistic use of it in the Greek of the New Testament, the LXX. and the Apocrypha. But this will not serve him; for both by the LXX. and in the Apocrypha, it is used in the same sense as in the Greek classic writers. "He shall offer his ἵλασμόν, sin-offering, saith the Lord God," Ezek. xliv, 27. "And the priest shall take the

blood of the ἐξίλασμοῦ, sin-offering,” Ezek. xlv, 19. Κριὸς τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ, “The ram of the atonement,” Num. v, 8. To which may be added, out of the Apocrypha, “Now as the high priest was making ἱλασμόν, an atonement,” 2 Macc. iii, 33.

The propitiatory sense of the word ἱλασμός being thus fixed, the modern Socinians have conceded, in their note on 1 John ii, 2, in their Improved Version, that it means the “pacifying of an offended party;” but they subjoin, that Christ is a propitiation, because by his Gospel he brings sinners to repentance, and thus averts the divine displeasure. The concession is important; and the comment cannot weaken it, because of its absurdity; for, in that interpretation of propitiation, Moses, or any of the Apostles, or any minister of the Gospel now, who succeeds in bringing sinners to repentance, is as truly a propitiation for sin as Christ himself. On Rom. iii, 25, however, the authors of the Improved Version continue to follow their master Socinus, and translate the passage, “whom God hath set forth a propitiation, through faith in his blood,” “whom God hath set forth as a mercy seat in his own blood,” and lay great stress upon this rendering, as removing that countenance to the doctrine of atonement by vicarious sufferings which the common translation affords. The word ἱλαστήριον is used in the Septuagint version, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to express the mercy seat or covering of the ark. But so little is to be gained by taking it in this sense in this passage, that this rendering is adopted by several orthodox commentators as expressing, by a figure, or rather by emphatically supplying a type to the antitype,—the doctrine of our Lord’s atonement. The mercy seat was so called, because, under the Old Testament, it was the place where the high priest, on the feast of expiation, sprinkled the blood of the sin-offerings, in order to make an atonement for himself and the whole congregation; and, since God accepted the offering which was then made, it was, for this reason, accounted the medium through which God showed himself propitious to the people. With reference to this, Jesus Christ may be called a mercy seat, as being the person in or through whom God shows himself propitious to mankind. And as, under the law, God was propitious to those who came to him by appearing before his mercy seat with the blood of their sin-offerings; so, under the Gospel dispensation, he is propitious to those who come unto him by Jesus Christ, through faith in that blood which is elsewhere called “the blood of sprinkling,” 788 and which he shed for the remission of sins. Some able critics have, however, argued, from the force of the context, that the word ought to be taken actively, and not merely declaratively; not as “a propitiatory,” but as “a propitiation,” which, says Grotius, is shown by the mention which is afterward made of blood, to which the power of propitiation is ascribed. Others supply θῦμα or ἱερεῖον, and render it expiatory sacrifice. But, whichever of these renderings be adopted, the

same doctrine is held forth to us. The covering of the ark was rendered a propitiatory only by the blood of the victims sprinkled before and upon it; and when the Apostle says, that God hath set forth Jesus Christ to be a propitiatory, he immediately adds, having the ceremonies of the temple in his view, "through faith in his blood." The text, therefore, contains no exhibition of any means of obtaining mercy but through the blood of sacrifice, according to the rule laid down in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission;" and is in strict accordance with Ephesians i, 7, "We have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins." It is only by his blood that Christ reconciles us to God.

Unable as they who deny the vicarious nature of the sufferings of Christ are to evade the testimony of the above passages which speak of our Lord as "a propitiation," their next resource often is to deny the existence of wrath in God, in the hope of proving that propitiation, in a proper sense, cannot be the doctrine of Scripture, whatever may be the force of the mere terms which the sacred writers employ. In order to give plausibility to their statement, they pervert the opinion of the orthodox, and argue as though it formed a part of the doctrine of Christ's propitiation and oblation for sin, to represent God as naturally an implacable and vengeful being, and only made placable and disposed to show mercy by satisfaction being made to his displeasure through our Lord's sufferings and death. This is as contrary to Scripture as it is to the opinions of all sober persons who hold the doctrine of Christ's atonement. God is love; but it is not necessary, in order to support this truth, to assume that he is nothing else. He has other attributes, which harmonize with this and with each other; though, assuredly, that harmony cannot be established by any who deny the propitiation for sin made by the death of Christ. It sufficiently proves that there is not only no implacability in God, but a most tender and placable affection toward the sinning human race itself, and that the Son of God, by whom the propitiation was made, was the free gift of the Father to us. This is the most eminent proof of his love, that, for our sakes, and that mercy might be extended to us, "He spared not his own Son; but delivered him up freely for us all." Thus he is the fountain and first moving cause of that scheme of recovery and salvation which the incarnation and death of our Lord brought into full and efficient operation. The true questions are, indeed, not whether God is love, or whether he is of a placable nature; but whether God is holy and just; whether we, his creatures, are under law or not; whether this law has any penalty, and whether God, in his rectoral character, is bound to execute and uphold that law. As the justice of God is punitive, (and if it is not punitive, his laws are a dead letter,) then is there wrath in God; then is God angry with the wicked; then is man, as a sinner, obnoxious to this anger; and so a propitiation becomes necessary to turn it



away from him. Nor are these terms unscriptural; they are used in the New Testament as emphatically as in the Old; though, the former is, in a special sense, a revelation of the mercy of God to man. John declares that, if any man believeth not on the Son of God, “the wrath of God abideth upon him;” and St. Paul affirms, that “the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.” The day of judgment is, with reference to the ungodly, said to be “the day of wrath;” God is called “a consuming fire;” and, as such, is the object of “reverence and godly fear.” Nor is this his displeasure light, and the consequences of it a trifling and temporary inconvenience. When we only regard the consequences which have followed sin in society, from the earliest ages, and in every part of the world, and add to these the many direct and fearful inflictions of punishment which have proceeded from the “Judge of the whole earth,” then, to use the language of Scripture, “our flesh may well tremble because of his judgments.” But when we look at the future state of the wicked as represented in Scripture, though it is expressed generally, and surrounded with the mystery of a place, and a condition of being, unknown to us in the present state, all evils which history has crowded into the lot of man appear insignificant in comparison of banishment from God, separation from good men, public condemnation, torment of spirit, “weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth,” “everlasting destruction,” “everlasting fire.” Let men talk ever so much or eloquently of the pure benevolence of God, they cannot abolish the facts recorded in the history of human suffering in this world as the effects of transgression; nor can they discharge these fearful comminations from the pages of the book of God. These cannot be criticised away; and if it is “Jesus who saves us from this wrath to come,” that is, from those effects of the wrath of God which are to come, then, but for him, we should have been liable to them. That principle in God, from which such effects follow, the Scriptures call wrath; and they who deny the existence of wrath in God, deny, therefore, the Scriptures.

It by no means follows, however, that this wrath is a passion in God; or that, though we contend that the awful attribute of his justice requires satisfaction, in order to the forgiveness of the guilty, we afford reason to any to charge us with attributing vengeful affections to the divine Being. “Our adversaries,” says Bishop Stillingfleet, “first make opinions for us, and then show that they are unreasonable. They first suppose that anger in God is to be considered as a passion, and that passion a desire of revenge; and then tell us, that if we do not prove that this desire of revenge can be satisfied by the sufferings of Christ, then we can never prove the doctrine of satisfaction to be true; whereas, we do not mean by God’s anger, any such passion, but the just declaration of God’s will to punish, upon our provocation of him by our sins; we do not make the design of the satisfaction to be that God may please himself in revenging the sins of the

guilty upon the most innocent person, because we make the design of punishment not to be the satisfaction of anger as a desire of revenge, but to be the vindication of the honour and rights of the offended person by such a way as he himself shall judge satisfactory to the ends of his government.” See Atonement and Expiation.

PROPITIATORY, among the Jews, was the cover or lid of the ark of the covenant, which was lined both within and without with plates of gold, insomuch that there was no wood to be seen. Some even take it to have been one piece of massive gold. The cherubims spread their wings over the propitiatory. This propitiatory was a type or figure of Christ. See Propitiation.

PROSELYTE, Προσήλυτος, signifies a stranger, a foreigner; the Hebrew word גר, or נכר, also denotes a stranger, one who comes from abroad, or from another place. In the language נכר of the Jews, those were called by this name who came to dwell in their country, or who embraced their religion, being not Jews by birth. In the New Testament they are called sometimes proselytes, and sometimes Gentiles, fearing God, Acts ii, 5; x, ii, 22; xiii, 16, 50. The Jews distinguish two kinds of proselytes. The first, proselytes of the gate; the others, proselytes of justice or righteousness. The first dwelt in the land of Israel, or even out of that country, and, without obliging themselves to circumcision, or to any other ceremony of the law, feared and worshipped the true God, observing the rules imposed on Noah. These were, according to the rabbins, 1. To abstain from idolatry; 2. From blasphemy; 3. From murder; 4. From adultery; 5. From theft; 6. To appoint just and upright judges; 7. Not to eat the flesh of any animal cut off while it was alive. Maimonides says, that the first six of these precepts were given to Adam, and the seventh to Noah. The privileges of proselytes of the gate were, first, that through holiness they might have hope of eternal life. Secondly, they could dwell in the land of Israel, and share in the outward prosperities of it. It is said they did not dwell in the cities, but only in the suburbs and the villages; but it is certain that the Jews often admitted into their cities, not only proselytes of habitation, but also Gentiles and idolaters, as appears by the reproaches on this account, throughout the Scriptures.

Proselytes of justice or of righteousness were those converted to Judaism, who had engaged themselves to receive circumcision, and to observe the whole law of Moses. Thus were they admitted to all the prerogatives of the people of the Lord. The rabbins inform us that, before circumcision was administered to them, and before they were admitted into the religion of the Hebrews, they were examined about the motives of their conversion; whether the change was voluntary, or whether it proceeded from interest,

fear, ambition, &c. When the proselyte was well proved and instructed, they gave him circumcision; and when the wound of his circumcision healed, they gave him baptism, by plunging his whole body into a cistern of water, by only one immersion. Boys under twelve years of age, and girls under thirteen, could not become proselytes till they had obtained the consent of their parents, or, in case of refusal, the concurrence of the officers of justice. Baptism in respect of girls had the same effect as circumcision in respect of boys. Each of them, by means of this, received, as it were, a new birth, so that those who were their parents before were no longer regarded as such after this ceremony, and those who before were slaves now became free.

Many, however, are of opinion that there appears to be no ground whatever in Scripture for this distinction of proselytes of the gate, and proselytes of righteousness. "According to my idea," says Dr. Tomline, "proselytes were those, and those only, who took upon themselves the obligation of the whole Mosaic law, but retained that name till they were admitted into the congregation of the Lord as adopted children. Gentiles were allowed to worship and offer sacrifices to the God of Israel in the outer court of the temple; and some of them, persuaded of the sole and universal sovereignty of the Lord Jehovah, might renounce idolatry without embracing the Mosaic law; but such persons appear to me never to be called proselytes in Scripture, or in any ancient Christian writer." He also observes that "the term proselytes of the gate is derived from an expression frequent in the Old Testament; namely, 'the stranger that is within thy gates;' but I think it evident that the strangers were those Gentiles who were permitted to live among the Jews under certain restrictions, and whom the Jews were forbidden 'to vex or oppress,' so long as they live in a peaceable manner." Dr. Lardner says, "I do not believe that the notion of two sorts of Jewish proselytes can be found in any Christian writer before the fourteenth century or later." Dr. Jennings also observes that "there does not appear to be sufficient evidence in the Scripture history of the existence of such proselytes of the gate, as the rabbins mention; nor, indeed, of any who with propriety can be styled proselytes, except such as fully embraced the Jewish religion."

PROSEUCHÆ. That the Jews had houses, or places for prayer, called *προσευχαὶ*, appears from a variety of passages in Philo; and, particularly in his oration against Flaccus, he complains that their *προσευχαὶ* were pulled down, and there was no place left in which they might worship God and pray for Cæsar. Among those who make the synagogues and proseuchæ to be 790 different places, are the learned Mr. Joseph Mede and Dr. Prideaux; and they think the difference consists partly in the form of the edifice; a synagogue, they say, being roofed like our houses or

churches; and a proseucha being only encompassed with a wall, or some other mound or enclosure, and open at the top, like our courts. They make them to differ in situation; synagogues being in towns and cities, proseuchæ in the fields, and frequently by the river side. Dr. Prideaux mentions another distinction in respect to the service performed in them. In synagogues, he says, the prayers were offered up in public forms in common for the whole congregation; but in the proseuchæ they prayed, as in the temple, every one apart for himself. And thus our Saviour prayed in the proseucha into which he entered. Yet, after all, the proof in favour of this notion is not so strong, but that it still remains a question with some, whether the synagogues and the proseuchæ were any thing more than two different names for the same place; the one taken from the people's assembling in them, the other from the service to which they were more immediately appropriated, namely, prayer. Nevertheless, the name proseuchæ will not prove that they were appropriated only to prayer, and therefore were different from synagogues, in which the Scriptures were also read and expounded; since the temple, in which sacrifices were offered, and all the parts of divine service were performed, is called οἶκος προσευχῆς, a house of prayer, Matt. xxi, 13.

PROTESTANT. The Emperor Charles V. called a diet at Spire, in 1529, to request aid from the German princes against the Turks, and to devise the most effectual means for allaying the religious disputes which then raged in consequence of Luther's opposition to the established religion. In this diet it was decreed by Ferdinand, archduke of Austria, and other popish princes, that in the countries which had embraced the new religion it should be lawful to continue in it till the meeting of a council; but that no Roman Catholic should be allowed to turn Lutheran, and that the reformers should deliver nothing in their sermons contrary to the received doctrine of the church. Against this decree, six Lutheran princes, namely, John and George, the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, Ernest and Francis, the two dukes of Lunenburg, the landgrave of Hesse, and the prince of Anhalt, with the deputies of thirteen imperial towns, namely, Strasburg, Ulm, Nuremberg, Constance, Rottingen, Windsheim, Memmingen, Nortlingen, Lindaw, Kempten, Hailbron, Wissemburg, and St. Gall, formally and solemnly protested and declared that they appealed to a general council; and hence the name of Protestants, by which the followers of Luther have ever since been known. Nor was it confined to them; for it soon after included the Calvinists, and has now of a long time been applied generally to the Christian sects, of whatever denomination, and in whatever country they may be found, which have separated from the see of Rome.

Mr. Chillingworth, addressing himself to a writer in favour of the church of Rome, speaks of the religion of the Protestants in the following excellent

terms: "Know then, sir, that when I say the religion of Protestants is in prudence to be preferred before yours, on the one side, I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of Bellarmine, or Baronius, or any other private man among you, nor the doctrine of the Sorbonne, of the Jesuits, or of the Dominicans, or of any other particular company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, the doctrine of the council of Trent; so, accordingly, on the other side, by the religion of Protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon, nor the confession of Augsburg, or Geneva, nor the catechism of Heidelberg, nor the articles of the church of England; no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions; but that in which they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of faith and action; that is, the Bible. The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they believe beside it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as a matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption. I, for my part, after a long, and, as I verily believe and hope, impartial, search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot but upon this rock only. I see plainly, and with my own eyes, that there are popes against popes, and councils against councils; some fathers against other fathers, the same fathers against themselves; a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age; traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found; no tradition but that of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe. This I will profess; according to this I will live; and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe or no, and, seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this, God hath said so, therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judging from him; neither shall any man take mine from me."

Under such views the Bible is held as the only sure foundation upon which all true Protestants build every article of the faith which they profess, and every point of doctrine which they teach; and all other foundations, whether they be the decisions of councils, the confessions of churches, the prescripts of popes, or the expositions of private men, are considered by

them as sandy and unsafe, or as in nowise to be ultimately relied on. Yet, on the other hand, they by no means fastidiously reject them as of no use; for while they admit the Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, to be the only infallible rule by which we must measure the truth or falsehood of every religious opinion, they are sensible that all men are not equally fitted to understand or to apply this rule; and that the wisest men want, on many occasions, all the helps afforded by the learning and research of others to enable them to understand its precise nature, and to define its certain extent. These helps are great and numerous, having been supplied, in every age of the church, by the united labours of learned men in every country, and by none in greater abundance than by those in Protestant communions.

PROVERBS, short aphorisms, and sententious moral and prudential maxims, usually expressed in numbers, or rhythm, or antithesis, as being more easily remembered, and of more use, than abstruse and methodical discourses. This method of instruction appears to be peculiarly suited to the disposition and genius of the Asiatics, among whom it has prevailed from the earliest ages. The Gymnosophists of India delivered their philosophy in brief enigmatical sentences; a practice adopted and carried to a great extent by the ancient Egyptians. The mode of conveying instruction by compendious maxims obtained among the Jews, from the first dawn of their literature, to its final extinction in the east through the power of the Mohammedan arms; and it was familiar to the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine, as we learn from the testimony of St. Jerom. The eloquence of Arabia was mostly exhibited in detached and unconnected sentences, which, like so many loose gems, attracted attention by the fulness of the periods, the elegance of the phraseology, and the acuteness of proverbial sayings. Nor do the Asiatics at present differ, in this respect, from their ancestors, as numerous amthâl, or moral sentences, are in circulation throughout the regions of the east, some of which have been published by Hottinger, Erpenius, the younger Schultens, and others who have distinguished themselves by the pursuit of oriental learning. "The moralists of the east," says Sir William Jones, "have, in general, chosen to deliver their precepts in short sententious maxims, to illustrate them by sprightly comparisons, or to inculcate them in the very ancient forms of agreeable apologues: there are, indeed, both in Arabic and Persian, philosophical tracts on ethics, written with sound ratiocination and elegant perspicuity; but in every part of the eastern world, from Pekin to Damascus, the popular teachers of moral wisdom have immemorially been poets; and there would be no end of enumerating their works, which are still extant in the five principal languages of Asia." The ingenious but ever disputing and loquacious Greeks were indebted to the same means for their earliest instruction in wisdom. The sayings of the seven wise men, the golden

verses of Pythagoras, the remains of Theognis and Phocylides, if genuine, and the gnōmai of the older poets, testify the prevalence of aphorisms in ancient Greece. Had no specimens remained of Hellenic proverbs, we might have concluded this to have been the case; for the Greeks borrowed the rudiments, if not the principal part, of their knowledge from those whom they arrogantly termed barbarians; and it is only through the medium of compendious maxims and brief sentences that traditional knowledge can be preserved. This mode of communicating moral and practical wisdom accorded with the sedate and deliberative character of the Romans; and, in truth, from its influence over the mind, and its fitness for popular instruction, proverbial expressions exist in all ages and in all languages.

Proverbs, in the Hebrew language, are called meshalim, which is derived from a verb signifying both “to rule,” “to have dominion,” and “to compare,” “to liken,” “to assimilate:” hence the term denotes the highly figurative and poetical style in general, and likewise those compendious and authoritative sentences in particular which are commonly denominated proverbs. This term, which our translators have adopted after the Vulgate, denotes, according to our great lexicographer, “a short sentence frequently repeated by the people, a saw, an adage;” and no other word can, perhaps, be substituted more accurately expressing the force of the Hebrew; or, if there could, it has been so long familiarized by constant use, that a change is totally inadmissible.

The Meshalim, or Proverbs of Solomon, on account of their intrinsic merit, as well as of the rank and renown of their author, would be received with submissive deference; in consequence of which, they would rapidly spread through every part of the Jewish territories. The pious instructions of the king would be listened to with the attention and respect they deserve, and, no doubt, would be carefully recorded by a people attached to his person, and holding his wisdom in the highest admiration. These, either preserved in writing, or handed down by oral communication, were subsequently collected into one volume, and constitute the book in the sacred canon, entitled, “The Proverbs of Solomon, the son of David, king of Israel.” The genuineness and authenticity of this title, and those in chap. x, 1, and xxv, 1, cannot be disputed; not the smallest reason appears for calling them in question. One portion of the book, from the twenty-fifth chapter to the end of the twenty-ninth, was compiled by the men of Hezekiah, as appears from the title prefixed to it. Eliakim, Shebna, Joah, Isaiah, Hosea, and Micah, personages of eminence and worth, were contemporary with Hezekiah; but whether these or others executed the compilation, it is now impossible to determine. They were persons, however, as we may reasonably suppose, well qualified for the undertaking, who collected what were known to

be the genuine proverbs of Solomon from the various writings in which they were dispersed, and arranged them in their present order. Whether the preceding twenty-four chapters, which, doubtless, existed in a combined form previous to the additional collection, were compiled by the author, or some other person, is quite uncertain. Both collections, however, being made at so early a period, is a satisfactory evidence that the Proverbs are the genuine production of Solomon, to whom they are ascribed; for, from the death of Solomon to the reign of Hezekiah, according to the Bible chronology, was a period of two hundred and forty-nine years, or, according to Dr. Hales, two hundred and sixty-five years; too short a space to admit of any forgery or material error, as either must have been immediately detected by the worthies who flourished during the virtuous reign of Hezekiah.

PROVIDENCE, the conduct and direction of the several parts of the universe, by a superior intelligent Being. The notion of a providence is founded upon this truth, that the Creator has not so fixed and ascertained the laws of nature, nor so connected the chain of second causes, as to leave the world to itself, but that he still preserves the reins in his own hands, and occasionally intervenes, alters, restrains, enforces, suspends, &c, those laws by a particular providence. Some use the word providence in a more general sense, signifying by it that power or action by which the several parts of the creation are ordinarily directed. Thus Damascenus defines providence to be that divine will by which all things are ordered and directed to the proper end: which notion of providence supposes no laws at all fixed by the author of nature at the creation, but that he reserved it at large, to be governed by himself immediately. The Epicureans denied any divine providence, as thinking it inconsistent with the ease and repose of the divine nature to meddle at all with human affairs. Simplicius argues thus for a providence: If God does not look to the affairs of the world, it is either because he cannot or will not; but the first is absurd, since, to govern cannot be difficult where to create was easy; and the latter is both absurd and blasphemous. In Plato's Tenth Dialogue of Laws, he teaches excellently, that (since what is self-moving is, by its nature, before that which moves only in consequence of being moved) mind must be prior to matter, and the cause of all its modifications and changes; and that, therefore, there is a universal Mind possessed of all perfection, which produced and which actuates all things. After this he shows that the Deity exercises a particular providence over the world, taking care of small no less than great things. In proving this he observes "that a superior nature of such excellence as the divine, which hears, sees, and knows all things, cannot, in any instance, be subject to negligence or sloth; that the meanest and the greatest part of the world are all equally his work or possession; that great things cannot be rightly taken care of without taking care of



small; and that, in all cases, the more able and perfect any artist is, (as a physician, an architect, or the ruler of the state,) the more his skill and care appear in little as well as great things. Let us not, then," says he, "conceive of God as worse than even mortal artists."

The term providence, in its primary signification, simply denotes foresight; and if we allow the existence of a supreme Being who formed the universe at first, we must necessarily allow that he has a perfect foresight of every event which at any time takes place in the natural or moral world. Matter can have no motion, nor spirit any energy, but what is derived from him; nor can he be ignorant of the effects which they will, either separately or conjointly, produce. A common mechanic has knowledge of the work of his own hands: when he puts the machine which he has made in motion, he foresees how long it will go, and what will be the state and position of its several parts at any particular point of time; or, if he is not perfectly able to do this, it is because he is not perfectly acquainted with all the powers of the materials which he has used in its construction: they are not of his making, and they may therefore have qualities which he does not understand, and consequently cannot regulate. But in the immense machine of the universe there is nothing except that which God has made; all the powers and properties, relations and dependencies, which created things have, they have, both in kind and degree, from him. Nothing, therefore, it should seem, can come to pass at any time, or in any part of the universe, which its incomprehensible Architect did not, from the moment his almighty fiat called it into existence, clearly foresee. The providence of God is implied in his very existence as an intelligent Creator; and it imports not only an abstract foresight of all possible events, but such a predisposition of causes and effects, such an adjustment of means and ends, as seems to us to exclude that contingency of human actions with which, as expectants of positive rewards and punishments in another world, we firmly believe it to be altogether consistent.

By providence we may understand, not merely foresight, but a uniform and constant operation of God subsequent to the act of creation. Thus, in every machine formed by human ingenuity, there is a necessity for the action of some extraneous power to put the machine in motion: a proper construction and disposition of parts not being sufficient to effect the end: there must be a spring, or a weight, or an impulse of air or water, or some substance or other, on which the motion of the several parts of the machine must depend. In like manner, the machine of the universe depends upon its Creator for the commencement and the conservation of the motion of its several parts. The power by which the insensible particles of matter coalesce into sensible lumps, as well as that by which the great 793orbs of the universe are reluctantly, as it were, retained in their courses, admits not an

explanation from mechanical causes: the effects of both of them are different from such as mere matter and motion can produce; they must ultimately be referred to God. Vegetable and animal life and increase cannot be accounted for, without recurring to him as the primary cause of both. In all these respects the providence of God is something more than foresight; it is a continual influence, a universal agency; "by him all things consist," and "in him we live, and move, and have our being."

Much labour has been employed to account for all the phenomena of nature by the powers of mechanism, or the necessary laws of matter and motion. But this, as we imagine, cannot be done. The primary causes of things must certainly be some powers and principles not mechanical, otherwise we shall be reduced to the necessity of maintaining an endless progression of motions communicated from matter to matter, without any first mover; or of saying that the first impelling matter moved itself. The former is an absurdity too great to be embraced by any one; and there is reason to hope that the essential inactivity of matter is at present so well understood, and so generally allowed, notwithstanding some modern opposers of this hypothesis, that there can be but few who will care to assert the latter. All our reasonings about bodies, and the whole of natural philosophy, are founded on the three laws of motion laid down by Sir Isaac Newton, at the beginning of the "Principia." These laws express the plainest truths; but they would have neither evidence nor meaning, were not inactivity contained in our idea of matter. Should it be said that matter, though naturally inert, may be made to be otherwise by divine power, this would be the same with saying that matter may be made not to be matter. If inactivity belong to it at all, it must belong to it as matter, or solid extension, and therefore must be inseparable from it. Matter is figured, movable, discernible, inactive, and capable of communicating motion by impulse to other matter: these are not accidental but primary qualities of matter. Beside, matter void of inactivity, if we were to suppose it possible, could produce no effects. The communication of motion, its direction, the resistance it suffers, and its cessation, in a word, the whole doctrine of motion cannot be consistently explained or clearly understood without supposing the inertia of matter. Self-moving matter must have thought and design, because, whenever matter moves, it must move in some particular direction, and with some precise degree of velocity; and as there is an infinity of these equally possible, it cannot move itself without selecting one of these preferably to and exclusively of all others, and therefore not without design. Moreover, it may be plainly proved that matter cannot be the ultimate cause of the phenomena of nature, or the agent which, by any powers inherent in itself, produces the general laws of nature, without possessing the highest degree of knowledge and wisdom; which might be easily evinced or exemplified by adverting to the particular law of

gravitation. "The philosopher," says an excellent writer, "who overlooks the laws of an all-governing Deity in nature, contenting himself with the appearance of the material universe only, and the mechanical laws of motion, neglects what is most excellent, and prefers what is imperfect to what is supremely perfect, finitude to infinity, what is narrow and weak to what is unlimited and almighty, and what is perishing to what endures for ever. Sir Isaac Newton thought it most unaccountable to exclude the Deity only out of the universe. It appeared to him much more just and reasonable to suppose that the whole chain of causes, or the several series of them, should centre in him as their source; and the whole system appear depending on him the only independent cause." If, then, the Deity pervades and actuates the material world, and his unremitting energy is the cause to which every effect in it must be traced; the spiritual world, which is of greater consequence, cannot be disregarded by him. Is there not one atom of matter on which he does not act; and is there one living being about which he has no concern? Does not a stone fall without him; and does, then, a man suffer without him? The inanimate world is of no consequence, abstracted from its subserviency to the animate and reasonable world: the former, therefore, must be preserved and governed entirely with a view to the latter. But it is not mere energy or the constant exertion of power that is discernible in the frame or laws of the universe, in maintaining the succession of men, and in producing men and other beings; but wisdom and skill are also conspicuous in the structure of every object in the inanimate creation. After a survey of the beauty and elegance of the works of nature, aided by the perusal of Matt. vi, 28, &c, we may ask ourselves, Has God, in the lowest of his works, been lavish of wisdom, beauty, and skill; and is he sparing of these in the concerns of reasonable beings? Or does he less regard order, propriety, and fitness in the determination of their states? The answer is obvious. Providence also implies a particular interposition of God in administering the affairs of individuals and nations, and wholly distinct from that general and incessant exertion of his power, by which he sustains the universe in existence.

The doctrine of providence may be evinced from the consideration of the divine perfections. The first cause of all things must be regarded as a being absolutely perfect; and the idea of absolute perfection comprehends infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; hence we deduce the doctrine of providence. The Deity cannot be an indifferent spectator of the series of events in that world to which he has given being. His goodness will as certainly engage him to direct them agreeably to the ends of goodness, as his wisdom and power enable him to do it in the most effectual manner. This conclusion is conformable to all our ideas of those attributes. Could we call that being good who would refuse to do any good which he is able to do without the least labour or difficulty? God is present every

where. He sees all that happens, and it is in his power, with perfect ease, to order all for the best. Can he then possess goodness, and at the same time not do this? A God without a providence is undoubtedly a contradiction. Nothing is plainer than that a being of perfect reason will, in every instance, take such care of the universe as perfect reason requires. That supreme intelligence and love, which are present to all things, and from whence all things sprung, must govern all occurrences. These considerations prove what has been called a particular, in opposition to a general, providence. We cannot conceive of any reasons that can influence the Deity to exercise any providence over the world, which are not likewise reasons for extending it to all that happens in the world. As far as it is confined to generals, or overlooks any individual, or any event, it is incomplete, and therefore unsuitable to the idea of a perfect being.

One common prejudice against this doctrine arises from the apprehension that it is below the dignity of the Deity to watch over, in the manner implied in it, the meanest beings, and the minutest affairs. To which it may be replied, that a great number of minute affairs, if they are each of them of some consequence, make up a sum which is of great consequence; and that there is no way of taking care of this sum, without taking care of each particular. This objection, therefore, under the appearance of honouring God, plainly dishonours him. Nothing is absolutely trifling in which the happiness of any individual, even the most insignificant, is at all concerned; nor is it beneath a wise and good being to interpose in any thing of this kind. To suppose the Deity above this, is to suppose him above acting up to the full extent of goodness and rectitude. The same eternal benevolence that first engaged him to produce beings, must also engage him to exercise a particular providence over them; and the very lowest beings, as well as the highest, seem to have a kind of right to his superintendence, from the act itself of bringing them into existence. Every apprehension that this is too great a condescension in him is founded on the poorest ideas; for, surely, whatever it was not too great condescension in him to create, it cannot be too great a condescension in him to take care of. Beside, with regard to God, all distinctions in the creation vanish. All beings are infinitely, that is, equally, inferior to him.

Accident, and chance, and fortune, are words which we often hear mentioned, and much is ascribed to them in the life of man. But they are words without meaning; or, as far as they have any signification, they are no other than names for the unknown operations of providence; for it is certain that in God's universe nothing comes to pass causelessly, or in vain. Every event has its own determined direction. That chaos of human affairs and intrigues where we can see no light, that mass of disorder and confusion which they often present to our view, is all clearness and order

in the sight of Him who is governing and directing the whole, and bringing forward every event in its due time and place. "The Lord sitteth on the flood. The Lord maketh the wrath of man to praise him," as he maketh the "hail and rain to obey his word. He hath prepared his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all. A man's heart deviseth his way, but the Lord directeth his steps." No other principle than this, embraced with a steady faith, and attended with a suitable practice, can ever be able to give repose and tranquillity to the mind; to animate our hopes, or extinguish our fears; to give us any true satisfaction in the enjoyments of life, or to minister consolation under its adversities. If we are persuaded that God governs the world, that he has the superintendence and direction of all events, and that we are the objects of his providential care; whatever may be our distress or our danger, we can never want consolation; we may always have a fund of hope, always a prospect of relief. But take away this hope and this prospect, take away the belief of God and of a superintending providence, and man would be of all creatures the most miserable; destitute of every comfort, every support, under present sufferings, and of every security against future dangers.

**PSALMS.** The book of Psalms is a collection of hymns, or sacred songs, in praise of God, and consists of poems of various kinds. They are the productions of different persons, but are generally called the Psalms of David, because a great part of them was composed by him, and David himself is distinguished by the name of the Psalmist. We cannot now ascertain all the Psalms written by David, but their number probably exceeds seventy; and much less are we able to discover the authors of the other Psalms, or the occasions upon which they were composed. A few of them were written after the return from the Babylonian captivity. The titles prefixed to them are of very questionable authority; and in many cases they are not intended to denote the writer but refer only to the person who was appointed to set them to music. David first introduced the practice of singing sacred hymns in the public service of God; and it was restored by Ezra. The authority of the Psalms is established not only by their rank among the sacred writings, and by the unvaried testimony of ages, but likewise by many intrinsic proofs of inspiration. Not only do they breathe through every part a divine spirit of eloquence, but they contain numberless illustrious prophecies that were remarkably accomplished, and are frequently appealed to by the evangelical writers. The sacred character of the whole book is established by the testimony of our Saviour and his Apostles, who, in various parts of the New Testament, appropriate the predictions of the Psalms as obviously apposite to the circumstances of their lives, and as intentionally composed to describe them. The veneration for the Psalms has in all ages of the church been considerable. The fathers assure us, that in the earlier times the whole book of Psalms was

generally learned by heart; and that the ministers of every gradation were expected to be able to repeat them from memory. These invaluable Scriptures are daily repeated without weariness, though their beauties are often overlooked in familiar and habitual perusal. As hymns immediately addressed to the Deity, they reduce righteousness to practice; and while we acquire the sentiments, we perform the offices of piety; while we supplicate for blessings, we celebrate the memorial of former mercies; and while in the exercise of devotion, faith is enlivened by the display of prophecy. Josephus asserts, and most of the ancient writers maintain, that the Psalms were composed in metre. They have undoubtedly a peculiar conformation of sentences, and a measured distribution of parts. Many of them are elegiac, and most of David's are of the lyric kind. There is no sufficient reason however to believe, as some writers have imagined, that they were written in rhyme, or in any of the Grecian measures. Some of them are acrostic; and though the regulations of the Hebrew measure are now lost, there can be no doubt, from their harmonious modulation, that they were written with some kind of metrical order; and they must have been composed in accommodation to the measure to which they were set. (See Poetry of the Hebrews.) The Hebrew copies and the Septuagint version of this book contain the same number of Psalms; only the Septuagint translators have, for some reason which does not appear, thrown the ninth and tenth into one, as also the one hundred and fourteenth and one hundred and fifteenth, and have divided the one hundred and sixteenth and one hundred and forty-seventh each into two.

It is very justly observed by Dr. Allix, that, "although the sense of near fifty Psalms be fixed and settled by divine authors, yet Christ and his Apostles did not undertake to quote all the Psalms they could, but only to give a key to their hearers, by which they might apply to the same subjects the Psalms of the same composure and expression." With regard to the Jews, Bishop Chandler very pertinently remarks, that "they must have understood David, their prince, to have been a figure of Messiah. They would not otherwise have made his Psalms part of their daily worship; nor would David have delivered them to the church to be so employed, were it not to instruct and support them in the knowledge and belief of this fundamental article. Were the Messiah not concerned in the Psalms, it would have been absurd to celebrate twice a day, in their public devotions, the events of one man's life, who was deceased so long ago, as to have no relation now to the Jews and the circumstances of their affairs; or to transcribe whole passages from them into their prayers for the coming of the Messiah." Upon the same principle it is easily seen that the objections, which may seem to lie against the use of Jewish services in Christian congregations, may cease at once. Thus it may be said, Are we concerned with the affairs of David and of Israel? Have we any thing to do with the ark and the temple? They are no

more. Are we to go up to Jerusalem, and to worship on Sion? They are desolated, and trodden under foot by the Turks. Are we to sacrifice young bullocks according to the law? The law is abolished, never to be observed again. Do we pray for victory over Moab, Edom, and Philistia; or for deliverance from Babylon? There are no such nations, no such places in the world. What then do we mean, when, taking such expressions into our mouths, we utter them in our own persons, as parts of our devotions, before God? Assuredly we must mean a spiritual Jerusalem and Sion; a spiritual ark and temple; a spiritual law; spiritual sacrifices; and spiritual victories over spiritual enemies; all described under the old names, which are still retained, though "old things are passed away, and all things are become new," 2 Cor. v, 17. By substituting Messiah for David, the Gospel for the law, the church Christian for that of Israel, and the enemies of the one for those of the other, the Psalms are made our own. Nay, they are with more fulness and propriety applied now to the substance, than they were of old to the "shadow of good things then to come," Heb. x, 1. For let it not pass unobserved, that when, upon the first publication of the Gospel, the Apostles had occasion to utter their transports of joy, on their being counted worthy to suffer for the name of their Lord and Master, which was then opposed by Jew and Gentile, they brake forth into an application of the second Psalm to the transactions then before their eyes, Acts iv, 25. The Psalms, thus applied, have advantages which no fresh compositions, however finely executed, can possibly have; since, beside their incomparable fitness to express our sentiments, they are at the same time memorials of, and appeals to, former mercies and deliverances; they are acknowledgments of prophecies accomplished; they point out the connection between the old and new dispensations, thereby teaching us to admire and adore the wisdom of God displayed in both, and furnishing while we read or sing them, an inexhaustible variety of the noblest matter that can engage the contemplations of man.

Very few of the Psalms, comparatively, appear to be simply prophetic, and to belong only to Messiah, without the intervention of any other person. Most of them, it is apprehended, have a double sense, which stands upon this ground and foundation, that the ancient patriarchs, prophets, priests, and kings, were typical characters, in their several offices, and in the more remarkable passages of their lives, their extraordinary depressions and miraculous exaltations foreshowing him who was to arise as the head of the holy family, the great prophet, the true priest, the everlasting king. The Israelitish polity, and the law of Moses, were purposely framed after the example and shadow of things spiritual and heavenly; and the events which happened to the ancient people of God were designed to shadow out parallel occurrences, which should afterward take place in the accomplishment of man's redemption, and the rise and

progress of the Christian church. (See Prophecy.) For this reason, the Psalms composed for the use of Israel, and by them accordingly used at the time, do admit of an application to us, who are now “the Israel of God,” Gal. vi, 16, and to our Redeemer, who is the King of this Israel. It would be an arduous and adventurous undertaking to attempt to lay down the rules observed in the conduct of the mystic allegory, so diverse are the modes in which the Holy Spirit has thought proper to communicate his counsels to different persons on different occasions; inspiring and directing the minds of the prophets according to his good pleasure; at one time vouchsafing more full and free discoveries of future events; while, at another, he is more obscure and sparing in his intimations. From hence, of course, arises a great variety in the Scripture usage of this kind of allegory as to the manner in which the spiritual sense is couched under the other. Sometimes it can hardly break forth and show itself at intervals through the literal, which meets the eye as the ruling sense, and seems to have taken entire possession of the words and phrases. On the contrary, it is much oftener the capital figure in the piece, and stands confessed at once by such splendour of language, that the letter, in its turn, is thrown into shade, and almost totally disappears. Sometimes it shines with a constant equable light, and sometimes it darts upon us on a sudden, like a flash of lightning from the clouds. But a composition is never more truly elegant and beautiful, than when the two senses, alike conspicuous, run parallel together through the whole poem, mutually corresponding with and illustrating each other.

Thus the establishment of David upon his throne, notwithstanding the opposition made to it by his enemies, is the subject of the second Psalm. David sustains in it a twofold character, literal and allegorical. If we read over the Psalm first with an eye to the literal David, the meaning is obvious, and put out of all dispute by the sacred history. There is indeed an uncommon glow in the expression, and sublimity in the figures; and the diction is now and then exaggerated, as it were, on purpose to intimate and lead us to the contemplation of higher and more important matters concealed within. In compliance with this admonition, if we take another survey of the Psalm, as relative to the person and concerns of the spiritual David, a nobler series of events instantly rises to view, and the meaning becomes more evident, as well as exalted. The colouring, which may perhaps seem too bold and glaring for the king of Israel, will no longer appear so, when laid upon his great antitype. After we have thus attentively considered the subject apart, let us look at them together, and we shall behold the full beauty and majesty of this most charming poem. We shall perceive the two senses very distinct from each other, yet conspiring in perfect harmony, and bearing a wonderful resemblance in every feature and lineament, while the analogy between them is so exactly preserved, that either may pass for the original, from whence the other was copied. New



light is continually cast upon the phraseology, fresh weight and dignity are added to the sentiment, till gradually ascending from things below to things above, from human affairs to those which are divine, they bear the great important theme upward with them, and at length place it in the height and brightness of heaven. What has been observed with regard to this Psalm, may also be applied to the seventy-second; the subject of which is of the same kind, and treated in the same manner. Its title might be, "The Inauguration of Solomon." The scheme of the allegory is alike in both; but a diversity of matter occasions an alteration in the diction. For whereas one is employed in celebrating the magnificent triumphs of victory, it is the design of the other to draw a pleasing picture of peace, and of that felicity which is her inseparable attendant. The style is therefore of a more even and temperate sort, and more richly ornamented. It abounds not with those sudden changes of the person speaking which dazzle and astonish; but the imagery is borrowed from the delightful scenes with which creation cheers the sight, and the pencil of the divine artist is dipped in the softer colours of nature. And here we may take notice how peculiarly adapted to the genius of this kind of allegory the parabolical style is, on account of that great variety of natural images to be found in it. For as these images are capable of being employed in the illustration of things divine and human, between which there is a certain analogy maintained, so they easily afford that ambiguity which is necessary in this species of composition, where the language is applicable to each sense, and obscure in neither; it comprehends both parts of the allegory, and may be clearly and distinctly referred to one or the other.

On this book Bishop Horsley remarks:--These Psalms go, in general, under the name of the Psalms of David. King David gave a regular and noble form to the musical part of the Jewish service. He was himself a great composer, both in poetry and music, and a munificent patron, no doubt, of arts in which he himself so much delighted and excelled. The Psalms, however, appear to be compositions of various authors, in various ages; some much more ancient than the times of King David, some of a much later age. Of many, David himself was undoubtedly the author; and that those of his composition were prophetic, we have David's own authority, which may be allowed to overpower a host of modern expositors. For thus King David, at the close of his life, describes himself and his sacred songs: "David, the son of Jesse, said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said, The Spirit of Jehovah spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." It was the word, therefore, of Jehovah's Spirit which was uttered by David's tongue. But it should seem, the Spirit of Jehovah would not be wanting to enable a mere man to make complaint of his own enemies, to describe his own sufferings just as he felt them, and his own escapes just as they

happened. But the Spirit of Jehovah described by David's utterance what was known to that Spirit only, and that Spirit only could describe. So that, if David be allowed to have had any knowledge of the true subject of his own compositions, it was nothing in his own life, but something put into his mind by the Holy Spirit of God; and the misapplication of the Psalms to the literal David has done more mischief than the misapplication of any other parts of the Scriptures among those who profess the belief of the Christian religion.

The Psalms are all poems of the lyric kind, that is, adapted to music, but with great variety in the style of composition. Some are simply odes. An ode is a dignified sort of song, narrative of the facts, either of public history or private life, in a highly adorned and figured style. But the figure in the Psalms is that which is peculiar to the Hebrew language, in which the figure gives its meaning with as much perspicuity as the plainest speech. Some are of the sort called elegiac, which are pathetic compositions upon mournful subjects. Some are ethic, delivering grave maxims of life, or the precepts of religion, in solemn, but for the most part simple, strains. Some are enigmatic, delivering the doctrines of religion in enigmata, contrived to strike the imagination forcibly, and yet easy to be understood. In all these the author delivers the whole matter in his own person. But a very great, I believe the far greater, part are a sort of dramatic ode, consisting of dialogues between persons sustaining certain characters. In these dialogue Psalms the persons are frequently the psalmist himself, or the chorus of priests and Levites, or the leader of the Levitical band, opening the ode with a proem declarative of the subject, and very often closing the whole with a solemn admonition drawn from what the other persons say. The other persons are Jehovah, sometimes as one, sometimes as another, of the three Persons; Christ in his incarnate state, sometimes before, sometimes after, his resurrection; the human soul of Christ as distinguished from the divine essence. Christ, in his incarnate state, is personated sometimes as a priest, sometimes as a king, sometimes as a conqueror; and in those Psalms in which he is introduced as a conqueror, the resemblance is very remarkable between this conqueror in the book of Psalms and the warrior on the white horse in the book of Revelation, who goes forth with a crown on his head, and a bow in his hand, conquering and to conquer. And the conquest in the Psalms is followed, like the conquest in the Revelation, by the marriage of the conqueror. These are circumstances of similitude which, to any one versed in the prophetic style, prove beyond a doubt that the mystical conqueror is the same personage in both.

**PSALMODY.** The service of the ancient Christian church usually began with reading or with the singing of psalms. We are not to understand this as if their psalmody was performed in one course of many psalms together,

without intermission, but rather, with some respite, and a mixture of other parts of divine service, to make the whole more agreeable and delightful. As to the persons concerned in singing the Psalms publicly in the church, they may be considered in four different respects, according to the different ways of psalmody; for sometimes the Psalms were sung by one person alone; and sometimes the whole assembly joined together, men, women, and children: this was the most ancient and general practice. At other times the Psalms were sung alternately; the congregation dividing themselves into two parts, and singing verse for verse. Beside all these, there was yet a fourth way of singing, pretty common in the fourth century, which was, when a single person began the verse, and the people joined with him in the close.

Psalmody was always esteemed a considerable part of devotion, and upon that account was usually performed in the standing posture. As to the voice or pronunciation, used in singing, it was of two sorts, the plain song, and the more artificial; the plain song was only a gentle inflexion, or turn of the voice, not very different from the chanting in our cathedrals; the artificial song seems to have been a regular musical composition, like our anthems. It was no objection against the psalmody of the church, that she sometimes made use of psalms and hymns of human composition, beside those of the inspired writers. St. Augustine himself made a psalm of many parts, in imitation of the hundred and nineteenth, to preserve his people from the errors of the Donatists. St. Hilary and St. Ambrose likewise made many hymns, which were sung in their respective churches. But two corruptions crept into the psalmody, which the fathers declaim against with great zeal. The first was, the introducing secular music, or an imitation of the light airs of the theatre, in the devotions of the church. The other was, the regarding more the sweetness of the composition than the sense and meaning; thereby pleasing the ear, without raising the affections of the soul.

The use of musical instruments in singing of psalms, seems to be as ancient as psalmody itself. The first psalm we read of was sung to a timbrel, namely, that which Moses and Miriam sung after the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egypt; and afterward, at Jerusalem, when the temple was built, musical instruments were constantly used at their public services. And this has been the common practice in all ages of the church. When the use of organs was first introduced, is not certainly known; but we find, that about A. D. 660, Constantine Copronymus, emperor of Constantinople, sent a present of an organ to King Pepin of France.

798Clement Marot, groom of the bed chamber to Francis I., king of France, was the first who engaged in translating the Psalms into metre. He versified

the first fifty at the instigation of Vatablus, Hebrew professor at Paris; and afterward, upon his return to Geneva, he made an acquaintance with Beza, who versified the rest, and had tunes set to them; and thus they began to be sung in private houses, and afterward were brought into the churches of the French and other countries. In imitation of this version, Sternhold, one of the grooms of the privy chamber to our King Edward VI., undertook a translation of the Psalms into metre. He went through but thirty-seven of them, the rest being soon after finished by Hopkins and others. This translation was at first discountenanced by many of the clergy, who looked upon it as done in opposition to the practice of chanting the Psalms in the cathedrals.

Early in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, metrical psalmody was introduced into this country. The new morning prayer began at St. Antholin's, London, when a psalm was sung in the Geneva fashion, all the congregation, men, women, and boys singing together. Bishop Jewel says, that "the singing of psalms, begun in one church in London, did quickly spread itself, not only through the city, but in the neighbouring places; sometimes at Paul's Cross six thousand people singing together."

A curious controversy on this subject arose among the Dissenters in the end of the seventeenth century. Whether singing in public worship had been partially discontinued during the times of persecution to avoid informers, or whether the miserable manner in which it was performed gave persons a distaste to it, so it appears, that in 1691, Mr. Benjamin Keach published a tract entitled, "The Breach Repaired in God's Worship: or, Psalms, Hymns, &c, proved to be a Holy Ordinance of Jesus Christ." To us it may appear strange that such a point should be disputed; but Mr. Keach was obliged to labour earnestly, and with a great deal of prudence and caution, to obtain the consent of his people to sing a hymn at the conclusion of the Lord's Supper. After six years more, they agreed to sing on the thanksgiving days; but it required still fourteen years more before he could persuade them to sing every Lord's day; and then it was only after the last prayer, that those who chose it might withdraw without joining in it! Nor did even this satisfy these scrupulous consciences; for, after all, a separation took place, and the inharmonious seceders formed a new church in May's Pond, where it was above twenty years longer before singing the praises of God could be endured. It is difficult at this period to believe it; but Mr. Ivimey quotes Mr. Crosby, as saying, that Mr. Keach's was the first church in which psalm singing was introduced. This remark, however, must probably be confined to the Baptist churches. The Presbyterians, it seems, were not quite so unmusical; for the Directory of the Westminster divines distinctly stated, that "it is the duty of Christians to praise God publicly by singing of Psalms together in the congregation." And beside

the old Scotch Psalms, Dr. John Patrick, of the Charter house, made a version which was in very general use among Dissenters, Presbyterians, and Independents, before it was superseded by the far superior compositions of Dr. Watts. These Psalms, however, like those of the English and Scotch establishment, were drawled out in notes of equal length, without accent or variety. Even the introduction of the triple-time tunes, probably about the time of Dr. Watts's psalms, gave also great offence to some people, because it marked the accent of the measure. Old Mr. Thomas Bradbury used to call this time "a long leg and a short one." The beautiful compositions of Dr. Watts, Mr. C. Wesley, and others, have produced a considerable revolution in modern psalmody. Better versions of the Psalms, and many excellent collections of hymns, are now in use, and may be considered as highly important gifts bestowed upon the modern church of God.

PSALTERY. See Music.

PTOLEMAIS. See Accho.

PUBLICAN, a collector or receiver of the Roman revenues. Judea being added to the provinces of the Roman empire, and the taxes paid by the Jews directly to the emperor, the publicans were the officers appointed to collect them. The ordinary taxes which the Romans levied in the provinces were of three sorts: 1. Customs upon goods imported and exported; which tribute was therefore called portorium, from portus, "a haven." 2. A tax upon cattle fed in certain pastures belonging to the Roman state, the number of which being kept in writing, this tribute was called scriptura. 3. A tax upon corn, of which the government demanded a tenth part. This tribute was called decuma. These publicans are distinguished by Sigonius into three sorts or degrees,--the farmers of the revenue, their partners, and their securities; in which he follows Polybius. These are called the mancipes, socii, and prædes, who were all under the quæstore særarii, that presided over the finances at Rome. The mancipes farmed the revenue of large districts or provinces, had the oversight of the inferior publicans, received their accounts and collections, and transmitted them to the quæstores ærarii. They often let out their provinces in smaller parcels to the socii; so called, because they were admitted to a share in the contract, perhaps for the sake of more easily raising the purchase money; at least to assist in collecting the tribute. Both the mancipes and socii are therefore properly styled τελῶναι, from τέλος, tributum, and ὠνέομαι, emo. They were obliged to procure prædes, or sureties, who gave security to the government for the fulfilment of the contract. The distribution of Sigonius, therefore, or rather of Polybius, is not quite exact, since there were properly but two sorts of publicans, the mancipes and the socii. The former are, probably, those

whom the Greeks call ἀρχιτελώναι, chiefs of the publicans; of which sort was Zaccheus. As they were superior to the common publicans in dignity, being mostly of the equestrian order, so they were generally in their moral character. But as for the common publicans, the collectors or receivers, as many of the socii were, they are spoken of with great contempt, by Heathens as well as Jews; and particularly by Theocritus, who said, that “among the beasts of the wilderness, bears and lions are the most cruel; among the beasts of the city, the publican and parasite.” The reason of the general hatred to them was, doubtless, their rapine and extortion. For, having a share in the farm of the tribute, at a certain rate, they were apt to oppress the people with illegal exactions, to raise as large a fortune as they could for themselves. Beside, publicans were particularly odious to the Jews, who looked upon them to be the instruments of their subjection to the Roman emperors, to which they generally held it sinful for them to submit. They considered it as incompatible with their liberty to pay tribute to any foreign power, Luke xx, 22, &c; and those of their own nation that engaged in this employment they regarded as Heathens, Matthew xviii, 17. It is even said, that they would not allow them to enter into their temple or synagogues, nor to join in prayers, nor even allow their evidence in a court of justice on any trial; nor would they accept of their offerings in the temple.

It appears by the Gospel that there were many publicans in Judea at the time of our Saviour. Zaccheus, probably, was one of the principal receivers, since he is called the chief of the publicans, Luke xix, 2; but St. Matthew was only an inferior publican. The Jews reproached our Saviour for showing kindness to these persons, Luke vii, 34; and he himself ranks them with harlots, Matt. xxi, 31. Some of them, it should seem, had humbling views of themselves, Luke xviii, 10. Zaccheus assures our Lord, who had honoured him with a visit, that he was ready to give the half of his goods to the poor, Luke xix, 8, and to return fourfold of whatever he had unjustly acquired.

PUBLIUS, the governor of Melita, Acts xxviii, 7–9. When St. Paul was shipwrecked on this island, Publius received him and his company into his house very kindly, and treated them for three days with great humanity.

PUL, king of Assyria. He came into the land of Israel in the time of Manahem, king of the ten tribes, 2 Kings xv, 19, &c, and invaded the kingdom on the other side of Jordan. But Manahem, by a present of one thousand talents of silver, prevailed on the king of Assyria, not only to withdraw his forces, but to recognize his title to the crown of Israel before he left the kingdom. This is the first time that we find any mention made of the kingdom of Assyria since the days of Nimrod; and Pul is the first

monarch of that nation who invaded Israel, and began their transportation out of their own country.

PULSE, קלי, Lev. xxiii, 14; 1 Sam. xvii, 17; 2 Sam. xvii, 28; a term applied to those grains or seeds which grow in pods, as beans, peas, vetches, &c, from פול, a bean. The Vulgate renders this kali in 2 Sam. xvii, 28, *frixum cicer*, “parched peas.” In Daniel i, 12, 16, the word זרעים, rendered pulse, may signify seeds in general.

PUNISHMENTS OF THE HEBREWS. There were several sorts of punishments in use among the Jews which are mentioned in the Scripture. 1. The punishment of the cross. (See Cross.) 2. Suspension, Esther vii, 10; Joshua viii, 29; 2 Samuel xxi, 12. 3. Stoning. 4. Fire. This punishment was common, Gen. xxxviii, 24; Leviticus xxi, 9. 5. The rack or tympanum, mentioned Heb. xi, 35. Commentators are much divided about the meaning of this punishment; but most of them are of opinion that the bastinado, or the punishment of the stick, is intended, and that the Apostle alludes to the cruelties exercised upon old Eleazar; for, in 2 Mac. vi, 19, where his martyrdom is spoken of, it is said that he came to the tympanum. 6. The precipice, or throwing persons headlong from a rock, with a stone tied about the neck, 2 Chron. xxv, 12. 7. Decapitation, Gen. xl, 19; Judges ix, 5; 2 Kings x, 7; Matt. xiv, 8. 8. The punishment of the saw, or to be cut asunder in the middle, Heb. xi, 37. This punishment was not unknown to the Hebrews. Some think it was originally from the Persians or Chaldeans. 9. Plucking out the eyes, Exod. xxi, 24. Some think this punishment was seldom executed, but the offender was made to suffer in his property rather than in his person: yet there are some instances on record, Judges xvi, 21; 1 Sam. xi, 2; 2 Kings xxv, 7. 10. The cutting off the extremities of the feet and hands, Judges i, 5–7; 2 Sam. iv, 12.

PUR, פור, αλῆρος, signifies lot. Pur, Phur, or Purim, was a solemn feast of the Jews, instituted in memory of the lots cast by Haman, the enemy of the Jews, Esther iii, 7. These lots were cast in the first month of the year, and gave the twelfth month of the same year for the execution of Haman’s design, to destroy all the Jews in Persia. Thus the superstition of Haman, in crediting these lots, caused his own ruin, and the preservation of the Jews, who, by means of Esther, had time to avert this blow. The Jews have exactly kept this feast down to our times. See Haman, Esther, and Mordecai.

PURGATORY, a place in which, according to the church of Rome, the just, who depart out of this life, are supposed to expiate certain offences which do not merit eternal damnation. Broughton has endeavoured to prove that this notion has been held by Pagans, Jews, and Mohammedans, as well as

by Christians; and that in the days of the Maccabees, the Jews believed that sin might be expiated by sacrifice after the death of the sinner. The arguments advanced for purgatory by the papists are these: Every sin, how slight soever, though no more than an idle word, as it is an offence to God, deserves punishment from him, and will be punished by him hereafter, if not cancelled by repentance here. 2. Such small sins do not deserve eternal punishment. 3. Few depart this life so pure as to be totally exempt from spots of this nature, and from every kind of debt due to God's justice. 4. Therefore, few will escape without suffering something from his justice for such debts as they have carried with them out of this world, according to the rule of divine justice, by which he treats every soul hereafter according to his works, and according to the state in which he finds it in death. From these positions, which the papist considers as so many self-evident truths, he infers that there must be some third place of punishment; for since the infinite holiness of God can admit nothing into heaven that is not clean and pure from all sin, both great and small, and his infinite justice can permit none to receive the reward of bliss, who as yet are not out of debt, but have something in justice to suffer, there must, of necessity, be some place or state, where souls departing this life, pardoned as to the eternal guilt of sin, yet obnoxious to some temporal penalty, or with the guilt of some venial faults, are purged and purified before their admittance into heaven. And this is what he is taught concerning purgatory; though he know not where it is, of what nature the pains are, or how long each soul is detained there, yet he believes that those who are in this place are relieved by the prayers of their fellow members here on earth, as also by alms and masses offered up to God for their souls. And as for such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms to procure masses for their relief, they are not neglected by the church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed, in every mass, and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office. Beside the above arguments, the following passages are alleged as proofs: 2 Macc. xii, 43–45; Matt. xii, 31, 32; 1 Cor. iii, 15; 1 Peter iii, 19. But it may be observed, 1. That the books of Maccabees have no evidence of inspiration, therefore quotations from them are not to be regarded. 2. If they were, the texts referred to would rather prove that there is no such place as purgatory, since Judas did not expect the souls departed to reap any benefit from the sin-offering till the resurrection. The texts quoted from the Scriptures have no reference to the doctrine, as may be seen by consulting the context, and any just commentator upon it. 3. The Scriptures, in general, speak of departed souls going immediately, at death, to a fixed state of happiness or misery, and give us no idea of purgatory, Isaiah lvii, 2; Rev. xiv, 13; Luke xvi, 22; 2 Cor. v, 8. 4. It is derogatory from the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ. If Christ died for us, and redeemed us from sin and hell, as the Scripture speaks, then the idea of farther meritorious suffering detracts from the perfection of his sacrifice, and



places merit still in the creature; a doctrine exactly opposite to the Scriptures.

PURITANS. In England, the term Puritans was applied to those who wished for a farther degree of reformation in the church than was adopted by Queen Elizabeth; and a purer form, not of faith, but of discipline and worship. It was a common name given to all who, from conscientious motives, though on different grounds, disapproved of the established religion, from the reformation under Elizabeth, to the Act of Uniformity in 1662. From that time to the revolution in 1688, as many as refused to comply with the established worship, (among whom were about two thousand clergymen, and perhaps five hundred thousand people,) were denominated Nonconformists. From the passing of the Act of Toleration on the accession of William and Mary, the name of Nonconformists was changed to that of Protestant Dissenters. Prior to the grand rebellion in 1640, the Puritans were, almost without exception, Episcopalians; but after the famous "League and Covenant" of those turbulent times the greater part of them became Presbyterians. Some, however, were Independents, and some Baptists. The objections of the latter were more fundamental; they disapproved of all national churches, as such, and disavowed the authority of human legislation in matters of faith and worship. The persecutions carried on against the Puritans during the reigns of Elizabeth and the Stuarts served to lay the foundation of a new empire, and eventually a vast republic, in the western world. Thither, as into a wilderness, they fled from the face of their persecutors; and, being protected in the free exercise of their religion, continued to increase, until at length they became an independent nation. The different principles, however, on which they had originally divided from the church establishment at home, operated in a way that might have been expected, when they came to the possession of the civil power abroad. Those who formed the colony of Massachusetts having never relinquished the principle of a national church, and of the power of the civil magistrate in matters of faith and worship, were less tolerant than those who settled at New Plymouth, at Rhode Island, and Providence Plantations. The very men who had just escaped the persecutions of the English prelates, now, in their turn, persecuted others who dissented from them; until, at length, the liberal system of toleration established in the parent country at the revolution, extended to the colonies, and in a good measure put an end to these censurable proceedings.

PURPLE, אַרְגָּמָן, Exodus xxv, 4, &c; πορφύρα, Mark xv, 17, 20; Luke xvi, 19; John xix, 2, 5; Rev. xvii, 4; xviii, 12, 16. This is supposed to be the very precious colour extracted from the purpura or murex, a species of shell fish; and the same with the famous Tyrian dye, so costly, and so much celebrated in antiquity. The purple dye is called in 1 Macc. iv, 23, "purple of the sea,"

or sea purple; it being the blood or juice of a turbinated shell fish, which the Jews call זלזון. (See Scarlet.) Among the blessings pronounced by Moses upon the tribes of Israel, those of Zebulun and Issachar are, "They shall suck of the abundance of the seas, and of the treasures hid in the sand," Deut. xxxiii, 19. Jonathan Ben Uzziel explains the latter clause thus: "From the sand are produced looking glasses, and glass in general; the 801 treasures, the method of finding and working which, was revealed to these tribes." Several ancient writers inform us, that there were havens in the coasts of the Zebulunites, in which the sand proper for making glass was found. The words of Tacitus are remarkable: "Et Belus amnis Judaico mari illabitur, circa ejus os lectæ arenæ admixto nitro in vitrum excoquantur." "The river Belus falls into the Jewish sea, about whose mouth those sands mixed with nitre are collected, out of which glass is formed." But it seems much more natural to explain "the treasures hid in the sand," of those highly valuable murices and purpuræ which were found on the sea coast, near the country of Zebulun and Issachar, and of which those tribes partook in common with their Heathen neighbours of Tyre, who rendered the curious dyes made from those shell fish so famous among the Romans by the names of Sarranum ostrum, Tyrii colores. In reference to the purple vestment, Luke xvi, 19, it may be observed that this was not appropriately a royal robe. In the earlier times it was the dress of any of high rank. Thus all the courtiers were styled by the historians purpurati. This colour is more properly crimson than purple; for the LXX., Josephus, and Philo, constantly use πορφύραν to express the Hebrew ארגמן, by which the Talmudists understood crimson; and that this Hebrew word expressed, not the Tyrian purple, but that brought to the city from another country, appears from Ezek. xxvii, 7. The purple robe put on our Saviour, John xix, 2, 5, is explained by a Roman custom, the dressing of a person in the robes of state, as the investiture of office. Hence the robe brought by Herod's or the Roman soldiers, scoffingly, was as though it had been the pictæ vestes usually sent by the Roman senate. In Acts xvi, 14, Lydia is said to be "a seller of purple." Mr. Harmer styles purple the most sublime of all earthly colours, having the gaudiness of red, of which it retains a shade, softened with the gravity of blue.

PUTEOLI, so called from its baths of hot water, a city of Campania, in Italy; now called Pozzuoli, in a province of the kingdom of Naples, called Terra di Lavoro, and about eight miles from Naples. St. Paul stayed a week with the Christians of this place, in his journey as a prisoner to Rome, Acts xxviii, 13. The Alexandrian merchant vessels preferred Puteoli to all the harbours in Italy, and here they deposited their rich freights. They conducted the ships adorned with wreaths and festive garments, in the form of a fleet, one after another, into the harbour, where they were received with the greatest demonstrations of friendship. Such was the case with the

sale of Alexandrian commodities throughout Italy. According to the course then pursued, the vessel in which St. Paul sailed went direct into this harbour.

QUAIL, שָׁלִי, Exod. xvi, 13; Num. xi, 31, 32; Psalm cv, 10; a bird of the gallinaceous kind. Hasselquist, mentioning the quail of the larger kind, says, "It is of the size of the turtle dove. I have met with it in the wilderness of Palestine, near the shores of the Dead Sea and the Jordan, between Jordan and Jericho, and in the deserts of Arabia Petrea. If the food of the Israelites was a bird, this is certainly it; being so common in the places through which they passed." It is said that God gave quails to his people in the wilderness upon two occasions: first, within a few days after they had passed the Red Sea, Exod. xvi, 3–13. The second time was at the encampment at the place called in Hebrew, Kibroth-hataavah, the graves of lust, Num. xi, 32; Psalm cv, 40. Both of these happened in the spring, when the quails passed from Asia into Europe. They are then to be found in great quantities upon the coast of the Red Sea and Mediterranean. God caused a wind to arise that drove them within and about the camp of the Israelites; and it is in this that the miracle consists, that they were brought so seasonably to this place, and in so great number as to furnish food for above a million of persons for more than a month. The Hebrew word *shalav* signifies "a quail," by the agreement of the ancient interpreters. And the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic languages call them nearly by the same name. The Septuagint, Symmachus, and most of commentators, both ancient and modern, understand it in the same manner; and with them agree Philo, Josephus, Apollinaris, and the rabbins; but Ludolphus has endeavoured to prove that a species of locust is spoken of by Moses. Dr. Shaw answers, that the holy psalmist, in describing this particular food of the Israelites, by calling the animals feathered fowls, entirely confutes this supposition. And it should be recollected, that this miracle was performed in compliance with the wish of the people that they might have flesh to eat.

QUAKERS. See Friends.

QUESTIONS. Among the ancients no pastime was more common than that of proposing and answering difficult questions. The person who solved the question was honoured with a reward; he who failed in the attempt suffered a certain punishment; both the rewards and penalties were varied according to the disposition of the company. That the custom of proposing riddles was very ancient, and derived from the eastern nations, appears from the story of Samson, in the book of Judges, who proposed one to the Philistines at his nuptial feast. Nor were these questions confined to entertainments, but, in the primitive times, were proposed on other occasions, by those who desired to make proof of another's wisdom and learning. Agreeably to this

custom, the queen of Sheba came to prove Solomon with hard questions, 1 Kings x, 1.

QUIETISTS, the disciples of Michael de Molinos, a Spanish priest, who flourished in the seventeenth century, and wrote a book called "The Spiritual Guide." He had many disciples in Spain, Italy, France, and the Netherlands. Some pretend that he borrowed his principles from the Spanish Illuminati; 802 and M. Gregoire will have it that they came originally from the Persian Soofees; while others no less confidently derive them from the Greek Hesycasts. The Quietists, however, deduce their principles from the Scriptures. They argue thus: "The Apostle tells us, that 'the Spirit makes intercession for' or in 'us.' Now if the Spirit pray in us, we must resign ourselves to his impulses, by remaining in a state of absolute rest, or quietude, till we attain the perfection of the unitive life," a life of union with, and, as it should seem, of absorption in, the Deity. They contend, that true religion consists in the present calm and tranquillity of a mind removed from all external and finite things, and centered in God; and in such a pure love of the supreme Being, as is independent of all prospect of interest or reward. To prove that our love to the Deity must be disinterested, they allege, that the Lord hath made all things for himself, as saith the Scripture; and it is for his glory that he wills our happiness. To conform, therefore, to the great end of our creation, we must prefer God to ourselves, and not desire our own happiness but for his glory; otherwise we shall go contrary to his order. As the perfections of the Deity are intrinsically amiable, it is our glory and perfection to go out of ourselves, to be lost and absorbed in the pure love of infinite beauty. Madam Guion, a woman of fashion in France, born 1648, becoming pious, was a warm advocate of these principles. She asserted, that the means of arriving at this perfect love, are prayer and the self-denial enjoined in the Gospel. Prayer she defines to be the entire bent of the soul toward its divine origin. Some of her pious canticles were translated by the poet Cowper, and represent her sentiments to the best advantage. Fenelon, the amiable archbishop of Cambay, also favoured these sentiments in his celebrated publication, entitled, "The Maxims of the Saints." The distinguishing tenet in his theology was the doctrine of the disinterested love of God for his own excellencies, independent of his relative benevolence: an important feature also in the system of Madam Guion, who, with the good archbishop, was persecuted by the pope and by Bossuet. See Mystics.

RAB. The title rabbi, with several others from the same root, רַבב, magnus est, vel multiplicatus est, began first to be assumed, according to Godwin, as a distinguishing title of honour by men of learning, about the time of the birth of Christ. We find it anciently given, indeed, to several magistrates and officers of state. In Esther i, 8, it is said, the king appointed כל-רב ביתו,

which we render “all the officers of his house.” In Jeremiah xli, 1, we read of the *ורֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ*, “the princes of the king.” In Job xxxii, 9, it is said, that the *רַבִּים*, which we render “great men, are not always wise;” a rendering which well expresses the original meaning of the word. It was not therefore in those days properly a title of honour, belonging to any particular office or dignity, in church or state; but all who were of superior rank, and condition in life were called *רַבִּים*. We do not find the prophets, or other men of learning in the Old Testament, affecting any title beside that which denoted their office; and they were contented to be addressed by their bare names. The first Jewish rabbi, said to have been distinguished with any title of honour, was Simeon, the son of Hillel, who succeeded his father as president of the sanhedrim; and his title was that of rabban. The later rabbies tell us, this title was conferred with a good deal of ceremony. When a person had gone through the schools and was thought worthy of the degree of rabbi, he was first placed in a chair somewhat raised above the company; then were delivered to him a key and a table book: the key, as a symbol of the power or authority now conferred upon him, to teach that knowledge to others which he had learned himself; and this key he afterward wore as a badge of his honour, and when he died it was buried with him: the table book was a symbol of his diligence in his studies, and of his endeavouring to make farther improvements in learning. The next ceremony in the creation of a rabbi was the imposition of hands on him by the delegates of the sanhedrim, practised in imitation of Moses’s ordaining Joshua by this rite, to succeed him in his office, Num. xxvii, 18; Deut. xxxiv, 9. And then they proclaimed his title.

According to Maimonides, the imposition of hands was not looked upon to be essential; but was sometimes omitted. They did not always, saith he, lay their hands on the head of the elder to be ordained; but called him rabbi, and said, “Behold thou art ordained, and hast power,” &c. We find this title given to John the Baptist, John iii, 26; and frequently to our blessed Saviour; as by John’s disciples, by Nicodemus, and by the people that followed, John i, 38; iii, 2; vi, 20. The reason of our Saviour’s prohibiting his disciples to be called rabbi is expressed in these words: “Be not ye called rabbi, for one is your master, even Christ,” *καθηγητῆς*, your guide and conductor, on whose word and instructions alone you are to depend in matters of religion and salvation. Accordingly the inspired Apostles pretend to nothing more than, as the ambassadors of Christ, to deliver his instructions; and, for their own part, they expressly disclaim all dominion over the faith and consciences of men, 2 Cor. i, 24; v, 20. The Jewish writers distinguish between the titles rab, rabbi, rabban. As for rab and rabbi, the only difference between them is, that rab was the title of such as had had their education, and taken their degree, in some foreign Jewish school; suppose at Babylon, where there was a school or academy of

considerable note; rabbi was the title of such as were educated in the land of Judea, who were accounted more honourable than the others. But as for rabban, it was the highest title; which, they say, was never conferred on more than seven persons, namely, on R. Simeon, five of his 803 descendants, and on R. Jochanan, who was of a different family. It was on this account, it should seem, that the blind man gave this title to Christ, Mark x, 51; being convinced that he was possessed of divine power, and worthy of the most honourable distinctions. And Mary Magdalene, when she saw Christ after his resurrection, "said unto him, Rabboni," John xx, 16, that is, my rabban, like my lord in English; for rabbon is the same with rabban, only pronounced according to the Syriac dialect.

There were several gradations among the Jews before the dignity of rabbin, as among us, before the degree of doctor. The head of a school was called chacham, or wise. He had the head seat in the assemblies and in the synagogues. He reprimanded the disobedient, and could excommunicate them; and this procured him great respect. In their schools they sat upon raised chairs, and their scholars were seated at their feet. Hence St. Paul is said to have studied at the feet of Rabbi Gamaliel, Acts xxii, 3. The studies of the rabbins are employed either on the text of the law, or the traditions, or the cabbala; these three objects form so many different schools and different sorts of rabbins. Those who chiefly apply to the letter of Scripture are called Caraites, Literalists. Those who chiefly study the traditions and oral laws of the Talmud are called Rabbanists. Those who give themselves to their secret and mysterious divinity, letters and numbers, are called Cabbalists, Traditionaries. The rabbins are generally very ignorant in history, chronology, philology, antiquity, and geography. They understand the holy language but imperfectly. They know not the true signification of a multitude of words in the sacred text. They are prodigiously conceited about their traditions, so that there is very little profit in reading them; and experience shows that most who have applied themselves to peruse their books, have been but little benefited by them, and have entertained a perfect contempt of their understanding and their works. The chief function of the rabbins is to preach in the synagogue, to make public prayers there, and to interpret the law; they have the power of binding and loosing, that is, of declaring what is forbidden, and what allowed. When the synagogue is poor and small, there is but one rabbin, who at the same time discharges the office of a judge and a teacher. But when the Jews are numerous and powerful, they appoint three pastors, and a house of judgment, where all their civil affairs are determined. Then the rabbin applies himself to instruction only, unless it be thought proper to call him into the council to give his advice, in which case he takes the chief place.

RABBATH, or RABBAT-AMMON, the capital city of the Ammonites, situated beyond Jordan. See Ammon.

RABBATH-MOAB, the capital city of the Moabites, called otherwise Ar, or Areopolis. See Moab.

RABBI. See Rab.

RABSHAKEH, a chief butler, or cupbearer. This is a term of dignity, and not a proper name. Rabshakeh was sent by Sennacherib, king of Assyria, to summon Hezekiah to surrender Jerusalem, 2 Kings xviii, 17, 18; xix, 4; Isaiah xxxvi.

RACA, a Syriac word which properly signifies empty, vain, beggarly, foolish, and which includes in it a strong idea of contempt. Our Saviour pronounces a censure on every person using this term to his neighbour, Matt. v, 22. Lightfoot assures us that, in the writings of the Jews, the word *raca* is a term of the utmost contempt, and that it was usual to pronounce it with marked signs of indignation.

RACHEL, the daughter of Laban, and sister of Leah. The Prophet Jeremiah, xxxi, 15, and St. Matthew, ii, 18, have put Rachel for the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, the children of Joseph, the son of Rachel. This prophecy was completed when these two tribes were carried into captivity beyond the Euphrates; and St. Matthew made application of it to what happened at Bethlehem, when Herod put to death the children of two years old and under. Then Rachel, who was buried there, might be said to make her lamentations for the death of so many innocent children sacrificed to the jealousy of a wicked monarch.

RAHAB was a hostess of the city of Jericho, who received and concealed the spies sent by Joshua. The Hebrew calls her *Zona*, Joshua ii, 1, which Jerom and many others understand of a prostitute. Others think she was only a hostess or innkeeper, and that this is the true signification of the original word. Had she been a woman of ill fame, would Salmon, a prince of the tribe of Judah, have taken her to wife? Or could he have done it by the law? Beside, the spies of Joshua would hardly have gone to lodge with a common harlot, they who were charged with so nice and dangerous a commission. Those who maintain that she was a harlot, pretend that she was perhaps one of those women who prostituted themselves in honour of the Pagan deities; as if this could extenuate her crime, or the scandal of her profession if she was a public woman. It is also observable that such women are called *kadeshah*, not *zona*, in the Hebrew. Rahab married Salmon, a prince of Judah, by whom she had Boaz, from whom descended

Obed, Jesse, and David. Thus Jesus Christ condescended to reckon this Canaanitish woman among his ancestors. St. Paul magnifies the faith of Rahab, Heb. xi, 31.

Rahab is also a name of Egypt, Isa. xxx, 7; li, 9.

RAIMENT. In addition to what occurs under the article Habits, it may be observed that to make presents of changes of raiment, Gen. xlv, 22, has always been common among all ranks of orientals. The perfuming of raiment with sweet-scented spices or extracts is also still a custom, which explains the smell of Jacob's raiment. A coat or robe of many colours, such as Jacob gave to Joseph, is also a mark of distinction. The Turks at Aleppo thus array their sons; and, in the time 804 of Sisera, a coat of divers colours is mentioned among the rich spoils which fell to the conquerors. A frequent change of garments is also very common both to show respect and to display opulence. Is there an allusion to this in Psalm cii, 26: "As a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed?" If so, it conveys the magnificent idea of the almighty Creator investing himself with the whole creation as with a robe, and having laid that aside, by new creations, or the successive production of beings, clothing himself with others, at his pleasure.

RAIN, the vapours exhaled by the sun, which descend from the clouds to water the earth, Eccles. xi, 3. The sacred writers often speak of the rain of the former and latter season, Deut. xi, 14; Hosea vi, 3. Twice in the year there generally fell plenty of rain in Judea; in the beginning of the civil year, about September or October; and half a year after, in the month of Abib, or March, which was the first month in the ecclesiastical or sacred year, whence it is called the latter rain in the first month, Joel ii, 23. (See Canaan.) The ancient Hebrews compared elocution, and even learning or doctrine, to rain: "My doctrine shall drop as the rain," Deut. xxxii, 2.

RAMESES, or RAAMSES, a city supposed to have been situated in the eastern part of Egypt, called the land of Goshen, which was also hence termed the land of Rameses. It was one of the cities built by the Israelites as a treasure city, as it is translated in our Bibles; probably a store city, or, as others interpret it, a fortress. Its position may be fixed about six or eight miles above the modern Cairo, a little to the south of the Babylon of the Persians, the ancient Letopolis; as Josephus says that the children of Israel, after quitting this place, in their first march to Succoth, passed by the latter city.

RAMOTH, a famous city in the mountains of Gilead, 1 Kings iv, 13. It is often called Ramoth-Gilead. Josephus calls it Ramathan, or Aramatha. The



city belonged to the tribe of Gad, Deut. iv, 43. It was assigned for a dwelling of the Levites, and was one of the cities of refuge beyond Jordan, Joshua xx, 8; xxi, 38. It became famous during the reigns of the latter kings of Israel, and was the occasion of several wars between them and the kings of Damascus, who had made a conquest of it, which the sovereigns of Israel endeavoured to regain, 1 Kings xxii, 3–5. Eusebius says, that Ramoth was fifteen miles from Philadelphia toward the east. St. Jerom places it in the neighbourhood of Jabbok, and consequently to the north of Philadelphia.

RAVEN, עורב, in Chaldee, orba, in Syriac, croac, in Latin, corvus, Gen. viii, 7; Lev. xi, 15; Deut. xiv, 14; 1 Kings xvii, 4, 6; Job xxxviii, 41; Psalm cxlvii, 9; Prov. xxx, 17; Cant. v, 11; Isa. xxxiv, 11; κόραξ, Luke xii, 24; a well known bird of prey. All the interpreters agree that oreb signifies the raven, from oreb, “evening,” on account of its colour. Michaëlis, in proposing a question respecting certain birds, says of the oreb, “Il est décidé, que c’est le corbeau; il seroit donc superflu de le demander. Mais je desirerois plus de certitude sur le nom Syriaque des corbeaux.” [It is settled that this is the raven; it would therefore be superfluous to investigate it. But I could wish more certainty respecting the Syriac name of ravens.] One can hardly doubt that it is taken from the note of this bird. On the decrease of the waters of the flood, so that the tops of the mountains became visible, Noah sent forth out of one of the windows of the ark a raven, a bold and adventurous bird, by way of experiment, to see whether the waters were sunk or abated. Forty days the violent rain had continued; and he might think this, therefore, a likely time for the waters to run off again. In the original text, in the Samaritan, in the Chaldee and Arabic, it is said that the raven “returned” to the ark; but the Greek interpreters, the Syriac, the Latin, and most of the eminent fathers and commentators, say that it did not return any more. Here are great authorities on both sides, but the latter reading, though so contrary in sense to the other, yet in the Hebrew is not very different in the form of the letters, and appears to be the better reading of the two. For if the raven had returned, what occasion had Noah to send forth a dove? Or why did he not take the raven in unto him into the ark, as he did afterward the dove? Or why did he not send forth the same raven again, as he did afterward the same dove again? It is not improperly expressed in our translation, that “the raven went forth to and fro,” flying hither and thither, “until the waters were dried up from off the face of the earth.” He found, perhaps, in the higher grounds, some of the carcasses of those who had perished in the deluge.

The Prophet Elijah was in his retirement fed by this bird. A writer, indeed, in the *Memoirs of Literature*, for April, 1710, endeavours to show, from many authors, that there was in the country of Bethschan, in Decapolis, by the brook Cherith or Carith, a little town called Aorabi or Orbo, Judges vii,

25; Isa. x, 6; and he therefore explains the word *orebim*, which, in 1 Kings xvii, 4, we translate “ravens,” of the inhabitants of that village, some of whom, he contends, daily carried bread and flesh to Elijah, who had retired to and lay in a cave in the neighbourhood. On the other hand, Scheuchzer ably vindicates the commonly received opinion. The editor of Calmet, also, in the appendix, under the article Elijah, has some pertinent observations on this subject. “We ought to consider,” says he, “1. That Ahab sought Elijah with avidity, and took an oath of every people, no doubt, also, in his dominions, that he was not concealed among its inhabitants; his situation, therefore, required the utmost privacy, even to solitude. 2. That when the brook Cherith was dried up, the prophet was obliged to quit his asylum, which he needed not to have done, had a people been his suppliers, for they could have brought him water as well as food.”

In Psalm cxlvii, 9, it is said, “The Lord giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry.” And in Job xxxviii, 41, “Who provideth for the raven his food, when his young ones cry unto God, wandering for want of meat?” Job and the psalmist may allude to what is said by some naturalists, that the ravens drive out their young ones early from their nests, and oblige them to seek food for their own sustenance. The same kind Providence which furnishes support to his intelligent offspring is not unmindful of the wants, or inattentive to the desires, of the meanest of his creatures.

Lo, the young ravens, from their nest exiled,  
On hunger’s wing attempt the aerial wild!  
Who leads their wanderings, and their feast supplies?  
To God ascend their importuning cries.

Christ instructs his disciples, from the same circumstance, to trust in the care and kindness of Heaven: “Consider the ravens; for they neither sow nor reap, neither have storehouse, nor barn; and God feedeth them. How much better are ye than the fowls!” Luke xii, 24. Solomon, speaking of the peculiar regard and veneration due to the worthy persons and salutary instructions of parents, observes, that an untimely fate, and the want of decent interment, may be expected from contrary conduct; and that the leering eye, which throws wicked contempt on a good father, and insolent disdain on a tender mother, shall be dug out of the unburied exposed corpse by the ravens of the valley, and eaten up by the young eagles, Prov. xxx, 17. It was a common punishment in the east, and one which the orientals dreaded above all others, to expose in the open fields the bodies of evil doers that had suffered by the laws of their offended country, to be devoured by the beasts of the field, and the fowls of heaven. The wise man insinuates that the raven makes his first and keenest attack on the eye, which perfectly corresponds with his habits, for he always begins his

banquet with that part. Isidore says of him, *Primo in cadaveribus oculum petit*; [he attacks first the eye of the dead;] and Epictetus, Ὅτι μὲν κορακες τῶν τετελευτηκότων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς λυμαίνονται, “the ravens devour the eyes of the dead.” Many other testimonies might be adduced, but these are sufficient to justify the allusion in the proverb.

The raven, it is well known, delights in solitude. He frequents the ruined tower or the deserted habitation. In Isaiah, xxxiv, 11, it is accordingly foretold that the raven, with other birds of similar dispositions, should fix his abode in the desolate houses of Edom. In the Septuagint and other versions the Hebrew word for desolation is rendered raven. The meaning is, that in those splendid palaces, where the voice of joy and gladness was heard, and every sound which could ravish the ear and subdue the heart, silence was, for the wickedness of their inhabitants, to hold her reign for ever, interrupted only by the scream of the cormorant and the croaking of the raven.

READING. In the countries of the Levant the people never read silently, but go on in a kind of singing voice, aloud. The eunuch was probably thus reading when Philip overheard him, and finding that he was reading the Scriptures, said, “Understandest thou what thou readest?”

REASON, Use of, in Religion. The sublime, incomprehensible nature of some of the Christian doctrines has so completely subdued the understanding of many pious men, as to make them think it presumptuous to apply reason in any way to the revelations of God; and the many instances in which the simplicity of truth has been corrupted by an alliance with philosophy confirm them in the belief that it is safer, as well as more respectable, to resign their minds to devout impressions, than to exercise their understandings in any speculations upon sacred subjects. Enthusiasts and fanatics of all different names and sects agree in decrying the use of reason, because it is the very essence of fanaticism to substitute, in place of the sober deductions of reason, the extravagant fancies of a disordered imagination, and to consider these fancies as the immediate illumination of the Spirit of God. Insidious writers in the deistical controversy have pretended to adopt those sentiments of humility and reverence, which are inseparable from true Christians, and even that total subjection of reason to faith which characterizes enthusiasts. A pamphlet was published about the middle of the last century that made a noise in its day, although it is now forgotten, entitled, “Christianity not founded on Argument,” which, while to a careless reader it may seem to magnify the Gospel, does in reality tend to undermine our faith, by separating it from a rational assent; and Mr. Hume, in the spirit of this pamphlet, concludes his *Essay on Miracles* with calling those dangerous friends or disguised enemies to the

Christian religion who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human reason: "Our most holy religion," he says, with a disingenuity very unbecoming his respectable talents, "is founded on faith, not on reason;" and, "mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity." The church of Rome, in order to subject the minds of her votaries to her authority, has reprobated the use of reason in matters of religion. She has revived an ancient position, that things may be true in theology which are false in philosophy; and she has, in some instances, made the merit of faith to consist in the absurdity of that which was believed.

The extravagance of these positions has produced, since the Reformation, an opposite extreme. While those who deny the truth of revelation consider reason as in all respects a sufficient guide, the Socinians, who admit that a revelation has been made, employ reason as the supreme judge of its doctrines, and boldly strike out of their creed every article that is not altogether conformable to those notions which may be derived from the exercise of reason. These controversies concerning the use of reason in matters of religion are disputes, not about words, but about the essence of Christianity. But a few plain observations are sufficient to ascertain where the truth lies in this subject.

The first use of reason in matters of religion is to examine the evidences of revelation. For, the more entire the submission which we consider as due to every thing that is revealed, we have the more need to be satisfied that any system which professes to be a divine revelation does really come from God.

After the exercise of reason has established in our minds a firm belief that Christianity is of divine original, the second use of reason is to learn what are the truths revealed. As these truths are not in our days communicated to any by immediate inspiration, the knowledge of them is to be acquired only from books transmitted to us with satisfying evidence that they were written above seventeen hundred years ago, in a remote country and foreign language, under the direction of the Spirit of God. In order to attain the meaning of these books we must study the language in which they were written; and we must study also the manners of the times, and the state of the countries, in which the writers lived; because these are circumstances to which an original author is often alluding, and by which his phraseology is generally affected; we must lay together different passages in which the same word or phrase occurs, because without this labour we cannot ascertain its precise signification; and we must mark the difference of style and manner which characterizes different writers, because a right apprehension of their meaning often depends upon attention to this difference. All this supposes the application of grammar, history,

geography, chronology, and criticism in matters of religion; that is, it supposes that the reason of man had been previously exercised in pursuing these different branches of knowledge, and that our success in attaining the true sense of Scripture depends upon the diligence with which we avail ourselves of the progress that has been made in them. It is obvious that every Christian is not capable of making this application. But this is no argument against the use of reason, of which we are now speaking. For they who use translations and commentaries rely only upon the reason of others, instead of exercising their own. The several branches of knowledge have been applied in every age by some persons for the benefit of others; and the progress in sacred criticism, which distinguishes the present times, is nothing else but the continued application, in elucidating the Scripture, of reason enlightened by every kind of subsidiary knowledge, and very much improved in this kind of exercise by the employment which the ancient classics have given it since the revival of letters.

After the two uses of reason that have been illustrated, a third comes to be mentioned, which may be considered as compounded of both. Reason is of eminent use in repelling the attacks of the adversaries of Christianity. When men of erudition, of philosophical acuteness, and of accomplished taste, direct their talents against our religion, the cause is very much hurt by an unskilful defender. He cannot unravel their sophistry; he does not see the amount and the effect of the concessions which he makes to them; he is bewildered by their quotations, and he is often led by their artifice upon dangerous ground. In all ages of the church there have been weak defenders of Christianity; and the only triumphs of the enemies of our religion have arisen from their being able to expose the defects of those methods of defending the truth which some of its advocates had unwarily chosen. A mind trained to accurate and philosophical views of the nature and the amount of evidence, enriched with historical knowledge, accustomed to throw out of a subject all that is minute and irrelative, to collect what is of importance within a short compass, and to form the comprehension of a whole, is the mind qualified to contend with the learning, the wit, and the sophistry of infidelity. Many such minds have appeared in this honourable controversy during the course of this and the last century; and the success has corresponded to the completeness of the furniture with which they engaged in the combat. The Christian doctrine has been vindicated by their masterly exposition from various misrepresentations; the arguments for its divine original have been placed in their true light; and the attempts to confound the miracles and prophecies upon which Christianity rests its claim, with the delusions of imposture, have been effectually repelled. Christianity has, in this way, received the most important advantages from the attacks of its enemies; and it is not improbable that its doctrines would never have been so thoroughly cleared from all the corruptions and

subtleties which had attached to them in the progress of ages, nor the evidences of its truths have been so accurately understood, nor its peculiar character been so perfectly discriminated, had not the zeal and abilities which have been employed against it called forth in its defence some of the most distinguished masters of reason. They brought into the service of Christianity the same weapons which had been drawn for her destruction, and, wielding them with confidence and skill in a good cause, became the successful champions of the truth.

The fourth use of reason consists in judging of the truths of religion. Every thing which is revealed by God comes to his creatures from so high an authority, that it may be rested in with perfect assurance as true. Nothing can be received by us as true which is contrary to the dictates of reason, because it is impossible for us to receive at the same time the truth and the falsehood of a proposition. But many things are true which we do not fully comprehend; and many propositions, which appear incredible when they are first enunciated, are found, upon examination, such as our understandings can readily admit. These principles embrace the whole of the subject, and they mark out the steps by which reason is to proceed in judging of the truths of religion. We first examine the evidences of revelation. If these satisfy our understandings, we are certain that there can be no contradiction between the doctrines of this true religion, and the dictates of right reason. If any such contradiction appear, there must be some mistake; by not making a proper use of our reason in the interpretation of the Gospel, we suppose that it contains doctrines which it does not teach; or we give the name of right reason to some narrow prejudices which deeper reflection, and more enlarged knowledge, will dissipate; or we consider a proposition as implying a contradiction, when, in truth, it is only imperfectly understood. Here, as in every other case, mistakes are to be corrected by measuring back our steps. We must examine closely and impartially the meaning of those passages which appear to contain the doctrine; we must compare them with one another; we must endeavour to derive light from the general phraseology of Scripture and the analogy of faith; and we shall generally be able, in this way, to separate the doctrine from all those adventitious circumstances which give it the appearance of absurdity. If a doctrine which, upon the closest examination, appears unquestionably to be taught in Scripture, still does not approve itself to our understanding, we must consider carefully what it is that prevents us from receiving it. There may be preconceived notions hastily taken up which that doctrine opposes; there may be pride of understanding that does not readily submit to the views which it communicates; or reason may need to be reminded, that we must expect to find in religion many things which we are not able to comprehend. One of the most important offices of reason is to recognize her own limits. She

never can be moved, by any authority, to receive as true what she perceives to be absurd. But, if she has formed a just estimate of human knowledge, she will not shelter her presumption in rejecting the truths of revelation under the pretence of contradictions that do not really exist; she will readily admit that there may be in a subject some points which she knows, and others of which she is ignorant; she will not allow her ignorance of the latter to shake the evidence of the former, but will yield a firm assent to that which she does understand, without presuming to deny what is beyond her comprehension. And thus, availing herself of all the light which she now has, she will wait in humble hope for the time when a larger measure shall be imparted.

REBEKAH, the wife of Isaac. See Isaac.

RECEIPT OF CUSTOM. Matthew, when called, was sitting at the receipt of custom, or dues on merchandise. He was a publican or tax-gatherer, or, as we should say, a custom house officer. The publicans had houses or booths built for them at the foot of bridges, at the mouth of rivers, by the sea shore, and the parts of the lake of Gennesareth, or sea of Tiberias, to collect the taxes on passengers and merchandise. See Publican.

RECHABITES. The Rechabites, though they dwelt among the Israelites, did not belong to any of their tribes; for they were Kenites, as appears from 1 Chron. ii, 55, where the Kenites are said to have come of "Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab." These Kenites, afterward styled Rechabites, were of the family of Jethro, otherwise called Hobab, whose daughter Moses married; for "the children of the Kenite, Moses's father-in-law," it is said, "went up out of the city of palm trees with the children of Judah, and dwelt among the people," Judges i, 16; and we read of "Heber the Kenite, who was of the children of Hobab, the father-in-law of Moses, who had severed himself from the Kenites," or from the bulk of them who settled in the tribe of Judah, "and pitched his tent in the plain of Zaanaim," Judges iv, 11. They appear to have sprung from Midian, the son of Abraham by Keturah, Gen. xxv, 2; for Jethro, from whom they are descended, is called a Midianite, Num. x, 23. Of this family was Jehonadab, the son of Rechab, a man of eminent zeal for the pure worship of God against idolatry, who assisted King Jehu in destroying the house of Ahab, and the worshippers of Baal, 2 Kings x, 15, 16, 23, &c. It was he who gave that rule of life to his children and posterity which we read of in Jer. xxxv, 6, 7. It consisted of these three articles: that they should drink no wine; that they should neither possess nor occupy any houses, fields, or vineyards; that they should dwell in tents. This was the institution of the children of Rechab; and this they continued to observe for upward of three hundred years, from the time of Jehu to that of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, when

Nebuchadnezzar coming to besiege Jerusalem, the Rechabites were obliged to leave the country and take refuge in the city. In Jer. xxxv, there is a promise made to this people, that Jonadab, the son of Rechab, should not want a man to stand before the Lord; that is, that his posterity should not fail: and to this day this tribe is found among the Arabians of the desert, distinct, free, and practising exactly the institutions of Jonadab, whose name they bear, and of whose institutions they boast. This is a remarkable instance of the exact fulfilment of a minute and isolated prophecy. See Beni Khaibir.

RECONCILIATION. The expressions “reconciliation” and “making peace” necessarily suppose a previous state of hostility between God and man, which is reciprocal. This is sometimes called enmity, a term, as it respects God, rather unfortunate, since enmity is almost fixed in our language to signify a malignant and revengeful feeling. Of this, the oppugners of the doctrine of the atonement have availed themselves to argue, that as there can be no such affection in the divine nature, therefore, reconciliation in Scripture does not mean the reconciliation of God to man, but of man to God, whose enmity the example and teaching of Christ, they tell us, is very effectual to subdue. It is, indeed, a sad and humbling truth, and one which the Socinians in their discussions on the natural innocence of man are not willing to admit, that by the infection of sin “the carnal mind is enmity to God,” that human nature is malignantly hostile to God and to the control of his law; but this is far from expressing the whole of that relation of man in which, in Scripture, he is said to be at enmity with God, and so to need a reconciliation, the making of peace between God and him. That relation is a legal one, as that of a sovereign in his judicial capacity, and a criminal who has violated his laws and risen up against his authority, and who is, therefore, treated as an enemy. The word ἐχθρὸς is used in this passive sense, both in the Greek writers and in the New Testament. So, in Romans xi, 28, the Jews, rejected and punished for refusing the Gospel, are said by the Apostle, “as concerning the Gospel,” to be “enemies for your sakes;” treated and accounted such; “but, as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers’ sakes.” In the same epistle, v, 10, the term is used precisely in the same sense, and that with reference to the reconciliation by Christ: “For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son;” that is, when we were objects of the divine judicial displeasure, accounted as enemies, and liable to be capitally treated as such. Enmity, in the sense of malignity and the sentiment of hatred, is added to this relation in the case of man; but it is no part of the relation itself; it is rather a cause of it, as it is one of the actings of a corrupt nature which render man obnoxious to the displeasure of God, and the penalty of his law, and place him in the condition of an enemy. It is this judicial variance and opposition between God and man which is



referred to in the term reconciliation, and in the phrase “making peace,” in the New Testament; and the hostility is, therefore, in its own nature, mutual.

But that there is no truth in the notion, that reconciliation means no more than our laying aside our enmity to God, may also be shown from several express passages. The first is the passage we have above cited: “For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God,” Rom. v, 10. Here the act of reconciling is ascribed to God, and not to us; but if this reconciliation consisted in the laying aside of our own enmity, the act would be ours alone: and, farther, that it could not be the laying aside of our enmity, is clear from the text, which speaks of reconciliation while we were yet enemies. The reconciliation spoken of here is not, as Socinus and his followers have said, our conversion. For that the Apostle is speaking of a benefit obtained for us previous to our conversion, appears evident from the opposite members of the two sentences, “much more, being justified, we shall be saved from wrath through him,” “much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” The Apostle argues from the greater to the less. If God were so benign to us before our conversion, what may we not expect from him now we are converted? To reconcile here cannot mean to convert; for the Apostle evidently speaks of something greatly remarkable in the act of Christ; but to convert sinners is nothing remarkable, since none but sinners can be ever converted; whereas it was a rare and singular thing for Christ to die for sinners, and to reconcile sinners to God by his death, when there have been but very few good men who have died for their friends. In the next place, conversion is referred more properly to his glorious life, than to his shameful death; but this reconciliation is attributed to his death, as contradistinguished from his glorious life, as is evident from the antithesis contained in the two verses. Beside, it is from the latter benefit that we learn the nature of the former. The latter, which belongs only to the converted, consists of the peace of God, and salvation from wrath, Rom. v, 9, 10. This the Apostle afterward calls receiving the reconciliation. And what is it to receive the reconciliation, but to receive the remission of sins? Acts x, 43. To receive conversion is a mode of speaking entirely unknown. If, then, to receive the reconciliation is to receive the remission of sins, and in effect to be delivered from wrath or punishment, to be reconciled must have a corresponding signification.

“God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them,” 2 Cor. v, 19. Here the manner of this reconciliation is expressly said to be, not our laying aside our enmity, but the non-imputation of our trespasses to us by God; in other words, the pardoning of our offences and restoring us to favour. The promise, on God’s part, to do this, is expressive of his previous reconciliation to the world by the

death of Christ; for our actual reconciliation is distinguished from this by what follows, “and hath committed to us the ministry of reconciliation,” by virtue of which all men were, by the Apostles, entreated and besought to be reconciled to God. The reason, too, of this reconciliation of God to the world, by virtue of which he promises not to impute sin, is grounded by the Apostle, in the last verse of the chapter, not upon the laying aside of enmity by men, but upon the sacrifice of Christ: “For he hath made him to be sin,” a sin-offering, “for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” “And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby,” Eph. ii, 16. Here the act of reconciling is attributed to Christ. Man is not spoken of as reconciling himself to God; but Christ is said to reconcile Jews and Gentiles together, and both to God, “by his cross.” Thus, says the Apostle, “he is our peace;” but in what manner is the peace effected? Not, in the first instance, by subduing the enmity of man’s heart, but by removing the enmity of “the law.” “Having abolished in” or by “his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments.” The ceremonial law only is here, probably meant; for by its abolition, through its fulfilment in Christ, the enmity between Jews and Gentiles was taken away; but still it was not only necessary to reconcile Jew and Gentile together, but to “reconcile both unto God.” This he did by the same act; abolishing the ceremonial law by becoming the antitype of all its sacrifices, and thus, by the sacrifice of himself, effecting the reconciliation of all to God, “slaying the enmity by his cross,” taking away whatever hindered the reconciliation of the guilty to God, which, as we have seen, was not enmity and hatred to God in the human mind only, but that judicial hostility and variance which separated God and man as Judge and criminal. The feeble criticism of Socinus, on this passage, in which he has been followed by his adherents to this day, is thus answered by Grotius: “In this passage the dative Θεῷ, to God, can only be governed by the verb ἀποκατάλλαξῃ, that he might reconcile; for the interpretation of Socinus, which makes to God stand by itself, or that to reconcile to God is to reconcile them among themselves, that they might serve God, is distorted and without example. Nor is the argument valid which is drawn from thence, that in this place St. Paul properly treats of the peace made between Jews and Gentiles; for neither does it follow from this argument, that it was beside his purpose to mention the peace made for each with God. For the two opposites which are joined, are so joined among themselves, that they should be primarily and chiefly joined by that bond; for they are not united among themselves, except by and for that bond. Gentiles and Jews, therefore, are made friends among themselves by friendship with God.”

Here also a critical remark will be appropriate. The above passages will show how falsely it has been asserted that God is no where in Scripture

said to be reconciled to us, and that they only declare that we are reconciled to God; but the fact is, that the very phrase of our being reconciled to God imports the turning away of his wrath from us. Whitby observes, on the words καταλλάττειν and καταλλαγή, “that they naturally import the reconciliation of one that is angry or displeased with us, both in profane and Jewish writers.” When the Philistines suspected that David would appease the anger of Saul, by becoming their adversary, they said, “Wherewith should he reconcile himself to his master? Should it not be with the heads of these men?” not, surely, How shall he remove his own anger against his master? but, how shall he remove his master’s anger against him? How shall he restore himself to his master’s favour? “If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee,” not, that thou hast aught against thy brother, “first be reconciled to thy brother;” that is, appease and conciliate him; so that the words, in fact, import, “See that thy brother be reconciled to thee,” since that which goes before is, not that he hath done thee an injury, but thou him. Thus, then, for us to be reconciled to God is to avail ourselves of the means by which the anger of God toward us is to be appeased, which the New Testament expressly declares to be meritoriously “the sin-offering” of Him “who knew no sin,” and instrumentally, as to each individual personally, “faith in his blood.” See Propitiation.

**REDEEMER.** The Hebrew *goel* is thus rendered, and the title is applied to Christ, as he is the Avenger of man upon his spiritual enemy, and delivers man from death and the power of the grave, which the human avenger could not do. The right of the institution of *goel* was only in a relative, one of the same blood; and hence our Saviour’s assumption of our nature is alluded to and implied under this term. There was also the right of buying back the family inheritance when alienated; and this also applies to Christ, our *Goel*, who has purchased back the heavenly inheritance into the human family. Under these views Job joyfully exclaims, “I know that my Redeemer,” my *Goel*, “liveth,” &c. See *Goel*, Mediator, and Jesus Christ.

**REDEMPTION** denotes our recovery from sin and death by the obedience and sacrifice of Christ, who, on this account, is called the Redeemer. “Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,” Rom. iii, 24. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us,” Gal. iii, 13. “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace,” Eph. i, 7. “Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish, and without spot,” 1 Pet. i, 18, 19. “And ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price,” 1 Cor. vi, 19, 20.

By redemption, those who deny the atonement made by Christ wish to understand deliverance merely, regarding only the effect, and studiously putting out of sight the cause from which it flows. But the very terms used in the above cited passages, “to redeem,” and “to be bought with a price,” will each be found to refute this notion of a gratuitous deliverance, whether from sin or punishment, or both. Our English word, to redeem, literally means “to buy back;” and λυτρόω, to redeem, and ἀπολύτρωσις, redemption, are, both in Greek writers and in the New Testament, used for the act of setting free a captive, by paying λύτρον, a ransom or redemption price. But, as Grotius has fully shown, by reference to the use of the words both in sacred and profane writers, redemption signifies not merely “the liberation of captives,” but deliverance from exile, death, and every other evil from which we may be freed; and λύτρον signifies every thing which satisfies another, so as to effect this deliverance. The nature of this redemption or purchased deliverance, (for it is not gratuitous liberation, as will presently appear,) is, therefore, to be ascertained by the circumstances of those who are the subjects of it. The subjects in the case before us are sinful men. They are under guilt, under “the curse of the law,” the servants of sin, under the power and dominion of the devil, and “taken captive by him at his will,” liable to the death of the body and to eternal punishment. To the whole of this case, the redemption, the purchased deliverance of man, as proclaimed in the Gospel, applies itself. Hence, in the 810 above cited and other passages, it is said, “We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins,” in opposition to guilt; redemption from “the curse of the law;” deliverance from sin, that “we should be set free from sin;” deliverance from the power of Satan; from death, by a resurrection; and from future “wrath,” by the gift of eternal life. Throughout the whole of this glorious doctrine of our redemption from these tremendous evils there is, however, in the New Testament, a constant reference to the λύτρον, the redemption price, which λύτρον is as constantly declared to be the death of Christ, which he endured in our stead. “The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many,” Matt. xx, 28. “Who gave himself a ransom for all,” 1 Tim. ii, 6. “In whom we have redemption through his blood,” Eph. i, 7. “Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ,” 1 Pet. i, 18, 19. That deliverance of man from sin, misery, and all other penal evils of his transgression, which constitutes our redemption by Christ, is not, therefore, a gratuitous deliverance, granted without a consideration, as an act of mere prerogative; the ransom, the redemption price, was exacted and paid; one thing was given for another, the precious blood of Christ for captive and condemned men. Of the same import are those passages which represent us as having been “bought,” or “purchased” by Christ. St. Peter speaks of those “who denied the Lord τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοῦς, that bought them;” and St. Paul,

in the passage above cited, says, “Ye are bought with a price, ἠγόρασθητε;” which price is expressly said by St. John to be the blood of Christ: “Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God (ἠγόρασας, hast purchased us) by thy blood,” Rev. v, 9.

RED SEA, celebrated chiefly for the miraculous passage of the Israelites through its waters. They were thrust out of Egypt, says Dr. Hales, on the fifteenth day of the first month; “about six hundred thousand men on foot, beside women and children. And a mixed multitude went up also with them; and flocks and herds, even very much cattle,” Exod. xii, 37–39; Num. xi, 4; xxxiii, 3. After they set out from Rameses, in the land of Goshen, in the neighbourhood of Cairo, their first encampment was at Succoth, signifying “booths,” or an “enclosure for cattle,” after a stage of about thirty miles; their second, at Etham, or Adsjerud, on the edge of the wilderness, about sixty miles farther; “for the Lord led them not by the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt: but God led the people about by the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea,” or by a circuitous rout to the land of promise, in order to train them and instruct them, in the solitudes of Arabia Petræa, Exodus xiii, 17–20; Deut. xxxii, 10. Instead of proceeding from Etham, round the head of the Red Sea, and coasting along its eastern shore, the Lord made them turn southward along its western shore, and, after a stage of about twenty or thirty miles, to encamp in the valley of Bedea, where there was an opening in the great chain of mountains that line the western coast, called Pi-hahiroth, the mouth of the ridge between Migdol westward, and the sea eastward, “over against Baal-zephon,” on the eastern coast; to tempt Pharaoh, whose heart he finally hardened, to pursue them when they were “entangled in the land,” and shut in by the wilderness on their rear and flanks, and by the sea in their front. The leading motive with Pharaoh and his servants was to bring back the Israelites to bondage, and of the Egyptians in general, to recover the treasures of which they had been spoiled, Exod. xiv, 1–5. So Pharaoh pursued the Israelites by the direct way of Migdol, with six hundred chariots, his horsemen, and his army, and overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, over against Baal-zephon. When their destruction, or their return to bondage, seemed to be inevitable, the Lord interposed and fought for Israel. He opened for them a passage across the Red Sea, where it was about twelve miles wide, and brought them through in safety; while he drowned the Egyptians, who blindly followed them to their own destruction, Psalm lxxvii, 18, &c.

On this memorable deliverance Moses composed a thanksgiving, which he and the Israelites sung unto the Lord. It is also a sublime prophecy, foretelling the powerful effect of this tremendous judgment on the

neighbouring nations of Edom, Moab, Palestine, and Canaan, the future settlement of the Israelites in the promised land; and the erection of the temple and sanctuary on Mount Zion, and the perpetuity of the dominion and worship of God.

The precise place of this passage has been much contested. Some place it near Suez, at the head of the gulf; others, with more probability, about ten hours' journey lower down, at Clysma, or the vale of Bedea. The day before the passage, by the divine command, the Israelites encamped beside Pi-hahiroth, "between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon," Exodus xiv, 2; Num. xxxiii, 7. Pi-hahiroth signifies "the mouth of the ridge," or chain of mountains, which line the western coast of the Red Sea, called Attaka, "deliverance," in which was a gap, which formed the extremity of the valley of Bedea, ending at the sea eastward, and running westward to some distance, toward Cairo; Migdol, signifying "a tower," probably lay in that direction; and Baal-zephon, signifying "the northern Baal," was probably a temple on the opposite promontory, built on the eastern coast of the Red Sea. And the modern names of places in the vicinity tend to confirm these expositions of the ancient. Beside Attaka, on the eastern coast opposite, is a head land, called Ras Musa, or "the Cape of Moses;" somewhat lower, Hamam Faraun, "Pharaoh's Springs;" below Girondel, a reach of the gulf, called Birket Faraun; and the general name of the gulf is Bahr al Kolsum, "the Bay of Submersion." 811 These names indicate that the passage was considerably below Suez, according to the tradition of the natives. The depth and breadth of the gulf, from Suez downward, is thus described by Niebuhr: "I have not found in this sea, from Suez southward, any bank or isthmus under water. When we departed from Suez, we sailed as far as Girondel, without fear of encountering any such. We had in the first place, the road of Suez, four fathom and half; at three German leagues from Suez, in the middle of the gulf, four fathoms; and about Girondel, near the shore, even to ten fathoms." Bruce, also, describing the place of passage opposite Ras Musa, or a little below it, says, "There is here about fourteen fathom of water in the channel, and about nine in the sides, and good anchorage every where. The farthest side, the eastern, is a low sandy coast, and a very easy landing place." Shaw reckons the breadth of the gulf at this place about ten miles; Neibuhr, three leagues and more; Bruce, something less than four leagues: we may therefore estimate it about twelve miles, from their joint reports. But this space the host of the Israelites could easily have passed in the course of a night, from the evening to the ensuing morning watch, or dawn of day, according to the Mosaical account. And surely the depth of the sea was no impediment, when the Lord divided it by "a strong east wind," which blew across the sea all that night, and made the bottom of the sea dry land; "and the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground, and the waters

were a wall unto them, on their right hand and on their left,” Exodus xiv, 21, 22.

In the queries of Michaëlis, sent to Niebuhr, when in Egypt, it was proposed to him to inquire upon the spot, whether there were not some ridges of rocks where the water was shallow, so that an army at particular times may pass over; secondly, whether the Etesian winds, which blow strongly all summer from the north-west, could not blow so violently against the sea as to keep it back on a heap, so that the Israelites might have passed without a miracle. And a copy of these queries was left, also, for Bruce, to join his inquiries likewise; his observations on which are excellent: “I must confess, however learned the gentlemen were who proposed these doubts, I did not think they merited any attention to solve them. This passage is told us by Scripture to be a miraculous one; and if so, we have nothing to do with natural causes. If we do not believe Moses, we need not believe the transaction at all, seeing that it is from his authority alone we derive it. If we believe in God, that he made the sea, we must believe he could divide it when he sees proper reason; and of that he must be the only judge. It is no greater miracle to divide the Red Sea than to divide the river Jordan. If the Etesian wind, blowing from the north-west in summer, could keep up the sea as a wall on the right, or to the south, of fifty feet high, still the difficulty would remain of building the wall on the left hand, or to the north. Beside, water standing in that position for a day must have lost the nature of fluid. Whence came that cohesion of particles which hindered that wall to escape at the sides? This is as great a miracle as that of Moses. If the Etesian winds had done this once, they must have repeated it many a time before and since, from the same causes. Yet Diodorus Siculus says the Troglodytes, the indigenous inhabitants of that very spot, had a tradition from father to son, from their very earliest ages, that ‘once this division of the sea did happen there; and that, after leaving its bottom some time dry, the sea again came back, and covered it with great fury.’ The words of this author are of the most remarkable kind: we cannot think this Heathen is writing in favour of revelation: he knew not Moses, nor says a word about Pharaoh and his host; but records the miracle of the division of the sea in words nearly as strong as those of Moses, from the mouths of unbiassed, undesigning Pagans.” Still skeptical queries have their use; they lead to a stricter investigation of facts, and thereby tend strongly to confirm the veracity of the history they mean to impeach. Thus it appears from the accurate observations of Niebuhr and Bruce, that there is no ledge of rocks running across the gulf any where, to afford a shallow passage. And the second query, about the Etesian or northerly wind, is refuted by the express mention of a strong easterly wind blowing across, and scooping out a dry passage; not that it was necessary for Omnipotence to employ it there as an instrument, any more than at Jordan; but it seems

to be introduced in the sacred history by way of anticipation, to exclude the natural agency that might in after times be employed for solving the miracle; and it is remarkable that the monsoon in the Red Sea blows the summer half of the year from the north, the winter half from the south, neither of which therefore, even if wind could be supposed to operate so violently upon the waters, could produce the miracle in question.

Wishing to diminish, though not to deny, the miracle, Niebuhr adopts the opinion of those who contend for a higher passage near Suez. "For," says he, "the miracle would be less if they crossed the sea there than near Bedea. But whosoever should suppose that the multitude of the Israelites could be able to cross it here without a prodigy would deceive himself; for, even in our days, no caravan passes that way to go from Cairo to Mount Sinai, although it would considerably shorten the journey. The passage would have been naturally more difficult for the Israelites some thousands of years back, when the gulf was probably larger, deeper, and more extended toward the north; for, in all appearance, the water has retired, and the ground near this end has been raised by the sands of the neighbouring desert." But it sufficiently appears, even from Niebuhr's own statement, that the passage of the Israelites could not have been taken near Suez; for, 1. He evidently confounded the town of Kolsum, the ruins of which he places near Suez, and where he supposed the passage to be made, with the bay of Kolsum, which began about forty-five miles lower down; as Bryant has satisfactorily proved, from the astronomical observations of Ptolemy and of Ulug Beigh, made at Heroum, the ancient head of the gulf. 2. Instead of crossing the sea at or near Ethan, their second station, the Israelites turned southward, along the western shore; and their third station at Pi-hahiroth, or Bedea, was at least a full day's journey below Ethan, as Bryant has satisfactorily proved from Scripture, Exodus xiv, 2. And it was this unexpected change in the direction of their march, and the apparently disadvantageous situation in which they were then placed, entangled in the land, and shut in by the wilderness, with a deep sea in front, the mountains of Attaka on the sides, and the enemy in their rear, that tempted the Egyptians to pursue them through the valley of Bedea, by the direct route from Cairo, who overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, opposite to Ball-zephon, Exod. xiv, 2-9.

Niebuhr wonders how the Israelites could suffer themselves to be brought into such a disadvantageous situation, or be led blindfold by Moses to their apparent destruction. "One need only travel with a caravan," says he, "which meets with the least obstacle, namely, a small torrent, to be convinced that the orientals do not let themselves be led, like fools, by their caravan baschi," or leader of the caravan. But the Israelites went out of Egypt with "a high hand," though led by Moses, yet under the visible



guidance and protection of “the Lord God of the Hebrews,” who “went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire;” and who, for their encouragement, to enter the passage of the sea miraculously prepared for them, removed the cloud which went before the camp of Israel hitherto, and placed it behind them. “And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to the one, but gave light by night to the other: so that the one came not near the other all the night,” Exod. xiv, 8–20.

Niebuhr wonders, also, how Pharaoh and the Egyptians could be led to follow the Israelites. “Pharaoh must have wanted prudence, if, after having seen so many prodigies in Egypt, he had entered into a sea of more than three leagues wide: all the Egyptians, too, must have been bereft of understanding, in wishing to pursue the Israelites into such a sea. Doubtless they knew their own country well enough to distinguish the bottom of a large sea, which bounds Egypt on that side, from a desert.” But Pharaoh and the Egyptians probably did not know their situation. The cloud which separated them from the Israelites increased the darkness of the night; and they probably did not enter into the sea till about midnight, by which time the van of the Israelites might have reached the eastern shore. Meanwhile, the bed of the sea, now beaten by the feet of the immense multitude of men and cattle that had gone before, might not have been easily distinguishable from the desert. If we ask, Why did the Egyptians venture to pursue the Israelites by night? Why did they not wait till day light, when they could see whither they were going? Niebuhr himself has unwittingly answered the question: Pharaoh wanted “prudence,” indeed, and the Egyptians were “bereft of understanding.” And this is the Scriptural solution; for God hardened the heart of Pharaoh to follow after them, that he might be honoured upon Pharaoh and all his host; and that, by their miraculous destruction, the Egyptians might know that he was the Lord supreme, Exod. xiv, 4–18. The Egyptians did not find out their mistake till the “morning appeared,” or till day-break, when the rear of the Israelites had gained the shore, and the Egyptians had reached the middle of the sea, and their whole host had entered into it: then, indeed, they attempted to fly back, but in vain; for “their chariot wheels were broken off, so that they drave them heavily, and their host was troubled” by the Lord, who looked or frowned upon them through the cloudy pillar of fire, and overwhelmed all their host in the midst of the sea; when the sea suddenly returned to his strength at the signal of Moses stretching forth his hand over it, Exod. xiv, 24–28.

The particulars of this transaction demonstrate, that neither the host of the Israelites, nor the host of Pharaoh, could possibly have passed at the head of the gulf near Suez; where the sea was only half a league broad, according

to Niebuhr's own supposition, and consequently too narrow to contain the whole host of Pharaoh at once; whose six hundred chariots alone, exclusive of his cavalry and infantry, must have occupied more ground. Manetho, and the Egyptian writers, have passed over in silence this tremendous visitation of their nation. An ancient writer, however, Artapanus, who wrote a history of the Jews, about B. C. 130, has preserved the following curious Egyptian traditions:--"The Memphites relate, that Moses, being well acquainted with the country, watched the influx of the tide, and made the multitude pass through the dry bed of the sea. But the Heliopolitans relate, that the king, with a great army, accompanied by the sacred animals, pursued after the Jews, who had carried off with them the substance of the Egyptians; and that Moses, having been directed by a divine voice to strike the sea with his rod, when he heard it, touched the water with his rod; and so the fluid divided, and the host passed over through a dry way. But when the Egyptians entered along with them, and pursued them, it is said, that fire flashed against them in front, and the sea, returning back, overwhelmed the passage. Thus the Egyptians perished, both by the fire, and by the reflux of the tide."

The latter account is extremely curious: it not only confirms Scripture, but it notices three additional circumstances: 1. That for their protection against the God of Israel, the Egyptians brought with them the sacred animals; and by this means God executed judgment upon all the bestial gods of Egypt, as foretold, 813Exod. xii, 12, that perished with their infatuated votaries; completing the destruction of both, which began with smiting the first-born both of man and beast. 2. That the recovery of the jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment, which they asked and obtained of the Egyptians, according to the divine command, Exod. xii, 35, 36, was a leading motive with the Egyptians to pursue them; as the bringing back the Israelites to slavery had been with Pharaoh and his servants, or officers. 3. That the destruction of the Egyptians was partly occasioned by lightning and thunderbolts from the presence of the Lord; exactly corresponding to the psalmist's sublime description: "The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid: the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water, the air thundered, thine arrows also went abroad. Yea, he sent out his arrows, and scattered them; he shot forth lightnings, hail stones, and coals of fire, and discomfited them. Then the channels of waters were seen, and the foundations of the world were discovered, at thy rebuke, O Lord, at the blast of the breath of thy nostrils," Psalm lxxvii, 16, 17; xviii, 13-15.

The Red Sea derived its name from Edom, signifying "red," a title of Esau, to whom the bordering country of Edom, or Idumæa, belonged, Gen. xxv, 30; xxxvi, 31-40. It was also called Yam Suph, "the weedy sea," in several

passages, Num. xxxiii, 10; Psalm cvi, 9, &c, which are improperly rendered “the Red Sea.” Some learned authors have supposed that it was so named from the quantity of weeds in it. “But in contradiction to this,” says Bruce, “I must confess, that I never in my life, and I have seen the whole extent of it, saw a weed of any sort in it. And indeed, upon the slightest consideration, it will appear to any one, that a narrow gulf, under the immediate influence of monsoons, blowing from contrary points six months each year, would have too much agitation to produce such vegetables, seldom found but in stagnant water, and seldomer, if ever, found in salt ones. My opinion then is, that it is from the large trees, or plants, of white coral, perfectly in imitation of plants on land, that the sea has taken the name ‘weedy.’ I saw one of these, which, from a root nearly central, threw out ramifications in a nearly central form, measuring twenty-six feet diameter every way.” This seems to be the most probable solution that has been hitherto proposed of the name. The tides in this sea are but moderate. At Suez the difference between high and low water did not exceed from three to four feet, according to Niebuhr’s observations on the tides in that gulf, during the years 1762 and 1763.

REED, אַגְמֹן, Job xl, 21; xli, 2, 20; Isaiah ix, 14; xix, 15; lviii, 5; κάλαμος, Matt. xi, 7; a plant growing in fenny and watery places; very weak and slender, and bending with the least breath of wind, Matt. xi, 7; Luke vii, 24. Thus it is threatened, “The Lord shall smite Israel as a reed is shaken in the water, and he shall root up Israel out of the good land which he gave to their fathers, and shall scatter them beyond the river, because they have made their idol groves, provoking him to anger,” 1 Kings xiv, 15. The slenderness and fragility of the reed is mentioned in 2 Kings xviii, 21; Isaiah xxxvi, 6; and is referred to in Matt. xii, 20, where the remark, illustrating the gentleness of our Saviour, is quoted from the prophecy of Isaiah, xlii, 3. The Hebrew word in these places is קַנֶּה, as also in Job xl, 21; Isaiah xix, 6; xxxv, 7; Ezek. xxix, 6. See Cane.

REFORMATION, usually spoken of the great Reformation in the church, begun by Luther in 1517. The sad departure from the standard of holiness which the Romish hierarchy should have placed before them, combined with the indecency and arrogance with which they trampled upon the rights of sovereigns, and upon the property and the comfort of all classes of men, had, for a considerable period, produced a general conviction, that a reformation of the church in its head and members, to use the expression which was then prevalent, was absolutely requisite: and some steps to accomplish this had been actually taken. The celebrated council of Constance, while, in its efforts to heal the schism which had so long grieved and scandalized the Catholic world, it set aside the rival pontiffs who claimed to be the successors of St. Peter, laid down the important maxim,

that a general council was superior to a pope, and that its decisions can restrain his power; and this doctrine, which might otherwise have appeared to arise out of the extraordinary circumstances under which it was declared, was fully confirmed by the council of Basil, which met several years after, and which decided the point upon grounds that might at all times be urged. The popes, indeed, remonstrated against this, but still they were compelled to lower their tone; and they were often reminded, even within the precincts of their own court, that the period was fast approaching when the fallacy of many of their pretensions would be ascertained and exposed. It had become common, before the election of a new pontiff, to frame certain articles of reformation, which the successful candidate was required to swear that he would carry into effect; and although the oath was uniformly disregarded or violated, the views which led to the imposition of it indicated the existence of a spirit which could not be eradicated, and which might, from events that could not be foreseen, and could not be controlled, acquire a vigour which no exertion of power could resist. Such, under the beneficent arrangement of Providence, was soon actually the case. In the progress of the opposition made to some of the worst abuses of Rome, they who conducted that opposition were guided to the word of life; they studied it with avidity and with delight; and they found themselves furnished by it with sufficient armour for the mighty contest in which they were to engage. They discovered in the New Testament what Christianity really was; their representations of it were received with wonder, and read with avidity; the secession from the church of Rome became much more rapid and much more extensive than it had previously been, and all possibility of reconciliation with that church was done away. Of this the popes were fully aware; and as the only way of counteracting that which was to them so formidable, they attempted, by various devices, to fetter the press, to prevent the circulation of the Bible, and thus again to plunge the world into that intellectual darkness from which it had been happily delivered. The scheme was impracticable. The “Indices Expurgatorii,” in which they pointed out the works that they condemned, and which they declared it to be heresy and pollution to peruse, increased the desire to become acquainted with them; and although some who indulged that curiosity suffered the punishment denounced by the inquisition against the enemies of papal superstition, there was an immense proportion which even spiritual tyranny could not reach; so that the light which had been kindled daily brightened, till it shone with unclouded lustre through many of the most powerful and the most refined nations of Europe.

It is worthy of careful observation, that the resistance which ultimately proved so successful, was first occasioned by practices that had been devised for establishing the monstrous despotism of the popes; that when it commenced, it was directed against what was conceived to be an abuse

of power, without the slightest suspicion being entertained that the power itself was unchristian; that the reformers gradually advanced; every additional inquiry to which they were conducted enlarging their views, and bringing them acquainted with fresh proofs of that daring usurpation to which men had long submitted, till at length the foundation upon which the whole system, venerated through ages, rested, was disclosed to them, and perceived to be a foundation of sand. The consequence was, that the supremacy of the pope was by multitudes abjured; that he was branded as antichrist; that communion with the popish church was avoided as sinful, and that the form of ecclesiastical polity, the essential principle of which was the infallibility of the bishop of Rome, was for ever renounced. The wonderful manner in which this signal revolution, so fraught with blessings to mankind, was accomplished, the various events which mark its history, and the characters and exertions of the men by whose agency it was effected, cannot be too often surveyed, or too deeply fixed in the memory. The whole, even with reference to the illumination of the human mind and the improvement of the social state of the world, is in a high degree interesting; and that interest is unspeakably increased by our discerning the most striking evidence of the gracious interposition of Providence dissipating the cloud which obscured divine truth, and restoring to mankind that sacred treasure which is sufficient to make all who seriously examine it wise unto salvation. It does not, however, come within the province of this work to give a minute history of the origin and progress of the Reformation, to trace the steps of Zuinglius and of Luther, and to detail the circumstances which advanced or retarded them in the glorious career upon which they had entered. Much discussion has taken place with respect to the motives by which Luther was actuated. This point, in reference to what he accomplished, is really of little moment; but there cannot be a doubt that although he might, throughout his arduous struggle, be guided occasionally by inferior considerations, he was eventually, at least, chiefly animated by the noble and disinterested wish to emancipate his fellow creatures from what he was convinced was the direct and most infatuated spiritual oppression; that he looked to Heaven for support, and that such support he largely received.

REFUGE, Cities of. In order to provide for the security of those who, without design, might happen to kill a person in whatever manner it should be, the Lord commanded Moses to appoint six cities of refuge, Exod. xxi, 18; Num. xxxv, 11, &c, that whoever should undesignedly spill the blood of a fellow creature, might retire thither, and have time to prepare for his defence before the judges; so that the relatives of the deceased might not pursue and kill him. Of these cities there were three on each side Jordan. Those on this side Jordan were Kedesh of Naphtali, Hebron, and Shechem; those beyond Jordan were Bezer, Golan, and Ramoth-Gilead, Joshua xx, 7,

8. They served not only for the Hebrews, but for strangers also that should dwell in their country. These cities were to be of easy access, and to have good roads to them, and bridges wherever there should be occasion. The width of these roads was, at least, to be two-and-thirty cubits, or eight-and-forty feet. When there were any cross roads, they were careful to erect posts with an inscription pointing to the city of refuge. Every year, on the fifteenth of the month Adar, which answers to our February moon, the magistrates of the city visited the roads, to see if they were in good condition. The city was to be well supplied with water and provisions. It was not allowed to make any weapons there, lest the relatives of the deceased should be furnished with arms for the gratifying of their revenge. Lastly, it was necessary that whoever took refuge there, should understand a trade or calling, that he might not be chargeable to the inhabitants. They were wont to send some prudent persons to meet those who were pursuing their revenge for the relations, that they might dispose them to clemency, and persuade them to wait the decision of justice.

Though the man-slayer had fled to the city of refuge, yet he was not on this account exempted from the pursuit of justice. An information was preferred against him, Num. xxxv, 12; he was summoned before the judges, and before the people, to clear himself, and to prove that the murder was merely casual and involuntary. If he was found innocent, he dwelt safely in the city to which he had retired; if otherwise, he was put to death according to the severity of the law. The following 815 texts of Scripture are not very explicit whether the affair was under the cognizance of the judges of the place where the murder was committed, or of the judges of the city of refuge to which the murderer had fled, Deut. xix, 11, 12; Joshua xx, 4–6; Num. xxxv, 25; and the commentators are at variance in this matter. But it appears, from a passage of Joshua, that the man-slayer was to undergo two trials; first, in the city of refuge, where the judges summarily examined the affair, and heard his allegations at his first arrival; secondly, when he was taken back to his own city, to be judged by the magistrates of the place, who took the cause under a more strict and scrupulous examination. If the latter judges declared him innocent, they had him reconducted, under a strong guard, to the city of refuge to which he had before fled. He was not, however, immediately liberated; but, to inspire the greater horror even of involuntary murder, it seems as if the law would punish it by a kind of banishment; for he was obliged to dwell in the city, without going out of it, till the death of the high priest; and if before that time he was imprudent enough to leave the city, the avenger of blood might safely kill him; but after the death of the high priest, he was at liberty to go whither he pleased without molestation.

It is a curious fact, that the North American Indian nations have most of them either a house or town of refuge, which is a sure asylum to protect a man-slayer, or the unfortunate captive, if they can once enter it. "In almost every Indian nation," says Adair, "there are several peaceable towns which are called old, beloved, ancient, holy, or white towns: (white being their fixed emblem of peace, friendship, prosperity, happiness, purity, &c:) they seem to have been formerly towns of refuge; for it is not in the memory of their oldest people that ever human blood was shed in them, although they often force persons from thence, and put them to death elsewhere." Sanctuaries affording security for criminals are still known in the east, and anciently were established in Europe.

REGENERATION, a new birth; that work of the Holy Spirit by which we experience a change of heart. It is expressed in Scripture by being born again, John iii, 7; born from above; being quickened, Eph. ii, 1; by Christ being formed in the heart, Gal. iv, 19; by our partaking of the divine nature, 2 Peter i, 4. The efficient cause of regeneration is the divine Spirit. That man is not the author of it, is evident from John i, 12, 13; iii, 4; Eph. ii, 8, 10. The instrumental cause is the word of God, James i, 18; 1 Peter i, 23; 1 Cor. iv, 15. The change in regeneration consists in the recovery of the moral image of God upon the heart; that is to say, so as to love him supremely and serve him ultimately as our highest end, and to delight in him superlatively as our chief good. The sum of the moral law is to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and soul, and strength, and mind. This is the duty of every rational creature; and in order to obey it perfectly, no part of our inward affection or actual service ought to be, at any time, or in the least degree, misapplied. Regeneration consists in the principle being implanted, obtaining the ascendancy, and habitually prevailing over its opposite. It may be remarked, that though the inspired writers use various terms and modes of speech in order to describe this change of mind, sometimes terming it conversion, regeneration, a new creation, or the new creature, putting off the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new man, walking not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, &c; yet it is all effected by the word of truth, or the Gospel of salvation, gaining an entrance into the mind, through divine teaching, so as to possess the understanding, subdue the will, and reign in the affections. In a word, it is faith working by love that constitutes the new creature, the regenerate man, Gal. v, 6; 1 John v, 1–5. Regeneration is to be distinguished from our justification, although it is connected with it. Every one who is justified, is also regenerated; but the one places us in a new relation, and the other in a new moral state. Our Lord, in one instance, uses the term regeneration for the resurrection state: "Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging," Matt. xix, 28. And, accordingly, Dr. Campbell

translates the passage thus: "At the renovation, when the Son of man shall be seated on the glorious throne, ye, my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge." We are accustomed, says he, to apply the term solely to the conversion of individuals; whereas its relation here is to the general state of things. The principal completion will be at the general resurrection, when there will be, in the most important sense, a renovation or regeneration of heaven and earth, when all things shall become new.

REHOBAM, the son and successor of Solomon; his mother was Naamah, an Ammonitish woman, whom Solomon had married, 1 Kings xiv, 20, 21. He was forty-one years of age when he began to reign, and, consequently, was born in the first year of his father's reign, A. M. 2990, or the year before. This prince reigned seventeen years at Jerusalem, and died A. M. 3046. After the death of Solomon, Rehoboam came to Shechem, because all Israel was there assembled to make him king, 1 Kings xii. Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who had headed a sedition against Solomon, and had been compelled, toward the close of his reign, to take refuge in Egypt, as soon as he heard that this prince was dead, returned into Judea, and came to the assembly of the people of Shechem. The Israelites would have made terms with Rehoboam; but, being a poor politician, and following the advice of some junior counsellors, he managed his business so imprudently that he lost the whole house of Israel, save the tribes of Judah and Benjamin.

816RELIGION. See Christianity.

REMONSTRANTS have obtained this name, particularly on the continent, because, in 1610, they presented to the states of Holland a petition, entitled their Remonstrance, in which they stated their grievances, and prayed for relief. They are also called Arminians, because they maintained the doctrines respecting predestination and grace, which were embraced and defended by James Harmenson or Arminius, an eminent Protestant divine, and a native of Holland, who was born in 1560, and died in 1609. He first studied at Leyden, and then at Geneva. While at the university of Geneva, he studied under Beza, by whom he was instructed in the doctrines of Calvin; and having been judged by Martin Lydius, professor of divinity at Franeker, a proper person to refute a work in which the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination had been attacked by some ministers of Delft, he undertook the task. On a strict examination of the reasons on both sides, however, he became a convert to the opinions which he was employed to refute. The result of his inquiries on this, and other subjects connected with it, was, that, thinking the doctrine of Calvin with respect to free will, predestination, and grace, too severe, he expressed his doubts respecting them in the year 1591, and at length adopted the religious system of those



who extend the love of God, and the merits of his Son, to all mankind. After his appointment to the theological chair of Leyden, in 1603, he avowed and vindicated the principles which he had embraced; but the prudence and caution with which he published and defended them could not screen him from the resentment of those who adhered to the theological system of Calvin, and in particular from the opposition of Gomar his colleague. After the death of Arminius, the controversy, thus begun, became more general, and threatened to involve the United Provinces in civil discord. However, the Arminian tenets gained ground, and were adopted by several persons of merit and distinction. The Calvinists or Gomarists as they were now called, appealed to a national synod. Accordingly, a synod was at length convened at Dordrecht or Dort, and was composed of ecclesiastical and lay deputies from the United Provinces, and also of ecclesiastical deputies from the reformed churches of England, Switzerland, Bremen, Hesse, and the Palatinate. This synod sat from the first of November, 1618, to the twenty-sixth of April, 1619. The principal advocate in favour of the Arminians was Episcopius, who was at that time professor of divinity at Leyden. The religious principles of the Arminians have insinuated themselves more or less into the established church in Holland, and imbued the theological system of many of those pastors who are appointed to maintain the doctrine and authority of the synod of Dort. The principles of Arminius were early introduced into various other countries, as Great Britain, France, Geneva, and many parts of Switzerland; but their progress is said to have been rather retarded of late, especially in Germany and several parts of Switzerland, by the prevalence of the Leibnitzian and Wolfian philosophy, which is more favourable to Calvinism. The distinguishing tenets of the Remonstrants may be said to consist chiefly in the different light in which they view the subjects of the five points, or in the different explanation which they give to them, and comprised in the five following articles: predestination, universal redemption, the operation of grace, the freedom of the will, and perseverance. They believe that God, having an equal regard for all his creatures, sent his Son to die for the sins not of the elect only, but of the whole world; that no mortal is rendered finally unhappy by an eternal and invincible decree, but that the misery of those who perish arises from themselves; and that, in this present imperfect state, believers, if not vigilant, may, through the force of temptation, and the influence of Satan, fall from grace, and sink into final perdition. See Arminianism.

REMPHAN, כִּיֹן פֶּמֶפֶא, signifies an idol, according to the Septuagint. Amos, v, 26, upbraids the Hebrews with having carried, during their wanderings in the wilderness, the tabernacle of their Moloch and Chiun, their images, the star of their god, which they made to themselves, according to our version of the Bible. St. Stephen, quoting this passage of

Amos, says, "Ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan," Acts vii, 43, which has given occasion to a variety of conjectures. Grotius thinks it to have been some deity, as Rimmon; and Capellus and Hammond take this Remphan to be a king of Egypt, deified by his subjects; a late writer is of opinion, that God here refers to the idolatries to which in succeeding ages the Jews were gradually given up, after having begun to revolt in the wilderness by the sin of the golden calf.

REPENTANCE is sometimes used generally for a change of mind, and an earnest wishing that something were undone that has been done. Esau found no place for repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears; he could not move his father Isaac to repent of what he had done, or to recall the blessing from Jacob and confer it on himself, Heb. xii, 17; Matt. iii, 2; iv, 17. Taken in a religious sense it signifies conviction of sin and sorrow for it. But there is, 1. A partial or worldly repentance, wherein one is grieved for and turns from his sin, merely on account of the hurt it has done, or is likely to do, him: so a malefactor, who still loves his sin, repents of doing it, because it brings him to punishment. 2. An evangelical repentance, which is a godly sorrow wrought in the heart of a sinful person by the word and Spirit of God, whereby, from a sense of his sin, as offensive to God, and defiling and endangering to his own soul, and from an apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, he, with grief and hatred of all his known sins, turns from them to God, as his Saviour and Lord. This is called "repentance toward God," as therein we turn from sin to him; and "repentance unto life," as it leads to spiritual life, and is the first step to eternal life, Matt. iii, 2; Acts iii, 19; xi, 18; xx, 12. God himself is said to repent, but this can only be understood of his altering his conduct toward his creatures, either in the bestowing of good or the infliction of evil: which change in the divine conduct is founded on a change in his creatures; and thus, speaking after the manner of men, God is said to repent.

REPETITIONS IN PRAYER. These are forbidden by our Lord, and were well styled "vain," if they consisted, as among the Mohammedans, in the repetition of words and phrases. Richardson mentions an old man who travelled with him, who was thought to be of peculiar sanctity, and most devout in prayer: "Certainly he did not pray in secret, communing with his heart, but called aloud with all his might, and repeated the words as fast as his tongue could give them utterance. The form and words of his prayer were the same with those of the others; but this good man had made a vow to repeat certain words of the prayer a given number of times, both night and morning. The word *rabboni*, for example, answering to our word Lord, he would bind himself to repeat a hundred or two hundred times, twice a day; and, accordingly, went on in the hearing of all the party; and, on his knees sometimes with his face directed steadily to heaven, and at other

times bowing down to the ground, and calling out rabboni, rabboni, rabboni, rabboni, rabboni, &c, as fast as he could articulate the words after each other, like a school boy going through his task, not like a man who, praying with the heart and the understanding also, continues longer on his knees, in the rapture of devotion, whose soul is a flame of fire, enkindled by his Maker, and fixing upon his God, like Jacob, will not let him go until he bless him. Having settled his accounts with the word rabboni, which the telling of his beads enabled him to know when he had done, he proceeded to dispose of his other vows in a similar manner. Allah houakbar, perhaps, came next, 'God most great;' and he would go on, as with the other, Allah houakbar, Allah houakbar, Allah houakbar, Allah houakbar, &c, repeating them as fast as he could frame his organs to pronounce them."

REPHAIM. The Rephaim were the ancient giants of the land of Canaan. There were anciently several families of them in this country. It is commonly thought that they were descended from one called Rephah or Rapha; but others imagine that the word Rephaim properly signifies giants, in the ancient language of this people. There were some of the Rephaim beyond Jordan, at Ashteroth Karnaim, in the time of Abraham, when Chedorlaomer made war against them, Gen. xiv, 5. There were also some of them in the country in the days of Moses. Og, king of Bashan, was one of the posterity of the Rephaim, Joshua xii, 4. Also in the time of Joshua there were some of their descendants in the land of Canaan, Joshua xvii, 15. Lastly, we hear of them still in David's time, in the city of Gath, 1 Chron. xx, 4-6. The giants Goliath, Sippai, Lahmi, and others, were some remains of the Rephaim; their magnitude and strength are known from Scripture. See Giants.

REPHIDIM, a station or encampment of the Israelites, Exod. xvii, 1. At this station, adjoining to Mount Horeb, the people again murmured for want of water; and they chid Moses, saying, "Give us water that we may drink." And "they tempted the Lord, saying, Is the Lord among us or not?" Moses, therefore, to convince them that he was, by a more obvious miracle than at Marah, smote the rock with his rod, by the divine command, and brought water out of it for the people to drink: wherefore, he called the place Meribah, "chiding," and the rock Massah, "temptation." On their way to Rephidim, the Amalekites, the original inhabitants of the country, who are noticed in Abraham's days, Gen. xiv, 7, not having the fear of God before their eyes, nor regarding the judgments recently inflicted on the Egyptians, attacked the rear of the Israelites when they were faint and weary; but were defeated by a chosen party, under the command of Joshua, the faithful lieutenant of Moses, who is first noticed on this occasion, and even then pointed out by the Lord as his successor. This victory was miraculous; for while Moses held up his hand Israel prevailed, but when

he let it down Amalek prevailed. So Aaron and Hur (the husband of Miriam, according to Josephus) held up both his hands steadily till sunset, and thereby gave a decided victory to Israel. This unprovoked aggression of the Amalekites drew down upon them from the Lord the sentence of "war from generation to generation," between them and the Israelites, and of final extermination, which was commanded to be written or registered in a book, for a memorial to Joshua and his successors, the judges and kings of Israel, and was carried into execution by Saul, 1 Sam. xv, 8, by David, 1 Sam. xxx, 17, and finally accomplished by the Simeonites in Hezekiah's reign, Exod. xvii, 8–13; Deut. xxv, 17; 1 Chron. iv, 43. While the Israelites were encamped at Rephidim, on the western side of Horeb, the mount of God, Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, who lived in that neighbourhood, and was priest and prince of Midian, came to visit him, with his wife Zipporah, and his two sons, Eleazar and Gershom, who had accompanied him part of the way to Egypt, but returned home again; and they rejoiced with him "for all the goodness which the Lord had done for Israel, whom he had delivered out of the hand of the Egyptians;" and upon this occasion, Jethro, as "a priest of the most high God," of the order of Melchizedek, "offered a burnt-offering and sacrifices of thanksgiving to God, at which Aaron and all the elders of Israel ate bread with Jethro before God," by a repetition of the eucharistic feast upon a sacrifice which Melchizedek formerly administered to Abraham, Gen. xiv, 18; Exod. xviii, 1–12. Thus was fulfilled the prophetic sign which the Lord had given to Moses when he first appeared to him in the burning bush: "This shall be a token unto thee that I have sent thee: when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain," Exod, iii, 12. The speedy accomplishment, therefore, of this sign, at the beginning of their journey, was well calculated to strengthen their faith or reliance on the divine protection throughout. Jethro appears to have been distinguished not only for his piety, but also for his political wisdom. By his advice, which also was approved by the Lord, Moses, to relieve himself from the fatigue of administering justice to the people, the whole day, from morning until evening, instituted inferior judges or magistrates over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, as his deputies, who were to relieve him from the burden of judging the smaller causes, but to refer the greater or more difficult to Moses, for his decision.

REPROBATION is equivalent to rejection. Rejection always implies a cause: "Reprobate silver shall men call them, insomuch that the Lord hath rejected them," Jer. vi, 30; that is, they are base metal, which will not bear the proof. Conditional reprobation, or rejecting men from the divine mercy, because of their impenitence or refusal of salvation, is a Scriptural doctrine; but to the unconditional, absolute reprobation of the rigid Calvinists, the following objections may be urged:--

1. It cannot be reconciled to the love of God. "God is love." "He is loving to every man, and his tender mercies are over all his works."

2. Nor to the wisdom of God; for the bringing into being a vast number of intelligent creatures under a necessity of sinning, and of being eternally lost, teaches no moral lesson to the world; and contradicts all those notions of wisdom in the ends and processes of government, which we are taught to look for, not only from natural reason, but from the Scriptures.

3. Nor to the grace of God, which is so often magnified in the Scriptures; for doth it argue any sovereign or high strain, any superabounding richness of grace or mercy in any man, when ten thousand have equally offended him, only to pardon one or two of them? Or in what sense has "the grace of God appeared unto all men," or even to one-millionth part of them?

4. Nor can this merciless reprobation be reconciled to any of those numerous passages in which almighty God is represented as tenderly compassionate and pitiful to the worst and most unworthy of his creatures, even them who finally perish. "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth." "Being grieved at the hardness of their hearts." "How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" "The Lord is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish." "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?"

5. It is as manifestly contrary to his justice. Here, indeed, we would not assume to measure this attribute of God by unauthorized human conceptions; but when God himself has appealed to those established notions of justice and equity which have been received among all enlightened persons, in all ages, as the measure and rule of his own, we cannot be charged with this presumption. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" "Are not my ways equal? saith the Lord." We may then be bold to affirm that justice and equity in God are what they are taken to be among reasonable men; and if all men every where would condemn it, as most contrary to justice and right, that a sovereign should condemn to death one or more of his subjects for not obeying laws which it is absolutely impossible for them, under any circumstances which they can possibly avail themselves of, to obey, and much more the greater part of his subjects; and to require them, on pain of aggravated punishment, to do something in order to the pardon and remission of their offences, which he knows they cannot do, say to stop the tide or to remove a mountain; it implies a charge as obviously unjust against God, who is "just in the judgments which he

executeth," to suppose him to act precisely in the same manner in regard to those whom he has passed by and rejected, without any avoidable fault of their own; to destroy them by the simple rule of his own sovereignty, or, in other words, to show that he has power to do it. In whatever light the subject be viewed, no fault, in any right construction, can be chargeable upon the persons so punished, or, as we may rather say, destroyed, since punishment supposes a judicial proceeding, which this act shuts out. For either the reprobates are destroyed for a pure reason of sovereignty without any reference to their sinfulness, and thus all criminality is left out of the consideration; or they are destroyed for the sin of Adam, to which they were not consenting; or for personal faults resulting from a corruption of nature which they brought into the world with them, and which God wills not to correct, and which they have no power to correct themselves. Every received notion of justice is thus violated. We grant, indeed, that some proceedings of the Almighty may appear at first irreconcilable with justice, which are not so; as that we should suffer pain and death, and be infected with a morally corrupt nature, in consequence of the transgression of our first progenitors; that children should suffer for their parents' faults in the ordinary course of providence; and that in general calamities the comparatively innocent should suffer the same evils as the guilty. But none of these are parallel cases. For the "free gift" has come upon all men, "to justification of life," through "the righteousness" of the second Adam, so that the terms of our probation are but changed. None are doomed to inevitable ruin, or the above words of the 819Apostle would have no meaning; and pain and death, as to all who avail themselves of the remedy, are made the instruments of a higher life, and of a superabounding of grace through Christ. The same observation may be made as to children who suffer evils for their parents' faults. This circumstance alters the terms of their probation; but if every condition of probation leaves to men the possibility and the hope of eternal life, and the circumstances of all are balanced and weighed by Him who administers the affairs of individuals on principles, the end of which is to turn all the evils of life into spiritual and higher blessings, there is, obviously, no impeachment of justice in the circumstances of the probation assigned to any person whatever. As to the innocent suffering equally with the guilty in general calamities, the persons so suffering are but comparatively innocent, and their personal transgressions against God deserve a higher punishment than any which this life witnesses; this may also as to them be overruled for merciful purposes, and a future life presents its manifold compensations. But as to the non-elect, the whole case, in this scheme of sovereign reprobation, or sovereign preterition, is supposed to be before us. Their state is fixed, their afflictions in this life will not in any instance be overruled for ends of edification and salvation; they are left under a necessity of sinning in every condition; and a future life presents no compensation, but a fearful looking

for of fiery and quenchless indignation. It is surely not possible for the ingenuity of man to reconcile this to any notion of just government which has ever obtained; and by the established notions of justice and equity in human affairs, we are taught by the Scriptures themselves to judge of the divine proceedings in all completely stated and comprehensible cases.

6. Equally impossible is it to reconcile this notion to the sincerity of God in offering salvation by Christ to all who hear the Gospel, of whom this scheme supposes the majority, or at least great numbers to be among, the reprobate. The Gospel, as we have seen, is commanded to be preached to every creature; which publication of good news to every creature is an offer of salvation to every creature, accompanied with earnest invitations to embrace it, and admonitory comminations lest any should neglect and despise it. But does it not involve a serious reflection upon the truth and sincerity of God which men ought to shudder at, to assume, that at the very time the Gospel is thus preached, no part of this good news was ever designed to benefit the majority, or any great part, of those to whom it is addressed? that they to whom this love of God in Christ is proclaimed were never loved by God? that he has decreed that many to whom he offers salvation, and whom he invites to receive it, shall never be saved? and that he will consider their sins aggravated by rejecting that which they never could receive, and which he never designed them to receive? It is no answer to this to say that we also admit that the offers of mercy are made by God to many whom he, by virtue of his prescience, knows will never receive them. We grant this; but it is enough to reply, that in this case there is no insincerity. On the Calvinian scheme the offer of salvation is made to those for whose sins Christ made no atonement; on the other, he made atonement for the sins of all. On the former, the offer is made to those whom God never designed to embrace it; on the latter to none but those whom God seriously and in truth wills that they should avail themselves of it; on one theory, the bar to the salvation of the nonelect lies in the want of a provided sacrifice for sin; on the other, it rests solely in men themselves; one consists, therefore, with a perfect sincerity of offer, the other cannot be maintained without bringing the sincerity of God into question, and fixing a stigma upon his moral truth.

7. Unconditional reprobation cannot be reconciled with that frequent declaration of Scripture, that “God is no respecter of persons.” This phrase, we grant, is not to be interpreted as though the bounties of the Almighty were dispensed in equal measures to his creatures. In the administration of favour, there is place for the exercise of that prerogative which, in a just sense, is called the sovereignty of God; but justice knows but of one rule; it is, in its nature, settled and fixed, and looks not at the person, but the case. To have respect of persons is a phrase, therefore, in Scripture, which

sometimes refers to judicial proceedings, and signifies to judge from partiality and affection, and not upon the merits of the question. It is also used by St. Peter with reference to the acceptance of Cornelius: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Here it is clear, that to respect persons, would be to reject or accept them without regard to their moral qualities, and on some national and other prejudice or partiality which forms no moral rule of any kind. But, if the doctrine of absolute election and reprobation be true; if we are to understand that men like Jacob and Esau, in the Calvinistic construction of the passage, while in the womb of their mother, nay, from eternity, are loved and hated, elected or reprobated, before they have done "good or evil," then it necessarily follows, that there is precisely this kind of respect of persons with God; for his acceptance or rejection of men stands on some ground of aversion or dislike, which cannot be resolved into any moral rule, and has no respect to the merits of the case itself; and if the Scripture affirms that there is no such respect of persons with God, then the doctrine which implies it is contradicted by inspired authority.

8. The doctrine of which we are showing the difficulties, brings with it the repulsive and shocking opinion of the eternal punishment of infants. Some Calvinists have, indeed, to get rid of the difficulty, or rather to put it out of sight, consigned them to annihilation; but of the annihilation of any human being there is no intimation in the word of God. In order, therefore, to avoid the fearful consequence of admitting the punishment of beings innocent as to all actual sin, there is no other way than to suppose all children, dying in infancy, to be an elected portion of mankind, which, however, would be a mere hypothesis brought in to serve a theory without any evidence. That some of those who, as they suppose, are under this sentence of reprobation, die in their infancy, is, probably, what most Calvinists allow; and, if their doctrine be received, cannot be denied; and it follows, therefore, that all such infants are eternally lost. Now, we know that infants are not lost, because our Lord gave it as a reason why little children ought not to be hindered from coming unto him, that "of such is the kingdom of heaven." On which Calvin himself remarks, "In this word, 'for of such is the kingdom of heaven,' Christ comprehends as well little children themselves, as those who in disposition resemble them. *Hac voce, tam parvulos, quam eorum similes, comprehendit.*" We are assured of the salvation of infants, also, because "the free gift has come upon all men to," in order to, "justification of life," and because children are not capable of rejecting that blessing, and must, therefore, derive benefit from it. The point, also, on which we have just now touched, that "there is no respect of persons with God," demonstrates it. For, as it will be acknowledged, that some children, dying in infancy, are saved, it must follow, from this



principle and axiom in the divine government, that all infants are saved; for the case of all infants, as to innocence or guilt, sin or righteousness, being the same, and God as a judge, being “no respecter of persons,” but regarding only the merits of the case, he cannot make this awful distinction as to them, that one part shall be eternally saved and the other eternally lost. That doctrine, therefore, which implies the perdition of infants, cannot be congruous to the Scriptures of truth, but is utterly abhorrent to them.

Finally, not to multiply these instances of the difficulties which accompany the doctrine of absolute reprobation, or of preterition, (to use the milder term, though the argument is not in the least changed by it,) it destroys the end of punitive justice. That end can only be, to deter men from offence, and to add strength to the law of God. But if the whole body of the reprobate are left to the influence of their fallen nature without remedy, they cannot be deterred from sin by threats of inevitable punishment; nor can they ever submit to the dominion of the law of God: their doom is fixed, and threats and examples can avail nothing.

RESTITUTION, that act of justice by which we restore to our neighbour whatever we have unjustly deprived him of, *Exod. xxii, 1; Luke xix, 8.* Moralists observe, respecting restitution, 1. That where it can be made in kind, or the injury can be certainly valued, we are to restore the thing or the value. 2. We are bound to restore the thing with the natural increase of it, that is, to satisfy for the loss sustained in the mean time, and the gain hindered. 3. When the thing cannot be restored, and the value of it is not certain, we are to give reasonable satisfaction, according to a liberal estimation. 4. We are at least to give, by way of restitution, what the law would give; for that is generally equal, and in most cases rather favourable than rigorous. 5. A man is not only bound to make restitution for the injury he did, but for all that directly follows upon the injurious act: for the first injury being wilful, we are supposed to will all that which follows upon it.

RESURRECTION. The belief of a general resurrection of the dead, which will come to pass at the end of the world, and will be followed with an immortality either of happiness or misery, is an article of religion in common to Jews and Christians. It is very expressly taught both in the Old and New Testaments, *Psalm xvi, 10; Job xix, 25, &c; Ezek. xxxvii, 1, &c; Isaiah xxvi, 19; John v, 28, 29; and to these may be added, Wisdom iii, 1, &c; iv, 15; 2 Macc. vii, 14, 23, 29, &c.* At the time when our Saviour appeared in Judea, the resurrection from the dead was received as one of the principal articles of the Jewish religion by the whole body of the nation, the Sadducees excepted, *Matt. xxii, 23; Luke xx, 28; Mark xii, 18; John xi, 23, 24; Acts xxiii, 6, 8.* Our Saviour arose himself from the dead, to give us, in his own person, a proof, a pledge, and a pattern of our future

resurrection. St. Paul, in almost all his epistles, speaks of a general resurrection, refutes those who denied or opposed it, and proves and explains it by several circumstances, Rom. vi, 5; 1 Cor. xv, 12–15; Phil. iii, 10, 11; Heb. xi, 35; 1 Thess. iv, 13–17, &c.

On this subject no point of discussion, of any importance, arises among those who admit the truth of Scripture, except as to the way in which the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is to be understood;--whether a resurrection of the substance of the body be meant, or some minute and indestructible part of it. The latter theory has been adopted for the sake of avoiding certain supposed difficulties. It cannot however fail to strike every impartial reader of the New Testament, that the doctrine of the resurrection is there taught without any nice distinctions. It is always exhibited as a miraculous work; and represents the same body which is laid in the grave as the subject of this change from death to life, by the power of Christ. Thus our Lord was raised in the same body in which he died, and his resurrection is constantly held forth as the model of ours; and the Apostle Paul expressly says, "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." The only passage of Scripture which appears to favour the notion of the rising of the immortal body from some indestructible germ, is 1 Cor. xv, 35, &c: "But some men will say, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain," &c. If, however, it had been the intention of the Apostle, holding this view of the case, to meet objections to the doctrine of the resurrection, grounded upon the difficulties of conceiving how the same body, in the popular sense, could be raised up in substance, we might have expected him to correct this misapprehension by declaring, that this was not the Christian doctrine; but that some small parts of the body only, bearing as little proportion to the whole as the germ of a seed to the plant, would be preserved, and be unfolded into the perfected body at the resurrection. Instead of this, he goes on immediately to remind the objector of the differences which exist between material bodies as they now exist; between the plant and the bare or naked grain; between one plant and another; between the flesh of men, of beasts, of fishes, and of birds; between celestial and terrestrial bodies; and between the lesser and greater celestial luminaries themselves. Still farther he proceeds to state the difference, not between the germ of the body to be raised, and the body given at the resurrection; but between the body itself, understood popularly, which dies, and the body which shall be raised. "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption," which would not be true of the supposed incorruptible and imperishable germ of this hypothesis; and can only be affirmed of the body itself, considered in substance, and, in its present state,

corruptible. Farther: the question put by the objector,—"How are the dead raised up?" does not refer to the *modus agendi* of the resurrection, or the process or manner in which the thing is to be effected, as the advocates of the germ hypothesis appear to assume. This is manifest from the answer of the Apostle, who goes on immediately to state, not in what manner the resurrection is to be effected, but what shall be the state or condition of the resurrection body; which is no answer at all to the question, if it be taken in that sense.

Thus, in the argument, the Apostle confines himself wholly to the possibility of the resurrection of the body in a refined and glorified state; but omits all reference to the mode in which the thing will be effected, as being out of the line of the objector's questions, and in itself above human thought, and wholly miraculous. It is, however, clear, that when he speaks of the body, as the subject of this wondrous "change," he speaks of it popularly, as the same body in substance, whatever changes in its qualities or figure may be impressed upon it. Great general changes it will experience, as from corruption to incorruption, from mortality to immortality; great changes of a particular kind will also take place, as its being freed from deformities and defects, and the accidental varieties produced by climate, aliments, labour, and hereditary diseases. It is also laid down by our Lord, that "in the resurrection they shall neither marry nor be given in marriage, but be like to the angels of God;" and this also implies a certain change of structure; and we may gather from the declaration of the Apostle, that though "the stomach" is now adapted "to meats, and meats to the stomach," yet God will "destroy both it and them;" that the animal appetite for food will be removed, and the organ now adapted to that appetite will have no place in the renewed frame. But great as these changes are, the human form will be retained in its perfection, after the model of our Lord's "glorious body," and the substance of the matter of which it is composed will not thereby be affected. That the same body which was laid in the grave shall arise out of it, is the manifest doctrine of the Scriptures. The notion of an incorruptible germ, or that of an original and unchangeable stamen, out of which a new and glorious body, at the resurrection, is to spring, appears to have been borrowed from the speculations of some of the Jewish rabbins. But if by this hypothesis it was designed to remove the difficulty of conceiving how the scattered parts of one body could be preserved from becoming integral parts of other bodies, it supposes that the constant care of Providence is exerted to maintain the incorruptibility of those individual germs, or stamina, so as to prevent their assimilation with each other. Now, if they have this by original quality, then the same quality may just as easily be supposed to appertain to every particle which composes a human body; so that, though it be used for food, it shall not be capable of assimilation, in any circumstances, with another

human body. But if these germs, or stamina, have not this quality by their original nature, they can only be prevented from assimilating with each other by that operation of God which is present to all his works, and which must always be directed to secure the execution of his own ultimate designs. If this view be adopted, then, if the resort must at last be to the superintendence of a Being of infinite power and wisdom, there is no greater difficulty in supposing that his care to secure this object may extend to a million as easily as to a hundred particles of matter. This is, in fact, the true and rational answer to the objection that the same piece of matter may happen to be a part of two or more bodies, as in the instances of men feeding upon animals which have fed upon men, and of men feeding upon one another. The question here is one which simply respects the frustrating a final purpose of the Almighty by an operation of nature. To suppose that he cannot prevent this, is to deny his power; to suppose him inattentive to it, is to suppose him indifferent to his own designs; and to assume that he employs care to prevent it, is to assume nothing greater, nothing in fact so great, as many instances of control, which are always occurring; as, for instance, the regulation of the proportion of the sexes in human births, which cannot be attributed to chance, but must either be referred to superintendence, or to some original law. Another objection to the resurrection of the body has been drawn from the changes of its substance during life; the answer to which is, that, allowing a frequent and total change of the substance of the body (which, however, is but an hypothesis) to take place, it affects not the doctrine of Scripture, which is, that the body which is laid in the grave shall be raised up. But then, we are told, that if our bodies have in fact undergone successive changes during life, the bodies in which we have sinned or performed rewardable actions may not be, in many instances, the same bodies as those which will be actually rewarded or punished. We answer, that rewards and punishments have their relation to the body, not so much as it is the subject but as it is the instrument of reward and punishment. It is the soul only which perceives pain or pleasure, which suffers or enjoys, and is, therefore, the only rewardable subject. Were we, therefore, to admit such corporeal mutations as are assumed in this objection, they affect not the case of our accountability. The personal identity or sameness of a rational being, as Mr. Locke has observed, consists in self-consciousness: "By this every one is to himself what he calls self, without considering whether that self be continued in the same or divers substances. It was by the same self which reflects on an action done many years ago, that the action was performed." If there were indeed any weight in this objection, it would affect the proceedings of human criminal courts in all cases of offences committed at some distance of time; but it contradicts the common sense, because it contradicts the common consciousness and experience, of mankind.

Our Lord has assured us, that “the hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” Then we shall “all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump,” and “the dead shall be raised incorruptible.” It is probable that the bodies of the righteous and the wicked, though each shall in some respects be the same as before, will each be in other respects not the same, but undergo some change conformable to the character of the individual, and suited to his future state of existence; yet both, as the passage just quoted clearly teaches, are then rendered indestructible. Respecting the good it is said, “When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, we shall appear with him in glory,” “we shall be like him; our body shall be fashioned like his glorious body;” yet, notwithstanding this, “it doth not yet fully appear what we shall be,” Col. iii, 4; 1 John iii, 2; Phil. iii, 21. This has a very obvious reason. Our present manner of knowing depends upon our present constitution, and we know not the exact relation which subsists between this constitution and the manner of being in a future world; we derive our ideas through the medium of the senses; the senses are necessarily conversant with terrestrial objects only; our language is suited to the communication of present ideas; and thus it follows that the objects of the future world may in some respects (whether few or many we cannot say) differ so extremely from terrestrial objects, that language cannot communicate to us any such ideas as would render those matters comprehensible. But language may suggest striking and pleasing analogies; and with such we are presented by the holy Apostle: “All flesh,” says he, “is not the same flesh: but there is one flesh of men, another of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds;” and yet all these are fashioned out of the same kind of substance, mere inert matter, till God gives it life and activity. It is sown an animal body; a body which previously existed with all the organs, faculties, and propensities, requisite to procure, receive, and appropriate nutriment, as well as to perpetuate the species; but it shall be raised a spiritual body, refined from the dregs of matter, freed from the organs and senses required only in its former state, and probably possessing the remaining senses in greater perfection, together with new and more exquisite faculties, fitted for the exalted state of existence and enjoyment to which it is now rising. In the present state the organs and senses appointed to transmit the impressions of objects to the mind, have a manifest relation to the respective objects: the eye and seeing, for example, to light; the ear and hearing, to sound. In the refined and glorious state of existence to which good men are tending, where the objects which solicit attention will be infinitely more numerous, interesting, and delightful, may not the new organs, faculties, and senses, be proportionally refined, acute, susceptible, or penetrating? Human industry and invention have placed us, in a manner, in new worlds; what,

then, may not a spiritual body, with sharpened faculties, and the grandest possible objects of contemplation, effect in the celestial regions to which Christians are invited? There the senses will no longer degrade the affections, the imagination no longer corrupt the heart; the magnificent scenery thrown open to view will animate the attention, give a glow and vigour to the sentiments; that roused attention will never tire; those glowing sentiments will never cloy; but the man, now constituted of an indestructible body, as well as of an immortal soul, may visit in eternal succession the streets of the celestial city, may “drink of the pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God, and of the Lamb;” and dwell for ever in those abodes of harmony and peace, which, though “eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor has it entered into the imagination of man to conceive,” we are assured “God hath prepared for them that love him,” 1 Cor. ii, 9.

REUBEN, Tribe of. This tribe, having much cattle, solicited and obtained from Moses possessions east of the Jordan; by which river it was separated from the main body of Israel: it was, in consequence, exposed to various inroads and oppressions from which the western tribes were free; and it was among 823the first carried into captivity by Tiglath pileser, 1 Chron. v, 26.

REVELATION, or APOCALYPSIS, is the name given to a canonical book of the New Testament. See Apocalypse.

RHODES, an island lying south of the province of Caria, in Lesser Asia, and, among the Asiatic islands, is accounted for dignity next to Cyprus and Lesbos. It is pleasant and healthful, and was anciently celebrated for the skill of its inhabitants in navigation, but most, for its prodigious statue of brass consecrated to the sun, and called the Colossus. This statue was seventy cubits high, and bestrode the mouth of the harbour, so that ships could sail between its legs, and it was accounted one of the seven wonders of the world. St. Paul, on his way to Jerusalem, A. D. 58, went from Miletus to Coos, from Coos to Rhodes, and from thence to Patara, in Lycia, Acts xxi, 1.

RIGHTEOUSNESS, justice, holiness. The righteousness of God is the essential perfection of his nature; sometimes it is put for his justice. The righteousness of Christ denotes, not only his absolute perfection, but, is taken for his perfect obedience unto death, and his suffering the penalty of the law in our stead. The righteousness of the law is that obedience which the law requires. The righteousness of faith is the justification which is received by faith.

RIMMON. See Naaman.

RINGS. The antiquity of rings appears from Scripture and from profane authors. Judah left his ring with Tamar, Gen. xxxviii, 18. When Pharaoh committed the government of Egypt to Joseph, he took his ring from his finger and gave it to Joseph, Gen. xli, 42. After the victory of the Israelites over the Midianites, they offered to the Lord the rings, the bracelets, and the golden necklaces, taken from the enemy, Num. xxxi, 50. The Israelitish women wore rings, not only on their fingers, but also in their nostrils and their ears. St. James distinguishes a man of wealth and dignity by the ring of gold on his finger, James ii, 2. At the return of the prodigal son, his father orders him to be dressed in a new suit of clothes, and to have a ring put on his finger, Luke xv, 22. When God threatened Jeconiah with the utmost effects of his anger, he tells him, that though he were the signet or ring on his finger, yet he should be torn off, Jer. xxii, 24. The ring was used chiefly to seal with, and Scripture generally assigns it to princes and great persons; as the king of Egypt, Joseph, Ahaz, Jezebel, King Ahasuerus, his favourite Haman, Mordecai, King Darius, 1 Kings xxi, 8; Esther iii, 10, &c; Dan. vi, 17. The patents and orders of these princes were sealed with their rings or signets, an impression from which was their confirmation. The ring was one mark of sovereign authority. Pharaoh gave his ring to Joseph, as a token of authority. When Alexander the Great gave his ring to Perdicas, this was understood as nominating him his successor.

RIVER. The Hebrews give the name of “the river,” without any addition, sometimes to the Nile, sometimes to the Euphrates, and sometimes to Jordan. It is the tenor of the discourse that must determine the sense of this vague and uncertain way of speaking. They give also the name of river to brooks and rivulets that are not considerable. The name of river is sometimes given to the sea, Hab. iii, 8; Psalm lxxviii, 16. It is also used as a symbol for plenty, Job xxix, 6; Psalm xxxvi, 8.

ROCK. Palestine, being a mountainous country, had also many rocks, which formed a part of the country’s defence; for in time of danger the people retired to them, and found a refuge against any sudden irruption of the enemy. The Benjamites took shelter in the rock Rimmon, Judges xx, 47. Samson kept garrison in the rock of Etham, Judges xv, 8. David found shelter in the rocks of Maon, Engedi, &c, 1 Sam. xxii, 1; xxiii, 25, 28; xxiv, 2–5. Jerom says that the southern parts of Judea were full of caves under ground, and of caverns in the mountains, to which the people retired in time of danger. The Kenites dwelt in the hollow places of the rocks, Num. xxiv, 21. Even at this day the villages of this country are subterraneous, or in the rocks. Josephus in several places speaks of hollow rocks, where thieves and robbers had their haunts; and travellers still find a great number

of them in Palestine, and in the adjoining provinces. Toward Lebanon, the mountains are high, but covered in many places with as much earth as fits them for cultivation. Among the crags of the rocks, the beautiful and far-famed cedar waves its lofty top, and extends its powerful arms, surrounded by the fir and the oak, the fig and the vine. On the road to Jerusalem, the mountains are not so lofty nor so rugged, but become fitter for tillage. They rise again to the south-east of Mount Carmel; are covered with woods, and afford very picturesque views; but advancing toward Judea, they lose their verdure, the valleys become narrow, dry, and stony, and terminate at the Dead Sea in a pile of desolate rocks, precipices, and caverns. These vast excavations, some of which will contain fifteen hundred men, are the grottoes of Engedi, which have been a refuge to the oppressed or the discontented in all ages. Westward of Jordan and the lake Asphaltites, another chain of rocks, still loftier and more rugged, presents a yet more gloomy aspect, and announces the distant entrance of the desert, and the termination of the habitable regions.

The name of rock is also given to God, by way of metaphor, because God is the strength, the refuge, and defence of Israel, as those places were to the people who resided among them, Psalm xviii, 2, 31; xxxi, 2, 3; Deut. xxxii, 15, 18, 30, 31; Psalm lxi, 2, &c.

ROD. This word is used sometimes for the branches of a tree: "And Jacob took him rods of green poplar, and of the hazel and chesnut tree," Gen. xxx, 37; sometimes for a staff or wand: "And thou shalt take this rod in thine hand, wherewith thou shalt do signs. 824And Moses took the rod of God in his hand," Exod. iv, 17, 20; or for a shepherd's crook: "And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, even of whatsoever passeth under the rod; the tenth shall be holy unto the Lord," Lev. xxvii, 32; or for a rod, properly so called, which God makes use of to correct men: "If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men," 2 Sam. vii, 14. "Let him take his rod away from me," Job ix, 34. The empire of the Messiah is sometimes represented by a rod of iron, to show its power and its might, Psalm ii, 9; Rev. ii, 27; xii, 5; xix, 15. Rod is sometimes put to signify a tribe or a people: "Remember thy congregation which thou hast purchased of old, the rod of thine inheritance which thou hast redeemed," Psalm lxxiv, 2. "Israel is the rod of his inheritance," Jer. x, 16. The rod of Aaron is the staff commonly used by the high priest. This is the rod that budded and blossomed like an almond tree, Num. xvii. See Aaron.

ROMAN CATHOLICS, or members of the church of Rome, otherwise called papists, from the pope being considered by them as the supreme head of the universal church, the successor of St. Peter, and the fountain of



theological truth and ecclesiastical honours. He keeps his court in great state at the palace of the Vatican, and is attended by seventy cardinals as his privy counsellors, in imitation of the seventy disciples of our Lord. The pope's authority in other kingdoms is merely spiritual, but in Italy he is a temporal sovereign, Louis XVIII. and the allies having, in 1814, restored him to his throne, and to those temporalities of which he was deprived by Buonaparte and the French revolution. On resuming his government, Pope Pius VII. soon restored the order of Jesuits and the inquisition; so that the Roman Catholic religion is now reinstated in its ancient splendour and authority. The principal dogmas of this religion are as follows: 1. That St. Peter was deputed by Christ to be his vicar, and the head of the catholic church; and that the bishops of Rome, being his successors, have the same apostolical authority; for our Saviour declares, in Matt. xvi, 18, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church;" by which rock they understand St. Peter himself, as the name signifies, and not his confession, as the Protestants explain it. And a succession in the church being now supposed necessary under the New Testament, as Aaron had his succession under the old dispensation, which was a figure of the new, this succession can now, they contend, be shown only in the chair of St. Peter at Rome, where it is asserted he presided twenty-five years previous to his death; therefore, the bishops of Rome are his true successors. 2. That the Roman Catholic church is the mother and mistress of all churches, and cannot possibly err in matters of faith; for the church has the promise of the Spirit of God to lead it into all truth, John xvi, 13; "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. xvi, 18. Christ also, who is himself the truth, has promised to the pastors and teachers of the church to be with them "always, even to the end of the world," Matt. xxviii, 20. "It is from the testimony and authority of the church, therefore," say they, "that we receive the Scriptures as the word of God." 3. That the Scriptures thus received on the authority of the church are not sufficient to our faith without apostolical traditions, which are of equal authority with the Scriptures; for St. Peter assures us, that in St. Paul's epistles there "are some things hard to be understood, which they who are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, to their own destruction," 2 Peter iii, 16. We are directed by St. Paul to "stand fast, and hold the traditions which we have been taught, whether by word or by epistle," 2 Thess. ii, 15. 4. That seven sacraments were instituted by Jesus Christ, namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; and that they confer grace. To prove that confirmation, or imposition of hands, is a sacrament, they quote Acts viii, 17: "They," the Apostles, "laid their hands on them," believers, "and they received the Holy Ghost." Penance is a sacrament in which the sins we commit after baptism, duly repented of, and confessed to a priest, are forgiven; and which they think was instituted by Christ himself when he breathed upon his Apostles after his

resurrection, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye remit, are remitted; and whose sins ye retain, are retained," John xx, 23. In favour of extreme unction, or anointing the sick with oil, they argue from James i, 14, 15, which is thus rendered in the Vulgate: "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil," &c. The sacrament of holy orders is inferred from 1 Tim. iv, 14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on the hands of the presbytery," or priesthood, as they render it. That marriage is a sacrament, they think evident from Ephes. v, 32: "This is a great mystery," representing the mystical union of Christ and his church. "Matrimony," say they, "is here the sign of a holy thing, and therefore it is a sacrament." Notwithstanding this, they enjoin celibacy upon the clergy, because they do not think it proper that those who, by their office and function, ought to be wholly devoted to God, should be diverted from those duties by the distractions of a married life, 1 Cor. vii, 32, 33. 5. That in the mass, or public service, there is offered unto God a true and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead; and that in the sacrament of the eucharist, under the forms of bread and wine, are really and substantially present the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a conversion made of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the wine into his blood, which is called transubstantiation; according to our Lord's words to his disciples, "This is my body," &c, Matt. xxvi, 26; wherefore it becomes with them an object of adoration. Farther: it is a matter of discipline, not of doctrine, in the Roman church, that the laity receive the eucharist in one kind, that is, in bread only. This sacrifice of the mass was, they think, predicted by the Prophet Malachi, i, 11, who says, "In every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering." 6. That there is a purgatory; and that souls kept prisoners there do receive help by the suffrages of the faithful. For it is said, in 1 Cor. iii, 15, "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire;" which they understand of the flames of purgatory. They also believe that souls are released from purgatory by the prayers and alms which are offered for them, principally by the holy sacrifice of the mass. They call purgatory a middle state of souls, into which those enter who depart this life in God's grace; yet not without some less stains of guilt, which retard them from entering heaven, where nothing unclean can enter. 7. That the saints reigning with Christ (and especially the blessed virgin) are to be honoured and invoked; that they offer prayers unto God for us; and that their relics are to be had in veneration. These honours, however, are not divine, but relative, and redound to the divine glory, Rev. v, 8; viii, 4, &c. 8. That the image of Christ, of the blessed virgin, the mother of God, and of other saints, ought to be retained in churches, and honour and veneration ought to be given unto them. And as the images of cherubims

were allowed in the temples, so images should be placed in churches, and had in veneration. 9. That the power of indulgences was left by Christ to the church, and that the use of them is very beneficial to Christian people; according to Matt. xvi, 19: "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." By indulgences they do not mean leave to commit sin, nor pardon for sins to come; but only releasing, by the power of the keys committed to the church, the debt of temporal punishment which may remain due upon account of our sins, after the sins themselves, as to their guilt and eternal punishment, have been already remitted through repentance and confession, and by virtue of the merit of Christ, and of all the saints. By their indulgences they assert that they apply to their souls the merits of Christ, and of the saints and martyrs through him.

The ceremonies of this church are numerous and splendid, as, 1. They make use of the sign of the cross in all their sacraments, to give us to understand, that they have their whole force and efficacy from the cross. 2. Sprinkling of the holy water by the priest on solemn days is used likewise by every one going in or coming out of church. 3. The ceremony of blessing bells is, by the Catholics, called christening them; because the name of some saint is ascribed to them, by virtue of whose invocation they are presented, in order that they may obtain his favour and protection. 4. They always bow at the name of Jesus, (which is also done as regularly in the church of England,) and they found the practice on Phil. ii, 10: "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow." 5. They keep a number of lamps and wax candles continually burning before the shrines and images of the saints. 6. They make use of incense, and have lighted candles upon the altar at the celebration of the mass. 7. The practice of washing the poor's feet, in imitation of our Lord's washing the feet of his disciples, is solemnized on Holy Thursday by all the princes of the Romish religion in Europe. The church of Rome also professes to keep the fast of Lent with great strictness, and observes a much greater number both of feasts and festivals than the church of England.

The church of Rome assumes the title of Catholic, or universal, as answering to that article in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the holy Catholic church." The above is perhaps a sufficient account of the Roman Catholic faith; but as the creed of Pope Pius IV. is universally admitted to be the true standard of that faith, it would be decidedly wrong to conclude without inserting it. Mr. Butler says it contains a succinct and explicit summary of the canons of the council of Trent, and was published in the form of a papal bull, in 1564. He adds, "It is received throughout the whole Roman Catholic church; every one who is admitted into that church, publicly reads and professes his assent to it." This document commences with reciting the Nicene Creed, which, as it is admitted by the Protestant

church of England, and inserted in the Common Prayer Book, need not be here repeated. It then proceeds with the twelve following articles, in addition to those of the Apostles' Creed, which they also reckon twelve: "13. I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same church. I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to the sense which the holy mother church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers. 14. I profess also that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of mankind, (though all are not necessary for every one,) namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, order, and matrimony; and that they confer grace; and of these, baptism, confirmation, and order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. 15. I also receive and admit the ceremonies of the Catholic church, received and approved in the solemn administration of all the above said sacraments. 16. I receive and embrace all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification. 17. I profess, likewise, that in the mass, is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic church calls transubstantiation. 18. I confess, also, that under either kind alone, Christ whole and entire, and a true sacrament, is received. 19. I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful. 20. Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated; that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated. 21. I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, and of the mother of Christ, ever a virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given to them. 22. I also affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people. 23. I acknowledge the holy Catholic and apostolic Roman church, the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ. 24. I also profess, and undoubtedly receive, all other things, delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy council of Trent; and likewise, I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto; and all heresies whatsoever,

condemned and anathematized by the church. This true catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same, whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. Amen."

Such is the avowed and accredited faith of the church of Rome; but it seems a most extraordinary circumstance, that, while this church has so enlarged the creed, it has reduced the number of the commandments, omitting altogether the second, "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image," &c, Exod. xx, 3-6; as if the Catholics were conscious it could by no means be reconciled with the twenty-first article of the above recited creed. And then, to prevent alarm, as every body must know there should be ten commandments, the last is divided into two, to make up the number. This is said to have been done, even before the Reformation. It was done in the French National Catechism, published in 1806, and sanctioned by Pope Pius VII., by the archbishop of Paris, and by the Emperor Napoleon. It is remarkable, also, that in Dr. Chalenor's "Garden of the Soul," printed in London by Coglan, in 1787, in a form of self-examination for the penitent upon each commandment, there is no reference to the one omitted; nor is there any reference to it in Bossuet's famous "Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church," when treating upon images, and the manner in which they are directed to be honoured. Lastly, in Butler's Catechism, the eighth edition, printed at Dublin in 1811, and sanctioned by four Roman Catholic archbishops, the commandments stand literally as follows: "1. I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no strange gods before me. 2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. 3. Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. 4. Honour thy father and thy mother. 5. Thou shalt not kill. 6. Thou shalt not commit adultery. 7. Thou shalt not steal. 8. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. 9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife. 10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods." Here it may be added, that by omitting the second command, the others are numbered differently from what they are by us. Thus, the third is brought in for the second, the fourth is made the third, &c, till they come to the last which is divided in two, for the purpose above mentioned. The gross and antisciptural errors, leading to superstition, idolatry, and many other evils, which are contained in the peculiarities of the papistical faith, are abundantly pointed out and refuted by the leading Protestant writers.

ROMANS, Epistle to the. This epistle was written from Corinth, A. D. 58, being the fourth year of the Emperor Nero, just before St. Paul set out for Jerusalem with the contributions which the Christians of Macedonia and Achaia had made for the relief of their poor brethren in Judea, Acts xx, 1; Rom. xv, 25, 26. It was transcribed or written as St. Paul dictated it, by Tertius; and the person who conveyed it to Rome was Phœbe, a deaconess

of the church of Cenchrea, which was the eastern port of the city of Corinth, Rom. xvi, 1, 22. It is addressed to the church at Rome, which consisted partly of Jewish and partly of Heathen converts; and throughout the epistle it is evident that the Apostle has regard to both these descriptions of Christians. St. Paul, when he wrote this epistle had not been at Rome, Rom. i, 13; xv, 23; but he had heard an account of the state of the church in that city from Aquila and Priscilla, two Christians who were banished from thence by the edict of Claudius, and with whom he lived during his first visit to Corinth. Whether any other Apostle had at this time preached the Gospel at Rome, cannot now be ascertained. Among those who witnessed the effect of the first effusion of the Holy Ghost are mentioned "strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes," Acts ii, 10; that is, persons of the Jewish religion, who usually resided at Rome, but who had come to Jerusalem to be present at the feast of pentecost. It is highly probable that these men, upon their return home, proclaimed the Gospel of Christ; and we may farther suppose that many Christians who had been converted at other places afterward settled at Rome, and were the cause of others embracing the Gospel. But, by whatever means Christianity had been introduced into Rome, it seems to have flourished there in great purity; for we learn from the beginning of this epistle that the faith of the Roman Christians was at this time much celebrated, Rom. i, 8. To confirm them in that faith, and to guard them against the errors of Judaizing Christians, was the object of this letter, in which St. Paul takes occasion to enlarge upon the nature of the Mosaic institution; to explain the fundamental principles and doctrines of Christianity; and to show that the whole human race, formerly divided into Jews and Gentiles, were now to be admitted into the religion of Jesus, indiscriminately, and free from every other obligation. The Apostle, after expressing his affection to the Roman Christians, and asserting that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all who believe, takes a comprehensive view of the conduct and condition of men under the different dispensations of Providence; he shows that all mankind, both Jews and Gentiles, were equally "under sin," and liable to the wrath and punishment of God; that therefore there was a necessity for a universal propitiation and redemption, which were now offered to the whole race of men, without any preference or exception, by the mercy of him who is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews; that faith in Jesus Christ, the universal Redeemer, was the only means of obtaining this salvation, which the deeds of the law were wholly incompetent to procure; that as the sins of the whole world originated from the disobedience of Adam, so the justification from those sins was to be derived from the obedience of Christ; that all distinction between Jew and Gentile was now abolished, and the ceremonial law entirely abrogated; that the unbelieving Jews would be excluded from the benefits of the Gospel, while the believing Gentiles would be partakers of them; and that this rejection of the Jews, and call of

the Gentiles, were predicted by the Jewish Prophets Hosea and Isaiah. He then points out the superiority of the Christian over the Jewish religion, and earnestly exhorts the Romans to abandon every species of wickedness, and to practise the duties of righteousness and holiness, which were now enjoined upon higher sanctions, and enforced by more powerful motives. In the latter part of the epistle, St. Paul gives some practical instructions, and recommends some particular virtues; and he concludes with a salutation and a doxology. This epistle is most valuable, on account of the arguments and truths which it contains, relative to the necessity, nature, and universality of the Gospel dispensation.

ROOFS. The letting down of the paralytic through the roof of the house where Jesus was, is satisfactorily explained by the following extract from Shaw's Travels: "The houses throughout the east are low, having generally a ground floor only, or one upper story, and flat-roofed, the roof being covered with a strong coat of plaster of terrace. They are built round a paved court, into which the entrance from the street is through a gateway or passage room furnished with benches, and sufficiently large to be used for receiving visits or transacting business. The stairs which lead to the roof are never placed on the outside of the house in the street, but usually in the gateway, or passage room to the court, sometimes at the entrance within the court. This court is now called, in Arabic, *el woost*, or 'the middle of the house,' literally answering to τὸ μέσον of St. Luke, v, 19. It is customary to fix cords from the parapet walls, Deut. xxii, 8, of the flat roofs across this court, and upon them to expand a veil or covering, as a shelter from the heat. In this area, probably, our Saviour taught. The paralytic was brought on to the roof by making a way through the crowd to the stairs in the gateway, or by the terraces of the adjoining houses. They rolled back the veil, and let the sick man down over the parapet of the roof into the area or court of the house, before Jesus." The windows of the eastern houses being chiefly within, facing the court, in order to see what was going on without in the streets of the city, the only way was to run up to the flat roof. Hence the frequent expression in Scripture, when allusion is made to sudden tumults and calamities, to get up to "the house top." See Houses.

ROSE, הַרְבִּיצִלִּת, Cant., ii, 1; Isaiah xxxv, 1. The rose, so much and so often sung by the poets of Persia, Arabia, Greece, and Rome, is, indeed, the pride of the garden for elegance of form, for glow of colour, and fragrance of smell. Tournefort mentions fifty-three kinds, of which the Damascus rose, and the rose of Sharon, are the finest. The beauty of these flowers is too well known to be insisted on; and they are at this day much admired in the east, where they are extremely fragrant. In what esteem the rose was among the Greeks, may be learned from the fifth and fifty-third odes of Anacreon. Among the ancients it occupied a conspicuous place in every chaplet; it

was a principal ornament in every festive meeting, and at every solemn sacrifice; and the comparisons in Ecclesiasticus xxiv, 14, and l, 8, show that the Jews were likewise much delighted with it. The rose bud, or opening rose, seems in particular a favourite ornament. The Jewish sensualists, in Wisdom ii, 8, are introduced saying, “Let us fill ourselves with costly wine and ointments; and let no flower of the spring pass by us. Let us crown ourselves with rose buds before they are withered.”

ROSH. The Hebrew speaks of a people called Rosh, Ezek. xxxviii, 2, 3. “The orientals hold,” says D’Herbelot, “that Japheth had a son called Rous, not mentioned by Moses, who peopled Russia, that is, Muscovy.” We question not but Rosh, or Ros, signifies Russia, or the people that dwell on the Araxes, called Rosch by the inhabitants; which was the habitation of the Scythians. It deserves notice, that the LXX. render the passage in Ezekiel, Γὰρ, ἄρχοντα Ῥὼς, Μεσοῶν, καὶ Θοβέλ, Gog, 828th the chief of Ros, Mesoch, and Thobel; and Jerom, not absolutely to reject this name, inserts both renderings: Gog, terram Magog, principem capitis (sive Ros) Mosoch, et Thubal. Symmachus and Theodotion also perceived Ros to be in this place the name of a people; and this is now the prevailing judgment of interpreters. Bochart, about A. D. 1640, contended that Russia was the nation meant by the term Ros; and this opinion is supported by the testimony of various Greek writers, who describe “the Ros as a Scythian nation, bordering on the northern Taurus.” Mosok, or Mesech, appears to be the same as the Moskwa, or Moscow, of the moderns; and we know, that not only is this the name of the city, but also of the river on which it stands. See Gog.

RUBY, a beautiful gem, whose colour is red, with an admixture of purple, and is, in its most perfect state, a gem of extreme value. In hardness it is equal to the sapphire, and second only to the diamond. It is mentioned in Job xxviii, 18, and Prov. viii, 11, &c.

RUE, ῥήγανον, Luke xi, 42, a small shrubby plant, common in gardens. It has a strong, unpleasant smell, and a bitterish, penetrating taste.

RUSH, ῥυῖλ, Exodus ii, 3; Job viii, 11; Isaiah xviii, 2; xxxv, 7; a plant growing in the water at the sides of rivers, and in marshy grounds.

RUSSIAN CHURCH. The Russians, like other nations, were originally Pagans, and worshipped fire, which they considered as the cause of thunder, under the name of Perun, and the earth under the name Volata; at the same time having some notions of a future state of rewards and punishments. Christianity was first professed by the Princess Olga, who was baptized at Constantinople. She recommended it to her grandson



Vladimir, on whose baptism, in 988, it was adopted by the nation generally; and from that time the Greek church has been the established religion throughout Russia, and Greek literature greatly encouraged. During the middle ages, however, the doctrine of transubstantiation, and some other popish peculiarities, were covertly introduced; and, by the irruption of the Mongol Tartars, in the fifteenth century, a stop was put to learning and civilization for full two centuries; but, on the accession of the present dynasty in 1613, civilization and Christianity were restored, and schools established for the education of the clergy. The Russian clergy are divided into regular and secular; the former are all monks, and the latter are the parochial clergy. The superior clergy are called archires; but the title of metropolitan, or bishop, is personal, and not properly attached to the see, as in the western church. Next after the archires rank the black clergy, including the chiefs of monasteries and convents, and after them the monks. The secular priests are called the white clergy, including the protoires, or proto-popes, priests, and deacons, together with the readers and sacristans. These amounted, in 1805, throughout the empire, to ninety-eight thousand seven hundred and twenty-six. The white clergy must be married before they can be ordained, but must not marry a second time; they are at liberty then to enter among the black clergy, and a way is thus opened for their accession to the higher orders. The whole empire is divided into thirty-six diocesses, or eparchies, in which are four hundred and eighty-three cathedrals, and twenty-six thousand, five hundred and ninety-eight churches. The churches are divided into three parts. 1. The altar, where stands the holy table, crucifix, &c, which is separated from the body of the church by a large screen, on which are painted our Saviour, the virgin, the Apostles, and other saints. Upon a platform before this are placed the readers and singers, and here the preacher generally stands behind a movable desk. 2. The nave, or body of the church, which may be called the inner court. 3. The trapeza, or outer court. The two last are designed for the congregation, but neither have any seats. The walls of the church are highly embellished with Scripture paintings, ornamented with gold, silver, and precious stones, but no images.

The church service is contained in twenty-four volumes, folio, in the Slavonian language, which is not well understood by the common people. Parts of the Scriptures are read in the service; but few, even of the ecclesiastics, possess a complete Bible. The patriarch of Russia was formerly almost equal in authority with the czar himself; but Peter the Great, on the death of the patriarch in 1700, abolished his office, and appointed an exarch. In 1721 he abolished this office also, and appointed a "holy legislative synod" for the government of the church, at the head of which is always placed a layman of rank and eminence. The monastic life was once so prevalent in this country, that there were four hundred and

seventy-nine convents for men, and seventy-four for women, in which there were about seventy thousand monks and nuns, &c; but this kind of life was so much discouraged by Peter the Great and the Empress Catherine, that the religious are now reduced to about five thousand monks and seventeen hundred nuns. Great part of their revenues has also been alienated, and appropriated to the support of hospitals and houses for the poor.

**RUTH.** The book of Ruth is so called from the name of the person, a native of Moab, whose history it contains. It may be considered as a supplement to the book of Judges, to which it was joined in the Hebrew canon, and the latter part of which it greatly resembles, being a detached story belonging to the same period. Ruth had a son called Obed, who was the grandfather of David, which circumstance probably occasioned her history to be written, as the genealogy of David, from Pharez, the son of Judah, from whom the Messiah was to spring, is here given; and some commentators have thought, that the descent of our Saviour from Ruth, a Gentile woman, was an intimation of the comprehensive nature of the Christian dispensation. We are nowhere informed when Ruth lived; but as King David was her great-grandson, we may place her history about B. C. 1250. This book was certainly written after the birth of David, and probably by the Prophet Samuel, though some have attributed it to Hezekiah, and others to Ezra. The story related in this book is extremely interesting; the widowed distress of Naomi, her affectionate concern for her daughters, the reluctant departure of Orpah, the dutiful attachment of Ruth, and the sorrowful return to Bethlehem, are very beautifully told. The simplicity of manners, likewise, which is shown in Ruth's industry and attention to Naomi; the elegant charity of Boaz; and his acknowledgment of his kindred with Ruth, afford a pleasing contrast to the turbulent scenes described in the book of the Judges. The respect, likewise, which the Israelites paid to the law of Moses, and their observance of ancient customs, are represented in a very lively and animated manner, Ruth iv. It is a pleasing digression from the general thread of the sacred history.

**SABAOTH,** or rather Zabaoth, a Hebrew word, signifying hosts or armies, יהוה צבאות, Jehovah Sabaoth, The Lord of Hosts. By this phrase we may understand the host of heaven, or the angels and ministers of the Lord; or the stars and planets, which, as an army ranged in battle array, perform the will of God; or, lastly, the people of the Lord, both of the old and new covenant, which is truly a great army, of which God is the Lord and commander.

**SABBATH.** The obligation of a sabbatical institution upon Christians, as well as the extent of it, have been the subjects of much controversy.

Christian churches themselves have differed; and the theologians of the same church. Much has been written upon the subject on each side, and much research and learning employed, sometimes to darken a very plain subject. The question respects the will of God as to this particular point,-- Whether one day in seven is to be wholly devoted to religion, exclusive of worldly business and worldly pleasures. Now, there are but two ways in which the will of God can be collected from his word; either by some explicit injunction upon all, or by incidental circumstances. Let us then allow, for a moment, that we have no such explicit injunction; yet we have certainly none to the contrary: let us allow that we have only for our guidance, in inferring the will of God in this particular, certain circumstances declarative of his will; yet this important conclusion is inevitable, that all such indicative circumstances are in favour of a sabbatical institution, and that there is not one which exhibits any thing contrary to it. The seventh day was hallowed at the close of the creation; its sanctity was afterward marked by the withholding of the manna on that day, and the provision of a double supply on the sixth, and that previous to the giving of the law from Sinai: it was then made a part of that great epitome of religious and moral duty, which God wrote with his own finger on tables of stone; it was a part of the public political law of the only people to whom almighty God ever made himself a political Head and Ruler; its observance is connected throughout the prophetic age with the highest promises, its violations with the severest maledictions; it was among the Jews in our Lord's time a day of solemn religious assembling, and was so observed by him; when changed to the first day of the week, it was the day on which the first Christians assembled; it was called, by way of eminence, "the Lord's day;" and we have inspired authority to say, that both under the Old and New Testament dispensations, it is used as an expressive type of the heavenly and eternal rest. Now, against all these circumstances so strongly declarative of the will of God, as to the observance of a sabbatical institution, what circumstance or passage of Scripture can be opposed, as bearing upon it a contrary indication? Certainly, not one; for those passages in St. Paul, in which he speaks of Jewish Sabbaths, with their Levitical rites, and of a distinction of days, the observance of which marked a weak or a criminal adherence to the abolished ceremonial dispensation; touch not the Sabbath as a branch of the moral law, or as it was changed, by the authority of the Apostles, to the first day of the week. If, then, we were left to determine the point by inference, the conclusion must be irresistibly in favour of the institution.

It may also be observed, that those who will so strenuously insist upon the absence of an express command as to the Sabbath in the writings of the evangelists and Apostles, as explicit as that of the decalogue, assume, that the will of God is only obligatory when manifested in some one mode,

which they judge to be most fit. But this is a dangerous hypothesis; for, however the will of God may be manifested, if it is with such clearness as to exclude all reasonable doubt, it is equally obligatory as when it assumes the formality of legal promulgation. Thus the Bible is not all in the form of express and authoritative command; it teaches by examples, by proverbs, by songs, by incidental allusions and occurrences; and yet is, throughout, a manifestation of the will of God as to morals and religion in their various branches, and, if disregarded, it will be so at every man's peril. But strong as this ground is, we quit it for a still stronger. It is wholly a mistake, that the Sabbath, because not reënacted with the formality of the decalogue, is not explicitly enjoined upon Christians, and that the testimony of Scripture to such an injunction is not unequivocal and irrefragible. The Sabbath was appointed at the creation of the world, and sanctified, or set apart for holy purposes, "for man," for all men, and therefore for Christians; since there was never any repeal of the original institution. To this we add, that if the moral law be the law of Christians, then is the Sabbath as explicitly enjoined upon them as upon the Jews. But that the moral law is our law, as well as the law of the Jews, all but Antinomians must acknowledge; and few, we suppose, will be inclined to run into the fearful mazes of that error, in order to support lax notions as to the obligation of the Sabbath; into which, however, they must be plunged, if they deny the law of the decalogue to be binding. That it is so bound upon us, a few passages of Scripture will prove as well as many. Our Lord declares, that he "came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil." Take it, that by "the law," he meant both the moral and the ceremonial; ceremonial law could only be fulfilled in him, by realizing its types; and moral law, by upholding its authority. For "the prophets," they admit of a similar distinction; they either enjoin morality, or utter prophecies of Christ; the latter of which were fulfilled in the sense of accomplishment, the former by being sanctioned and enforced. That the observance of the Sabbath is a part of the moral law, is clear from its being found in the decalogue, the doctrine of which our Lord sums up in the moral duties of loving God and our neighbour; and for this reason the injunctions of the prophets, on the subject of the Sabbath, are to be regarded as a part of their moral teaching. Some divines have, it is true, called the observance of the Sabbath a positive, and not a moral precept. If it were so, its obligation is precisely the same, in all cases where God himself has not relaxed it; and if a positive precept only, it has surely a special eminence given to it, by being placed in the list of the ten commandments, and being capable, with them, of an epitome which resolves them into the love of God and our neighbour. The truth seems to be, that it is a mixed precept, and not wholly positive, but intimately, perhaps essentially connected with several moral principles of homage to God, and mercy to men; with the obligation of religious worship, of public religious worship, and of undistracted public worship: and this will account

for its collocation in the decalogue with the highest duties of religion, and the leading rules of personal and social morality. The passage from our Lord's sermon on the mount, with its context, is a sufficiently explicit enforcement of the moral law, generally, upon his followers; but when he says, "The Sabbath was made for man," he clearly refers to its original institution, as a universal law, and not to its obligation upon the Jews only, in consequence of the enactments of the law of Moses. It "was made for man," not as he may be a Jew, or a Christian; but as man, a creature bound to love, worship, and obey his God and Maker, and on his trial for eternity.

Another explicit proof that the law of the ten commandments, and, consequently, the law of the Sabbath, is obligatory upon Christians, is found in the answer of the Apostle to an objection to the doctrine of justification by faith: "Do we then make void the law through faith?" Rom. iii, 31; which is equivalent to asking, Does Christianity teach that the law is no longer obligatory on Christians, because it teaches that no man can be justified by it? To this he answers, in the most solemn form of expression, "God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Now, the sense in which the Apostle uses the term, "the law," in this argument, is indubitably marked in Rom. vii, 7: "I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet:" which, being a plain reference to the tenth command of the decalogue, as plainly shows that the decalogue is "the law" of which he speaks. This, then, is the law which is established by the Gospel; and this can mean nothing else but the establishment and confirmation of its authority, as the rule of all inward and outward holiness. Whoever, therefore, denies the obligation of the Sabbath on Christians, denies the obligation of the whole decalogue; and there is no real medium between the acknowledgment of the divine authority of this sacred institution, as a universal law, and that gross corruption of Christianity, generally designated Antinomianism.

Nor is there any force in the dilemma into which the anti-sabbatarians would push us, when they argue, that, if the case be so, then are we bound to the same circumstantial exactitude of obedience with regard to this command, as to the other precepts of the decalogue; and, therefore, that we are bound to observe the seventh day, reckoning from Saturday, as the Sabbath day. But, as the command is partly positive, and partly moral, it may have circumstances which are capable of being altered in perfect accordance with the moral principles on which it rests, and the moral ends which it proposes. Such circumstances are not indeed to be judged of on our own authority. We must either have such general principles for our guidance as have been revealed by God, and cannot therefore be questioned, or some special authority from which there can be no just appeal. Now, though there is not on record any divine command issued to

the Apostles, to change the Sabbath from the day on which it was held by the Jews, to the first day of the week; yet, when we see that this was done in the apostolic age, and that St. Paul speaks of the Jewish Sabbaths as not being obligatory upon Christians, while he yet contends that the whole moral law is obligatory upon them; the fair inference is, that this change of the day was made by divine direction. It is indeed more than inference that the change was made under the sanction of inspired men; and those men, the appointed rulers in the church of Christ; whose business it was to "set all things in order," which pertained to its worship and moral government. We may therefore rest well enough satisfied with this,--that as a Sabbath is obligatory upon us, we act under apostolic authority for observing it on the first day of the week, and thus commemorate at once the creation and the redemption of the world.

Thus, even if it were conceded, that the change of the day was made by the agreement of the Apostles, without express directions from Christ, which is not probable, it is certain that it was not done without that general authority which was confided to them by Christ; but it would not follow even from this change, that they did in reality make any alteration in the law of the Sabbath, either as it stood at the time of its original institution at the close of the creation, or in the decalogue of Moses. The same portion of time which constituted the seventh day from the creation could not be observed in all parts of the earth; and it is not probable, therefore, that the original law expresses more, than that a seventh day, or one day in seven, the seventh day after six days of labour, should be thus appropriated, from whatever point the enumeration might set out, or the hebdomadal cycle begin. For if more had been intended, then it would have been necessary to establish a rule for the reckoning of days themselves, which has been different in different nations; some reckoning from evening to evening, as the Jews now do, others from midnight to midnight, &c. So that those persons in this country and in America, who hold their Sabbath on Saturday, under the notion of exactly conforming to the Old Testament, and yet calculate the days from midnight to midnight, have no assurance at all that they do not desecrate a part of the original Sabbath, which might begin, as the Jewish Sabbath now, on Friday evening, and, on the contrary, hallow a portion of a common day, by extending the Sabbath beyond Saturday evening. Even if this were ascertained, the differences of latitude and longitude would throw the whole into disorder; and it is not probable that a universal law should have been fettered with that circumstantial exactness, which would have rendered difficult, and sometimes doubtful, astronomical calculations necessary in order to its being obeyed according to the intention of the lawgiver. Accordingly we find, says Mr. Holden, that in the original institution it is stated in general terms, that God blessed and sanctified the seventh day, which must undoubtedly imply the sanctity of

every seventh day; but not that it is to be subsequently reckoned from the first demiurgic day. Had this been included in the command of the Almighty, something, it is probable, would have been added declaratory of the intention; whereas expressions the most undefined are employed; not a syllable is uttered concerning the order and number of the days; and it cannot reasonably be disputed that the command is truly obeyed by the separation of every seventh day, from common to sacred purposes, at whatever given time the cycle may commence. The difference in the mode of expression here, from that which the sacred historian has used in the first chapter, is very remarkable. At the conclusion of each division of the work of creation, he says, "The evening and the morning were the first day," and so on; but at the termination of the whole, he merely calls it the seventh day; a diversity of phrase, which, as it would be inconsistent with every idea of inspiration to suppose it undesigned, must have been intended to denote a day, leaving it to each people as to what manner it is to be reckoned. The term obviously imports the period of the earth's rotation round its axis, while it is left undetermined, whether it shall be counted from evening or morning, from noon or midnight. The terms of the law are, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." With respect to time, it is here mentioned in the same indefinite manner as at its primeval institution, nothing more being expressly required than to observe a day of sacred rest after every six days of labour. The seventh day is to be kept holy; but not a word is said as to what epoch the commencement of the series is to be referred; nor could the Hebrews have determined from the decalogue what day of the week was to be kept as their Sabbath. The precept is not, Remember the seventh day of the week, to keep it holy, but, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy;" and in the following explication of these expressions, it is not said that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath, but without restriction, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" not the seventh according to any particular method of computing the septenary cycle, but, in reference to the six before mentioned, every seventh day in rotation after six of labour.

Thus that part of the Jewish law, the decalogue, which, on the authority of the New Testament, we have shown to be obligatory upon Christians, leaves the computation of the hebdomadal cycle undetermined; and, after six days of labour, enjoins the seventh as the Sabbath, to which the Christian practice as exactly conforms as the Jewish. It is not, however, left to every individual to determine which day should be his Sabbath, though he should fulfil the law so far as to abstract the seventh part of his time

from labour. It was ordained for worship, for public worship; and it is therefore necessary that the Sabbath should be uniformly observed by a whole community at the same time. The divine Legislator of the Jews interposed for this end, by special direction, as to his people. The first Sabbath kept in the wilderness was calculated from the first day in which the manna fell; and with no apparent reference to the creation of the world. By apostolic authority, it is now fixed to be held on the first day of the week; and thus one of the great ends for which it was established, that it should be a day of “holy convocation,” is secured.

Traces of the original appointment of the Sabbath, and of its observance prior to the giving forth of the law of Moses, have been found by the learned in the tradition which universally prevailed of the sacredness of the number seven, and the fixing of the first period of time to the revolution of seven days. The measuring of time by a day and night is pointed out to the common sense of mankind by the diurnal course of the sun. Lunar months and solar years are equally obvious to all rational creatures; so that the reason why time has been computed by days, months, and years, is readily given; but how the division of time into weeks of seven days, and this from the beginning, came to obtain universally among mankind, no man can account for, without having respect to some impressions on the minds of men from the constitution and law of nature, with the tradition of a sabbatical rest from the foundation of the world. Yet plain intimations of this weekly revolution of time are to be found in the earliest Greek poets: Hesiod, Homer, Linus, as well as among the nations of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans. It deserves consideration, too, on this subject, that Noah, in sending forth the dove out of the ark, observed the septenary revolution of days, Gen. viii, 10, 12; and at a subsequent period, in the days of the Patriarch Jacob, a week is spoken of as a well known period of time, Gen. xxix, 27; Judges xiv, 12, 15, 17. These considerations are surely sufficient to evince the futility of the arguments which are sometimes plausibly urged for the first institution of the Sabbath under the law; and the design of which, in most cases is, to set aside the moral obligation of appropriating one day in seven to the purposes of the public worship of God, and the observation of divine ordinances. But the truth is, that the seventh day was set apart from the beginning as a day of rest; and it was also strictly enjoined upon the Israelites in their law, both on the ground of its original institution, Exod. xx, 8–11, and also to commemorate their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt, Deut. v, 15.

“A Sabbath day’s journey” was reckoned to be two thousand cubits, or one mile, Acts i, 12. The sabbatical year was celebrated among the Jews every seventh year when the land was left without culture, Exod. xxii, 10. God appointed the observation of the sabbatical year, to preserve the



remembrance of the creation of the world, to enforce the acknowledgment of his sovereign authority over all things, and in particular over the land of Canaan, which he had given to the Israelites, by delivering up the fruits to the poor and the stranger. It was a sort of tribute, or small rent, by which they held the possession. Beside, he intended to inculcate humanity upon his people, by commanding that they should resign to the slaves, the poor, and the strangers, and to the brutes, the produce of their fields, of their vineyards, and of their gardens. In the sabbatical year all debts were remitted, and the slaves were liberated, Exodus xxi, 2; Deut. xv, 2.

SABEANS, or “men of stature,” Isa. xlv, 14. These men were probably the Sabeans of Arabia Felix, or of Asia. They submitted to Cyrus. The Sabeans of Arabia were descended from Saba; but as there are several of this name, who were all heads of peoples, or of tribes, we must distinguish several kinds of Sabeans. 1. Those Sabeans who seized the flocks of Job, i, 15, were, probably, a people of Arabia Deserta, about Bozra; or, perhaps, a flying troop of Sabeans which infested that country. 2. Sabeans, descendants from Sheba, son of Cush, Gen. x, 7, are probably of Arabia Felix: they were famous for spices; the poets gave them the epithet of soft and effeminate, and say they were governed by women:

Medis, levibusque Sabæis

Imperat hic sexus.

[This sex governs the Medes, and the gentle Sabeans.]

Several are of opinion, that from them came the queen of Sheba, 1 Kings x, 1, 2; and that of these Sabeans the psalmist speaks, Psalm lxxii, 10, “The kings of Arabia and Sheba shall give gifts;” and Jeremiah, vi, 20: “What are the perfumes of Sheba to me?” and Isaiah, lx, 6: “All who come from Sheba shall offer gold and perfumes.” 3. Sabeans, sons of Shebah, son of Reumah, Gen. x, 7, probably dwelt in Arabia Felix. Probably it is of these Ezekiel speaks, xxvii, 22, who came with their merchandise to the fairs of Tyre: and Joel, iii, 8: “I will deliver up your children to the tribe of Judah, who shall sell them to the Sabeans, a very distant nation.” 4. Sabeans, descendants from Joktan, may very well be those mentioned by Ezekiel, xxvii, 23: “Saba, Assur, and Chelmad, thy dealers.” They are thought to have inhabited beyond the Euphrates; whence they are connected with Asshur and Chilmad, Gen. x, 28; 1 Chron. i, 22. 5. Sabeans are also placed in Africa, in the isle of Meroë. Josephus brings the queen of Sheba from thence, and pretends that it had the name of Shebah, or Saba, before that of Meroë.

SABELLIANS were so called from Sabellius, a presbyter, or, according to others, a bishop, of Upper Egypt, who was the founder of the sect. As, from

their doctrine, it follows that God the Father suffered, they were hence called by their adversaries, Patripassians; and, as their idea of the trinity was by some called a modal trinity, they have likewise been called Modalists. Sabellius having been a disciple of Noëtus, Noëtians is another name by which his followers have sometimes been known; and as, from their fears of infringing on the fundamental doctrine of all true religion, the unity of God, they neglected all distinctions of persons, and taught the notion of one God with three names, they may hence be also considered as a species of Unitarians. Sabellius flourished about the middle of the third century, and his doctrine seems to have had many followers for a short time. Its growth, however, was soon checked by the opposition made to it by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, and the sentence of condemnation pronounced upon its author by Pope Dionysius, in a council held at Rome, A. D. 263. Sabellius taught that there is but one person in the Godhead; and, in confirmation of this doctrine, he made use of this comparison: As man, though composed of body and soul, is but one person, so God, though he is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is but one person. Hence the Sabellians reduced the three persons in the 833trinity to three characters or relations, and maintained that the Word and Holy Spirit are only virtues, emanations, or functions, of the Deity; that he who is in heaven is the Father of all things; that he descended into the virgin, became a child, and was born of her as a son; and that, having accomplished the mystery of our redemption, he effused himself upon the Apostles in tongues of fire, and was then denominated the Holy Ghost. This they explain by resembling God to the sun, the illuminative virtue or quality of which was the word, and its quickening virtue the Holy Spirit. The word, according to their doctrine, was darted, like a divine ray, to accomplish the work of redemption; and having reäscended to heaven, the influences of the Father were communicated, after a like manner, to the Apostles. They also attempted to illustrate this mystery, by one light kindled by another; by the fountain and stream, and by the stock and branch. With respect to the sentiments of Sabellius himself, the accounts are various. According to some, he taught that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were one subsistence, and one person, with three names; and that, in the Old Testament, the Deity delivered the law as the Father; in the New Testament dwelt among men as the Son; and descended on the Apostles as the Holy Spirit. According to Mosheim, his sentiments differed from those of Noëtus, in this, that the latter was of opinion, that the person of the Father had assumed the human nature of Christ; whereas Sabellius maintained, that a certain energy only proceeded from the supreme Parent, or a certain portion of the divine nature was united to the Son of God, the man Jesus; and he considered, in the same manner, the Holy Ghost as a portion of the everlasting Father.

Between the system of Sabellianism and what is termed the indwelling scheme, there appears to be a considerable resemblance, if it be not precisely the same, differently explained. The indwelling scheme is chiefly founded on that passage in the New Testament, where the Apostle speaking of Christ says, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Dr. Watts, toward the close of his life, adopted this opinion, and wrote several pieces in its defence. His sentiments on the trinity appear to have been, that the Godhead, the Deity itself, personally distinguished as the Father, was united to the man Christ Jesus; in consequence of which union or indwelling of the Godhead, he became properly God. Mr. Palmer observes, that Dr. Watts conceived this union to have subsisted before the Saviour's appearance in the flesh, and that the human soul of Christ existed with the Father from before the foundation of the world: on which ground he maintains the real descent of Christ from heaven to earth, and the whole scene of his humiliation, which he thought incompatible with the common opinion concerning him.

**SACKCLOTH**, a sort of mourning worn at the death of a friend or relation. In great calamities, in penitence, in trouble also, they wore sackcloth about their bodies: "Gird yourselves with sackcloth, and mourn for Abner," 2 Sam. iii, 31. "Let us gird ourselves with sackcloth; and let us go and implore the clemency of the king of Israel," 1 Kings xx, 31. Ahab rent his clothes, put on a shirt of haircloth next to his skin, fasted, and lay upon sackcloth, 1 Kings xxi, 27. When Mordecai was informed of the destruction threatened to his nation, he put on sackcloth, and covered his head with ashes, Esther iv. On the contrary, in time of joy, or on hearing good news, those who were clad in sackcloth tore it from their bodies, and cast it from them, Psalm xxx, 11. The prophets were often clothed in sackcloth, and generally in coarse clothing. The Lord bids Isaiah to put off the sackcloth from about his body, and to go naked, that is, without his upper garment, Isaiah xx, 2. Zechariah says that false prophets shall no longer prophesy in sackcloth, to deceive the simple, Zech. xiii, 4.

**SACRAMENT**. There is no word in the Bible which corresponds to the word sacrament. It is a Latin word; and, agreeably to its derivation, it was applied by the early writers of the western church to any ceremony of our holy religion, especially if it were figurative or mystical. But a more confined signification of this word by degrees prevailed, and in that stricter sense it has been always used by the divines of modern times. Sacraments, says Dr. Hill, are conceived in the church of Rome to consist of matter, deriving, from the action of the priest in pronouncing certain words, a divine virtue, by which grace is conveyed to the soul of every person who receives them. It is supposed to be necessary that the priest, in pronouncing the words, has the intention of giving to the matter that divine virtue;

otherwise it remains in its original state. On the part of those who receive the sacrament, it is required that they be free from any of those sins, called in the church of Rome mortal; but it is not required of them to exercise any good disposition, to possess faith, or to resolve that they shall amend their lives; for such is conceived to be the physical virtue of a sacrament administered by a priest with a good intention, that, unless when it is opposed by the obstacle of a mortal sin, the very act of receiving it is sufficient. This act was called, in the language of the schools, *opus operatum*, the work done independently of any disposition of mind attending the deed; and the superiority of the sacraments of the New Testament over the sacraments of the Old was thus expressed, that the sacraments of the Old Testament were effectual *ex opere operantis*, from the piety and faith of the persons to whom they were administered; while the sacraments of the New Testament convey grace, *ex opere operato*, from their own intrinsic virtue, and an immediate physical influence upon the mind of him who receives them. This notion represents the sacraments as a mere charm, the use of which, being totally disjoined from every mental exercise, cannot be regarded as a reasonable service. It gives men the hope of receiving, by the use of a charm, the full participation of the grace of God, although they continue to indulge that very large class of sins, to which the accommodating morality of the church of Rome extends the name of venial; and yet it makes this high privilege entirely dependent upon the intention of another, who, although he performs all the outward acts which belong to the sacrament, may, if he chooses, withhold the communication of that physical virtue, without which the sacrament is of none avail.

The Socinian doctrine concerning the nature of the sacraments is founded upon a sense of the absurdity and danger of the popish doctrine, and a solicitude to avoid any approach to it, and runs into the opposite extreme. It is conceived that the sacraments are not essentially distinct from any other rites or ceremonies; that, as they consist of a symbolical action, in which something external and material is employed to represent what is spiritual and invisible, they may by this address to the senses be of use in reviving the remembrance of past events, and in cherishing pious sentiments; but that their effect is purely moral, and that they contribute, by that moral effect, to the improvement of the individual in the same manner with reading the Scriptures, and many other exercises of religion. It is admitted, indeed, by the Socinians, that the sacraments are of farther advantage to the whole society of Christians, as being the solemn badges by which the disciples of Jesus are discriminated from other men, and the appointed method of declaring that faith in Christ, by the public profession of which Christians minister to the improvement of one another. But in these two points, the moral effect upon the individual, and the advantage

to society, is contained all that a Socinian holds concerning the general nature of the sacraments. This doctrine, like all other parts of the Socinian system, represents religion in the simple view of being a lesson of righteousness, and loses sight of that character of the Gospel, which is meant to be implied in calling it a covenant of grace. The greater part of Protestants, therefore, following an expression of the Apostle, Rom. iv, 11, when he is speaking of circumcision, consider the sacraments as not only signs, but also seals, of the covenant of grace. Those who apply this phrase to the sacraments of the New Testament, admit every part of the Socinian doctrine concerning the nature of sacraments, and are accustomed to employ that doctrine to correct those popish errors upon this subject which are not yet eradicated from the minds of many of the people. But although they admit that the Socinian doctrine is true as far as it goes, they consider it as incomplete. For, while they hold that the sacraments yield no benefit to those upon whom the signs employed in them do not produce the proper moral effect, they regard these signs as intended to represent an inward invisible grace, which proceeds from him by whom they are appointed, and as pledges that that grace will be conveyed to all in whom the moral effect is produced. The sacraments, therefore, in their opinion, constitute federal acts, in which the persons who receive them with proper dispositions, solemnly engage to fulfil their part of the covenant, and God confirms his promise to them in a sensible manner; not as if the promise of God were of itself insufficient to render any event certain, but because this manner of exhibiting the blessings promised gives a stronger impression of the truth of the promise, and conveys to the mind an assurance that it will be fulfilled. According to this account of the sacraments, the express institution of God is essentially requisite to constitute their nature; and in this respect sacraments are distinguished from what may be called the ceremonies of religion. Ceremonies are in their nature arbitrary; and different means may be employed by different persons with success, according to their constitution, their education, and their circumstances, to cherish the sentiments of devotion, and to confirm good purposes. But no rite which is not ordained by God can be conceived to be a seal of his promise, or the pledge of any event that depends upon his good pleasure. Hence, that any rite may come up to our idea of a sacrament, we require in it, not merely a vague and general resemblance between the external matter which is the visible substance of the rite, and the thing thereby signified, but also words of institution, and a promise by which the two are connected together; and hence we reject five of the seven sacraments that are numbered in the church of Rome, because in some of the five we do not find any matter without which there is not that sign which enters into our definition of a sacrament; and in others we do not find any promise connecting the matter used with the grace said to be thereby signified, although upon this connection the essence of a sacrament depends.

SACRIFICE, properly so called, is the solemn infliction of death on a living creature, generally by the effusion of its blood, in a way of religious worship; and the presenting of this act to God, as a supplication for the pardon of sin, and a supposed means of compensation for the insult and injury thereby offered to his majesty and government. Sacrifices have, in all ages, and by almost every nation, been regarded as necessary to placate the divine anger, and render the Deity propitious. Though the Gentiles had lost the knowledge of the true God, they still retained such a dread of him, that they sometimes sacrificed their own offspring for the purpose of averting his anger. Unhappy and bewildered mortals, seeking relief from their guilty fears, hoped to atone for past crimes by committing others still more awful; they gave their first-born for their transgression, the fruit of their body for the sin of their soul. The Scriptures sufficiently indicate that sacrifices were instituted by divine appointment, immediately after the entrance of sin, to prefigure the sacrifice of Christ. Accordingly, we find Abel, Noah, Abraham, Job, and others, offering sacrifices in the faith of the Messiah; and the divine acceptance of their sacrifices is particularly recorded. But, in religious institutions, the Most High has ever been jealous of his prerogative. He alone prescribes his own worship; and he regards as vain and presumptuous every pretence of honouring him which he has not commanded. The sacrifice of blood and death could not have been offered to him without impiety, nor would he have accepted it, had not his high authority pointed the way by an explicit prescription.

Under the law, sacrifices of various kinds were appointed for the children of Israel; the paschal lamb, Exod. xii, 3; the holocaust, or whole burnt-offering, Lev. vii, 8; the sin-offering, or sacrifice of expiation, Lev. iv, 3, 4; and the peace-offering, or sacrifice of thanksgiving, Lev. vii, 11, 12; all of which emblematically set forth the sacrifice of Christ, being the instituted types and shadows of it, Heb. ix, 9–15; x, 1. Accordingly, Christ abolished the whole of them when he offered his own sacrifice. “Above, when he said, Sacrifice, and offering, and burnt-offerings, and offering for sin, thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein, which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once for all,” Heb. x, 8–10; 1 Cor. v, 7. In illustrating this fundamental doctrine of Christianity, the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, sets forth the excellency of the sacrifice of our great High Priest above those of the law in various particulars. The legal sacrifices were only brute animals, such as bullocks, heifers, goats, lambs, &c; but the sacrifice of Christ was himself, a person of infinite dignity and worth, Heb. ix, 12, 13; i, 3; ix, 14, 26; x, 10. The former, though they cleansed from ceremonial uncleanness, could not

possibly expiate sin, or purify the conscience from the guilt of it; and so it is said that God was not well pleased in them, Heb. x, 4, 5, 8, 11. But Christ, by the sacrifice of himself, hath effectually, and for ever, put away sin, having made an adequate atonement unto God for it, and by means of faith in it he also purges the conscience from dead works to serve the living God, Heb. ix, 10–26; Ephes. v, 2. The legal sacrifices were statedly offered, year after year, by which their insufficiency was indicated, and an intimation given that God was still calling sins to his remembrance, Heb. x, 3; but the last required no repetition, because it fully and at once answered all the ends of sacrifice, on which account God hath declared that he will remember the sins and iniquities of his people no more.

The term sacrifice is often used in a secondary or metaphorical sense, and applied to the good works of believers, and to the duties of prayer and praise, as in the following passages: “But to do good, and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased,” Heb. xiii, 16. “Having received of Epaphroditus the things which ye sent, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God,” Phil. iv, 18. “Ye are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ,” 1 Peter ii, 5. “By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually; that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name,” Heb. xiii, 15. “I beseech you, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service,” Rom. xii, 1. “There is a peculiar reason,” says Dr. Owen, “for assigning this appellation to moral duties; for in every sacrifice there was a presentation of something unto God. The worshipper was not to offer that which cost him nothing; part of his substance was to be transferred from himself unto God. So it is in these duties; they cannot be properly observed without the alienation of something that was our own,—our time, ease, property, &c, and a dedication of it to the Lord. Hence they have the general nature of sacrifices.” The ceremonies used in offering the Jewish sacrifices require to be noticed as illustrative of many texts of Scripture, and some points of important doctrine. See Atonement, Offerings, Expiation, Propitiation, Reconciliation, and Redemption.

SADDUCEES, a sect among the Jews. It is said that the principles of the Sadducees were derived from Antigonus Sochæus, president of the sanhedrim, about B. C. 250, who, rejecting the traditionary doctrines of the scribes, taught that man ought to serve God out of pure love, and not from hope of reward, or fear of punishment; and that they derived their name from Sadoc, one of his followers, who, mistaking or perverting this doctrine, maintained that there was no future state of rewards and punishments. Whatever foundation there may be for this account of the

origin of the sect, it is certain, that in the time of our Saviour the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead, Acts xxiii, 8, and the existence of angels and spirits, or souls of departed men; though, as Mr. Hume observes, it is not easy to comprehend how they could at the same time admit the authority of the law of Moses. They carried their ideas of human freedom so far as to assert that men were absolutely masters of their own actions, and at full liberty to do either good or evil. Josephus even says that they denied the essential difference between good and evil; and, though they believed that God created and preserved the world, they seem to have denied his particular providence. These tenets, which resemble the Epicurean philosophy, led, as might be expected, to great profligacy of life; and we find the licentious wickedness of the Sadducees frequently condemned in the New Testament; yet they professed themselves obliged to observe the Mosaic law, because of the temporal rewards and punishments annexed to such observance; and hence they were always severe in their punishment of any crimes which tended to disturb the public tranquillity. 836The Sadducees rejected all tradition, and some authors have contended that they admitted only the books of Moses; but there seems no ground for that opinion, either in the Scriptures or in any ancient writer. Even Josephus, who was himself a Pharisee, and took every opportunity of reproaching the Sadducees, does not mention that they rejected any part of the Scriptures; he only says that “the Pharisees have delivered to the people many institutions as received from the fathers, which are not written in the law of Moses. For this reason the Sadducees reject these things, asserting that those things are binding which are written, but that the things received by tradition from the fathers are not to be observed.” Beside, it is generally believed that the Sadducees expected the Messiah with great impatience, which seems to imply their belief in the prophecies, though they misinterpreted their meaning. Confining all their hopes to this present world, enjoying its riches, and devoting themselves to its pleasures, they might well be particularly anxious that their lot of life should be cast in the splendid reign of this expected temporal king, with the hope of sharing in his conquests and glory; but this expectation was so contrary to the lowly appearance of our Saviour, that they joined their inveterate enemies, the Pharisees, in persecuting him and his religion. Josephus says, that the Sadducees were able to draw over to them the rich only, the people not following them; and he elsewhere mentions that this sect spread chiefly among the young. The Sadducees were far less numerous than the Pharisees, but they were in general persons of greater opulence and dignity. The council before whom our Saviour and St. Paul were carried consisted partly of Pharisees and partly of Sadducees.

SALAMIS, once a famous city in the isle of Cyprus, opposite to Seleucia, on the Syrian coast; and as it was the first place where the Gospel was



preached, it was in the primitive times made the see of the primate of the whole island. It was destroyed by the Saracens, and from the ruins was built Famagusta, which was taken by the Turks in 1570. Here St. Paul preached, A. D. 44, Acts xiii, 5.

SALMON, son of Nahshon: he married Rahab, by whom he had Boaz, 1 Chron. ii, 11, 51, 54; Ruth iv, 20, 21; Matt. i, 4. He is named the father of Bethlehem, because his descendants peopled Bethlehem.

SALOME, the wife of Zebedee, and mother of St. James the greater, and St. John the evangelist, Matthew xxvii, 56; and one of those holy women who used to attend upon our Saviour in his journeyings, and to minister to him. She was the person who requested of Jesus Christ, that her two sons, James and John, might sit on his right and left hand when he should enter upon his kingdom, having then but the same obscure views as the rest of the disciples; but she gave proof of her faith when she followed Christ to Calvary, and did not forsake him even at the cross, Mark xv, 40; Matt. xxvii, 55, 56. She was also one of the women that brought perfumes to embalm him, and who came, for this purpose, to the sepulchre "early in the morning," Mark xvi, 1, 2. At the tomb they saw two angels, who informed them that Jesus was risen. Returning to Jerusalem, Jesus appeared to them on the way, and said to them, "Be not afraid: go, tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me."

SALT. God appointed that salt should be used in all the sacrifices that were offered to him, Leviticus ii, 13. Salt is esteemed the symbol of wisdom and grace, Colossians iv, 6; Mark ix, 50; also of perpetuity and incorruption, Numbers xviii, 19; 2 Chronicles xiii, 5. The orientals were accustomed also to ratify their federal engagements by salt. This substance was, among the ancients, the emblem of friendship and fidelity, and therefore used in all their sacrifices and covenants. It was a sacred pledge of hospitality which they never ventured to violate. Numerous instances occur of travellers in Arabia, after being plundered and stripped by the wandering tribes of the desert, claiming the protection of some civilized Arab, who, after receiving them into his tent, and giving them salt, instantly relieves their distress, and never forsakes them till he has placed them in safety. An agreement, thus ratified, is called, in Scripture, "a covenant of salt." The obligation which this symbol imposes on the mind of an oriental, is well illustrated by the Baron du Tott in the following anecdote: One who was desirous of his acquaintance promised in a short time to return. The baron had already attended him half way down the staircase, when stopping, and turning briskly to one of his domestics, "Bring me directly," said he, "some bread and salt." What he requested was brought; when, taking a little salt between

his fingers, and putting it with a mysterious air on a bit of bread, he ate it with a devout gravity, assuring du Tott he might now rely on him.

Although salt, in small quantities, may contribute to the communicating and fertilizing of some kinds of stubborn soil, yet, according to the observations of Pliny, “all places in which salt is found are barren and produce nothing.” The effect of salt, where it abounds, on vegetation, is described by burning, in Deut. xxix, 23, “The whole land thereof is brimstone, and salt of burning.” Thus Volney, speaking of the borders of the Asphaltic lake, or Dead Sea, says, “The true cause of the absence of vegetables and animals is the acrid saltness of its waters, which is infinitely greater than that of the sea. The land surrounding the lake, being equally impregnated with that saltness, refuses to produce plants; the air itself, which is by evaporation loaded with it, and which moreover receives vapours of sulphur and bitumen, cannot suit vegetation; whence that dead appearance which reigns around the lake.” So a salt land, Jer. xvii, 6, is the same as the “parched places of the wilderness,” and is descriptive of barrenness, as saltness also is, Job xxxix, 6; Psalm cvii, 34; Ezek. xlvi, 11; Zech. ii, 9. Hence the ancient custom of sowing an enemy’s city, 837 when taken, with salt, in token of perpetual desolation, Judges iv, 45; and thus in after times the city of Milan was burned, razed, sown with salt, and ploughed by the exasperated emperor, Frederic Barbarossa. The salt used by the ancients was what we call rock or fossil salt; and also that left by the evaporation of salt lakes. Both these kinds were impure, being mixed with earth, sand, &c, and lost their strength by deliquescence. Maundrell, describing the valley of salt, says, “On the side toward Gibul there is a small precipice, occasioned by the continual taking away of the salt; and in this you may see how the veins of it lie. I broke a piece of it, of which that part that was exposed to the sun, rain, and air, though it had the sparks and particles of salt, yet it had perfectly lost its savour; the inner part, which was connected with the rock, retained its savour, as I found by proof.” Christ reminds his disciples, Matt. v, 13, “Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.” This is spoken of the mineral salt as mentioned by Maundrell, a great deal of which was made use of in offerings at the temple; such of it as had become insipid was thrown out to repair the road. The existence of such a salt, and its application to such a use, Schoetgenius has largely proved in his “*Horæ Hebraicæ*.” The salt unfit for the land, Luke xvi, 34, Le Clerc conjectures to be that made of wood ashes, which easily loses its savour, and becomes no longer serviceable.

*Effœtos cinerem immundum jactare per agros.*

Virgil. *Georg.* i, 81.

“But blush not fattening dung to cast around,  
Or sordid ashes o’er th’ exhausted ground.”

Warton.

SALUTATIONS at meeting are not less common in the east than in the countries of Europe, but are generally confined to those of their own nation or religious party. When the Arabs salute each other, it is generally in these terms: *Salum aleikum*, “Peace be with you;” laying, as they utter the words, the right hand on the heart. The answer is, *Aleikum essalum*, “With you be peace;” to which aged people are inclined to add, “and the mercy and blessing of God.” The Mohammedans of Egypt and Syria never salute a Christian in these terms: they content themselves with saying to them, “Good day to you;” or, “Friend, how do you do?” Niebuhr’s statement is confirmed by Mr. Bruce, who says that some Arabs, to whom he gave the *salam*, or salutation of peace, either made no reply, or expressed their astonishment at his impudence in using such freedom. Thus it appears that the orientals have two kinds of salutations; one for strangers, and the other for their own countrymen, or persons of their own religious profession. The Jews in the days of our Lord seem to have generally observed the same custom; they would not address the usual compliment of, “Peace be with you,” to either Heathens or publicans; the publicans of the Jewish nation would use it to their countrymen who were publicans, but not to Heathens, though the more rigid Jews refused to do it either to publicans or Heathens. Our Lord required his disciples to lay aside the moroseness of Jews, and cherish a benevolent disposition toward all around them: “If ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? Do not even the publicans so?” They were bound by the same authority to embrace their brethren in Christ with a special affection, yet they were to look upon every man as a brother, to feel a sincere and cordial interest in his welfare, and at meeting to express their benevolence, in language corresponding with the feelings of their hearts. This precept is not inconsistent with the charge which the Prophet Elisha gave to his servant Gehazi, not to salute any man he met, nor return his salutation; for he wished him to make all the haste in his power to restore the child of the Shunamite, who had laid him under so many obligations. The manners of the country rendered Elisha’s precautions particularly proper and necessary, as the salutations of the east often take up a long time. For a similar reason our Lord himself commanded his disciples on one occasion to salute no man by the way: it is not to be supposed that he would require his followers to violate or neglect an innocent custom, still less one of his own precepts; he only directed them to make the best use of their time in executing his work. This precaution was rendered necessary by the length of time which their tedious forms of salutation required. They begin their salutations at a considerable distance, by bringing the hand down to the knees, and then carrying it to the stomach. They express their devotedness to a person by

holding down the hand, as they do their affection by raising it afterward to the heart. When they come close together, they take each other by the hand in token of friendship. The country people at meeting clap each other's hands very smartly twenty or thirty times together, without saying any thing more than, "How do ye do? I wish you good health." After this first compliment, many other friendly questions about the health of the family, mentioning each of the children distinctly, whose names they know. To avoid this useless waste of time, our Lord commanded them to avoid the customary salutations of those whom they might happen to meet by the way. All the forms of salutation now observed appear to have been in general use in the days of our Lord; for he represents a servant as falling down at the feet of his master, when he had a favour to ask; and an inferior servant, as paying the same compliment to the first, who belonged, it would seem, to a higher class; "The servant, therefore, fell down and worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. And his fellow servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all," Matt. xviii, 26, 29. When Jairus solicited the Saviour to go and heal his daughter, he fell down at his feet: the Apostle Peter, on another occasion, seems to have fallen down at his knees, in the same manner as the modern Arabs fall down at the knees of a superior. The woman who was afflicted with an issue of blood touched the hem of his garment, and the Syro-Phenician woman fell down at his feet. In Persia, the salutation among intimate friends is made by inclining the neck over each other's neck, and then inclining cheek to cheek; which Mr. Morier thinks is most likely the falling upon the neck and kissing, so frequently mentioned in Scripture, Gen. xxxiii, 4; xlv, 14; Luke xv, 20.

SALVATION imports, in general, some great deliverance from any evil or danger. Thus, the conducting the Israelites through the Red Sea, and delivering them out of the hands of the Egyptians, is called a great salvation. But salvation by way of eminence, is applied to that wonderful deliverance which our blessed Saviour procured for mankind, by saving them from the punishment of their sins; and in the New Testament is the same as our redemption by Christ. This is that salvation referred to by St. Paul: "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" The salvation which Christ purchased, and the Gospel tenders to every creature, comprehends the greatest blessings which God can bestow; a deliverance from the most dreadful evils that mankind can suffer. It contains all that can make the nature of man perfect or his life happy, and secures him from whatever can render his condition miserable. The blessings of it are inexpressible, and beyond imagination. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." For, to be saved as Christ saves, is to have all our innumerable sins and transgressions forgiven and blotted out;

all those heavy loads of guilt which oppressed our souls perfectly removed from our minds. It is to be reconciled to God, and restored to his favour, so that he will be no longer angry, terrible, and retributive, but a most kind, compassionate, and tender Father. It is to be at peace with him and with our consciences; to have a title to his peculiar love, care, and protection, all our days; to be rescued from the bondage and dominion of sin, and the tyranny of the devil. It is to be translated from the power of darkness, into the kingdom of Christ; so that sin shall reign no longer in our mortal bodies, but we shall be enabled to serve God in newness of life. It is to be placed in a state of true freedom and liberty, to be no longer under the control of blind passions, and hurried on by our impetuous lusts to do what our reason condemns. It is to have a new principle of life infused into our souls; to have the Holy Spirit resident in our hearts, whose comfortable influence must ever cheer and refresh us, and by whose counsels we may be always advised, directed, and governed. It is to be transformed into the image of God; and to be made like him in wisdom, righteousness, and all other perfections of which man's nature is capable.

Finally, to be saved as Christ came to save mankind, is to be translated, after this life is ended, into a state of eternal felicity, never more to die or suffer, never more to know pain and sickness, grief and sorrow, labour and weariness, disquiet, or vexation, but to live in perfect peace, freedom, and liberty, and to enjoy the greatest good after the most perfect manner for ever. It is to have our bodies raised again, and reunited to our souls; so that they shall be no longer gross, earthly, corruptible bodies, but spiritual, heavenly, immortal ones, fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body, in which he now sits at the right hand of God. It is to live in the city of the great King, the heavenly Jerusalem, where the glory of the Lord fills the place with perpetual light and bliss. It is to spend eternity in the most noble and hallowed employments, in viewing and contemplating the wonderful works of God, admiring the wisdom of his providence, adoring his infinite love to the sons of men, reflecting on our own inexpressible happiness, and singing everlasting hymns of praise, joy, and triumph to God and our Lord Jesus Christ for vouchsafing all these blessings. It is to dwell for ever in a place, where no objects of pity or compassion, of anger or envy, of hatred or distrust, are to be found; but where all will increase the happiness of each other, by mutual love and kindness. It is to converse with the most perfect society, to be restored to the fellowship of our friends and relations who have died in the faith of Christ, and to be with Jesus Christ, to behold his glory, to live for ever in seeing and enjoying the great God, in "whose presence is fulness of joy, and at whose right hand are pleasures for evermore." This is the salvation that Christ has purchased for us; and which his Gospel offers to all mankind.

SAMARIA, one of the three divisions of the Holy Land, having Galilee on the north, Judea on the south, the river Jordan on the east, and the Mediterranean Sea on the west. It took its name from its capital city, Samaria; and formed, together with Galilee and some cantons on the east of Jordan, during the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah, the kingdom of the former. The general aspect and produce of the country are nearly the same as those of Judea. But Mr. Buckingham observes, that “while in Judea the hills are mostly as bare as the imagination can paint them, and a few of the narrow valleys only are fertile, in Samaria, the very summits of the eminences are as well clothed as the sides of them. These, with the luxuriant valleys which they enclose, present scenes of unbroken verdure in almost every point of view, which are delightfully variegated by the picturesque forms of the hills and vales themselves, enriched by the occasional sight of wood and water, in clusters of olive and other trees, and rills and torrents running among them.”

2. Samaria, the capital city of the kingdom of the ten tribes that revolted from the house of David. It was built by Omri, king of Israel, 839 who began to reign A. M. 3079, and who died 3086. He bought the hill Samaria of Shemer for two talents of silver, or for the sum of 6841. 7s. 6d. It took the name of Samaria from Shemer, the owner of the hill, 1 Kings xvi, 24. Some think, however, that there were before this some beginnings of a city in that place, because, antecedent to the reign of Omri, there is mention made of Samaria, 1 Kings xiii, 32, A. M. 3030. But others take this for a prolepsis, or an anticipation, in the discourse of the man of God. However this may be, it is certain that Samaria was no considerable place, and did not become the capital of the kingdom, till after the reign of Omri. Before him, the kings of Israel dwelt at Shechem or at Tirzah. Samaria was advantageously situated upon an agreeable and fruitful hill, twelve miles from Dothaim, twelve from Merrom, and four from Atharath. Josephus says it was a day’s journey from Jerusalem. The kings of Samaria omitted nothing to make this city the strongest, the finest, and the richest that was possible. Ahab built there a palace of ivory, 1 Kings xxii, 39; that is, in which there were many ivory ornaments; and, according to Amos, iii, 15; iv, 1, 2, it became the seat of luxury and effeminacy. Benhadad, king of Syria, built public places, called “streets,” in Samaria, 1 Kings xx, 34; probably bazaars for trade, and quarters where his people dwelt to pursue commerce. His son Benhadad besieged this place under the reign of Ahab, 1 Kings xx, A. M. 3103. It was besieged by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, in the ninth year of the reign of Hoshea, king of Israel, 2 Kings xvii, 6, &c, which was the fourth of Hezekiah, king of Judah. It was taken three years after, A. M. 3283. The Prophet Hosea, x, 4, 8, 9, speaks of the cruelties exercised by Shalmaneser against the besieged; and Micah, i, 6, says that the city was reduced to a heap of stones. The Cuthites that were sent by

Esar-haddon to inhabit the country of Samaria did not think it worth their while to repair the ruined city: they dwelt at Shechem, which they made the capital city of their state. They were in this condition when Alexander the Great came into Phenicia and Judea. However, the Cuthites had rebuilt some of the houses of Samaria, even from the time of the return of the Jews from the captivity, since the inhabitants of Samaria are spoken of, Ezra iv, 17; Neh. iv, 2. And the Samaritans, being jealous of the Jews, on account of the favours that Alexander the Great had conferred on them, revolted from him, while he was in Egypt, and burned Andromachus alive, whom he had left governor of Syria. Alexander soon marched against them, took Samaria, and appointed Macedonians to inhabit it, giving the country round it to the Jews; and to encourage them in the cultivation, he exempted them from tribute. The kings of Egypt and Syria, who succeeded Alexander, deprived them of the property of this country. But Alexander Balas, king of Syria, restored to Jonathan Maccabæus the cities of Lydda, Ephrem, and Ramatha, which he cut off from the country of Samaria, 1 Macc. x, 30, 38; xi, 28, 34. Lastly, the Jews reëntered into the full possession of this whole country under John Hircanus, the Asmonean, who took Samaria, and, according to Josephus, made the river run through its ruins. It continued in this state till A. M. 3947, when Aulus Gabinius, the proconsul of Syria, rebuilt it, and gave it the name of Gabiniana. Yet it remained very inconsiderable till Herod the Great restored it to its ancient splendour.

The sacred authors of the New Testament speak but little of Samaria; and when they do mention it, the country is rather to be understood than the city, Luke xvii, 11; John iv, 4, 5. After the death of Stephen, Acts viii, 1, 2, 3, when the disciples were dispersed through the cities of Judea and Samaria, Philip made several converts in this city. There it was that Simon Magus resided, and thither Peter and John went to communicate the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Travellers give the following account of its present state:--Sebaste is the name which Herod gave to the name of the ancient Samaria, the imperial city of the ten tribes, in honour of Augustus (Sebastos) Cæsar, when he rebuilt and fortified it, converting the greater part of it into a citadel, and erecting here a noble temple. "The situation," says Dr. Richardson, "is extremely beautiful, and strong by nature; more so, I think, than Jerusalem. It stands on a fine, large, insulated hill, compassed all around by a broad deep valley; and when fortified, as it is stated to have been by Herod, one would have imagined that, in the ancient system of warfare, nothing but famine could have reduced such a place. The valley is surrounded by four hills, one on each side, which are cultivated in terraces up to the top, sown with grain, and planted with fig and olive trees, as is also the valley. The

hill of Samaria likewise rises in terraces to a height equal to any of the adjoining mountains. The present village is small and poor, and, after passing the valley, the ascent to it is very steep. Viewed from the station of our tents, it is extremely interesting, both from its natural situation, and from the picturesque remains of a ruined convent, of good Gothic architecture. Having passed the village, toward the middle of the first terrace, there is a number of columns still standing. I counted twelve in one row, beside several that stood apart, the brotherless remains of other rows. The situation is extremely delightful, and my guide informed me, that they belonged to the serai, or palace. On the next terrace there are no remains of solid building, but heaps of stone and lime and rubbish mixed with the soil in great profusion. Ascending to the third or highest terrace, the traces of former building were not so numerous, but we enjoyed a delightful view of the surrounding country. The eye passed over the deep valley that encompasses the hill of Sebaste, and rested on the mountains beyond, that retreated as they rose with a gentle slope, and met the 840view in every direction, like a book laid out for perusal on a reading desk. This was the seat of the capital of the short-lived and wicked kingdom of Israel; and on the face of these mountains the eye surveys the scene of many bloody conflicts and many memorable events. Here those holy men of God, Elijah and Elisha, spoke their tremendous warnings in the ears of their incorrigible rulers, and wrought their miracles in the sight of all the people. From this lofty eminence we descended to the south side of the hill, where we saw the remains of a stately colonnade that stretches along this beautiful exposure from east to west. Sixty columns are still standing in one row. The shafts are plain; and fragments of Ionic volutes, that lie scattered about, testify the order to which they belonged. These are probably the relics of some of the magnificent structures with which Herod the Great adorned Samaria. None of the walls remain." Mr. Buckingham mentions a current tradition, that the avenue of columns formed a part of Herod's palace. According to his account, there were eighty-three of these columns erect in 1816, beside others prostrate; all without capitals. Josephus states, that, about the middle of the city, Herod built "a sacred place, of a furlong and a half in circuit, and adorned it with all sorts of decorations; and therein erected a temple, illustrious for both its largeness and beauty." It is probable that these columns belonged to it. On the eastern side of the same summit are the remains, Mr. Buckingham states, of another building, "of which eight large and eight small columns are still standing, with many others fallen near them. These also are without capitals, and are of a smaller size and of an inferior stone to the others." "In the walls of the humble dwellings forming the modern village, portions of sculptured blocks of stone are perceived, and even fragments of granite pillars have been worked into the masonry."



SAMARITANS, an ancient sect among the Jews, still subsisting in some parts of the Levant, under the same name. Its origin was in the time of Rehoboam, under whose reign a division was made of the people of Israel into two distinct kingdoms. One of these kingdoms, called Judah, consisted of such as adhered to Rehoboam and the house of David; the other retained the ancient name of Israelites, under the command of Jeroboam. The capital of the state of these latter was Samaria; and hence it was that they were denominated Samaritans. Some affirm that Salmanazar, king of Assyria, having conquered Samaria, led the whole people captive into the remotest parts of his empire, and filled their places with colonies of Babylonians, Cutheans, and other idolaters. These finding themselves daily destroyed by wild beasts, it is said, desired an Israelitish priest to instruct them in the ancient laws and customs of the land they inhabited. This was granted them; and they thenceforth ceased to be incommoded with any beasts. However, with the law of Moses, they still retained somewhat of their ancient idolatry. The rabbins say, they adored the figure of a dove on Mount Gerizim. As the revolted tribes had no more of the Scriptures than the five books of Moses, so the priest could bring no others with him beside those books written in the old Phenician letters.

Upon the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, the religion of the Samaritans received another alteration on the following occasion: one of the sons of Jehoiada, the high priest, whom Josephus calls Manasseh, married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite; but the law of God having forbidden the intermarriages of the Israelites with any other nation, Nehemiah set himself to reform this corruption, which had spread into many Jewish families, and obliged all that had taken strange wives immediately to part with them, Neh. xiii, 23–30. Manasseh, unwilling to surrender his wife, fled to Samaria; and many others in the same circumstances, and with similar disposition, went and settled under the protection of Sanballat, governor of Samaria. Manasseh brought with him some other apostate priests, with many other Jews, who disliked the regulations made by Nehemiah at Jerusalem; and now the Samaritans, having obtained a high priest, and other priests of the descendants from Aaron, were soon brought off from the worship of the false gods, and became as much enemies to idolatry as the best of the Jews. However, Manasseh gave them no other Scriptures beside the Pentateuch, lest, if they had the other Scriptures, they should then find that Jerusalem was the only place where they should offer their sacrifices. From that time the worship of the Samaritans came much nearer to that of the Jews, and they afterward obtained leave of Alexander the Great to build a temple on Mount Gerizim, near the city of Samaria, in imitation of the temple at Jerusalem, where they practised the same forms of worship. To this mountain and temple the Samaritan woman of Sychar

refers in her discourse with our Saviour, John iv, 20. The Samaritans soon after revolted from Alexander, who drove them out of Samaria, introduced Macedonians in their room, and gave the province of Samaria to the Jews. This circumstance contributed in no small degree to increase the hatred and animosity between those two people. When any Israelite deserved punishment on account of the violation of some important point of the law, he presently took refuge in Samaria or Shechem, and embraced the worship at the temple of Gerizim. When the affairs of the Jews were prosperous, the Samaritans did not fail to call themselves Hebrews, and of the race of Abraham. But when the Jews suffered persecution, the Samaritans disowned them, and alleged that they were Phenicians originally, or descended from Joseph, or Manasseh his son. This was their practice in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. It is certain, the modern Samaritans are far from idolatry; some of the most learned among the Jewish doctors own, that they observe the law of 841Moses more rigidly than the Jews themselves. They have a Hebrew copy of the Pentateuch, differing in some respects from that of the Jews; and written in different characters, commonly called Samaritan characters; which Origen, Jerom, and other fathers and critics, ancient and modern, take to be the primitive character of the ancient Hebrews, though others maintain the contrary. The point of preference, as to purity, antiquity, &c, of the two Pentateuchs, is also much disputed by modern critics.

The Samaritans are now few in number; though it is not very long since they pretended to have priests descended directly from the family of Aaron. They were chiefly found at Gaza, Neapolis or Shechem, (the ancient Sicheu or Naplouse,) Damascus, Cairo, &c. They had a temple, or chapel, on Mount Gerizim, where they performed their sacrifices. They have also synagogues in other parts of Palestine, and also in Egypt. Joseph Scaliger, being curious to know their usages, wrote to the Samaritans of Egypt, and to the high priest of the whole sect, who resided at Neapolis. They returned two answers, dated in the year 998 of the Hegira of Mohammed. These answers never came to the hands of Scaliger. They are now in the library at Paris, and have been translated into Latin by Father Morin, priest of the oratory; and printed in the collection of letters of that father in England, 1662, under the title of “*Antiquitates Ecclesie Orientalis.*” M. Simon has inserted a French translation in the first edition of “*Ceremonies et Coutumes des Juifs,*” in the manner of a supplement to Leo de Modena. In the first of these answers, written in the name of the assembly of Israel, in Egypt, they declare that they celebrate the passover every year, on the fourteenth day of the first month, on Mount Gerizim, and that he who then did the office of high priest was called Eleazar, a descendant of Phinehas, son of Aaron. In the second answer, which is in the name of the high priest Eleazar, and the synagogue of Shechem, they declare, that they keep the

Sabbath in all the rigour with which it is enjoined in the book of Exodus; none among them stirring out of doors, but to the synagogue. They add, that they begin the feast of the passover with the sacrifice appointed for that purpose in Exodus; that they sacrifice no where else but on Mount Gerizim; that they observe the feasts of harvest, the expiation, the tabernacles, &c. They add farther, that they never defer circumcision beyond the eighth day; never marry their nieces, as the Jews do; have but one wife; and, in fine, do nothing but what is commanded in the law: whereas the Jews frequently abandon the law to follow the inventions of their rabbins. At the time when they wrote to Scaliger, they reckoned one hundred and twenty-two high priests; affirmed that the Jews had no high priests of the race of Phinehas; and that the Jews belied them in calling them Cutheans; for that they are descended from the tribe of Joseph by Ephraim.

SAMSON, son of Manoah, of the tribe of Dan, Judges xiii, 2, &c. We are no where acquainted with the name of his mother. He was born, A. M. 2849, and was a Nazarite from his infancy, by the divine command. He was brought up in a place called the camp of Dan, between Zorah and Estaol, Judges xiii, 25. His extraordinary achievements are particularly recorded in Judges xiv-xvi. "Faith" is attributed to him by St. Paul, though whether he retained it to the end of his life may be doubted. He is not inaptly called by an old writer, "a rough believer."

SAMUEL, the son of Elkanah and of Hannah, of the tribe of Levi, and family of Kohath, was born, A. M. 2848. He was an eminent inspired prophet, historian, and the seventeenth and last Judge of Israel; and died in the ninety-eighth year of his age, two years before Saul, A. M. 2947, 1 Sam. xxv. To Samuel are ascribed the book of Judges, that of Ruth, and the first book of Samuel. There is, indeed, great probability that he composed the first twenty-four chapters of the first book of Samuel; since they contain nothing but what he might have written, and such transactions as he was chiefly concerned in. However, in these chapters there are some small additions, which seem to have been inserted after his death. Samuel began the order of the prophets, which was never discontinued till the death of Zechariah and Malachi, Acts iii, 24. From early youth to hoary years, the character of Samuel is one on which the mind rests with veneration and delight.

SANBALLAT, the governor of the Cuthites or Samaritans, and an enemy to the Jews. He was a native of Horon, a city beyond Jordan, in the country of the Moabites, Neh. ii, 10, 19; iv, vi.

SANCTIFICATION, that work of God's grace by which we are renewed after the image of God, set apart for his service, and enabled to die unto sin and live unto righteousness. Sanctification is either of nature, whereby we are renewed after the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, Eph. iv, 24; Col. iii, 19, or of practice, whereby we die unto sin, have its power destroyed in us, cease from the love and practice of it, hate it as abominable, and live unto righteousness, loving and studying good works, Tit. ii, 11, 12. Sanctification comprehends all the graces of knowledge, faith, repentance, love, humility, zeal, patience, &c, and the exercise of them in our conduct toward God or man, Gal. v, 22–24; 1 Peter i, 15, 16; Matt. v, vi, vii. Sanctification in this world must be complete; the whole nature must be sanctified, all sin must be utterly abolished, or the soul can never be admitted into the glorious presence of God, Heb. xii, 14; 1 Peter i, 15; Rev. xxi, 27; yet the saints, while here, are in a state of spiritual warfare with Satan and his temptations, with the world and its influence, 2 Cor. ii, 11; Gal. v, 17, 24; Rom. vii, 23; 1 John ii, 15, 16.

SANCTIFY. In the Old Testament, to sanctify often denotes to separate from a common to a holy purpose; to set apart or consecrate to God as his special property, and for his service. 842Our Lord also uses this term, when he says, "For their sakes I sanctify myself," John xvii, 19; that is, I separate and dedicate myself to be a sacrifice to God for them, "that they also may be sanctified through the truth;" that is, that they may be cleansed from the guilt of sin. Under the law of Moses, there was a church purity, or ceremonial sanctification, which might be obtained by the observance of external rites and ordinances, while persons were destitute of internal purity or holiness. Every defiled person was made "common," and excluded from the privilege of a right to draw nigh to God in his solemn worship; but in his purification he was again separated to him, and restored to his sacred right. Hence St. Paul speaks of "the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, as sanctifying unto the purifying of the flesh," Heb. ix, 13. These things were in reality of no moral worth or value; they were merely typical institutions, intended to represent the blessings of the new and better covenant, those "good things that were to come;" and therefore God is frequently spoken of in the prophets as despising them, namely, in any other view than that for which his wisdom had ordained them, Isaiah i, 11–15; Psalm 1, 8, 9; li, 16. But that dispensation is now at an end; under the New Testament, the state of things is changed, for now "neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." The thing signified, namely, internal purity and holiness, is no less necessary to a right to the privileges of the Gospel, than the observance of those external rites was unto the privileges of the law.

SANCTUARY. See Temple.

SANDALS, at first, were only soles tied to the feet with strings or thongs; afterward they were covered; and at last they called even shoes sandals. When Judith went to the camp of Holofernes, she put sandals on her feet; and her sandals ravished his eyes, Judith x, 4; xvi, 9. They were a magnificent kind of buskins proper only to ladies of condition, and such as dressed themselves for admiration. But there were sandals also belonging to men, and of mean value. We read, "If the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband's brother will not perform the duty of a husband's brother; then shall his brother's wife come unto him, in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face; and shall say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house. And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him who hath had his shoe loosed," Deuteronomy xxv, 7. A late writer observes that the word rendered "shoe," usually means "sandal," that is, a mere sole fastened on the foot in a very simple manner; and that the primary and radical meaning of the word rendered face, is surface, the superficies of any thing. Hence he would submit, that the passage may be to the following purpose: The brother's wife shall loose the sandal from off the foot of her husband's brother; and shall spit upon its face or surface, (that is, of the shoe,) and shall say, &c. This ceremony is coincident with certain customs among the Turks. We are told that in a complaint against her own husband, for withholding himself from her intimacy, the wife when before the judge takes off her own shoe, and spits upon it; but in case of complaint against her husband's brother, she takes off his shoe and spits upon it.

The business of untying and carrying the sandals being that of a servant, the expressions of the Baptist, "whose shoes I am not worthy to bear," "whose shoe latchet I am not worthy to unloose," was an acknowledgment of his great inferiority to Christ, and that Christ was his Lord. To pull off the sandals on entering a sacred place, or the house of a person of distinction, was the usual mark of respect. They were taken care of by the attendant servant. At the doors of an Indian pagoda, there are as many sandals and slippers hung up, as there are hats in our places of worship.

SANHEDRIM, SANHEDRIN, or SYNEDRIUM, among the ancient Jews, the supreme council, or court of judicature, of that republic; in which were despatched all the great affairs both of religion and policy. The word is derived from the Greek συνέδριον, a council, assembly, or company of people sitting together; from σύν, together, and ἡδρα, a seat. Many of the learned agree, that it was instituted by Moses, Numbers xi; and consisted at first of seventy elders, who judged finally of all causes and affairs; and

that they subsisted, without intermission, from Moses to Ezra, Deut. xxvii, 1; xxxi, 9; Josh. xxiv, 1, 31; Judg. ii, 7; 2 Chron. xix, 8; Ezek. viii, 11. Others will have it, that the council of seventy elders, established by Moses, was temporary, and did not hold after his death; adding, that we find no sign of any such perpetual and infallible tribunal throughout the whole Old Testament; and that the sanhedrim was first set up in the time when the Maccabees, or Asmoneans, took upon themselves the administration of the government under the title of high priests, and afterward of kings, that is, after the persecution of Antiochus. This is by far the most probable opinion. The Jews, however, contend strenuously for the antiquity of their great sanhedrim: M. Simon strengthens and defends their proofs, and M. Le Clerc attacks them. Whatever may be the origin and establishment of the sanhedrim, it is certain that it was subsisting in the time of our Saviour, since it is spoken of in the Gospels, Matt. v, 21; Mark xiii, 9; xiv, 55; xv, 1; and since Jesus Christ himself was arraigned and condemned by it; that it was held at Jerusalem; and that the decision of all the most important affairs among the Jews belonged to it. The president of this assembly was called nasi, or prince; his deputy was called abbeth-din, father of the house of judgment; and the sub-deputy was called chacan, the wise: the rest were denominated tzekanim, elders or senators. The room in which they sat was a rotunda, half of which was built without the temple, and half within; that is, one semicircle <sup>843</sup>of the room was within the compass of the temple; and as it was never allowed to sit down in the temple, they tell us this part was for those who stood up; the other half, or semicircle, extended without the holy place, and here the judges sat. The nasi, or prince, sat on a throne at the end of the hall, having his deputy at his right hand, and his sub-deputy at his left; the other senators were ranged in order on each side.

The sanhedrim subsisted until the destruction of Jerusalem, but its authority was almost reduced to nothing, from the time in which the Jewish nation became subject to the Roman empire. The rabbins pretend, that the sanhedrim has always subsisted in their nation from the time of Moses to the destruction of the temple by the Romans; and they maintain that it consisted of seventy counsellors, six out of each tribe, and Moses as president; and thus the number was seventy-one: but six senators out of each tribe make the number seventy-two, which, with the president, constitute a council of seventy-three persons, and therefore it has been the opinion of some authors that this was the number of the members of the sanhedrim. As to the personal qualifications of the judges of this court, it was required that they should be of untainted birth; and they were often of the race of the priests or Levites, or of the number of inferior judges, or of the lesser sanhedrim, which consisted of twenty-three judges. They were to be skilful in the written and traditional law; and they were obliged to

study magic, divination, fortune telling, physic, astrology, arithmetic, and languages. It was also required, that none of them should be eunuchs, usurers, decrepid or deformed, or gamesters; and that they should be of mature age, rich, and of good countenance and body. Thus say the rabbins.

The authority of the sanhedrim was very extensive. This council decided causes brought before it by appeal from inferior courts. The king, high priest, and prophets were subject to its jurisdiction. The general officers of the nation were brought before the sanhedrim. How far their right of judging in capital cases extended, and how long it continued, have been subjects of controversy. Among the rabbins it has been a generally received opinion, that about forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, their nation had been deprived of the power of life and death. And most authors assert, that this privilege was taken from them ever since Judea was made a province of the Roman empire, that is, after the banishment of Archelaus. Others, however, maintain that the Jews had still the power of life and death; but that this privilege was restricted to crimes committed against their law, and depended upon the governor's will and pleasure. In the time of Moses, this council was held at the door of the tabernacle of the testimony. As soon as the people were in possession of the land of promise, the sanhedrim followed the tabernacle, and it continued at Jerusalem, whither it was removed, till the captivity. During the captivity it was kept at Babylon. After the return from Babylon, it remained at Jerusalem, as it is said, to the time of the sicarii or assassins; afterward it was removed to Jamnia, thence to Jericho, to Uzzah, to Sepharvaim, to Bethsamia, to Sephoris, and last of all to Tiberias, where it continued till its utter extinction. Such is the account which the Jews give of their sanhedrim. But, as stated above, much of this is disputed. Petau fixes the beginning of the sanhedrim to the period when Gabinius was governor of Judea, by whom were erected tribunals in the five cities of Judea, namely, Jerusalem, Gadara, Amathus, Jericho, and Sephoris. Grotius agrees in the date of its commencement with the rabbins, but he fixes its termination at the beginning of Herod's reign. Basnage places it under Judas Maccabæus and his brother Jonathan. Upon the whole, it may be observed, that the origin of the sanhedrim has not been satisfactorily ascertained; and that the council of the seventy elders, established by Moses, was not what the Hebrews understood by the name of sanhedrim.

Before the death of our Saviour, two very famous rabbins had been presidents of the sanhedrim, namely Hillel and Schammai, who entertained very different opinions on several subjects, and particularly that of divorce. This gave occasion to the question which the Pharisees put to Jesus Christ upon that head, Matt. xix, 3. (See Divorce.) Hillel had Menahem for his associate in the presidency of the sanhedrim. But the latter afterward

deserted that honourable post, and joined himself with a great number of his disciples, to the party of Herod Antipas, who promoted the levying of taxes for the use of the Roman emperors with all his might. These were probably the Herodians mentioned in the Gospel, Matt. xxii, 16. To Hillel succeeded Simeon his son, who by some is supposed to have been the person who took Jesus Christ in his arms, Luke ii, 28, and publicly acknowledged him to be the Messiah. If this be the case, the Jewish sanhedrim had for president a person that was entirely disposed to embrace Christianity. Gamaliel, the son and successor of Simeon, seems to have been also of a candid disposition and character. There were several inferior sanhedrims in Palestine, all depending on the great sanhedrim at Jerusalem. The inferior sanhedrim consisted each of twenty-three persons; and there was one in each city and town. Some say, that to have a right to hold a sanhedrim, it was requisite there should be one hundred and twenty inhabitants in the place. Where the inhabitants came short of the number of one hundred and twenty, they only established three judges. In the great as well as the inferior sanhedrim were two scribes; the one to write down the suffrages of those who were for condemnation, the other to take down the suffrages of those who were for absolution.

SAPPHIRE, ספיר, Exod. xxiv, 10; xxviii, 18; Job xxviii, 6, 16; Cantic. v, 14; Isa. liv, 11; Ezek. i, 26; x, 1; xxviii, 13, σάπφειρος, Rev. xxi, 19, only. That this is the sapphire, there can be no doubt. The Septuagint, the 844Vulgate, and the general run of commentators, ancient and modern, agree in this. The sapphire is a pellucid gem. In its finest state it is extremely beautiful and valuable, and second only to the diamond in lustre, hardness, and value. Its proper colour is pure blue; in the choicest specimens it is of the deepest azure; and in others varies into paleness, in shades of all degrees between that and a pure crystal brightness, without the least tinge of colour, but with a lustre much superior to the crystal. The oriental sapphire is the most beautiful and valuable. It is transparent, of a fine sky colour, sometimes variegated with veins of a white sparry substance, and distinct separate spots of a gold colour. Whence it is that the prophets describe the throne of God like unto sapphire, Ezek. i, 26; x, 1. Isaiah, liv, 11, 12, prophesying the future grandeur of Jerusalem, says,

“Behold, I lay thy stones in cement of vermilion,

And thy foundations with sapphires:

And I will make thy battlements of rubies,

And thy gates of carbuncles;

And the whole circuit of thy walls shall be of precious stones.”

“These seem,” says Bishop Lowth, “to be general images to express beauty, magnificence, purity, strength, and solidity, agreeably to the ideas of the eastern nations; and to have never been intended to be strictly scrutinized,



or minutely and particularly explained, as if they had each of them some precise moral or spiritual meaning.” Tobit, xiii, 16, 17, in his prophecy of the final restoration of Israel, describes the New Jerusalem in the same oriental manner: “For Jerusalem shall be built up with sapphires, and emeralds, and precious stones; thy walls, and towers, and battlements, with pure gold. And the streets of Jerusalem shall be paved with the beryl and carbuncle, and with stones of Ophir,” Rev. xxi, 18–21.

SARAH, the wife of Abraham, and his sister, as he himself informs us, by the same father, but not the same mother, Gen. xx, 12. See Abraham.

SARDIS, a city of Asia Minor, and formerly the capital of Cræsus, king of the Lydians. The church of Sardis was one of the seven churches of Asia, to which the writer of the Apocalypse was directed to send an epistle, Rev. iii, 1–3.

SARDIUS, σάρδις, so called from its redness, Exod. xxviii, 17; xxxix, 10; Ezek. xxviii, 13; σάρδιος, Rev. xxi, 20; a precious stone of a blood-red colour. It took its Greek name from Sardis, where the best of them were found.

SARDONYX, σαρδόνυξ, Rev. xxi, 20. A precious stone which seems to have its name from its resemblance partly to the sardius and partly to the onyx. It is generally tinged with black and blood colour, which are distinguished from each other by circles or rows, so distinct that they appear to be the effect of art.

SATAN signifies an adversary or enemy, and is commonly applied in the Scriptures to the devil, or the chief of the fallen angels. By collecting the passages where Satan, or the devil, is mentioned, it may be concluded, that he fell from heaven with his company; that God cast him down from thence for the punishment of his pride; that by his envy and malice, sin, death, and all other evils came into the world; that, by the permission of God he exercises a sort of government in the world over subordinate apostate angels like himself; that God makes use of him to prove good men, and chastise bad ones; that he is a lying spirit in the mouth of false prophets and seducers; that it is he, or his agents, that torment or possess men, and inspire them with evil designs, as when he suggested to David, the numbering of the people, to Judas to betray his Lord and Master, and to Ananias and Sapphira to conceal the price of their field; that he is full of rage like a roaring lion, and of subtlety like a serpent, to tempt, to betray, to destroy, and to involve us in guilt and wickedness; that his power and malice are restrained within certain limits, and controlled by the will of God; in a word, that he is an enemy to God and man, and uses his utmost

endeavours to rob God of his glory, and men of their souls. See Devil and Demoniacs.

SAUL, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, the first king of the Israelites, 1 Sam. ix, 1, 2, &c. Saul's fruitless journey when seeking his father's asses; (See Ass;) his meeting the Prophet Samuel; the particulars foretold to him, with his being anointed as king, about A. M. 2909; his prophesying along with the young prophets; his appointment by the lot; his modesty in hiding himself; his first victory over the Ammonites; his rash sacrifice in the absence of Samuel; his equally rash curse; his victories over the Philistines and Amalekites; his sparing of King Agag with the judgment denounced against him for it; his jealousy and persecution of David; his barbarous massacre of the priests and people of Nob; his repeated confessions of his injustice to David, &c, are recorded in 1 Sam. ix-xxxii. He reigned forty years, but exhibited to posterity a melancholy example of a monarch, elevated to the summit of worldly grandeur, who, having cast off the fear of God, gradually became the slave of jealousy, duplicity, treachery, and the most malignant and diabolical tempers. His behaviour toward David shows him to have been destitute of every generous and noble sentiment that can dignify human nature; and it is not an easy task to speak with any moderation of the atrocity and baseness which uniformly mark it. His character is that of a wicked man, "waxing worse and worse;" but while we are shocked at its deformity, it should be our study to profit by it, which we can only do by using it as a beacon to warn us, "lest we also be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin."

SCARLET, תולעת, Gen. xxxviii, 28; Exod. xxv, 4. This tincture or colour expressed by a word which signifies worm colour, was produced from a worm or insect which grew in a coccus, or excrescence of a shrub of the ilex kind, which Pliny calls "coccus scolecicus," the wormy berry, and Dioscorides terms "a small dry twig, to which the grains adhere like lentiles:" but these grains, as a great author observes on Solinus, "are within full of little worms or maggots, whose juice is remarkable for dying scarlet, and making that famous colour which we admire, and with which the ancients were enraptured." We retain the name in the cochineal, from the opuntia of America; but we improperly call a mineral colour "vermilion," which is derived from vermiculus, a little worm. The shrub on which the cochineal insect is found is sometimes called the "kermez oak," from kermez, the Arabic word both for the worm and the colour; whence "carmasinus," the French "cramoisi," and the English "crimson."

SCEPTRE, a word derived from the Greek, properly signifies, a rod of command, a staff of authority, which is supposed to be in the hands of kings, governors of a province, or of the chief of a people, Gen. xlix, 10;

Numb. xxiv, 17; Isa. xiv, 5. The sceptre is put for the rod of correction, and for the sovereign authority that punishes and humbles, Psalm ii, 9; Prov. xxii, 15. The term sceptre is frequently used for a tribe, probably because the prince of each tribe carried a sceptre, or a wand of command, to show his dignity.

SCEVA, a Jew, and chief of the priests, Acts xix, 14, 15, 16. He was probably a person of authority in the synagogue at Ephesus, and had seven sons.

SCHISM, from σχίσμα, a rent or fissure. In its general meaning, it signifies division or separation; and in particular, on account of religion. Schism, is properly a division among those who stand in one connection or fellowship; but when the difference is carried so far that the parties concerned entirely break off all communion and intercourse one with another, and form distinct connections for obtaining the general ends of that religious fellowship which they once cultivated; it is undeniable there is something different from the schism spoken of in the New Testament. This is a separation from the body. Dr. Campbell shows that the word schism in Scripture does not usually signify an open separation, but that men may be guilty of schism by such an alienation of affection from their brethren as violates the internal union in the hearts of Christians, though there be no error in doctrine, nor separation from communion.

SCORPION, עקרב, Deut. viii, 15; 1 Kings xii, 11, 14; 2 Chron. x, 11, 14; Ezek. ii, 6, σκορπίος, Luke x, 19; xi, 12; Rev. ix, 3; Eccus. xxvi, 7; xxxix, 30. Parkhurst derives the name from עק, to press, squeeze, and רב, much, greatly, or קרב, near, close. Calmet remarks, that “it fixes so violently on such persons as it seizes upon, that it cannot be plucked off without difficulty;” and Martinius declares: *Habent scorpii forcipes seu furcas tanquam brachia, quibus retinent quod apprehendunt, postquam caudæ aculeo punxerunt*: “Scorpions have pincers or nippers, with which they keep hold of what they seize after they have wounded it with their sting.”

The scorpion, el-akerb, is generally two inches in length, and resembles so much the lobster in form, that the latter is called by the Arabs akerb d’elbahar, the “sea scorpion.” It has several joints or divisions in its tail, which are supposed to be indicative of its age; thus, if it have five, it is considered to be five years old. The poison of this animal is in its tail, at the end of which is a small, curved, sharp-pointed sting, similar to the prickle of a buckthorn tree; the curve being downward, it turns its tail upward when it strikes a blow. The scorpion delights in stony places and in old ruins. Some are of a yellow colour, others brown, and some black. The yellow possess the strongest poison, but the venom of each affects the

part wounded, with frigidity, which takes place soon after the sting has been inflicted. Dioscorides thus describes the effect produced: "Where the scorpion has stung, the place becomes inflamed and hardened; it reddens by tension, and is painful by intervals, being now chilly, now burning. The pain soon rises high, and rages, sometimes more, sometimes less. A sweating succeeds, attended by a shivering and trembling; the extremities of the body become cold; the groin swells; the hair stands on end; the visage becomes pale; and the skin feels, throughout it, the sensation of perpetual prickling, as if by needles." This description strikingly illustrates Revelation ix, 3-5, 10, in its mention of "the torment of a scorpion, when he striketh a man."

Some writers consider the scorpion as a species of serpent, because the poison of it is equally powerful: so the sacred writers commonly join the scorpion and serpent together in their descriptions. Thus Moses, in his farewell address to Israel, Deut. viii, 15, reminds them, that God "led them through the great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents and scorpions." We find them again united in the commission of our Lord to his disciples, Luke x, 19, "I give you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy;" and in his directions concerning the duty of prayer, Luke xi, 11, 12, "If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion?"

The scorpion is contrasted with an egg, on account of the oval shape of its body. The body of the scorpion, says Lamy, is very like an egg, as its head can scarcely be distinguished; especially if it be a scorpion of the white kind, which is the first species mentioned by Ælian, Avicenna, and others. Bochart has produced testimonies to prove that the scorpions in Judea were about the bigness of an egg. So the similitude is preserved between the thing asked and given. The Greeks have a proverb, ἀντὶ πέρκης σκορπίον, instead of a perch, or fish, a scorpion.

SCOURGE or WHIP. This punishment was very common among the Jews, Deut. xxv, 1-3. There were two ways of giving the lash; one with thongs, or whips, made of ropes' ends, or straps of leather; the other with rods, or twigs. St. Paul informs us, that at five different times he received thirty-nine stripes from the Jews, 2 Cor. xi, 24, namely, in their synagogues, and before their courts of judgment. 846For, according to the law, punishment by stripes was restricted to forty at one beating, Deut. xxv, 3. But the whip, with which these stripes were given, consisting of three separate cords, and each stroke being accounted as three stripes, thirteen strokes made thirty-nine stripes, beyond which they never went. He adds, that he had been

thrice beaten with rods, namely, by the Roman lictors, or beadles, at the command of the superior magistrates.

SCRIBES. The scribes are mentioned very early in the sacred history, and many authors suppose that they were of two descriptions, the one ecclesiastical, the other civil. It is said, "Out of Zebulon come they that handle the pen of the writer," Judges v, 14; and the rabbins state, that the scribes were chiefly of the tribe of Simeon; but it is thought that only those of the tribe of Levi were allowed to transcribe the Holy Scriptures. These scribes are very frequently called wise men, and counsellors; and those of them who were remarkable for writing well were held in great esteem. In the reign of David, Seraiah, 2 Sam. viii, 17, in the reign of Hezekiah, Shebna, 2 Kings xviii, 18, and in the reign of Josiah, Shaphan, 2 Kings xxii, 3, are called scribes, and are ranked with the chief officers of the kingdom; and Elishama the scribe, Jer. xxxvi, 12, in the reign of Jehoiakim, is mentioned among the princes. We read also of the "principal scribe of the host," or army, Jer. lii, 25; and it is probable that there were scribes in other departments of the state. Previous to the Babylonian captivity, the word scribe seems to have been applied to any person who was concerned in writing, in the same manner as the word secretary is with us. The civil scribes are not mentioned in the New Testament.

It appears that the office of the ecclesiastical scribes, if this distinction be allowed, was originally confined to writing copies of the law, as their name imports; but the knowledge, thus necessarily acquired, soon led them to become instructors of the people in the written law, which, it is believed, they publicly read. Baruch was an amanuensis or scribe to Jeremiah; and Ezra is called "a ready scribe in the law of Moses, having prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments," Ezra vii, 6, 10; but there is no mention of the scribes being formed into a distinct body of men till after the cessation of prophecy. When, however, there were no inspired teachers in Israel, no divine oracle in the temple, the scribes presumed to interpret, expound, and comment upon the law and the prophets in the schools and in the synagogues. Hence arose those numberless glosses, and interpretations, and opinions, which so much perplexed and perverted the text instead of explaining it; and hence arose that unauthorized maxim, which was the principal source of all the Jewish sects, that the oral or traditionary law was of Divine origin, as well as the written law of Moses. Ezra had examined the various traditions concerning the ancient and approved usages of the Jewish church, which had been in practice before the captivity, and were remembered by the chief and most aged of the elders of the people; and he had given to some of these traditionary customs and opinions the sanction of his authority. The scribes, therefore, who lived after the time of Simon

the Just, in order to give weight to their various interpretations of the law, at first pretended that they also were founded upon tradition, and added them to the opinions which Ezra had established as authentic; and in process of time it came to be asserted, that when Moses was forty days on Mount Sinai, he received from God two laws, the one in writing, the other oral; that this oral law was communicated by Moses to Aaron and Joshua, and that it passed unimpaired and uncorrupted from generation to generation, by the tradition of the elders, or great national council, established in the time of Moses; and that this oral law was to be considered as supplemental and explanatory of the written law, which was represented as being in many places obscure, scanty, and defective. In some cases they were led to expound the law by the traditions, in direct opposition to its true intent and meaning; and it may be supposed that the intercourse of the Jews with the Greeks, after the death of Alexander, contributed much to increase those vain subtleties with which they had perplexed and burdened the doctrines of religion. During our Saviour's ministry, the scribes were those who made the law of Moses their particular study, and who were employed in instructing the people. Their reputed skill in the Scriptures induced Herod, Matt. ii, 4, to consult them concerning the time at which the Messiah was to be born. And our Saviour speaks of them as sitting in Moses's seat, Matt. xxiii, 2, which implies that they taught the law; and he foretold that he should be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, Matt. xvi, 21, and that they should put him to death, which shows that they were men of great power and authority among the Jews. Scribes, doctors of law, and lawyers, were only different names for the same class of persons. Those who in Luke v, are called Pharisees and doctors of the law, are soon afterward called Pharisees and scribes; and he who, in Matt. xxii, 35, is called a lawyer, is, in Mark xii, 28, called one of the scribes. They had scholars under their care, whom they taught the knowledge of the law, and who, in their schools, sat on low stools just beneath their seats; which explains St. Paul's expression that he was "brought up at the feet of Gamaliel," Acts xxii, 3. We find that our Saviour's manner of teaching was contrasted with that of those vain disputers; for it is said, when he had ended his sermon upon the mount, "the people were astonished at his doctrine; for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes," Matt. vii, 29. By the time of our Saviour, the scribes had, indeed, in a manner, laid aside the written law, having no farther regard to that than as it agreed with their traditionary expositions of it; and thus, by their additions, corruptions, and misinterpretations, 847they had made "the word of God of none effect through their traditions," Matt. xv, 6. It may be observed, that this in a great measure accounts for the extreme blindness of the Jews with respect to their Messiah, whom they had been taught by these commentators upon the prophecies to expect as a temporal prince. Thus, when our Saviour asserts his divine nature, and appeals to "Moses

and the prophets who spake of him, the people sought to slay him,” John v; and he expresses no surprise at their intention. But when he converses with Nicodemus, John iii, who appears to have been convinced by his miracles that he was “a teacher sent from God,” when he “came to Jesus by night,” anxious to obtain farther information concerning his nature and his doctrine, our Lord, after intimating the necessity of laying aside all prejudices against the spiritual nature of his kingdom, asks, “Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?” that is, knowest not that Moses and the prophets describe the Messiah as the Son of God? and he then proceeds to explain in very clear language the dignity of his person and office, and the purpose for which he came into the world, referring to the predictions of the ancient Scriptures. And Stephen, Acts vii, just before his death, addresses the multitude by an appeal to the law and the prophets, and reprobates in the most severe terms the teachers who misled the people. Our Lord, when speaking of “them of old time,” classed the “prophets, and wise men, and scribes,” together, Matt. xxiii, 34; but of the later scribes he uniformly speaks with censure and indignation, and usually joins them with the Pharisees, to which sect they in general belonged. St. Paul asks, 1 Cor. i, 20, “Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world?” with evident contempt for such as, “professing themselves wise above what was written, became fools.”

SCRIPTURE, a term most commonly used to denote the writings of the Old and New Testament, which are sometimes called The Scriptures, sometimes the sacred or holy writings, and sometimes canonical scripture. See Bible.

SEA. The Hebrews gave the name of sea to all great collections of water, to great lakes or pools. Thus the sea of Galilee, or of Tiberias, or of Cinnereth, is no other than the lake of Tiberias, or Gennesareth, in Galilee. The Dead Sea, the sea of the Wilderness, the sea of the East, the sea of Sodom, the sea of Salt, or the Salt Sea, the sea of Asphaltites, or of bitumen, is no other than the lake of Sodom. The Arabians and orientals in general frequently gave the name of sea to great rivers, as the Nile, the Euphrates, the Tigris, and others, which, by their magnitude, and by the extent of their overflowings, seemed as little seas, or great lakes. In Isa. xi, 15, these words particularly apply to the Nile at the Delta.

SEAL. The ancient Hebrews wore their seals or signets, in rings on their fingers, or in bracelets on their arms, as is now the custom in the east. Haman sealed the decree of King Ahasuerus against the Jews with the king’s seal, Esther iii, 12. The priests of Bel desired the king to seal the door of their temple with his own seal. The spouse in the Canticles, viii, 6, wishes that his spouse would wear him as a signet on her arm. Pliny

observes, that the use of seals or signets was rare at the time of the Trojan war, and that they were under the necessity of closing their letters with several knots. But among the Hebrews they are much more ancient. Judah left his seal as a pledge with Tamar, Gen. xxxviii, 25. Moses says, Deut. xxxii, 34, that God keeps sealed up in his treasuries, under his own seal, the instruments of his vengeance. Job says, ix, 7, that he keeps the stars as under his seal, and allows them to appear when he thinks proper. He says also, "My transgression is sealed up in a bag," Job xiv, 7. When they intended to seal up a letter, or a book, they wrapped it round with flax, or thread, then applied the wax to it, and afterward the seal. The Lord commanded Isaiah to tie up or wrap up the book in which his prophecies were written, and to seal them till the time he should bid him publish them, Isaiah viii, 16, 17. He gives the same command to Daniel, xii, 4. The book that was shown to St. John the evangelist, Rev. v, 1; vi, 1, 2, &c, was sealed with seven seals. It was a rare thing to affix such a number of seals; but this insinuated the great importance and secrecy of the matter. In civil contracts they generally made two originals: one continued open, and was kept by him for whose interest the contract was made; the other was sealed and deposited in some public office.

SECEDERS, a numerous body of Presbyterians in Scotland, who, in the last century, seceded from the Scotch establishment. They did not, as they have uniformly declared, secede from the principles of the church of Scotland, as they are represented in her confession of faith, catechisms, longer and shorter, directory for worship, and form of Presbyterian government; but only from her present judicatories, that, they suppose, have departed from her true principles. A sermon preached by Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, of Stirling, at the opening of the synod of Perth and Sterling, in 1732, gave rise to this party. In this discourse, founded on Psalm cxviii, 22, "The stone which the builders refused," &c, he boldly testified against what he supposed corruptions in the national church; for which freedom the synod voted him censurable, and ordered him to be rebuked at their bar. He, and three other ministers, protested against this sentence, and appealed to the next assembly. The assembly, which met in May, 1733, approved of the proceedings of the synod, and ordered Mr. Erskine to be rebuked at their bar. He refused to submit to the rebuke; whence he and his brethren were, by the sentence of the assembly, suspended from the ministry. Against this, he and his friends protested; and, being joined by many others, both ministers and elders, declaring their secession from the national church, they did, in 1736, constitute themselves into an ecclesiastical court, which they called the Associate Presbytery, and published a defence of their proceedings. They admit that the people have a right to choose their own pastors; that the Scriptures are the supreme



judge by which all controversies must be determined; and that Jesus Christ is the only Head of his church, and the only King in Zion.

In 1745, the seceding ministers were become so numerous, that they were erected into three different presbyteries, under one synod. In 1747, through a difference in civil matters, they were divided into Burghers and Anti-Burghers. Of these two classes, the latter were the most rigid in their sentiments, and associated, therefore, the least with any other body of Christians. But this difference has been lately healed, and no longer subsists, either in Scotland or America.

SECHEM, SICHEM, SYCHEM, or SHECHEM, called also Sychar in the New Testament, afterward Neapolis, and in the present day Nablous, Naplous, Napolose, and Naplosa, (for it is thus variously written,) a city of Samaria, near the parcel of ground which Jacob bought of Hamor, the father of Shechem, and gave to his son Joseph. Here Joseph's bones were brought out of Egypt to be interred; and on the same piece of ground was the well called Jacob's well, at which our Saviour sat down when he had the memorable conversation with the woman of Samaria, John iv, which caused her, and many other inhabitants of Sechem, or Sychar, as it is there called, to receive him as the Messiah. On contemplating this place and its vicinity, Dr. E. D. Clarke says, "The traveller directing his footsteps toward its ancient sepulchres, as everlasting as the rocks in which they are hewn, is permitted, upon the authority of sacred and indisputable record, to contemplate the spot where the remains of Joseph, of Eleazer, and of Joshua, were severally deposited. If any thing connected with the memory of past ages be calculated to awaken local enthusiasm, the land around this city is preëminently entitled to consideration. The sacred story of events transacted in the field of Sichem, from our earliest years, is remembered with delight; but with the territory before our eyes where those events took place, and in the view of objects existing as they were described above three thousand years ago, the grateful impression kindles into ecstasy. Along the valley, we beheld 'a company of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead,' as in the days of Reuben and Judah, 'with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh,' who would gladly have purchased another Joseph of his brethren, and conveyed him as a slave to some Potiphar in Egypt. Upon the hills around flocks and herds were feeding, as of old; nor in the simple garb of the shepherds of Samaria was there any thing repugnant to the notions we may entertain of the appearance presented by the sons of Jacob." The celebrated well called Jacob's well, but which, with the inhabitants of Sechem, is known by the name of Bir Samaria, or the "Well of Samaria," is situated about half an hour's walk east of the town.

SEEING. To see, in Scripture, is often used to express the sense of vision, knowledge of spiritual things, and even the supernatural knowledge of hidden things, of prophecy, of visions, of ecstasies. Whence it is that formerly those were called seers who afterward were termed, nabi, or prophets; and that prophecies were called visions. Moreover, to see, is used for expressing all kinds of sensations. It is said in Exodus, xx, 18, that the Israelites saw voices, thunder, lightning, the sounding of the trumpet, and the whole mountain of Sinai covered with clouds, or smoke. And St. Austin observes, that the verb, to see, is applied to all the five natural senses; to see, to hear, to smell, to taste, to touch. "To see goodness," is to enjoy it. "To see the goodness of the Lord," Psalm xxvii, 13; that is, to enjoy the mercy or blessing which God hath promised. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God;" that is, they shall have the perfect and immediate fruition of the glorious presence of God in heaven; or they shall understand the mysteries of salvation; they shall perceive the loving kindness of God toward them in this life, and shall at length perfectly enjoy him in heaven.

SEIR, the Horite, whose dwelling was to the east and south of the Dead Sea, in the mountains of Seir, Genesis xiv, 6; xxxvi, 20; Deuteronomy ii, 12; where at first reigned the descendants of Seir the Horite, of whom Moses gives us a list in Genesis xxxvi, 20, 21–30; 1 Chron. 38, 39, &c. The posterity of Esau afterward were in possession of the mountains of Seir, and Esau himself dwelt there when Jacob returned from Mesopotamia, Gen. xxxiii, 3; xxxiii, 14; xxxvi, 8, 9.

Seir, Mount, a mountainous tract, extending from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, to the gulf of Acaba, or Ezion-Geber. The whole of this tract was probably before called Mount Hor, and was inhabited by the Horites, the descendants, as it is thought, of Hor, who is no otherwise known, and whose name is now only retained in that part of the plain where Aaron died. These people were driven out from their country by the Edomites, or the children of Esau, who dwelt there in their stead, and were in possession of this region when the Israelites passed by in their passage from Egypt to the land of Canaan. The country had, however, been previously overrun, and no doubt very much depopulated, by the invasion of Chedorlaomer, king of Elam. At what time the name of Hor was changed to that of Seir cannot be ascertained. Mount Seir rises abruptly on its western side from the valleys of El Ghor and El Araba; presenting an impregnable front to the strong country of the Edomite mountaineers, which compelled the Israelites, who were unable (if permitted by their leader) to force a passage through this mountain barrier, to skirt its western base, along the great valley of the Ghor and Araba, and so to "compass the land of Edom by the way of the Red Sea," that is, to descend to its southern extremity at Ezion-Geber, as they could not penetrate it higher up. To the

southward 849of this place Burckhardt observed an opening in the mountains, where he supposed the Israelites to have passed. This passage brought them into the high plains on the east of Mount Seir, which are so much higher than the valley on the west, that the mountainous territory of the Edomites was every where more accessible: a circumstance which perhaps contributed to make them more afraid of the Israelites on this border, whom they had set at defiance on the opposite one. The mean elevation of this chain cannot be estimated at less than four thousand feet. In the summer it produces most of the European fruits, namely, apricots, figs, pomegranates, olives, apples, and peaches; while in winter deep snows occasionally fall, with frosts, to the middle of March. The inhabitants, like those of most mountainous regions, are very healthy. Burckhardt says, that there was no part of Syria in which he saw so few invalids: a circumstance which did not escape the observation of the ancients, who denominated it, *Palæstina tertia sive salutaris*. [Palestine the third or the healthy.]

SELAH. This expression is found in the Psalms seventy-four times, and thrice in the Prophet Habakkuk. The interpreters Symmachus and Theodotion generally translate *selah* by *diapsalma*, which signifies “a rest” or “pause” in singing. Jerom and Aquila translate it “for ever.” Some moderns pretend that *selah* has no signification, and that it is only a note of the ancient music, whose use is no longer known; and, indeed, *selah* may be taken away from all the places where it is found without interrupting the sense of the psalm. Calmet says it intimates the end, or a pause, and that is its proper signification; but as it is not always found at the conclusion of the sense, or of the psalm or song, so it is highly probable the ancient musicians put *selah* in the margin of their psalters, to show where a musical pause was to be made, or where the tune ended.

SELEUCIA, a city of Syria, situated upon the Mediterranean, near the place where the Orontes discharges itself into the sea. St. Paul and Barnabas were at this place when they embarked for Cyprus, Acts xiii, 4. The same city is mentioned in 1 Mac. xi, 8.

SENNACHERIB, king of Assyria, son and successor of Shalmaneser. He began his reign A. M. 3290, and reigned only four years. Hezekiah, king of Judah, having refused to pay him tribute, though he afterward submitted, he invaded Judea with a great army, took several forts, and after repeated, insolent, and blasphemous messages, besieged Jerusalem; but his army being suddenly smitten with a pestilence, which cut off a hundred and eighty-five thousand in a single night, he returned to Nineveh, where he was murdered in the temple of Nisroch by his sons Adrammelech and

Sharezer, and was succeeded by his other son, Esar-haddon, 2 Kings xix, 7, 13, 37.

SEPHARVAIM, a country of Assyria, 2 Kings xvii, 24, 31. This province cannot now be exactly delineated in respect to its situation. The Scripture speaks of the king of the city of Sepharvaim, which probably was the capital of the people of this name, 2 Kings xix, 13; Isaiah xxxvii, 13.

SEPTUAGINT. Among the Greek versions of the Old Testament, says Mr. Horne, the Alexandrian or Septuagint is the most ancient and valuable, and was held in so much esteem both by the Jews as well as by the first Christians, as to be constantly read in the synagogues and churches. Hence it is uniformly cited by the early fathers, whether Greek or Latin; and from this version all the translations into other languages which were anciently approved by the Christian church were executed, with the exception of the Syriac; as the Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Gothic, and old Italic or the Latin version in use before the time of Jerom; and to this day the Septuagint is exclusively read in the Greek and most other oriental churches. This version has derived its name either from the Jewish account of seventy-two persons having been employed to make it, or from its having received the approbation of the sanhedrim or great council of the Jews, which consisted of seventy, or, more correctly, of seventy-two persons. Much uncertainty, however, has prevailed concerning the real history of this ancient version; and while some have strenuously advocated its miraculous and Divine origin, other eminent philologists have laboured to prove that it must have been executed by several persons and at different times. According to one account, Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, caused this translation to be made for the use of the library which he had founded at Alexandria, at the request and with the advice of the celebrated Demetrius Phalereus, his principal librarian. For this purpose, it is reported, that he sent Aristeas and Andreas, two distinguished officers of his court, to Jerusalem, on an embassy to Eleazar, then high priest of the Jews, to request of the latter a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures, and that there might also be sent to him seventy-two persons, six chosen out of each of the twelve tribes, who were equally well skilled in the Hebrew and Greek languages. These learned men were accordingly shut up in the island of Pharos; where, having agreed in a translation of each period after a mutual conference, Demetrius wrote down their version as they dictated it to him; and thus, in the space of seventy-two days, the whole was accomplished. This relation is derived from a letter ascribed to Aristeas himself, the authenticity of which has been greatly disputed. If, as there is every reason to believe is the case, this piece is a forgery, it was made at a very early period; for it was in existence in the time of Josephus, who has made use of it in his Jewish Antiquities. The veracity of Aristeas's narrative was not questioned until the

seventeenth or eighteenth century, at which time, indeed, Biblical criticism was, comparatively, in its infancy, Vives, Scaliger, Van Dale, Dr. Prideaux, and, above all, Dr. Hody, were the principal writers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries who attacked the genuineness of the pretended 850 narrative of Aristeas; and though it was ably vindicated by Bishop Walton, Isaac Vossius, Whiston, Brett, and other modern writers, the majority of the learned of our own time are fully agreed in considering it as fictitious. Philo, the Jew, who also notices the Septuagint version, was ignorant of most of the circumstances narrated by Aristeas; but he relates others which appear not less extraordinary. According to him, Ptolemy Philadelphus sent to Palestine for some learned Jews, whose number he does not specify; and these, going over to the island of Pharos, there executed so many distinct versions, all of which so exactly and uniformly agreed in sense, phrases, and words, as proved them to have been not common interpreters, but men prophetically inspired and divinely directed, who had every word dictated to them by the Spirit of God throughout the entire translation. He adds, that an annual festival was celebrated by the Alexandrian Jews in the isle of Pharos, where the version was made, until his time, to preserve the memory of it, and to thank God for so great a benefit.

It is not a little remarkable that the Samaritans have traditions in favour of their version of the Pentateuch, equally extravagant with these preserved by the Jews. In the Samaritan chronicle of Abul Phatach, which was compiled in the fourteenth century from ancient and modern authors, both Hebrew and Arabic, there is a story to the following effect: that Ptolemy Philadelphus, in the tenth year of his reign, directed his attention to the difference subsisting between the Samaritans and Jews concerning the law, the former receiving only the Pentateuch, and rejecting every other work ascribed to the prophets by the Jews. In order to determine this difference, he commanded the two nations to send deputies to Alexandria. The Jews entrusted this mission to Osar, the Samaritans to Aaron, to whom several other associates were added. Separate apartments in a particular quarter of Alexandria were assigned to each of these strangers, who were prohibited from having any personal intercourse, and each of them had a Greek scribe to write his version. Thus were the law and other Scriptures translated by the Samaritans; whose version being most carefully examined, the king was convinced that their text was more complete than that of the Jews. Such is the narrative of Abul Phatach, divested, however, of numerous marvellous circumstances with which it has been decorated by the Samaritans, who are not surpassed, even by the Jews, in their partiality for idle legends.

A fact, buried under such a mass of fables as the translation of the Septuagint has been by the historians who have pretended to record it, necessarily loses all its historical character, which, indeed, we are fully justified in disregarding altogether. Although there is no doubt but that some truth is concealed under this load of fables, yet it is by no means an easy task to discern the truth from what is false: the following, however, is the result of our researches concerning this celebrated version:--

It is probable that the seventy interpreters, as they are called, executed their version of the Pentateuch during the joint reigns of Ptolemy Lagus and his son Philadelphus. The pseudo Aristeas, Josephus, Philo, and many other writers whom it were tedious to enumerate, relate that this version was made during the reign of Ptolemy II., or Philadelphus; Joseph Ben Gorion, however, among the rabbins, Theodoret, and many other Christian writers, refer its date to the time of Ptolemy Lagus. Now, these two traditions can be reconciled only by supposing the version to have been performed during the two years when Ptolemy Philadelphus shared the throne with his father; which date coincides with the third and fourth years of the hundred and twenty-third Olympiad, that is, about B. C. 286 and 285. Farther, this version was neither made by the command of Ptolemy, nor at the request nor under the superintendence of Demetrius Phalereus; but was voluntarily undertaken by the Jews for the use of their countrymen. It is well known, that, at the period above noticed, there was a great number of Jews settled in Egypt, particularly at Alexandria: these, being most strictly observant of the religious institutions and usages of their forefathers, had their sanhedrim or grand council composed of seventy or seventy-two members, and very numerous synagogues, in which the law was read to them on every Sabbath; and as the bulk of the common people were no longer acquainted with Biblical Hebrew, the Greek language alone being used in their ordinary intercourse, it became necessary to translate the Pentateuch into Greek for their use. This is a far more probable account of the origin of the Alexandrian version than the traditions above stated. If this translation had been made by public authority, it would unquestionably have been performed under the direction of the sanhedrim, who would have examined and perhaps corrected it, if it had been the work of a single individual, previously to giving it the stamp of their approbation, and introducing it into their synagogues. In either case the translation would probably be denominated the Septuagint, because the sanhedrim was composed of seventy or seventy-two members. It is even possible that the sanhedrim, in order to ascertain the fidelity of the work, might have sent to Palestine for some learned men, of whose assistance and advice they would have availed themselves in examining the version. This fact, if it could be proved, for it is offered as a mere conjecture, would account for the story of the king of Egypt's sending an embassy to Jerusalem: there is, however,

one circumstance which proves that, in executing this translation, the synagogues were originally in contemplation, namely, that all the ancient writers unanimously concur in saying that the Pentateuch was first translated. The five books of Moses, indeed, were the only books read in the synagogues until the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria; who having forbidden that practice in Palestine, the Jews evaded his commands by substituting for the Pentateuch the reading of the prophetic books. When, afterward, the Jews were delivered from the tyranny of the kings of Syria, they read the law and the prophets alternately in the synagogues; and the same custom was adopted by the Hellenistic or Græcising Jews.

But, whatever was the real number of the authors of the version, their introduction of Coptic words, such as οἴφι ἄχι ρεμφάν, &c, as well as their rendering of ideas purely Hebrew altogether in the Egyptian manner, clearly prove that they were natives of Egypt. Thus, they express the creation of the world, not by the proper Greek word κτίσις, but by γένεσις, a term employed by the philosophers of Alexandria to express the origin of the universe. The Hebrew word thummim, Exodus xxviii, 30, which signifies “perfections,” they render ἀλήθεια, truth. The difference of style also indicates the version to have been the work not of one but of several translators, and to have been executed at different times. The best qualified and most able among them was the translator of the Pentateuch, who was evidently master of both Greek and Hebrew: he has religiously followed the Hebrew text, and has in various instances introduced the most suitable and best chosen expressions. From the very close resemblance subsisting between the text of the Greek version and the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Louis De Dieu, Selden, Whiston, Hassencamp, and Bauer, are of opinion that the author of the Alexandrian version made it from the Samaritan Pentateuch. And in proportion as these two correspond, the Greek differs from the Hebrew. This opinion is farther supported by the declarations of Origen and Jerom, that the translator found the venerable name of Jehovah, not in the letters in common use, but in very ancient characters; and also by the fact that those consonants in the Septuagint are frequently confounded together, the shapes of which are similar in the Samaritan, but not in the Hebrew, alphabet. This hypothesis, however ingenious and plausible, is by no means determinate; and what militates most against it is, the inveterate enmity subsisting between the Jews and Samaritans, added to the constant and unvarying testimony of antiquity, that the Greek version of the Pentateuch was executed by Jews. There is no other way by which to reconcile these conflicting opinions than by supposing either that the manuscript used by the Egyptian Jews approximated toward the letters and text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, or that the translators of the Septuagint made use of manuscripts written in

ancient characters. Next to the Pentateuch, for ability and fidelity of execution, ranks the translation of the book of Proverbs, the author of which was well skilled in the two languages: Michaëlis is of opinion that, of all the books of the Septuagint, the style of the Proverbs is the best, the translator having clothed the most ingenious thoughts in as neat and elegant language as was ever used by a Pythagorean sage, to express his philosophical maxims.

The Septuagint version, though originally made for the use of the Egyptian Jews, gradually acquired the highest authority among the Jews of Palestine, who were acquainted with the Greek language, and subsequently also among Christians: it appears, indeed, that the legend above confuted, of the translators having been divinely inspired, was invented in order that the LXX. might be held in the greater estimation. Philo, the Jew, a native of Egypt, has evidently followed it in his allegorical expositions of the Mosaic law; and though Dr. Hody was of opinion that Josephus, who was a native of Palestine, corroborated his work on Jewish antiquities from the Hebrew text, yet Salmasius, Bochart, Bauer, and others, have shown that he has adhered to the Septuagint throughout that work. How extensively this version was in use among the Jews, appears from the solemn sanction given to it by the inspired writers of the New Testament, who have in very many passages quoted the Greek version of the Old Testament. Their example was followed by the earlier fathers and doctors of the church, who, with the exception of Origen and Jerom, were unacquainted with Hebrew: notwithstanding their zeal for the word of God, they did not exert themselves to learn the original language of the sacred writings, but acquiesced in the Greek representation of them, judging it, no doubt, to be fully sufficient for all the purposes of their pious labours. The Greek Scriptures were the only Scriptures known to or valued by the Greeks. This was the text commented on by Chrysostom and Theodoret: it was this which furnished topics to Athanasius, Nazianzen, and Basil. From this fountain the stream was derived to the Latin church, first by the Italic or Vulgate translation of the Scriptures, which was made from the Septuagint, and not from the Hebrew; and, secondly, by the study of the Greek fathers. It was by this borrowed light that the Latin fathers illumined the western hemisphere; and, when the age of Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, and Gregory, successively passed away, this was the light put into the hands of the next dynasty of theologians, the schoolmen, who carried on the work of theological disquisition by the aid of this luminary, and none other. So that, either in Greek or in Latin, it was still the Septuagint Scriptures that were read, explained, and quoted as authority, for a period of fifteen hundred years.



SEPTUAGINT CHRONOLOGY is that which is formed from the dates and periods of time mentioned in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. It reckons one thousand five hundred years more from the creation to Abraham than the Hebrew Bible. Dr. Kennicott, in the dissertation prefixed to his Hebrew Bible, has shown it to be very probable, that the chronology of the Hebrew Scriptures, since the period just mentioned, was corrupted by the Jews between A. D. 175 and 200; and that the chronology of the Septuagint is more agreeable to truth. It is a fact, that, during the second and third centuries, the Hebrew Scriptures were almost entirely in the hands of the Jews, while the Septuagint was confined to the Christians. The Jews had, therefore, a very favourable opportunity for this corruption. The following is the reason which is given by the oriental writers: It being a very ancient tradition that Messiah was to come in the sixth chiliad, because he was to come in the last days, founded on a mystical application of the six days of the creation, the contrivance was to shorten the age of the world from about 5500 to 3760; and thence to prove that Jesus could not be the Messiah. Dr. Kennicott adds, that some Hebrew copies, having the larger chronology, were extant till the time of Eusebius, and some till the year 700.

SEPULCHRES. The descriptions of the eastern sepulchres, by travellers, serve to explain several passages of Scripture. Shaw says, "If we except a few persons who are buried within the precincts of some sanctuary, the rest are carried out at a small distance from their cities and villages, where a great extent of ground is allotted for that purpose. Each family has a particular portion of it, walled in like a garden, where the bones of their ancestors have remained undisturbed for many generations: for in these inclosures the graves are all distinct and separate, having each of them a stone placed upright, both at the head and feet, inscribed with the name of the person who lieth there interred, while the intermediate space is either planted with flowers, bordered round with stone, or paved all over with tiles. The graves of the principal citizens are farther distinguished by some square chambers or cupolas that are built over them, Mark v, 3. Now, as all these different sorts of tombs and sepulchres, with the very walls likewise of the inclosures, are constantly kept clean, white-washed, and beautified, they continue to this day to be an excellent comment upon that expression of our Saviour, where he mentions the garnishing of the sepulchres, Matt. xxiii, 29; and again, verse 27, where he compares the scribes, Pharisees, and hypocrites, to whited sepulchres." With respect to the demoniacs who are said by St. Matthew to come out of the tombs, Light observes, "I trod the ground celebrated for the miracle of the unclean spirit, driven by our Saviour among the swine. The tombs still exist in the form of caverns, on the sides of the hills that rise from the shore of the lake; and from their wild appearance may well be considered the habitation of men exceeding fierce,

possessed by a devil; they extend at a distance for more than a mile from the present town.” In the account we have of the resurrection of Lazarus, when Mary went suddenly out to meet Jesus, the Jews supposed that she was gone to the grave, “to weep there.” The following extract from Buckingham illustrates this: “Not far from the spot at which we halted to enjoy this enchanting view, was an extensive cemetery, at which we noticed the custom so prevalent among eastern nations of visiting the tombs of their deceased friends. These were formed with great care, and finished with extraordinary neatness: and at the foot of each grave was enclosed a small earthen vessel, in which was planted a sprig of myrtle, regularly watered every day by the mourning friend who visited it. Throughout the whole of this extensive place of burial we did not observe a single grave to which this token of respect and sorrow was not attached; and, scattered among the tombs, in different quarters of the cemetery, we saw from twenty to thirty parties of females, sitting near the honoured remains of some recently lost and deeply regretted relative or friend, and either watering their myrtle plants, or strewing flowers over the green turf that closed upon their heads.” See Burial.

SERPENT. In Egypt and other oriental countries, a serpent was the common symbol of a powerful monarch; it was embroidered on the robes of princes, and blazoned on their diadem, to signify their absolute power and invincible might, and that, as the wound inflicted by the basilisk is incurable, so the fatal effects of their displeasure were neither to be avoided nor endured. These are the allusions involved in the address of the prophet, to the irreconcilable enemies of his nation: “Rejoice not thou, whole Palestina, because the rod of him that smote thee is broken; for out of the serpent’s roots shall come forth a cockatrice, and his fruit shall be a fiery flying serpent,” Isaiah xiv, 29. Uzziah, the king of Judah, had subdued the Philistines; but taking advantage of the weak reign of Ahaz, they again invaded the kingdom of Judea, and reduced some cities in the southern part of the country under their dominion. On the death of Ahaz, Isaiah delivers this prophecy, threatening them with a more severe chastisement from the hand of Hezekiah, the grandson of Uzziah, by whose victorious arms they had been reduced to sue for peace; which he accomplished, when “he smote the Philistines, even unto Gaza and the borders thereof,” 2 Kings xviii, 8. Uzziah, therefore, must be meant by the rod that smote them, and by the serpent from whom should spring the fiery flying serpent, that is, Hezekiah, a much more terrible enemy than even Uzziah had been. But the symbol of regal power which the oriental kings preferred to all others, was the basilisk. This fact is attested by its Arabian name *melecha*, from the Hebrew verb *malach*, “to reign;” from its Greek name *βασιλίσκος*, and its Latin name *regulus*: all of which, it is asserted, referred to the conspicuous place it occupied among the regal ornaments of the east. The basilisk is of

a reddish colour, and its head is decorated with a crest in the form of a crown; it is not entirely prostrate, like other serpents, but moves along with its head and half the body erect; the other parts sweep the ground behind,

And wind its spacious back in rolling spires.

All the other species of serpents are said to acknowledge the superiority of the real or the fabled basilisk, by flying from its presence, and hiding themselves in the dust. It is also supposed to live longer than any other serpent; 853the ancient Heathens therefore pronounced it immortal, and placed it in the number of their deities; and because it had the dangerous power, in general belief, of killing with its pestiferous breath the strongest animals, it seemed to then invested with the power of life and death. It became, therefore, the favourite symbol of kings; and was employed by the prophet, to symbolize the great and good Hezekiah, with strict propriety.

2. The cerastes, or horned snake. The only allusion to this species of serpent in the sacred volume occurs in the valedictory predictions of Jacob, where he describes the character and actions of Dan and his posterity: “Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder, שפיפון, in the path, that biteth the horse’s heels, so that his rider shall fall backward,” Gen. xlix, 17. It is indisputably clear, that the patriarch intended some kind of serpent; for the circumstances will not apply to a freebooter watching for his prey. It only remains to investigate the species to which it belongs. The principal care of the Jewish writers is to ascertain the etymology of the name, about which their sentiments are much divided. The Arabian authors quoted by Bochart inform us, that the sephiphon is a most pernicious reptile, and very dangerous to man. It is of a sandy colour, variegated with black and white spots. The particulars in the character of Dan, however, agree better with the cerastes, or horned snake, than with any other species of serpent. It lies in wait for passengers in the sand, or in the rut of the wheels on the highway. From its lurking place it treacherously bites the horse’s heels, so that the rider falls backward, in consequence of the animal’s hinder legs becoming almost immediately torpid by the dreadful activity of the poison. The cerastes is equally formidable to man and the lower animals; and the more dangerous, because it is not easy to distinguish him from the sand in which he lies; and he never spares the helpless traveller who unwarily comes within his reach. Like the cerastes, Dan was to excel in cunning and artifice, to prevail against his enemies rather by his policy in the cabinet than by his valour in the field.

3. The seraph, or fiery flying serpent, to a Biblical student, is one of the most interesting creatures that has yet been mentioned. It bears the name of an order among the hosts of heaven, whom Isaiah beheld in vision, placed above the throne of Jehovah in the temple; the brazen figure of this

serpent is supposed to be a type of our blessed Redeemer, who was for our salvation lifted up upon the cross, as the serpent was elevated in the camp of Israel, for the preservation of that people. It is the only species of serpent which the almighty Creator has provided with wings, by means of which, instead of creeping or leaping, it rises from the ground, and leaning upon the extremity of its tail, moves with great velocity. It is a native of Egypt, and the deserts of Arabia; and receives its name from the Hebrew verb *seraph*, which signifies to burn, in allusion to the violent inflammation which its poison produces, or rather to its fiery colour, which the brazen serpent was intended to represent. Bochart is of opinion, that the seraph is the same as the *hydrus*, or, as Cicero calls it, the serpent of the waters. For, in the book of Isaiah, the land of Egypt is called the region from whence come the viper and flying seraph, or burning serpent. Ælian says, they come from the deserts of Libya and Arabia, to inhabit the streams of the Nile; and that they have the form of the *hydrus*.

The existence of winged serpents is attested by many writers of modern times. A kind of snakes were discovered among the Pyrenees, from whose sides proceeded cartilages in the form of wings; and Scaliger mentions a peasant who killed a serpent of the same species which attacked him, and presented it to the king of France. Le Blanc, as quoted by Bochart, says, at the head of lake Chiamay are extensive woods and vast marshes, which it is very dangerous to approach, because they are infested with very large serpents, which, raised from the ground on wings resembling those of bats, and leaning on the extremity of their tails, move with great rapidity. They exist, it is reported, about these places in so great numbers, that they have almost laid waste the neighbouring province. And, in the same work, Le Blanc affirms that he had seen some of them of immense size, which, when hungry, rushed impetuously on sheep and other tame animals. But the original term *מְעוֹפֵף* does not always signify flying with wings; it often expresses vibration, swinging backward and forward, a tremulous motion, a fluttering; and this is precisely the motion of a serpent, when he springs from one tree to another. Niebuhr mentions a sort of serpent at Bassorah, which they call *heie thiare*. "They commonly keep upon the date trees; and as it would be laborious for them to come down from a very high tree, in order to ascend another, they twist themselves by the tail to a branch of the former, which, making a spring by the motion they give it, throws them to the branches of the second. Hence it is that the modern Arabs call them flying serpents, *heie thiare*. Admiral Anson also speaks of the flying serpents that he met with at the island of Quibo, but which were without wings." From this account it may be inferred, that the flying serpent mentioned in the prophet was of that species of serpents which, from their swift darting motion, the Greeks call *aconitias*, and the Romans, *jaculus*. The original phrase will bear another interpretation, which, perhaps,

approaches still nearer the truth. The verb עורף sometimes means to sparkle, to emit coruscations of light. In this sense, the noun תעפה frequently occurs in the sacred volume; thus Zophar says: “The coruscation, תעפה, shall be as the morning.” The word in the verse under consideration may therefore refer to the ruddy colour of that serpent, and express the sparkling of the blazing sunbeams upon its scales, which are extremely brilliant.

4. The dragon. In Hebrew, the word תנין signifies either a dragon or a whale. As the name of a serpent, it frequently denotes one 854 of any species; as when the rod of Moses is said to have been turned into a serpent, לתנין. But, in its more strict and appropriate application, it is the proper name of the dragon, which differs from the serpent chiefly in its size. “Three kinds of dragons were formerly distinguished in India. 1. Those of the hills and mountains. 2. Those of the valleys and caves. 3. Those of the fens and marshes. The first is the largest, and covered with scales resplendent as burnished gold. They have a kind of beard hanging from their lower jaw, their aspect is frightful, their cry loud and shrill, their crest bright yellow, and they have a protuberance on their heads, as the colour of a burning coal. Those of the flat country are of a silver colour, and frequent rivers, to which the former never come. Those of the marshes are black, slow, and have no crest. Their bite is not venomous, though the creatures be dreadful.” This description agrees in every particular with the boa, which is justly considered as the proper dragon. But so great is the inconsistency of the human mind, that the creature which is now an object of universal dislike was, in early times, honoured with religious worship by every nation of the earth. Rites were devised and temples built to its honour; and priests were appointed to conduct the ceremonies. These miserable idolaters appeared before the altars of their contemptible deity in gorgeous vestments, their heads adorned with serpents, or with the figures of serpents embroidered on their tiaras, when the creatures themselves were not to be had; and in their frantic exclamations cried out, in evident allusion to the triumph which the old serpent obtained over our first mother, Eva, Eva. So completely was Satan permitted to insult our fallen race, that the serpent, his chosen agent in accomplishing our ruin, was actually raised to the first place among the deities of the Heathen world, and revered by the most solemn acts of worship. The figure of the serpent adorned the portals of the proudest temples in the east.

The serpent was a very common symbol of the sun; and he is represented biting his tail, and with his body formed into a circle, in order to indicate the ordinary course of this luminary; and under this form it was an emblem of time and eternity. The serpent was also the symbol of medicine, and of the gods which presided over it, as of Apollo and Æsculapius. In most of the ancient rites we find some allusion to the serpent, under the several

titles of Ob, Ops, Python, &c. This idolatry is alluded to by Moses, Lev. xx, 27. The woman of Endor, who had a familiar spirit, is called Oub, or Ob, and it is interpreted Pythonissa: the place where she resided, says the learned Mr. Bryant, seems to have been named from the worship then instituted; for Endor is compounded of En-ador, and signifies fons pithonis, the “fountain of light,” the oracle of the god Ador; which oracle was probably founded by the Canaanites, and had never been totally suppressed. His pillar was also called Abbadir, or Abadir, compounded of ab and adir, and meaning the serpent deity Addir, the same as Adorus. In the orgies of Bacchus, the persons who partook of the ceremony, used to carry serpents in their hands, and with horrid screams call upon Eva! Eva! Eva being, according to the writer just mentioned, the same as epha, or opha, which the Greeks rendered ophis, and by it denoted a serpent, and containing no allusion to Eve, as above conjectured. These ceremonies, and this symbolic worship, began among the magi, who were the sons of Chus; and by them they were propagated in various parts. Wherever the Ammonians founded any places of worship, and introduced their rites, there was generally some story of a serpent. There was a legend about a serpent at Colchis, at Thebes, and at Delphi; and likewise in other places. The Greeks called Apollo himself Python, which is the same as Oupis, Opis, or Oub. In Egypt there was a serpent named Thermuthis, which was looked upon as very sacred; and the natives are said to have made use of it as a royal tiara, with which they ornamented the statues of Isis. The kings of Egypt wore high bonnets, terminating in a round ball, and surrounded with figures of asps; and the priests likewise had the representation of serpents upon their bonnets. Abadon, or Abaddon, mentioned in the Revelation, ix, 11, is supposed by Mr. Bryant to have been the name of the Ophite god, with whose worship the world had been so long infected. This worship began among the people of Chaldea, who built the city of Ophis upon the Tigris, and were greatly addicted to divination, and to the worship of the serpent. From Chaldea the worship passed into Egypt, where the serpent deity was called Canoph, Can-eph, and C’neph; it also had the name of Ob, or Oub, and was the same as the Basiliscus, or royal serpent, the same as the Thermuthis, and made use of by way of ornament to the statues of their gods. The chief deity of Egypt is said to have been Vulcan, who was styled Opas; he was the same as Osiris, the sun, and hence was often called Ob-el, or Pytho, sol; and there were pillars sacred to him, with curious hieroglyphical inscriptions bearing the same name, whence among the Greeks, who copied from the Egyptians, every thing gradually tapering to a point was styled obelos, or obeliscus. As the worship of the serpent began among the sons of Chus, Mr. Bryant conjectures that from thence they were denominated Ethiopians and Aithiopians, from Ath-ope, or Athopes, the god whom they worshipped, and not from their complexion: the Ethiopes brought these rites into Greece, and called the island where they

first established them, Ellopia, Solis Serpentis insula, the same with Eubœa, or Oubaia, that is, the Serpent Island. The same learned writer discovers traces of the serpent worship among the Hyperboreans, at Rhodes, named Ophiusa, in Phrygia, and upon the Hellespont, in the island Cyprus, in Crete, among the Athenians, in the name of Cecrops, among the natives of Thebes in Bœotia, among the Lacedæmonians, in Italy, in Syria, &c, and in the names of many places, as well as the people where the 855Ophites settled. One of the most early heresies introduced into the Christian church was that of the Ophitæ, who introduced serpents emblematically among their rites. This is seen in many of the medals, the relics of Gnosticism which are still preserved.

The form assumed by the tempter when he seduced our first parents, has been handed down in the traditions of most ancient nations; and, though animals of the serpent tribe were very generally worshipped by the Pagans, as symbols of the Agathodemon; they were likewise viewed as types or figures of the evil principle. 1. One of the most remarkable accounts of the primeval tempter under the shape of a serpent occurs in the Zend-Avesta of the ancient Persians. 2. To the dracontian Ahriman of the Persians, the malignant serpent caliya of Hindoo theology appears to be very closely allied. He is represented, at least, as the decided enemy of the mediatorial god; whom he persecutes with the utmost virulence, though he is finally vanquished by his celestial adversary. 3. The serpent typhon of the Egyptians, who is sometimes identified with the ocean, because the deluge was esteemed the work of the evil principle; and the serpent python of the Greeks, who is evidently the same as the monster typhon; appear to have similarly originated, in the first instance, from some remembrance of the form which Satan assumed when in paradise. Perhaps also the notion, that python was oracular,--a notion which caused the so frequent use of serpents in the rites of divination, may have sprung from a recollection of the vocal responses which the tempter gave to Eve under the borrowed figure of that reptile. 4. We may still ascribe to the same source that rebellious serpent whose treason seems to have been so well remembered among the inhabitants of Syria. Pherecydes, a native of that country, bestows upon him the Greek name of ophioneus, or the "serpent god;" which, in fact, is a mere translation of the Syriac or Chaldaic nachash. He represents him as being the prince of those evil spirits who contended with the supreme god Cronus, and who in consequence were ejected from heaven. Their happiness being thus justly forfeited, they were henceforth plunged in the depths of Tartarus, hateful and mutually hating each other. From Syria and the east the legend passed into Greece, mingled, however, with allusions to the deluge. The same evil being, in the same form, appears again in the mythology of the Goths or Scythians. We are told by the ancient Scalds, that the bad principle, whom they denominate loke, unites great personal

beauty with a malignant and inconstant nature: and he is described as surpassing all creatures in the depth of his cunning and the artfulness of his perfidy. Here the pristine glory and majesty of Satan, before the lineaments of celestial beauty were defaced by his rebellious apostasy, seem not obscurely to be alluded to; while the craft and malevolence, which mark his character as a fallen angel, are depicted with sufficient accuracy.

The most remarkable corroboration, however, of the Mosaic history is to be found in those fables which involve the mythological serpent, and in the worship which was so generally offered to him throughout the world. The worship of the serpent may be traced in almost every religion through ancient Asia, Europe, Africa, America. But how an object of abhorrence could have been exalted into an object of veneration, must be referred to the subtlety of the arch enemy himself, whose constant endeavour has been rather to corrupt than obliterate the true faith, that, in the perpetual conflict between truth and error, the mind of man might be more surely confounded and debased. Among other devices, that of elevating himself into an object of adoration, has ever been the most cherished. It was that which he proposed to our Lord: "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." We cannot, therefore, wonder that the same being who had the presumption to make this proposal to the Son of God, should have had the address to insinuate himself into the worship of the children of men. In this he was unhappily but too well seconded by the natural tendency of human corruption. The unenlightened Heathen, in obedience to the voice of nature, acknowledged his dependence upon a superior being. His reason assured him that there must be a God; his conscience assured him that God was good; but he felt and acknowledged the prevalence of evil, and attributed it, naturally to an evil agent. But as the evil spirit, to his unilluminated mind, seemed as omnipotent as the good agent, he worshipped both; the one, that he might propitiate his kindness; the other that he might avert his displeasure. The great point of devil worship being gained, namely, the acknowledgment of the evil spirit as God, the transition to idolatry became easy. The mind, once darkened by the admission of an allegiance divided between God and Satan, became gradually more feeble and superstitious, until at length sensible objects were called in to aid the weakness of degraded intellect; and from their first form as symbols, passed rapidly through the successive stages of apotheosis, until they were elevated into gods. Of these the most remarkable was the serpent; upon the basis of tradition, regarded, first as the symbol of the malignant being; subsequently considered talismanic and oracular; and lastly, venerated and worshipped as divine.

SERPENT, Brazen. This was a figure of a serpent, called above the seraph, which Moses caused to be put on the top of a pole, Num. xxi, 9, that all



those bitten by the serpent, who should look upon this image, might be healed. Our Saviour, in the Gospel of St. John, iii, 14, declares, that “as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up,” alluding to his own death which, through faith, was to give life to the world. The brazen serpent was preserved among the Israelites down to the time of Hezekiah; who, being informed that the people paid a superstitious worship to it, had it broken 856 in pieces, and by way of contempt gave it the name of Nehushtan, that is to say, a brazen bauble or trifle, 2 Kings xviii, 4. See Type.

**SERVANT.** This word generally signifies a slave. For formerly among the Hebrews, and the neighbouring nations, the greater part of servants were slaves, that is to say, they belonged absolutely to their masters, who had a right to dispose of their persons, their bodies, goods, and even of their lives, in some cases. The Hebrews had two sorts of servants or slaves, Leviticus xxv, 44, 45, &c. Some were strangers, either bought, or taken in the wars. The others were Hebrew slaves, who, being poor, sold themselves, or were sold to pay their debts; or were delivered up for slaves by their parents, in cases of necessity. This sort of Hebrew slaves continued in slavery but to the year of jubilee; then they might return to liberty again, and their masters could not retain them against their wills. If they would continue voluntarily with their masters, they were brought before the judges; there they made a declaration, that for this time they disclaimed the privilege of the law, had their ears bored with an awl, by applying them to the door-posts of their master, Exod. xxi, 2, 5–7, &c; and after that they had no longer any power of recovering their liberty, except at the next year of jubilee. Servant is also taken for a man that dedicates himself to the service of another, by the choice of his own will and inclination. Thus Joshua was the servant of Moses, Elisha of Elijah, Gehazi of Elisha; St. Peter, St. Andrew, St. Philip, and the rest, were servants of Jesus Christ.

**SETH,** son of Adam and of Eve, was born A. M. 130, Gen. v, 3, 6, 10, 11. Seth, at the age of one hundred and five years, begat Enos, A. M. 235. He lived after this eight hundred and seven years, in all nine hundred and twelve years, and died A. M. 1042. Seth was the chief of “the children of God,” as the Scripture calls them, Gen. vi, 2; that is, those who before the flood preserved true religion and piety in the world, while the descendants of Cain gave themselves up to wickedness. The invention of letters and writing is by the rabbins ascribed to this patriarch.

**SEVEN.** The number seven is consecrated, in the holy books and in the religion of the Jews, by a great number of events and mysterious circumstances. God created the world in the space of seven days, and consecrated the seventh day to repose. This rest of the seventh day,

according to St. Paul, Heb. iv, 4, intimates eternal rest. And not only the seventh day is honoured among the Jews, by the repose of the Sabbath, but every seventh year is also consecrated to the rest of the earth, by the name of a sabbatical year; as also the seven times seventh year, or forty-ninth year, is the year of jubilee. In the prophetic style, a week often stands for seven years, Dan. ix, 24–26. Jacob served his father-in-law Laban seven years for each of his daughters. Pharaoh's mysterious dream represented to his imagination seven fat oxen, and seven lean ones; seven full ears of corn, and as many that were empty and shrivelled. These stood for seven years of plenty, and seven of scarcity. The number of seven days is observed in the octaves of the great solemnities of the passover, of tabernacles, and of the dedication of the tabernacle and the temple; the seven branches of the golden candlestick, the number of seven sacrifices appointed on several occasions, Numbers xxvii, 11; xxix, 17–21, &c. Seven trumpets, seven priests that sounded them, seven days to surround the walls of Jericho, Joshua vi, 4, 6, 8. In the Revelation, are the seven churches, seven candlesticks, seven spirits, seven stars, seven lamps, seven seals, seven angels, seven phials, seven plagues, &c. In certain passages, the number seven is put for a great number. Isaiah, iv, 1, says that seven women should lay hold on one man, to ask him to marry them. Hannah, the mother of Samuel, says, 1 Sam. ii, 5, that she who was barren should have seven children. Jeremiah, xv, 9, makes use of the same expression. God threatens his people to smite them seven times for their transgressions, Lev. xxvi, 24, that is to say several times. The Psalmist, speaking of very pure silver, says it is "purified seven times," Psalm xii, 6. And elsewhere, "Render unto our neighbours sevenfold into their bosom," Psalm lxxix, 12; punish them severely, and as often as they deserve it. The slayer of Cain was to be punished seven times; but of Lamech seventy times seven times, Gen. iv, 15, 24. The slothful man thinks himself wiser than seven men, that set forth proverbs, Prov. xxvi, 16; he thinks himself of more worth than many wise men. St. Peter asks our Saviour, Matthew xviii, 21, 22, How many times should he forgive his brother? till seven times? And Christ answers him, I say not only seven times, but seventy times seven; meaning, as often as he may offend, however frequent it may be.

SHARON, Plain of, a beautiful and spacious plain, extending from Cæsarea to Joppa on the sea coast, and eastward to the mountains of Judea; and is celebrated for its wines, its flowers, and its pastures. It still preserves some portions of its natural beauty, and is adorned in the spring with the white and red rose, the narcissus, the white and orange lily, the carnation and other flowers; but for the rest of the year it appears little better than a desert, with here and there a ruined village, and some clumps of olive trees and sycamores. This name was almost become a proverb, to express a place of extraordinary beauty and fruitfulness, Isaiah xxxiii, 9; xxxv, 2. But there

are three cantons of Palestine known by the name of Sharon. The first, according to Eusebius and St. Jerom, is a canton between Mount Tabor and the sea of Tiberias. The second, a canton between the city of Cæsarea of Palestine and Joppa. And the third a canton beyond Jordan, in the country of Basan, and in the division of the tribe of Gad. Modern travellers give this name also to the plain that lies between Ecdippe and Ptolemais.

**SHAVING.** In time of mourning the Jews shaved their heads, and neglected to trim their beards. The king of the Ammonites shaved off half the beards of David's ambassadors, which was the greatest insult he could offer. This will appear from the regard which the easterns have ever paid to the beard. D'Arvieux gives a remarkable instance of an Arab who, having received a wound in his jaw, chose to hazard his life rather than to suffer his surgeon to take off his beard. It was one of the most infamous punishments of cowardice in Sparta, that they who turned their backs in the day of battle were obliged to appear abroad with one half of their beard shaved, and the other half unshaved. The easterns considered the beard as venerable, because it distinguished men from women, and was the mark of freemen in opposition to slaves. It was still, in times comparatively modern, the greatest indignity that could be offered in Persia. Shah Abbas, king of that country, enraged that the emperor of Hindostan had inadvertently addressed him by a title far inferior to that of the great shah-in-shah, or king of kings, ordered the beards of the ambassadors to be shaved off, and sent them home to their master. "One of the buffoons of the bashaw," says Belzoni, "took it into his head one day, for a frolic, to shave his beard, which is no trifle among the Turks; for some of them, I really believe, would sooner have their head cut off than their beard. In this state he went home to his women, who actually thrust him out of the door; and such was the disgrace of cutting off his beard, that even his fellow buffoons would not eat with him till it was grown again."

**SHEAF.** After the feast of the passover the Jews brought a sheaf into the temple, as the first fruits of the barley harvest, Lev. xxiii, 10, 12; and these were the ceremonies that were then performed. On the 16th of the month Nisan, in the evening, when the feast day of the passover was ended, and the second day was begun, which was a working day, the house of judgment deputed three men to go in solemnity, and gather the sheaf of barley. The inhabitants of the neighbouring cities came together, to be present at the ceremony. The barley was gathered in the territory of Jerusalem. The deputies demanded three times successively if the sun was set; and were as often answered that it was. Then they demanded three times if they might be permitted to cut the sheaf, and permission was as often granted. They reaped it out of three different fields, with three different sickles, and put the ears into three boxes to carry to the temple.

This sheaf was threshed in the court; and of the grain they took a full omer, and after it had been winnowed, parched, and bruised, they sprinkled oil over it, and added a handful of incense; then the priest who received the offering, waved it before the Lord to the four quarters of the world, crosswise; he cast part of it upon the altar, and the rest was his own. After this every one might begin to reap the harvest.

SHEBA. Of “the queen of Sheba,” mention is made 1 Kings x, 1, 2, &c; 2 Chron. ix, 1, 2, &c; Matt. xii, 42; Luke xi, 31. She is called “queen of the south,” and was, according to some, a queen of Arabia; and, according to others, a queen of Ethiopia. Josephus says, that Sheba was the ancient name of the city of Meroe, before Cambyses gave it that of his sister; and that it was from thence the queen came of whom we are speaking. This opinion has much prevailed. The Abyssinians at this day, maintain, that this princess was of their country, and that her posterity reigned there a long time. They preserve a catalogue of them, their names and successions.

שׁ SHEEP, הֶשֶׁ, occurs frequently, and צֹאן, a general name for both sheep and goats, considered collectively in a flock, Arabic zain. The sheep is a well known animal. The benefits which mankind owe to it are numerous. Its fleece, its skin, its flesh, its tallow, and even its horns and bowels are articles of great utility to human life and happiness. Its mildness and inoffensiveness of temper, strongly recommend it to human affection and regard; and have designated it the pattern and emblem of meekness, innocence, patience, and submission. It is a social animal. The flock follow the ram as their leader; who frequently displays the most impetuous courage in their defence: dogs, and even men, when attempting to molest them, have often suffered from his sagacious and generous valour. There are two varieties of sheep found in Syria. The first, called the “Bidoween sheep,” differs little from the large breed among us, except that the tail is somewhat longer and thicker. The second is much more common, and is more valued on account of the extraordinary bulk of its tail, which has been remarked by all the eastern travellers. The carcass of one of these sheep, without including the head, feet, entrails, and skin, weighs from fifty to sixty pounds, of which the tail makes up fifteen pounds. Some of a larger size, fattened with care, will sometimes weigh one hundred and fifty pounds, the tail alone composing one third of the whole weight. It is of a substance between fat and marrow, and is not eaten separately, but mixed with the lean meat in many of their dishes, and often also used instead of butter. A reference to this part is made in Exod. xxix, 22; Lev. iii, 9; where the fat and the tail were to be burnt on the altar of sacrifice. Mr. Street considers this precept to have had respect to the health of the Israelites; observing that “bilious disorders are very frequent in hot countries; the eating of fat meat is a great encouragement and excitement to them; and

though the fat of the tail is now considered as a delicacy, it is really unwholesome." The conclusion of the seventeenth verse, which is, "Ye shall eat neither fat nor blood," justifies this opinion. The prohibition of eating fat, that is of fat unmixed with the flesh, the omentum or caul, is given also, Lev. vii, 23.

SHEKEL, שקל, signifies weight, money, shekel, siclus, a Hebrew weight and money, Exod. xxx, 23, 24; 2 Sam. xiv, 26. Shekel is used to denote the weight of any thing; as iron, hair, spices, &c. Dr. Arbuthnot makes the weight of the shekel equal to 9 dwt. 247 gr. 858 English troy weight; and the value equal to 2s. 3<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>d. sterling money: but the golden shekel was worth 1l. 16s. 6d. English money. Some are of opinion that the Jews had two kinds of shekels, namely, the common one already noticed, and the shekel of the sanctuary, which last they make double the former. But most authors make them the same, and think that the word sanctuary is added to express a just and exact weight, according to the standards kept in the temple or tabernacle. Moses, Num. xviii, 16, and Ezekiel, xlv, 12, say, that the shekel was worth twenty gerahs.

SHEM, the son of Noah, Gen. vi, 10. He was born A. M. 1558. It is the opinion of the generality of commentators, that Shem was younger than Japheth, and the second son of Noah, for reasons given under the article Japheth. See also Gen. ix, 23–25. He lived six hundred years, and died A. M. 2158. The posterity of Shem obtained their portion in the best parts of Asia. The Jews ascribe to Shem the theological tradition of the things that Noah had learned from the first men. Shem communicated them to his children, and by this means the true religion was preserved in the world. Some have thought Shem the same as Melchisedec, and that he himself had been at the school of Methuselah before the deluge: that he gave to Abraham the whole tradition, the ceremonies of the sacrifices of religion, according to which this patriarch afterward offered his sacrifices. But this opinion has no adequate support. Lastly, the Jews say, that he taught men the law of justice, and the manner of reckoning months and years, and the intercalations of the months. All that can be said as to these speculations is, that Noah and all his sons were the depositaries of the knowledge which existed among men before the flood, and were perhaps both specially qualified by God first to attain it, and then to transmit it to their descendants. Shem had five sons, Elam, Asher, Arphaxad, Lud, and Aran, who peopled the richest provinces of Asia.

SHEPHERDS. The patriarchal shepherds, rich in flocks and herds, in silver and gold, and attended by a numerous train of servants purchased with their money, or hired from the neighbouring towns and villages, acknowledge no civil superior; they held the rank, and exercised the rights, of sovereign

princes; they concluded alliances with the kings in whose territories they tended their flocks; they made peace or war with the surrounding states; and, in fine, they wanted nothing of sovereign authority but the name. Unfettered by the cumbrous ceremonies of regal power, they led a plain and laborious life, in perfect freedom and overflowing abundance. Refusing to confine themselves to any particular spot, (for the pastures were not yet appropriated,) they lived in tents, and removed from one place to another in search of pasture for their cattle. Strangers in the countries where they sojourned, they refused to mingle with the permanent settlers, to occupy their towns, and to form with them one people. They were conscious of their strength, and jealous of their independence; and although patient and forbearing, their conduct proved, on several occasions, that they wanted neither skill nor courage to vindicate their rights and avenge their wrongs. In the wealth, the power, and the splendour of patriarchal shepherds, we discover the rudiments of regal grandeur and authority; and in their numerous and hardy retainers, the germ of potent empires. Hence the custom so prevalent among the ancients, of distinguishing the office and duties of their kings and princes, by terms borrowed from the pastoral life: Agamemnon, shepherd of the people, *Αγαμεμνονα ποιμενα λαων*, is a phrase frequently used in the strains of Homer. The sacred writers very often speak of kings under the name of shepherds, and compare the royal sceptre to the shepherd's crook: "He chose David also his servant, and took him from the sheep folds; from following the ewes great with young, he brought him to feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance. So he fed them according to the integrity of his heart, and guided them by the skilfulness of his hands." And Jehovah said to David himself: "Thou shalt feed my people Israel, and thou shalt be a captain over Israel." The royal Psalmist, on the other hand, celebrates under the same allusions, the special care and goodness of God toward himself, and also toward his ancient people. "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want." "Give ear, O shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth." In many other places of Scripture, the church is compared to a sheep fold, the saints to sheep, and the ministers of religion to shepherds, who must render, at last, an account of their administration to the Shepherd and Overseer to whom they owe their authority.

The patriarchs did not commit their flocks and herds solely to the care of menial servants and strangers; they tended them in person, or placed them under the superintendence of their sons and their daughters, who were bred to the same laborious employment, and taught to perform, without reluctance, the meanest services. Rebecca, the only daughter of a shepherd prince, went to a considerable distance to draw water; and it is evident, from the readiness and address with which she let down her pitcher from

her shoulder, and gave drink to the servant of Abraham, and afterward drew for all his camels, that she had been long accustomed to that humble employment. From the same authority we know that Rachel, the daughter of Laban, kept her father's flocks, and submitted to the various privations and hardships of the pastoral life, in the deserts of Syria. The patriarch Jacob, though he was the son of a shepherd prince, kept the flocks of Laban, his maternal uncle; and his own sons followed the same business, both in Mesopotamia, and after his return to the land of Canaan. This primeval simplicity was long retained among the Greeks. Homer often sends the daughters of princes and nobles to tend the flocks, to wash the clothes of the family at the fountain, or in the flowing stream, and to perform many other menial services. Adonis, the son of Cinyras, a king of Cyprus, fed his flocks by the streaming rivers:

*Et formosus oves ad flumina pavit Adonis.*

*Vir. Ecl. x, l. 18.*

“Along the streams his flock Adonis fed.”

Dryden.

Andromache, the wife of Hector, complains that Achilles had slain her seven brothers when they were tending their flocks and herds. Æneas pastured his oxen on Mount Ida, when Achilles seized them, and forced the Trojan hero to flee. Phœbus himself was a keeper of oxen in the groves and valleys of Mount Ida. This custom has descended to modern times; for in Syria the daughters of the Turcoman and Arabian shepherds, and in India the Brahmin women of distinction, are seen drawing water at the village wells, and tending their cattle to the lakes and rivers.

The flocks and herds of these shepherds were immensely numerous. The sheep of the Bedoween Arabs in Egypt, and probably throughout the east, are very fine, black-faced and white-faced, and many of them clothed in a brown coloured fleece: and of this superior breed the ample flocks of the Syrian shepherds consisted. So great was the stock of Abraham and Lot, that they were obliged to separate, because “the land was not able to bear them.” From the present which Jacob made to his brother Esau, consisting of five hundred and eighty head of different sorts, we may form some idea of the countless numbers of great and small cattle which he had acquired in the service of Laban. In modern times, the numbers of cattle in the Turcoman flocks, which feed on the fertile plains of Syria, are almost incredible. They sometimes occupy three or four days in passing from one part of the country to another. Chardin had an opportunity of seeing a clan of Turcoman shepherds on their march, about two days' distance from Aleppo. The whole country was covered with them. Many of their principal people with whom he conversed on the road, assured him, that there were four hundred thousand beasts of carriage, camels, horses, oxen, cows, and

asses, and three millions of sheep and goats. This astonishing account of Chardin is confirmed by Dr. Shaw, who states, that several Arabian tribes, who can bring no more than three or four hundred horses into the field, are possessed of more than as many thousand camels, and triple the number of sheep and black cattle. Russel, in his "History of Aleppo," speaks of vast flocks which pass that city every year, of which many sheep are sold to supply the inhabitants. The flocks and herds which belonged to the Jewish patriarchs were not more numerous.

The care of such overgrown flocks, says Paxton, required many shepherds. These were of different kinds; the master of the family and his children, with a number of herdsmen who were hired to assist them, and felt but little interest in the preservation and increase of their charge. In Hebrew, these persons, so different in station and feeling, were not distinguished by appropriate names; the master, the slave, and the hired servant, were all known by the common appellation of shepherds. The distinction, not sufficiently important to require the invention of a particular term, is expressed among every people by a periphrasis. The only instance in the Old Testament, in which the hired servant is distinguished from the master, or one of his family, occurs in the history of David, where he is said to have left the sheep, על שומר, "in the hand of a keeper," while he went down to visit his brethren, and the armies who were fighting against the Philistines under the banners of Saul, 1 Samuel xvii, 20. This word exactly corresponds with the Latin term *custos*, "a keeper," which Virgil uses to denote a hireling shepherd, in his tenth Eclogue:

Atque utinam ex vobis unus vestrique fuissem,  
Aut *custos gregis*, aut *maturæ vinitor uvæ*.  
"O that your birth and business had been mine,  
To feed the flock and prune the spreading vine!"  
Wharton.

In such extensive pastoral concerns, the vigilance and activity of the master were often insufficient for directing the operations of so many shepherds, who were not unfrequently scattered over a considerable extent of country. An upper servant was therefore appointed to superintend their labours, and take care that his master suffered no injury. In the house of Abraham, this honourable station was held by Eliezer, a native of Damascus, a servant in every respect worthy of so great and good a master. The numerous flocks of Pharaoh seem to have required the superintending care of many overseers, Gen. xlvi, 6. Doeg, an Edomite, was entrusted with the whole pastoral establishment of Saul, 1 Sam. xxi, 7. But in the reign of David, the important office of chief herdsman was abolished, and the vast flocks and herds of that monarch were entrusted to a number of superintendents; animals of the same species forming a separate flock, under its proper



overseer, 1 Chronicles xxvii, 29. These overseers, in the language of the Hebrews, were called the princes of the flock; they were treated with great distinction, and seem to have been selected in the reign of David from among the nobles of his court. Eumæus, a person of noble birth, agreeably to this custom, was charged with the care of the herds of swine belonging to Ulysses. The office of chief shepherd is frequently mentioned by the classic authors of antiquity. Diodorus relates from Ctesias, that Simma was overseer of the royal flocks under Ninus, king of Assyria. According to Plutarch, one Samo managed the flocks and herds of Neoptolemus, the king of the Molossians. The office of chief shepherd was also known among the Latins; for, in the seventh Æneid, Tyrrheus is named as governor of the royal flocks:

Tyrrheusque pater, cui regia parent  
Armenta, et late custodia credita camp.  
“Their father, Tyrrheus, did his fodder bring;  
Tyrrheus, chief ranger to the Latian king.”  
Dryden.

And Livy informs us, that Faustulus held the same office under Numitor, king of the Latins. But it is needless to multiply quotations; every scholar knows that the Greek and Roman classics abound with allusions to this office, which in those days was one of great importance and dignity, on the faithful discharge of which the power and splendour of an eastern potentate greatly depended. The office of chief shepherd, therefore, being in pastoral countries one of great trust, of high responsibility, and of distinguished honour, is with great propriety applied to our Lord by the Apostle Peter: “And when the chief shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory which fadeth not away,” 1 Peter v, 4. The same allusion occurs in these words of Paul: “Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his will,” Hebrews xiii, 20.

SHIBBOLETH, “an ear of corn,” was a word which the Gileadites used as the test of an Ephraimite. For the Ephraimites could not, from disuse, pronounce the Hebrew letter shin; therefore, they said Sibboleth instead of Shibboleth, Judges xii, 6. The Greeks, says Hartley, have not the sound sh in their language: hence they are liable to be detected, like the Ephraimites. I was struck with this circumstance, in learning Turkish from a Greek tutor; pasha, he pronounced pasa; shimdi, he called simdi; Dervish, Dervis, &c. Shibboleth he would, of course, pronounce Sibboleth.

SHIELD. See Arms.

SHILOH, Gen. xlix, 10. The Hebrew text is, “until Shiloh come.” All Christian commentators agree, that this word ought to be understood of the Messiah, that is, of Jesus Christ. The LXX. read it, “Until the coming of him to whom it is reserved.” It must be owned that the signification of the Hebrew word Shiloh is not well known. Some translate the clause, “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, till he comes to whom it belongs;” others, “till the coming of the peacemaker, or the pacific, or prosperity;” and some, “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah till its end, its ruin,” till the downfall of the kingdom of the Jews. However, this much is clear, that the ancient Jews are in this matter agreed with the Christians, in acknowledging that the word stands for Messiah, the King. It is thus that the paraphrasts, Onkelos and Jonathan, and the ancient Hebrew commentaries upon Genesis, and the Talmudists explain it. If Jesus Christ and his Apostles did not make use of this passage to prove the coming of the Messiah, it was because then the completion of this prophecy was not sufficiently manifest. The sceptre still continued among the Jews; they had still kings of their own nation, in the persons of the Herods; but soon after the sceptre was entirely taken away from them, and a people began to be gathered to Christ, out of the Gentile nations.

2. Shiloh, a celebrated city of the tribe of Ephraim, twelve miles from Shechem, Joshua xviii, xix, xxi. It was in this place that the tabernacle of the Lord was set up, when the people were settled in the country. The ark and the tabernacle of the Lord continued at Shiloh from A. M. 2560 till 2888, when it was taken by the Philistines, under the administration of the high priest Eli, 1 Sam. iv. Here the Prophet Ahijah dwelt, 1 Kings xiv, 2.

SHINAR, a province of Babylonia, where men undertook to build the tower of Babel, Genesis xi, 2; x, 10. Calneh was built in this country. Amraphel was king of Shinar in the days of Abraham, Genesis xiv, 1. See Babylon.

SHISHAK, king of Egypt, declared war against Rehoboam in the fifth year of the reign of that prince, 2 Chron. xii, 2, 3, &c. This Shishak, according to Sir Isaac Newton, was the greatest conqueror, and the most celebrated hero, of all antiquity, being the son of Ammon, or the Egyptian Jupiter, and known to the Greeks by the name of Bacchus, Osiris, and Hercules; was the Belus of the Chaldeans, and the Mars or Mavors of the Thracians, &c. He made great conquests in India, Assyria, Media, Scythia, Phenicia, Syria, Judea, &c. His army was at last routed in Greece by Perseus; which, with other circumstances, compelled him to return home.

SHITTIM, SITTIM, SITTAH, שִׁטִּים, Exod. xxv, 5, 10, 13, 23, 28; xxvi, 26, 32, 37; xxvii, 1, 6; xxx, 5; xxxv, 7, 24; xxxvi, 20, 31, 36; xxxvii, 1, 4, 10,

15, 25, 28; xxxviii, 1, 6; Deut. x, 3; Isaiah xli, 19. What particular species of wood this is, interpreters are not agreed. The LXX. render ἄσηπτα ξύλα, incorruptible wood. St. Jerom says, the shittim wood grows in the deserts of Arabia, and is like white thorn, as to its colour and leaves: but the tree is so large as to furnish very long planks. The wood is hard, tough, smooth, and extremely beautiful. It is thought that this wood is the black acacia, because that, it is said, is the most common tree growing in the deserts of Arabia; and agrees with what the Scriptures say of the shittim wood. The acacia vera grows abundantly in Egypt, in places far from the sea; in the mountains of Sinai, near the Red Sea, and in the deserts. It is of the size of a large mulberry tree. The spreading branches and larger limbs are armed with thorns which grow three together; the bark is rough; the leaves are oblong, and stand opposite each other; the flowers, though sometimes white, are generally of a bright yellow; and the fruit which resembles a bean, is contained in pods like those of the lupin. "The acacia tree," says Dr. Shaw, "being by much the largest and most common tree in these deserts, Arabia Petraea, we have some reason to conjecture, that the shittim wood was the wood of the acacia; especially as its flowers are of an excellent smell, for the shittah tree is, in Isaiah xli, 19, joined with the myrtle and other fragrant shrubs."

SHOES. To put off the shoes from one's feet, was an act of reverence to the Divine majesty of God, Exod. iii, 5. It was likewise 861a sign of mourning and humiliation. David went up the ascent of Mount Olivet barefoot, 2 Sam. xv, 30; Isa. xx, 2, 4; Ezek. xxiv, 17. See Sandal.

SHOULDER. To give or lend the shoulder for the bearing of a burden, signifies to submit to servitude. "Issachar bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute," Gen. xlix, 15. And Isaiah, x, 27, comforting Israel with the promise of deliverance from Assyria, says, "His burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder." The Scripture calls that a rebellious shoulder, a withdrawing shoulder, which will not submit to the yoke; and to bear it together with joint consent, is termed "serving with one shoulder." To bear any thing upon the shoulder, is to sustain it, and this is applied to government and authority. Thus Messiah was to bear the government upon his shoulder: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor," &c, Isa. ix, 6; and God promises Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, to give him the key of the house of David, and to lay it upon his shoulder; "so he shall open, and none shall shut, and he shall shut, and none shall open;" that is, the sole authority shall rest upon him.

SHUSHAN, or SUSA, the ancient capital of Persia, seated on the river Ulai, the modern Abzal. After the union of the kingdoms of Media and

Persia by Cyrus, Susa was made the winter residence of the kings of Persia, from its southern position, and the shelter afforded by a range of mountains on the north and east, which rendered the heat insupportable in the summer season; while Ecbatana, in Media, from its greater elevation, and more northern situation, was preferred at this season, as being more cool and agreeable. Here the transactions occurred related in the book of Esther. Here also Daniel had the vision of the ram with two horns, and the goat with one horn, &c, in the third year of Belshazzar's reign. Susa was situated in the ancient province of Elam, or Elymais, called also Susiana, and now forming a part of Kuzestan. It has for several hundred years, like Babylon, been reduced to a heap of undistinguished ruins. Mr. Kinneir says, "About seven or eight miles to the west of Dezphoul, commence the ruins of Shus, stretching not less, perhaps, than twelve miles, from one extremity to the other. They extend as far as the eastern bank of the Kerah; occupying an immense space between that river and the Abzal; and, like the ruins of Ctesiphon, Babylon, and Kufa, consist of hillocks of earth and rubbish, covered with broken pieces of brick and coloured tile. The largest and most remarkable of these mounds stand at the distance of about two miles from the Kerah. The first is, at the lowest computation, a mile in circumference, and nearly a hundred feet in height; and the other, although not quite so high, is double the circuit of the former. These mounds bear some resemblance to the pyramids of Babylon; with this difference, that instead of being entirely made of brick, they are formed of clay and pieces of tile, with irregular layers of brick and mortar, five or six feet in thickness, to serve, it should seem, as a kind of prop to the mass. Large blocks of marble, covered with hieroglyphics, are not unfrequently here discovered by the Arabs when digging in search of hidden treasure; and at the foot of the most elevated of the pyramids stands the tomb of Daniel, a small and apparently a modern building, erected on the spot where the relics of that prophet are believed to rest. The site of the city of Shus is now a gloomy wilderness, infested by lions, hyænas, and other beasts of prey. The dread of these furious animals compelled Mr. Monteith and myself to take shelter for the night within the walls that encompass Daniel's tomb." Of this tomb Sir John Malcom observes, that "it is a small building, but sufficient to shelter some dervishes who watch the remains of the prophet, and are supported by the alms of pious pilgrims who visit the holy sepulchre. These dervishes are now the only inhabitants of Susa; and every species of wild beast roams at large over that spot on which some of the proudest palaces ever raised by human art once stood." He also observes, respecting the authenticity of this tomb, that "although the building at the tomb of Daniel be comparatively modern, nothing could have led to its being built where it is, but a belief that this was the real site of the prophet's sepulchre."

SIDON, or ZIDON, a celebrated city and port of Phenicia, and one of the most ancient cities in the world; as it is supposed to have been founded by Sidon, the eldest son of Canaan, which will carry it up to above two thousand years before Christ. But if it was founded by Sidon, his descendants were driven out by a body of Phenician colonists, or Cushim from the east; who are supposed either to have given it its name, or to have retained the old one in compliment to their god Siton, or Dagon. Its inhabitants appear to have early acquired a preëminence in arts, manufactures, and commerce; and from their superior skill in hewing timber, by which must be understood their cutting it out and preparing it for building, as well as the mere act of felling it, Sidonian workmen were hired by Solomon to prepare the wood for the building of his temple. The Sidonians are said to have been the first manufacturers of glass; and Homer often speaks of them as excelling in many useful and ingenious arts, giving them the title of Πολυδαίδαλοι. Add to this, they were, if not the first shipwrights and navigators, the first who ventured beyond their own coasts, and in those early ages engrossed the greatest part of the then commerce of the world. The natural result of these exclusive advantages to the inhabitants of Sidon was, a high degree of wealth and prosperity; and content with the riches which their trade and manufactures brought them, they lived in ease and luxury, trusting the defence of their city and property, like the Tyrians after them, to hired troops; so that to live in ease and security, is said in Scripture to be after the manner of the Sidonians. 862In all these respects, however, Sidon was totally eclipsed by her neighbour and rival Tyre; whose more enterprising inhabitants pushed their commercial dealings to the extremities of the known world, raised their city to a rank in power and opulence unknown before, and converted it into a luxurious metropolis, and the emporium of the produce of all nations. After the subversion of the Grecian empire by the Romans, Sidon fell into the hands of the latter; who, to put an end to the frequent revolt of the inhabitants, deprived it of its freedom. It then fell successively under the power of the Saracens, the Seljukian Turks, and the sultans of Egypt; who, in 1289, that they might never more afford shelter to the Christians, destroyed both it and Tyre. But it again somewhat revived, and has ever since been in the possession of the Ottoman Turks.

SIGN. This word is used in the sense of token and pledge; as, when the Lord gave to Noah the rainbow, as a sign of his covenant, Gen. ix, 12, 13; and when he appointed to Abraham the use of circumcision, as the seal of the covenant he had made with him and his posterity, Gen. xvii, 11. Sign is also put for a miracle: "Thou shalt do these signs and wonders in the midst of Egypt," Exodus iv, 7–9, &c. A sign or token is often put for the proof or evidence of a thing: For example, "This shall be a token or sign unto thee, that I have sent thee," Exod. iii, 12. "Shew me a sign, that thou talkest with

me,” Judges vi, 17, that is a proof. “What shall be the sign,” or evidence, “that the Lord will heal me?” 2 Kings xx, 8. This acceptation agrees with the first above mentioned; as also what is said in Gen. iv, 15, “And the Lord set a mark or sign upon Cain;” he gave him a pledge that his life should not be taken away. The signs of heaven, and the signs of the magicians, are the phenomena of the heavens, and the impostures of magicians, which they made use of for the purposes of deception: “The Lord frustrateth the tokens or signs of the liars, and maketh diviners mad,” Isaiah xliv, 25. “Be not dismayed at the signs of heaven, for the Heathen are dismayed at them,” Jer. x, 2. To be a sign was farther to be a type, or prediction, of what should happen. Thus the Prophet Isaiah, viii, 18, “Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and for wonders in Israel.” See also Ezek. iv, 3.

SILAS, or Sylvanus, was, according to St. Luke, Acts xv, 22, one of the “chief men among the brethren,” which makes it probable, that he was of the number of the seventy disciples. When a dispute was raised at Antioch about the observation of the legal ceremonies, they chose Paul, Barnabas, Judas, and Silas, to go to Jerusalem, to advise with the Apostles concerning this question. He is thought to be the same Silas who is mentioned by the name of Sylvanus, in the title of the two epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians. St. Peter sent his first epistle by him from Rome, wherein he styles him “a faithful brother.” Silas joined himself to St. Paul; and after Saul and Barnabas had parted, on account of John Mark, Acts xv, 37–41, Silas followed St. Paul, and went with him to visit the churches of Syria and Cilicia.

SILENCE. This word not only signifies to refrain from speaking; but also in the style of the Hebrews, it is taken for, “to be quiet, to remain immovable.” As for example: “Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon,” in Hebrew, be silent. “And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed,” Joshua x, 12, 13, or were silent, at the commandment of Joshua.

SILOAH, the same as Siloam, Neh. iii, 15; Luke xiii, 4; a fountain under the walls of Jerusalem, toward the east, between the city and the brook Kidron, perhaps the same with Enrogel. Near this was a tower, Luke xiii, 4.

שריקות SILK, משי. As the word which is rendered “silk” in our version more probably meant cotton, or rather muslin, it is doubtful whether silk is mentioned expressly in the Scripture, unless, perhaps, in Isaiah xix, 9, where we find the Hebrew word שריקות, from שרק, yellowish, tawny; which is generally the natural colour of raw silk; hence the Latin sericum: or it may be from the Seres, a nation whence the Greeks and Romans first

obtained the article silk. Calmet remarks that the ancient Greeks and Romans had but little knowledge of the nature of silk. The Seres communicated their silk to the Persians, from whom it passed to the Greeks, and from them to the Romans. But the Persians and orientals for a long time kept the secret of manufacturing it among themselves. Silk was first brought into Greece after Alexander's conquest of Persia, and came into Italy during the flourishing times of the Roman empire; but was long so dear in all these parts as to be worth its weight in gold. At length the emperor Justinian, who died in the year 365, by means of two monks, whom he sent into India for that purpose, procured great quantities of silk worms' eggs to be brought to Constantinople, and from these have sprung all the silk worms and all the silk trade that have been since in Europe, See Flax.

SILVER, כֶּסֶף, Gen. xx, 16; ἀργύριον, 1 Pet. i, 18; Acts iii, 4; xx, 33; a well known metal, of a white shining colour; next in value to gold. It does not appear to have been in use before the deluge; at least Moses says nothing of it: he speaks only of the metals brass and iron, Gen. iv, 22. But in Abraham's time it was become common, and traffic was carried on with it, Gen. xxiii, 2, 15. Yet it was not then coined, but was only in bars or ingots; and in commerce was always weighed.

SIMEON, son of Jacob and Leah, was born A. M. 2247, Genesis xxix, 33; xxxiv, 25. Jacob, on his death bed, showed his indignation against Simeon and Levi for their cruelty to the Shechemites, Gen. xlix, 5: "I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel." And in effect these two tribes were scattered in Israel. As to Levi, he never had any fixed lot or portion; and Simeon received only a canton that was dismembered from the tribe of Judah, Joshua xix, 1, &c, and some other 863lands they went to conquer in the mountains of Seir, and the desert of Gedor, 1 Chronicles iv, 27, 39, 42.

2. Simeon, a holy man, who was at Jerusalem, full of the Holy Ghost, and expecting the redemption of Israel, Luke ii, 25, 26, &c. The Holy Ghost had assured him, that he should not die before he had seen the Christ of the Lord; he therefore came into the temple, prompted by inspiration, just at the time when Joseph and Mary presented Jesus Christ there, in obedience to the law. Simeon took the child into his arms, gave thanks to God, and then blessed Joseph and Mary. It is believed, with good reason, that he died soon after he had given his testimony to Jesus Christ. Some have conjectured, that Simeon, who received Jesus Christ into his arms, was the same as Simeon the Just, the son of Hillel, and master of Gamaliel, whose disciple St. Paul was. See Sanhedrim.

SIMON MACCABÆUS, surnamed Thossi, son of Mattathias, and brother of Judas and Jonathan. He was chief prince and pontiff of the Jews from A. M. 3860 to 3869, and was succeeded by John Hyrcanus. For the particulars of his life and transactions, see 1 Mac. ii, 65; v, 17; x, 74–82; xii, 33, &c; xiii, 1, &c; xiv, 4, &c; xv, 1, &c.

2. Simon, the Canaanite, an Apostle of Jesus Christ. It is doubtful whether the name of Canaanite was derived to him from the city Cana in Galilee, or whether it should not be taken according to its signification in the Hebrew, by deriving it from the root kana, “to be zealous,” and this is the opinion of some learned men. See Luke vi, 15; Acts i, 13, where he is surnamed Zelotes; see also Matt. x, 4; Mark iii, 18.

3. Simon, brother of our Lord, Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3; that is to say, his cousin-german, being son of Mary, sister to the holy virgin. He is thought to be the same with Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, and son of Cleopas.

4. Simon Magus. Of this heretic, or rather father of heresy, Dr. Burton gives the following account:--Justin Martyr, about A. D. 140, presented a defence of Christianity to the emperor Antoninus Pius, in which he mentions, as a well known fact, that Simon, a native of Gittum, a village in Samaria, came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, was looked upon there as a god, and had a statue erected to him, with a Latin inscription, in the river Tiber, between the two bridges. Justin adds, that nearly all the Samaritans, and a few also in other nations, acknowledged and worshipped him as the supreme God. There is in this passage such a minute detail, such a confident appeal to the emperor’s own knowledge of what the apologist was saying, that we can hardly suppose the story to be false, when not only the emperor, but every person in Rome would have been able to detect it. I would observe, also, that Justin Martyr was himself a native of Samaria; hence he was able to name the very place where Simon was born; and when he says, in his second defence, which was presented a few years later, “I have despised the impious and false doctrine of Simon which is in my country;” when we see the shame which he felt at the name of Christian being assumed by the followers of that impostor; we can never believe that he would have countenanced the story, if the truth of it had not been notorious, much less would he have given to his own country the disgrace of originating the evil.

Simon Magus was a native of Gittum, a town in Samaria; and it is stated in a suspicious document of ancient though doubtful date, that he studied for some time at Alexandria. Concerning the time of his birth, and of his first rising into notice, little can now be known. The only contemporary document which mentions him is the Acts of the Apostles; and we there read, that, when Philip the deacon preached the Gospel in Samaria after the



death of Stephen, “there was a certain man, called Simon, which beforetime in the same city used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one; to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is the great power of God. And to him they had regard, because that of long time he had bewitched them with sorceries,” Acts viii, 9–11. According to my calculation, the death of Stephen happened in the same year with the crucifixion of our Lord; and it appears from the passage now quoted, that Simon’s celebrity had begun some time before. We are then told that “Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done,” Acts viii, 13. I need not mention how he shortly fell away from the faith which he had embraced, and how St. Peter rebuked him for thinking that the gift of God might be purchased for money, Acts viii, 20; but I would observe, that some of those persons who insist upon the fact that Simon was not a Christian appear to have forgotten that he was actually baptized. For a time, at least, he believed in Jesus Christ; and part of this belief he appears always to have retained; that is, he always believed that Jesus Christ was a being more than human, who came from God. If these events happened, as I have supposed, within a short time of our Lord’s ascension, the fathers had good reason to call Simon Magus the parent of all heresies; for he must then have been among the first persons, beyond the limits of Jerusalem, who embraced the Gospel; and we might hope that there was no one before him who perverted the faith which he had professed.

From the detailed account which we have of Simon in the Acts of the Apostles, I should be inclined to infer these two things: 1. That St. Luke knew no earlier instance of apostasy from the Gospel; and he mentions this because it was the first: and 2. That when St. Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles the heresy of Simon was widely spread; and therefore he tells his readers how it had begun. Concerning the remainder of Simon’s life we know little, and in that little it is difficult to separate truth from fiction. I should be inclined, for the reasons given above, to believe the account of Justin Martyr, who says that Simon Magus went to Rome in the reign of Claudius, and attracted numerous followers. Eusebius quotes this passage of Justin Martyr; but he adds, upon some other authority, which he does not name, that St. Peter came to Rome at the same time; and that, in consequence of his preaching, the popularity of the impostor was entirely destroyed. This would be a most interesting and important fact, if we were certain of its being true; but Eusebius contradicts himself in his account of Simon Magus going to Rome; and later writers have so embellished the story of this meeting, and made the death of Simon so astonishingly miraculous, that criticism is at a loss to know what to believe. The account

which we have of Simon's death is, in a few words, as follows: St. Peter and St. Paul being both at Rome, Simon Magus gave out that he was Christ; and, in proof of his assertion, he undertook to raise himself aloft into the air. The attempt at first appeared as if it would succeed; but the two Apostles addressing themselves in prayer to God, the impostor fell to the ground, and his death ensued shortly after. It is difficult to give this marvellous narration, without forgetting that we are treating of a grave and sacred subject; and the question for us to consider is, whether we are to look upon the whole as a fiction, or whether, as is most probable, it contains a basis and groundwork of truth. I must observe, in the first place, that Arnobius, who did not write till the fourth century, is the first person who says anything of Simon's death at all approaching to this story; nor does he by any means give it all the particulars which later writers have supplied. It will be observed, also, that Eusebius, who wrote after Arnobius, does not say any thing of Simon's extraordinary end; but merely states that his credit and influence were extinguished, as soon as St. Peter began to preach in Rome. It is probable, therefore, that no Greek writer before the time of Eusebius had mentioned this story; but, on the other hand, there is such a host of evidence, that the death of Simon Magus was in some way or other connected with the presence of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, that we might be carrying our skepticism too far if we rejected it.

With respect to the doctrines of Simon Magus, we know for certain that Christ held a conspicuous place in the philosophy which he taught; but to define with accuracy the various points of this philosophy, is a difficult, if not impossible, task. The fathers perhaps may be suspected of laying too many impieties to the charge of this heretic; and some of their accounts cannot be reconciled with each other. Still, however, we may extract from their writings an outline of the truth; and in this instance, as before, I would attach particular weight to the authority of Justin Martyr. That writer says that nearly all the inhabitants of Samaria, and a few persons in other countries, acknowledged and worshipped Simon Magus as the first or supreme God: and in another place he says that they styled him God, above all dominion and authority and power. Later writers have increased the blasphemy of this doctrine, and said that Simon declared himself to the Samaritans as the Father, to the Jews as the Son, and to the rest of the world as the Holy Ghost. But I cannot bring myself to believe that he ever advanced so far in wickedness or absurdity. The true state of the case may perhaps be collected from the words of St. Luke, who tells us that Simon gave himself out to be "some great one," and that the people said of him, "This man is the great power of God," Acts viii, 10. Such is the title which he bore before he had heard of Christ; and there is no reason to think that he afterward raised his pretensions, and identified himself with God. He gave himself out as "the great power of God," that is, a person in whom

divine power resided: and, after he had heard the Apostles, he seems to have so far enlarged his doctrine, as to have said, that the God whose minister he was, and who had always been worshipped in Samaria, had revealed himself to the Jews by his Son, and to the rest of the world by the Holy Ghost. There is reason to believe that he declared himself to be the Christ who appeared to the Jews; or rather, he said that the same spirit which descended upon Jesus had descended afterward upon himself; for he did not believe that Jesus had a real body, but he taught that he was only a phantom. To this he added, that the Holy Ghost, by which God was revealed to the Gentiles, resided in himself: and this I take to be the real origin of the story, that he was the God who revealed himself as the Father to the Samaritans, as the Son to the Jews, and as the Holy Ghost to the rest of the world.

Another charge, which is equally difficult to believe, relates to a female companion, whom he is said to have declared to be the first idea, or conception, which he, as God, put forth from his mind. By another mental process, in which this first idea was a partner, he produced the angels, and they created the world. All this was highly mystical, and writers have had recourse to different allegories, by which the absurdity may be explained. That Simon never identified a real living person with an idea emanating from the mind of God, may, I think, be assumed as certain. But we see, in this story, evident traces of the Gnostic doctrines. Valentinus, in the second century, made the first cause, or Bythus, act upon Σιγή, or Ἐννοία, that is, upon his own mind, and produce the first pair of æons. This then was the doctrine of Simon: the supreme God, by a mental process, produced different orders of angels, and they created the world. It was this same God, whose first or principal power resided in Simon Magus. But when later writers had said that he actually proclaimed himself as God, it followed that it was he, who, by an operation of his own mind, produced the angels. If I have argued rightly, I have freed the doctrine of Simon Magus from some of its impieties; but there is still much which is absurd, and much which is impious; for he believed that the world was created, not by the supreme God, but by inferior beings: he taught also, that Christ was one of those successive generations of æons which were derived from God; not the æon which created the world; but he was sent from God to rescue mankind from the tyranny of the demiurgus, or creative æon. Simon was also inventor of the strange notion, that the Jesus who was said to be born and crucified had not a material body, but was only a phantom. His other doctrines were, that the writers of the Old Testament were not inspired by the supreme God, the Fountain of good, but by those inferior beings who created the world, and who were the authors of evil. He denied a general resurrection; and the lives of himself and his followers are said to have been a continued course of impure and vicious conduct.

Such was the doctrine and the practice of Simon Magus, from whom all the pseudo-Christian or Gnostic heresies were said to be derived. Simon himself seems to have been one of those Jews who, as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles, travelled about the country, exorcising evil spirits. But he was also a man of speculative mind; and, having studied the doctrines of Plato, he entered into the questions which were then so commonly agitated, concerning the eternity of matter, and the origin of evil. Hence we find him embracing the opinion, that the world was created by angels, who were themselves produced from God. This was a corrupted Platonism. Plato imagined that the ideas which were in the mind of the Deity created intellectual beings: Simon taught that the supreme God by an operation of his own mind produced the angels. The first intelligences of Plato were employed by God to create the world: Simon also taught that the angels, or æons, created the world; but in one respect the Gnostics had totally changed the philosophy of Plato; for they taught that the angel, or angels, who created the world, acted contrary to the wishes of the supreme God.

SIN, the transgression of the law, or want of conformity to the will of God, 1 John iii, 4. Original sin is that whereby our whole nature is corrupted, and rendered contrary to the nature and law of God; or, according to the ninth article of the church of England, "It is that whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is, of his own nature, inclined to evil." This is sometimes called, "indwelling sin," Rom. vii. The imputation of the sin of Adam to his posterity, is also what divines call, with some latitude of expression, original sin. Actual sin is a direct violation of God's law, and generally applied to those who are capable of committing moral evil; as opposed to idiots or children, who have not the right use of their powers. Sins of omission consist in leaving those things undone which ought to be done. Sins of commission are those which are committed against affirmative precepts, or doing what should not be done. Sins of infirmity are those which arise from ignorance, surprise, &c. Secret sins are those committed in secret, or those of which, through blindness or prejudice, we do not see the evil, Psalm xix, 7–12. Presumptuous sins are those which are done boldly against light and conviction. The unpardonable sin is, according to some, the ascribing to the devil the miracles which Christ wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost. This sin, or blasphemy, as it should rather be called, many scribes and Pharisees were guilty of, who, beholding our Lord do his miracles, affirmed that he wrought them by Beelzebub, the prince of devils, which was, in effect, calling the Holy Ghost Satan, a most horrible blasphemy; and, as on this ground they rejected Christ, and salvation by him, their sin could certainly have no forgiveness, Mark iii, 22–30. No one therefore could be guilty of

this blasphemy, except those who were spectators of Christ's miracles. There is, however, another view of this unpardonable offence, which deserves consideration: The sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, says Bishop Tomline, is mentioned in the first three Gospels. It appears that all the three evangelists agree in representing the sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost as a crime which would not be forgiven; but no one of them affirms that those who had ascribed Christ's power of casting out devils to Beelzebub, had been guilty of that sin, and in St. Luke it is not mentioned that any such charge had been made. Our Saviour, according to the account in St. Matthew and St. Mark, endeavoured to convince the Jews of their error; but so far from accusing them of having committed an unpardonable sin in what they had said concerning him, he declares that "whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him;" that is, whatever reproaches men may utter against the Son of man during his ministry, however they may calumniate the authority upon which he acts, it is still possible that hereafter they may repent and believe, and all their sins may be forgiven them; but the reviling of the Holy Ghost is described as an offence of a far more heinous nature: "The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness." "Unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven." It is plain that this sin against the Holy Ghost could not be committed while our Saviour was upon earth, since he always speaks of the Holy Ghost as not being to come till after his ascension into heaven. A few days after that great event, the descent of the Holy Ghost enabled the Apostles to work miracles, and communicated to them a variety of other supernatural gifts. If men should ascribe these powers to Beelzebub, or in any respect reject their authority, they would blaspheme the Holy Ghost, from whom they were derived; and that sin would be unpardonable, because this was the completion of the evidence of the divine authority of Christ and his religion; and they who rejected these last means of conviction, could have no other opportunity of being brought to faith in 866Christ, the only appointed condition of pardon and forgiveness. The greater heinousness of the sin of these men would consist in their rejecting a greater body of testimony; for they are supposed to be acquainted with the resurrection of our Saviour from the dead, with his ascension into heaven, with the miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost, and with the supernatural powers which it communicated; circumstances, all of which were enforced by the Apostles when they preached the Gospel; but none of which could be known to those who refused to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah during his actual ministry. Though this was a great sin, it was not an unpardonable one, it might be remedied by subsequent belief, by yielding to subsequent testimony. But, on the other hand, they who finally rejected the accumulated and complete evidence of Jesus being the Messiah, as

exhibited by the inspired Apostles, precluded themselves from the possibility of conviction, because no farther testimony would be afforded them, and consequently, there being no means of repentance, they would be incapable of forgiveness and redemption. Hence it appears that the sin against the Holy Ghost consisted in finally rejecting the Gospel as preached by the Apostles, who confirmed the truth of the doctrine which they taught "by signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost," Heb. ii, 4. It was unpardonable, because this was the consummation of the proofs afforded to the men of that generation of the divine mission of Christ. This sin was manifestly distinct from all other sins; it indicated an invincible obstinacy of mind, an impious and unalterable determination to refuse the offered mercy of God. It would appear from this, that those only committed or could commit this irremissible offence, who were witnesses of the mighty works wrought by the Holy Spirit in the Apostles after Christ's ascension and the day of pentecost. Our Lord's declaration appears chiefly to respect the Jews. This view will serve to explain those passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the hopeless case of Jewish apostates is described. But see Blasphemy.

SIN, Desert of. To this the tenth station the Israelites came exactly a month after they left Egypt. And here again they murmured for "the bread and the flesh-pots of Egypt." So the Lord gave them quails for a day, and manna for forty years, till they came to the borders of Canaan. On this occasion the institution of the Sabbath was revived, as a day of rest, which had been intermitted during their Egyptian bondage. On this day there fell no manna, but on the preceding they were directed to gather two days' provision. To perpetuate the memorial of "this bread from heaven" to future generations, a pot of manna, which was preserved fresh, by a standing miracle, was ordered to be laid up beside the ark of the covenant, in the sanctuary, Exod. xvi.

SINAI, a famous mountain of Arabia Petræa, on which God gave the law to Moses, Exod. xix, 1; xxiv, 16; xxxi, 18; xxxiv, 2, 4, &c; Lev. xxv, 1; xxvi, 46. It stands in a kind of peninsula, formed by the two arms of the Red Sea; one extending north, called the Gulf of Kolsom; the other extending east, called the Gulf of Elan. The Arabs call Mount Sinai by the name of Tor, that is, the mountain, by way of excellence; or Gibel Mousa, "the mountain of Moses." It is two hundred and sixty miles from Cairo, which is a journey of ten days. The wilderness of Sinai, where the Israelites continued encamped almost a year, and where Moses erected the tabernacle of the covenant, is considerably elevated above the rest of the country; the ascent to it is very craggy, the greater part cut out of the rock; then one comes to a large space of ground, which is a plain surrounded on all sides by rocks and eminences, whose length is nearly twelve miles. Toward the

extremity of this plain, on the north, two high mountains appear; the highest is called Sinai, the other Horeb. They are of very steep ascent, and do not stand on much ground in comparison to their extraordinary height. Sinai is at least one third part higher than the other, and its ascent more upright and difficult. The top of the mountain terminates in an uneven and rugged space, which might contain about sixty persons. On this eminence is built a little chapel, called St. Catherine's, where it is thought the body of this saint rested for three hundred and sixty years; but afterward it was removed into a church at the foot of the mountain. Near this chapel issues a fountain of very good fresh water; it is looked upon as miraculous, it not being conceivable how water can flow from the brow of so high and so barren a mountain. Mount Horeb stands west of Sinai; so that at sun-rising the shadow of Sinai covers Horeb. Beside the little fountain at the top of Sinai, there is another at the foot of Horeb, which supplies the monastery of St. Catherine. Five or six paces from thence they show a stone, whose height is four or five feet, and breadth about three, which they say is the very stone from whence Moses caused the water to gush out. Its colour is of a spotted grey; and it is, as it were, set in a kind of earth, where no other rock appears. This stone has twelve holes or channels, which are about a foot wide, from whence they say the water issued which the Israelites drank.

“Sinai,” says Sandys, “has three tops of a marvellous height; that on the west side, where God appeared to Moses in a bush, fruitful in pasturage, far lower than the middlemost, and shadowed when the sun riseth thereon; which is that whereon God gave the law to Moses, and which is now called the Mount of Moses, at the foot of which stands the monastery called St. Catherine's, from which there were steps formerly up to the very top of the mountain, and were computed fourteen thousand in number. At present some of them are broken, but those that remain are well made, and easy to go up and down. There are, in several places of the ascent, good cisterns; and especially near the top, a fair and good one. The third or most easterly summit is called by the 867religious in those parts, Mount Catherine; on the top of which there is a dome, under which they say was interred the body of this saint, brought thither by angels after she was beheaded at Alexandria.” One may judge of the height of St. Catherine's Mount, which certainly is not so high as that of Moses by a third part, from this circumstance, that Thevenot found much snow on both when he was there, which was in February. The monastery of St. Catherine is from Cairo some eight days' journey over the deserts.

SION, or ZION, Mount, a mount or hill on the south of Old Jerusalem or Salem, and higher than that on which the ancient city stood. This hill was, perhaps, on this account, made choice of by the Jebusites for building a

fort or citadel upon; which fort was taken by David, who transferred his court thither from Hebron, and brought the ark of the Lord and set it in a tabernacle or tent pitched for it. On this account it is, that this hill is so frequently styled in the Psalms the "holy hill;" and, by way of excellence, is used in the poetical language of Scripture to denote the whole city of Jerusalem. Here David built a palace, and a city, called after him the city of David; and which subsequently formed a part of Jerusalem, enclosed within the same walls, although a great part of the hill is now left without them; while, on the contrary, Calvary, which is supposed to have stood formerly without the walls, is now enclosed within them, the city having drawn itself round about this sacred mount. "This hill," says M. Chateaubriand, "is of a yellowish colour, and barren appearance; open in form of a crescent, toward Jerusalem; and is about as high as Montmartre at Paris, but rounder at the top. This sacred summit is distinguished by three monuments, or, more properly, by three ruins, the house of Caiaphas, the place where Christ celebrated his last supper, and the tomb or palace of David. From the top of the hill you see, to the south, the valley of Ben Hinnom; beyond this, the field of blood, purchased with the thirty pieces of silver given to Judas; the hill of Evil Counsel, the tombs of the judges, and the whole desert toward Hebron and Bethlehem. To the north, the wall of Jerusalem, which passes over the top of Sion, intercepts the view of the city, the site of which gradually slopes toward the Valley of Jehoshaphat."

Dr. Richardson observes of Sion, "At the time when I visited this sacred ground, one part of it supported a crop of barley, another was undergoing the labour of the plough, and the soil turned up consisted of stones and lime mixed with earth, such as is usually met with in the foundations of ruined cities. It is nearly a mile in circumference, is highest on the west side, and toward the east falls down in broad terraces on the upper part of the mountain, and narrow ones on the side as it slopes down toward the brook Kedron. Each terrace is divided from the one above it by a low wall of dry stone, built of the ruins of this celebrated spot. The terraces near the bottom of the hill are used as gardens, and are watered from the pool of Siloam. We have here another remarkable instance of the special fulfilment of prophecy. 'Therefore shall Zion for your sakes be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps,' Micah iii, 12." Mr. Jolliffe represents the hill of Sion as not more raised above the city than the Aventine hill above the Roman forum; but conjectures that its height, from its base in the Valley of Gehinnon, from which it rises abruptly, may be equivalent to some of the lowest hills which encompass Bath; that is, if the estimate be correct, about three hundred and sixty feet, which is the height of the lowest of the hills above that city.



SISTER, in the style of the Hebrews, has equal latitude as brother. It is used not only for a sister by natural relation from the same father and mother, but also for a sister only by the same father or by the same mother, or a near relation only. Sarah is called sister to Abraham, Gen. xii, 13; xx, 12, though only his niece according to some, or sister by the father's side according to others. In the law, Lev. xviii, 18, it is forbidden to take to wife the sister of a wife; to marry two sisters; or, according to some interpreters, to marry a second wife, having one already. Literally, "Thou shalt not take a wife over her sister to afflict her;" as if meaning to forbid polygamy. In the Gospels, the brothers and sisters of Jesus Christ are his cousins, children of the sisters of the holy virgin, Matt. xiii, 56; Mark vi, 3.

SLAVE. See Servant.

SLEEP, Sleeping, Slumbering, is taken either for the sleep or repose of the body; or for the sleep of the soul, which is supineness, indolence, stupidity; or for the sleep of death. "You shall sleep with your fathers;" you shall die, as they are dead. Jeremiah, li, 39, threatens Babylon, in the name of the Lord, with a perpetual sleep, out of which they shall not awake. Daniel, xii, 2, speaks of those that sleep in the dust of the grave. "Lazarus our friend sleepeth; let us go and awake him," John xi, 11; he is dead, let us go and raise him up. "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light," Eph. v, 14. Here St. Paul speaks to those that were dead in sin and infidelity. St. Peter says of the wicked, "Their damnation slumbereth not," 2 Peter ii, 3. God is not asleep, he will not forget to punish them in his own due time. Isaiah, lxv, 4, speaks of a superstitious practice among the Pagans, who went to sleep in the temples of their idols, to obtain prophetic dreams: "They remain among the graves, and lodge in the monuments." The word, which we translate "monuments," signifies places "kept" or "observed." Some interpret it of idol temples, some of caves and dens, in which the Heathens used to worship their idols; and some of tombs or monuments for dead persons. Thus also the superstitious and idolatrous Jews, in contempt of the prophets, and of the temple of the Lord, went into the tombs and temples of idols to sleep there, and to have dreams that might discover future events to them. The Pagans for this purpose used to lie upon the skins of the sacrificed victims.

SLINGS. See Arms.

SMYRNA, a city of Asia Minor, and one of the finest in all the Levant. It contended for the honour of giving birth to Homer, and its title is by many thought to be the best founded. The Christian church in Smyrna was one of the seven churches of Asia to which the Apostle John was commanded to address an epistle, Rev. ii, 8–10. The present Smyrna, which the Turks

call Esmir, is about four miles in circumference, and contains a population of about a hundred thousand souls. It is less remarkable for the elegance of its buildings than for the beauty of its situation, the extent of its commerce, and the riches of its inhabitants.

SOCINIANS, a sect so called from Faustus Socinus, who died in Poland in 1604. This celebrated man was born in Tuscany, and was descended from an ancient and noble family. In the earlier period of his life he devoted little time to literary acquisitions, but he was possessed of a vigorous understanding, and of that steady fortitude which qualified him for the memorable part which he afterward acted. His connection with his uncle Lælius probably gave a bias to his mind with respect to religion. He warmly embraced his tenets, and he spent a great part of his days in studying and disseminating them. Having left his native country, he visited Poland; and finally he settled in it for the express purpose of propagating his own peculiar views of religious truth. The fundamental principles which he assumed were, the rejection of all mystery from revelation, and the necessity of trying its doctrines by the light of reason; and he rigorously applied this latter maxim in conducting his theological investigations. He inculcated in the strictest sense, the unity of God; considered the Word and the Holy Ghost as attributes of the supreme Being; taught that Christ was a man peculiarly honoured by the Almighty, having been born through the operation of the Spirit; and that he was so highly exalted, in consequence of his office as the Saviour of the world, that he might be styled the Son of God, and ought to be worshipped. Struck with several declarations of our Lord which seemed to imply that he had descended from heaven, and which militated against his leading tenet respecting Jesus, he endeavoured to evade the application of them, by supposing or affirming that, previous to the commencement of our Saviour's ministry, he had, through the power of God, been taken up to the celestial regions, and had in them received from the Almighty the truths which he was commissioned to reveal.

The first reception of Socinus in Poland, even by those who might have been expected to welcome him, was most discouraging. The Unitarian churches which had been previously established in that kingdom, differing from him in several points, would not admit him into their communion; and he had to encounter the enmity of the great majority of Christians, who abhorred his tenets, and branded them as impious. But, notwithstanding all this, and although he was visited with much suffering and affliction, his perseverance, his talents, and his zeal soon excited admiration; his views were adopted by many even in the highest stations of life; his principles were embodied in a catechism, which, though not imposed upon his followers, they read with very extensive acquiescence; and he had the satisfaction of beholding the sentiments which he had long cherished,

embraced by various churches enjoying the protection of government, and permitted to establish seminaries of education by which the impression made on the public mind might be preserved and deepened. There was not, however, perfect unanimity of faith among all his associates who united in denying the divinity of our Lord. Vast numbers of these, previous to their having perused the papers of Lælius Socinus, had so far received the system of Arianism, that they believed Christ to have existed before he entered into the world; and although many, in consequence of the reasonings and representations of Socinus, abandoned this doctrine, it was retained by some, who, from their leader, were called Farnovians. Socinus conducted himself toward these men with admirable address. Fully aware that the tendency of their having departed so far from the orthodox tenets was to lead them to still farther recession, and sensible that his own system naturally and consequentially resulted from what they readily admitted, he used every method to conciliate them, and he permitted them to remain with his followers, upon condition of their not openly insisting on the preëxistence of Christ. They did, however, at length separate from the great body of his adherents; but they gradually approached nearer and nearer to them, and, upon the death of Farnovius, most of them incorporated themselves with the Socinians, and all trace of them as a distinct party was obliterated.

Socinus was much more agitated by the promulgation of an opinion very opposite to those now mentioned. As might have been anticipated, there were some who, having adopted the sentiments of Lælius Socinus as to the simple humanity of Christ, deduced from this tenet consequences which appeared to them obviously to flow from it, although these had not been perceived or admitted by Lælius himself. A striking example of this took place in the time of Faustus Socinus. Francis David, a man of considerable influence among the Unitarians, being the superintendent of their churches in Transylvania, maintained that, as Christ was born just like other men, so he continued, notwithstanding his exaltation, to be merely a human being; and that therefore all invocation of him, and worship paid to him, were to be shunned as impiety or idolatry. Socinus inveighed with the utmost warmth against this opinion; he used every method to induce David to renounce it; and, at the desire of one of his friends, he resided for a considerable time at the house of his opponent, that the subject at issue might be fully and calmly discussed. He failed, however, in accomplishing his object. David persisted, as he had, upon the ground which he had taken, good reason to do, in asserting the doctrine which he had announced; and he was soon after this thrown by the prince of Transylvania into prison, where he lingered for several years, and then died at an advanced age. It has been insinuated that Socinus was accessory to this cruel deed of detestable persecution; and, although attempts have been

made to wipe off the imputation, there is too much cause to think that it is not wholly unfounded. Most certain it is, that he had it much at heart to root out what he viewed as the heresy of David, and that the support of it after the death of the unhappy sufferer by some distinguished Unitarians gave him much uneasiness. It is not unlikely that the zeal which he thus displayed arose from his apprehension that the tenets which he opposed would supplant his own, and from the difficulty that he must have experienced in turning aside the inferences which were affirmed to follow from what he admitted. If such was the case, and it seems in many respects more probable than the conjecture of Mosheim, that it is to be attributed to the dread of rendering the sect more odious than it actually was, we have a striking proof of his discernment, though at the expense of his candour; for the present creed of Unitarianism approaches much nearer to that of David than to the doctrines of the founder of Socinianism himself.

But, while he was thus disquieted by opposition which, after the liberty with which he had himself departed from the faith of the most ancient and numerous Christian churches, should have created no surprise, he was highly gratified by the zeal and the establishment of his followers. Under the protection of the ample toleration which they enjoyed in Poland they were sedulous in their attempts to imprint their tenets upon those among whom they lived, and to send these tenets abroad to foreign nations. The Anti-trinitarians in Poland had early translated the Scriptures, and their successors under Socinus composed many works with the design of defending the principles of their faith. They also sent missionaries to propagate their views and to disseminate the books which supported them, anticipating success similar to that which had accompanied their efforts in Transylvania. But in Hungary and in Austria they were successfully opposed by the united and cordial efforts of Catholics and Protestants. In Holland they were more fortunate; and in England they established only one congregation, which differed in some points from the parent sect, and which soon dwindled away.

These failures, which the ardour, the ability, and the high rank of many who engaged in the diffusion of Socinianism were unable to prevent, were soon followed by their expulsion from the country in which they had so long remained in security and peace. Toward the middle of the seventeenth century some of the students attending the academy at Racow, wantonly insulted the feelings and the principles of the Catholics, by a contemptible act of outrage against a crucifix, which, with stones, they threw down from the place in which it had been erected. By men warmly attached to their own religion, and who had at all times regarded the Socinians as undermining its foundation, this youthful excess was represented as confirming all the charges that had been made against the community to

which the perpetrators belonged, and they determined to exert themselves to procure their punishment or extirpation. The supporters of the established religion accordingly applied to the diet at Warsaw; and, notwithstanding the powerful influence used in favour of the Socinians, a cruel edict was passed, abolishing their academy at Racow, banishing the learned men who had taught in it, breaking the printing presses, and shutting up the churches. This edict was carried into effect with much severity; but it did not exhaust the enmity now cherished against the sect; for within a few years after, by a solemn act of the Polish diet, they were banished from the territories of the republic, and, with sad departure from the tolerant and beneficent spirit of the Gospel, death was denounced against all who held their opinions, or who even sheltered and protected those who entertained them. A short time was allowed to the unfortunate victims to arrange their affairs before they bade an eternal adieu to scenes which all the ties of human life must have endeared to them; but this period was abridged. Some, however, had escaped the operation of the law, and had remained in Poland; but three years after the edict was renewed, and the Socinians who still lingered in their beloved country were driven from it with a rigour and an inhumanity reflecting infamy upon those who were guilty of them, and leading to the most melancholy reflections upon that dismal perversion of all that is amiable in our nature, which has so often been effected by a mistaken zeal for a religion breathing the tenderest concern for the happiness of mankind. The principles of Socinus were, notwithstanding, secretly fostered, and various causes tended to perpetuate them even where in profession they were abjured. The propensity, so natural to man, of dissipating every shade of mystery, and casting the light of his own understanding around the subjects of his contemplation, did not cease to operate; and the application of this principle, so gratifying to the pride of human reason, carried many farther than even Socinus had probably anticipated.

The Socinians hold, that Jesus Christ was a mere man, who had no existence before he was born of the virgin Mary; that the Holy Ghost is no distinct person; but that the Father only is truly and properly God. They own that the name of God is given in Scripture to Jesus Christ, but contend that it is only a deputed title; which, however, invests him with a great authority over all creatures. They deny the doctrine of satisfaction and imputed righteousness, and say, that Christ only preached the truth to mankind, set before them in himself an example of heroic virtue, and sealed his doctrines with his blood. Original sin they esteem a mere scholastic chimera. Some of them, likewise, maintain the sleep of the soul, which, they say, becomes insensible at death, and is raised again with the body at the resurrection, when the good shall be established in the possession of eternal felicity, while the wicked shall be consigned to a fire

that will torment them, not eternally, but for a certain duration, proportioned to their demerits.

SODOM, the capital of Pentapolis, which for some time was the residence of Lot, the nephew of Abraham. The history of its destruction is given in the book of Genesis. See Abraham, Lot, and Dead Sea.

SOLOMON, or SALOMON, son of David and Bathsheba, was born A. M. 2971. The Lord loved him, and sent Nathan to David to give Solomon the name of Jedidiah, or, "beloved of the Lord," 2 Sam. xii, 24, 25. This was probably when Nathan assured David that his son should succeed him, and that he should inherit those promises which had been made to him some years before, when he had conceived the design of building a temple to the Lord; for then God declared, by the prophet Nathan, that the honour of building a temple should be reserved for his son, 2 Sam. vii, 5, &c. Solomon, being confirmed in his kingdom, contracted an alliance with Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and married his daughter, A.M. 2291. He brought her to Jerusalem, and had apartments for her in the city of David, till he should build her a palace, which he did some years afterward, when he had finished the temple. It is thought that on occasion of this marriage, Solomon composed the Canticles, which are a kind of epithalamium. The Scripture speaks of the daughter of Pharaoh, as contributing to pervert Solomon, 1 Kings xi, 1, 2; Neh. xiii, 26; and it is very likely, that if at first this princess might seem converted to the Lord, she afterward might retain her private disposition to idolatry, and might engage her husband in it.

Solomon, accompanied by his troops and all Israel, went up to Gibeon, where was then the brazen altar, upon which he offered a thousand burnt-offerings. The night following, God appeared to him in a dream, and said, "Ask of me what thou wilt." Solomon begged of God a wise and understanding heart, and such qualities as were necessary for the government of the people committed to him. This request pleased the Lord, and was fully granted by him. Solomon returned to Jerusalem, where he offered a great number of sacrifices on the altar before the ark of the Lord, and made a great feast for his servants. He enjoyed a profound peace throughout his dominions; Judah and Israel lived in security; and his neighbours either paid him tribute, or were his allies; he ruled over all the countries and kingdoms from the Euphrates to the Nile, and his dominions extended even beyond the former; he had abundance of horses and chariots of war; he exceeded the orientals, and all the Egyptians, in wisdom and prudence; he was the wisest of mankind, and his reputation was spread through all nations. He composed or collected, three thousand proverbs, and one thousand and five canticles. He knew the nature of plants and trees, from the cedar on Libanus to the hyssop on the wall; also of beasts, of

birds, of reptiles, of fishes. There was a concourse of strangers from all countries to hear his wisdom, and ambassadors from the most remote princes.

When Hiram, king of Tyre, knew that Solomon was made king of Israel, he sent ambassadors to congratulate him on his accession to the crown. Some time afterward, Solomon desired him to supply wood and workmen, to assist in building a temple to the Lord. Hiram gladly undertook this service, and Solomon, on his part, obliged himself to give twenty thousand measures of wheat, and twenty thousand measures of oil. The Hebrew and the Vulgate have only twenty measures of oil; but the reading ought no doubt to be twenty thousand. Solomon began to build the temple in the fourth year of his reign, and the second after the death of David; four hundred and eighty years after the exodus from Egypt. He employed in this great work seventy thousand proselytes, descendants of the ancient Canaanites, in carrying burdens, fourscore thousand in cutting stones out of the quarries, and three thousand six hundred overseers of the works; beside thirty thousand Israelites in the quarries of Libanus.

The temple was completed in the eleventh year of Solomon, so that he was but seven years in performing this vast work. The dedication was made the year following, A. M. 3001. To make this ceremony the more august, Solomon chose for it the eighth day of the seventh month of the holy year, which was the first of the civil year, and answered to our October. The ceremony of the dedication lasted seven days, at the end of which began the feast of tabernacles, which continued seven days longer; so that the people continued at Jerusalem fourteen or fifteen days, from the eighth to the twenty-second of the seventh month. When the ark was placed in the sanctuary, while the priests and Levites were celebrating the praises of the Lord, the temple was filled with a miraculous cloud, so that the priests could no longer stand to perform the functions of their ministry. Then Solomon, being on his throne, prostrated himself with his face to the ground; and rising up, and turning toward the sanctuary, he addressed his prayer to God, and besought him that the house which he had built might be acceptable to him, that he would bless and sanctify it, and hear the prayers of those who should address him from this holy place. He besought him also to fulfil the promises he had made to David his servant in favour of his family, and of the kings his successors. Then turning himself to the people, he solemnly blessed them. Fire coming down from heaven consumed the victims and burnt sacrifices on the altar, and the glory of the Lord filled the whole temple. On this day the king caused to be sacrificed twenty-two thousand oxen, and one hundred and twenty thousand sheep for peace-offerings. And because the altar of burnt-

offerings was not sufficient for all these victims, the king consecrated the court of the people.

Solomon afterward built a palace for himself, and another for his queen, the king of Egypt's daughter. He was thirteen years in finishing these buildings, and employed in them whatever the most exquisite art, or the most profuse riches, could furnish. The palace in which he generally resided was called the house of the forest of Lebanon; probably because of the great quantity of cedar used in it. Solomon also built the walls of Jerusalem, and the place called Millo in this city; he repaired and fortified Hazer, Megiddo, Gezer, the two Bethhorons, Upper and Lower, Baalath, and Palmyra in the desert of Syria. He also fortified the cities where he had magazines of corn, wine, and oil; and those where his horses and chariots were kept. He brought under his government the Hittites, the Hivites, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, which remained in the land of Israel. He made them tributaries, and compelled them to work at the public works. He fitted out a fleet at Ezion-Geber, and at Elath, on the Red Sea, to go to Ophir. Hiram, king of Tyre, furnished him with mariners, who instructed the subjects of Solomon. They performed this voyage in three years, and brought back gold, ivory, ebony, precious wood, peacocks, apes, and other curiosities. In one voyage they brought Solomon four hundred and fifty talents of gold, 2 Chron. ix, 21. About the same time, the queen of Sheba came to Jerusalem, attracted by the great fame of the king. She brought rich presents of gold, spices, and precious stones; and proposed several enigmas and hard questions, to which Solomon gave her such satisfactory answers, that she owned what had been told her of his wisdom and magnificence was far short of what she had found. The king, on his part, made her rich presents in return.

Solomon was one of the richest, if not the very richest, of all princes that have ever lived; and the Scripture expressly tells us he exceeded in riches and wisdom all the kings of the earth. His annual revenues were six hundred and sixty-six talents of gold, without reckoning tributes from kings and nations, or paid by Israelites, or sums received for customs. The bucklers of his guards, and the throne he sat on, were overlaid with gold. All the vessels of his table, and the utensils of his palaces, were of gold. From all parts he received presents, vessels of gold and silver, precious stuffs, spices, arms, horses, and mules; and the whole earth desired to see his face, and to hear the wisdom which God had put into his heart. But the latter actions of his life disgraced his character. Beside Pharaoh's daughter, he married wives from among the Moabites, Ammonites, Idumeans, Sidonians, and Hittites. He had seven hundred wives, who were so many queens, beside three hundred concubines. These women perverted his heart in his declining age, so that he worshipped Ashtoreth, goddess of the



Sidonians, Moloch, idol of the Ammonites, and Chemosh, god of the Moabites. To these he built temples on the Mount of Olives, over against and east of Jerusalem, and thus insulted openly the Majesty he had adored.

Solomon died after he had reigned forty years, A. M. 3029. He might be about fifty-eight years of age; for he was about eighteen when he began to reign. Josephus makes him to have reigned eighty years and to have lived ninety-four years; but this is a manifest error. The history of this prince was written by the prophets Nathan, Ahijah, and Iddo. He was buried in the city of David; and Rehoboam his son reigned in his stead. Of all the ingenious works composed by Solomon, we have nothing remaining but his Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles; that is, every literary monument respecting him has perished, except those written under inspiration--the inspired history which registers his apostasy, and his own inspired works, which, in all the principles they contain, condemn his vices. Some have ascribed to him the book of Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus; but these were written by Hellenistic Jews.

SOUL, that immortal, immaterial, active substance or principle in man, whereby he perceives, remembers, reasons, and wills. See Materialism.

SOWING. Our Lord, in his parable of the sower, says, "Some seeds fell by the wayside, and the fowls came and devoured them." Buckingham, in his Travels in Palestine, remarks, "We ascended to an elevated plain where husbandmen were sowing, and some thousands of starlings covered the ground, as the wild pigeons do in Egypt, laying a heavy contribution on the grain thrown into the furrows, which are not covered by harrowing, as in Europe." The sowing "beside all waters," mentioned by Isaiah, seems to refer to the sowing of rice, which is done on low grounds flooded, and prepared for sowing by being trodden by oxen and asses, mid-leg deep; thus, they send "forth thither the feet of the ox and the ass."

SPARROW, צפור, Gen. vii, 14, and afterward frequently; *σπουθιον*, Matt. x, 29; Luke xii, 6, 7; a little bird every where known. The Hebrew word is used not only for a sparrow, but for all sorts of clean birds, or for those the use of which was not forbidden by the law. That the sparrow is not intended in Psalm cii, 7, is evident from several circumstances; for that is intimated to be a bird of night, one that is both solitary and mournful; none of which characteristics is applicable to the sparrow, which rests by night, is gregarious and cheerful. It seems rather to mean a bird melancholy and drooping, much like one confined in a cage. See Swallow.

SPEECH. See Language.

SPIDER, עכביש, Job viii, 14; Isa. lix, 5. An insect well known, remarkable for the thread which it spins, with which it forms a web of curious texture, but so frail that it is exposed to be broken and destroyed by the slightest accident. To the slenderness of this filmy workmanship, Job compares the hope of the wicked. This, says Dr. Good, was “doubtless a proverbial allusion; and so exquisite, that it is impossible to conceive any figure that can more fully describe the utter vanity of the hopes and prosperity of the wicked.”

“Deceiving bliss! in bitter shame it ends,

His prop a cobweb, which an insect rends.”

So Isaiah says, “They weave the web of the spider; of their webs no garment shall be made; neither shall they cover themselves with their works.”

SPIKENARD, נרד. By this was meant a highly aromatic plant growing in the Indies, called “nardostachys,” by Dioscorides and Galen; from whence was made the very valuable extract or unguent, or favourite perfume, used at the ancient baths and feasts, unguentum nardinum, unguentum nardi spicatae, [the perfume or unction of spikenard,] which it appears from a passage in Horace, was so valuable, that as much of it as could be contained in a small box of precious stone, was considered as a sort of equivalent for a large vessel of wine, and a handsome quota for a guest to contribute at an entertainment, according to the custom of antiquity:

Nardo vina merebere:

Nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum.

“Bring you the odours, and a cask is thine.

Thy little box of ointment shall produce

A mighty cask.”

Francis.

St. Mark, xiv, 3, mentions “ointment of spikenard very precious,” which is said to be worth more than three hundred denarii; and John, xii, 3, mentions a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly; the house was filled with the odour of the ointment; it was worth three hundred denarii. It is not to be supposed that this was a Syrian production, but the true “atar” of Indian spikenard; an unguent, containing the very essence of the plant, and brought at a great expense from a remote country.

SPIRIT, in Hebrew, רוּחַ, in Greek, πνεῦμα, and in Latin, spiritus, is in the Scriptures sometimes taken for the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Holy Trinity. The word signifies also the reasonable soul which animates us, and continues in existence even after the death of the body: that spiritual, thinking and reasoning substance, which is capable of eternal happiness,

Num. xvi, 22; Acts vii, 59. The term spirit is also often used for an angel, a demon, and a ghost, or soul separate from the body. It is said, in Acts xxiii, 8, that the Sadducees denied the existence of angels and spirits. Jesus Christ appearing to his disciples, said to them, Luke xxiv, 39, "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." And St. Paul calls the good angels "ministering spirits," Heb. i, 14. In 1 Sam. xvi, 14; xviii, 10; xix 9, it is said that an evil spirit from the Lord troubled Saul: and we have also the expression unclean spirits. Add to this, spirit is sometimes put for the disposition of the heart or mind: see Num. v, 14; Zech. xii, 10; Luke xiii, 11; Isa. xi, 2. Discerning of spirits, or the secret character and thoughts of men, was a gift of God, and placed among the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. xii, 10; 1 John iv, 1.

STAR, in Hebrew, כוכב. Under the name of stars, the ancient Hebrews comprehended all the heavenly bodies, constellations, and planets; in a word, all the luminaries, the sun and moon excepted. The number of the stars was looked upon as infinite. And the Psalmist, to exalt the power and magnificence of God, says, that he numbers the stars and calls them by their names; and so are they put to express a vast multitude, Gen. xv, 5; xxii, 17; Exod. xxxiii, 13.

STEPHEN, the first martyr. He is always put at the head of the seven deacons; and it is believed he had studied at the feet of Gamaliel. As he was full of the Holy Ghost, and of zeal, Acts vi, 5, 6, &c, he performed many wonderful miracles: and those of the synagogue of the Libertines, of the Cyrenians, of the Alexandrians, and others, disputing with him, could not withstand the wisdom and the power with which he spoke. Then having suborned false witnesses, to testify that they had heard him blaspheme against Moses, and against God, they drew him before the sanhedrim. Stephen appeared in the midst of this assembly, with a countenance like that of an angel; and the high priest asking him what he had to answer, in his defence he rapidly traced the history of the Jews, showing that they had always opposed themselves to God and his prophets; faithfully upbraided them with the hardness of their hearts, with their putting the prophets to death, and, lastly, with slaying Christ himself. At these words they were filled with rage, and gnashed their teeth against him. But Stephen, lifting up his eyes to heaven, calmly exclaimed, "I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing at the right hand of God." Then the Jews cried out, and stopped their ears as though they had heard blasphemy, and falling on him, they drew him out of the city, and stoned him. The witnesses laid down their clothes at the feet of a young man called Saul, afterward St. Paul, who then appears to have commenced his career of persecution. "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit; and he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this

sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep,” an example of the majesty and meekness of true Christian heroism, and as the first, so also the pattern, of all subsequent martyrs. His Christian brethren forsook not the remains of this holy man; but took care to bury him, and accompanied his funeral with great mourning, Acts viii, 2.

STOICS, a sect of Heathen philosophers, Acts xvii, 18. Their distinguishing tenets were, that God is underived, incorruptible, and eternal; possessed of infinite wisdom and goodness; the efficient cause of all the qualities and forms of things; and the constant preserver and governor of the world: That matter, in its original elements, is also underived and eternal; and is by the powerful energy of the Deity impressed with motion and form: That though God and matter subsisted from eternity, the present regular frame of nature had a beginning originating in the gross and dark chaos, and will terminate in a universal conflagration, that will reduce the world to its pristine state: That at this period all material forms will be lost in one chaotic mass; and all animated nature be reunited to the Deity: That from this chaotic state, however, the world will again emerge by the energy of the efficient principle; and gods, and men, and all forms of regulated nature be renewed and dissolved, in endless succession: And that after the revolution of the great year all things will be restored, and the race of men will return to life. Some imagined, that each individual would return to its former body; while others supposed, that similar souls would be placed in similar bodies. Those among the stoics who maintained the existence of the soul after death, supposed it to be removed into the celestial regions of the gods, where it remains until, at the general conflagration, all souls, both human and divine, shall be absorbed in the Deity. But many imagined that, before they were admitted among the divinities, they must purge away their inherent vices and imperfections, by a temporary residence in some aerial regions between the earth and the planets. According to the general doctrine of the stoics, all things are subject to a stern irresistible fatality, even the gods themselves. Some of them explained this fate as an eternal chain of causes and effects; while others, more approaching the Christian system, describe it as resulting from the divine decrees--the fiat of an eternal providence. Considering the system practically, it was the object of this philosophy to divest men of their passions and affections. They taught, therefore, that a wise man might be happy in the midst of torture; and that all external things were to him indifferent. Their virtues all arose from, and centred in, themselves; and self approbation was their great reward.

STONE. This word is sometimes taken in the sense of rock, and is applied figuratively to God, as the refuge of his people. See Rock, The Hebrews gave the name of “stones” to the weights used in commerce; no doubt

because they were originally formed of stone. "Just weights," is therefore in Hebrew, "just stones." "The corner stone," or "the head stone of the corner," is a figurative representation of Christ. It is the stone at the angle of a building, whether at the foundation or the top of the wall. Christ was that corner stone, which, though rejected by the Jews, became the corner stone of the church, and the stone that binds and unites the synagogue and the Gentiles in the unity of the same faith. Some have thought the showers of stones cast down by the Lord out of heaven, mentioned several times in the Old Testament, to be showers of hail of extraordinary size; which was probably the case, as they even now sometimes occur in those countries in a most terrific and destructive form, and show how irresistible an agent this meteor is in the hands of an offended God. The knives of stone that were made use of by the Jews in circumcision, were not enjoined by the law; but the use of them was founded, either upon custom, or upon the experience that this kind of instrument is found to be less dangerous than those made of metal. Zipporah made use of a stone to circumcise her sons, *Exod. iv, 25*. Joshua, *v, 2*, did the same, when he caused such of the Israelites to be circumcised at Gilgal, as had not received circumcision during their journey in the wilderness. The Egyptians, according to Herodotus, made use of knives of stone to open dead bodies that were to be embalmed; and Pliny assures us, that the priests of the mother of the gods had sharp stones, with which they cut and slashed themselves, which they thought they could not do with any thing else without danger. Great heaps of stones, raised up for a witness of any memorable event, and to preserve the remembrance of some matter of great importance, are among the most ancient monuments. In those elder ages, before the use of writing, these monuments were instead of inscriptions, pyramids, medals, or histories. Jacob and Laban raised such a monument upon Mount Gilead in memory of their covenant, *Gen. xxxi, 46*. Joshua erected one at Gilgal, made of stones taken out of the Jordan, to preserve the memorial of his miraculous passage over this river, *Josh. iv, 5-7*. The Israelites that dwelt beyond Jordan also raised one upon the banks of the river, as a testimony that they constituted but one nation with their brethren on the other side, *Joshua xxii, 10*. Sometimes they heaped up such a collection of stones upon the burying place of some odious persons, as was done in the case of Achan and Absalom, *Joshua vii, 26*; *2 Kings xviii, 17*.

A "heart of stone" may be understood several ways. *Job, xli, 24*, speaking of the leviathan, says, that "his heart is as firm as a stone, yea as hard as a piece of the nether millstone:" that is, he is of a very extraordinary strength, boldness, and courage. It is said, *1 Sam. xxv, 37*, that Nabal's heart died within him, and he became as a stone, when he was told of the danger he had incurred by his imprudence; his heart became contracted or convulsed, and this was the occasion of his death. *Ezekiel, xxxvi, 26*, says, that the

Lord will take away from his people their heart of stone, and give them a heart of flesh; that is, he will render them contrite, and sensible to spiritual things. "I will give him a white stone," Rev. ii, 17; that is, I will give him full and public pardon and absolution. It is spoken in allusion to an ancient custom of delivering a white stone to such as they acquitted in judgment. They used likewise to give a white stone to such as conquered in the Grecian games.

STORK, חסידה, Lev. xi, 19; Deut. xiv, 18; Job xxxix, 13; Psalm civ, 17; Jer. viii, 7; 874Zech. v, 9; a bird similar to the crane in size, has the same formation as to the bill, neck, legs, and body, but is rather more corpulent. The colour of the crane is ash and black; that of the stork is white and brown. The nails of its toes are also very peculiar; not being clawed like those of other birds, but flat like the nails of a man. It has a very long beak, and long red legs. It feeds upon serpents, frogs, and insects, and on this account might be reckoned by Moses among unclean birds. As it seeks for these in watery places, nature has provided it with long legs; and as it flies away, as well as the crane and heron, to its nest with its plunder, therefore its bill is strong and jagged, the sharp hooks of which enable it to retain its slippery prey. It has long been remarkable for its love to its parents, whom it never forsakes, but tenderly feeds and cherishes when they have become old, and unable to provide for themselves. The very learned and judicious Bochart has collected a variety of passages from the ancients, in which they testify this curious particular. Its very name in the Hebrew language, chasida, signifies mercy or piety: and its English name is taken, if not directly, yet secondarily, through the Saxon, from the Greek word *στοργή*, which is often used for natural affection.

The stork's an emblem of true piety;  
Because, when age has seized and made his dam  
Unfit for flight, the grateful young one takes  
His mother on his back, provides her food,  
Repaying thus her tender care of him  
Ere he was fit to fly.  
Beaumont.

It is a bird of passage, and is spoken of as such in Scripture: "The stork knoweth her appointed time," Jer. viii, 7.

Who bid the stork, Columbus-like, explore  
Heavens not its own, and worlds unknown before?  
Who calls the council, states the certain day,  
Who forms the phalanx, and who points the way?  
Pope.

Bochart has collected several testimonies of the migration of storks. Ælian says, that in summer time they remain stationary, but at the close of autumn they repair to Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia. "For about the space of a fortnight before they pass from one country to another," says Dr. Shaw, "they constantly resort together, from all the adjacent parts, in a certain plain; and there forming themselves, once every day, into a 'douwanne,' or council, (according to the phrase of these eastern nations,) are said to determine the exact time of their departure, and the place of their future abodes." See Swallow.

STRANGER. Moses inculcated and enforced by numerous and by powerful considerations, as well as by various examples of benevolent hospitality, mentioned in the book of Genesis, the exhibition of kindness and humanity to strangers. There were two classes of persons who, in reference to this subject, were denominated strangers, גרים. One class were those who, whether Hebrews or foreigners, were destitute of a home, in Hebrew הורשבים. The others were persons who, though not natives, had a home in Palestine; the latter were גרים, strangers or foreigners, in the strict sense of the word. Both of these classes, according to the civil code of Moses, were to be treated with kindness, and were to enjoy the same rights with other citizens, Lev. xix, 33, 34; xxiv, 16, 22; Num. ix, 14; xv, 14; Deut. x, 18; xxiii, 7; xxiv, 17; xxvii, 19. In the earlier periods of the Hebrew state, persons who were natives of another country, but who had come, either from choice or from necessity, to take up their residence among the Hebrews, appear to have been placed in favourable circumstances. At a later period, namely, in the reigns of David and Solomon, they were compelled to labour on the religious edifices which were erected by those princes; as we may learn from such passages as these: "And Solomon numbered all the strangers that were in the land of Israel, after the numbering wherewith David his father had numbered them; and they were found a hundred and fifty thousand and three thousand and six hundred; and he set three score and ten thousand of them to be bearers of burdens," &c, 1 Chron. xxii, 2; 2 Chron. ii, 1, 16, 17. The exaction of such laborious services from foreigners was probably limited to those who had been taken prisoners in war; and who, according to the rights of war, as they were understood at that period, could be justly employed in any offices, however low and however laborious, which the conqueror thought proper to impose. In the time of Christ, the degenerate Jews did not find it convenient to render to the strangers from a foreign country those deeds of kindness and humanity which were not only their due, but which were demanded in their behalf by the laws of Moses. They were in the habit of understanding by the word רע, neighbour, their friends merely, and accordingly restricted the exercise of their benevolence by the same narrow limits that bounded in

this case their interpretation; contrary as both were to the spirit of those passages which have been adduced above, Lev. xix, 18.

**STREETS, Corners of.** Our Lord reproves the Pharisees for praying in the corners of the streets, that is, choosing public places for what ought to have been private devotion. The Hindoos, Mohammedans, and others still have this practice. "Both Hindoos and Mussulmans offer their devotions in the most public places; as, at the landing places of rivers, in the public streets, and on the roofs of boats, without the least modesty or attempt at concealment." "An aged Turk," observes Richardson, "is particularly proud of a long flowing white beard, a well shaved cheek and head, and a clean turban. It is a common thing to see such characters, far past the bloom of life, mounted on stone seats, with a bit of Persian carpet, at the corner of the streets, or in front of their bazaars, combing their beards, smoking their pipes, or drinking their coffee, with a pitcher of water standing beside them, or saying their prayers, or reading the Koran."

**STUMBLING, Stone of.** "We set out from Argos very early in the morning," says 875Hartley, "and were almost eleven hours in reaching Tripolitza. The road is, for the most part, dreary; leading over lofty and barren hills, the principal of which is Mount Parthenius. In England, where the roads are so excellent, we do not readily perceive the force and just application of the Scriptural figures, derived from a 'stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence,' Isaiah viii, 14, and similar passages; but in the east, where the roads are, for the most part, nothing more than an accustomed track, the constant danger and impediment arising to travellers from stones and rocks fully explain the allusion."

In the grand description which Isaiah gives, lxiii, 13, of God "with his glorious arm" leading his people through the Red Sea, it is said, "That led them through the deep, as a horse in the wilderness, that they should not stumble;" that is, who preserved them from falling amidst the numerous inequalities in the bed of the sea, caused in some instances by deep cavities, and in others by abrupt intervening rocks. The figure is a very natural one, especially in the east, where the Arabs and Tartars are famed for their dexterity in the management of even bad horses. A curious instance of this occurs in Colonel Campbell's "Overland Journey to the East Indies." Speaking of the Tartar, an accredited courier of the Turkish government, under whose guidance he travelled in disguise across the desert from Aleppo to Mosul, he says, "One day, after riding about four miles from a caravansera, at which we had changed our cattle, I found that a most execrably bad horse had fallen to my lot. He was stiff, feeble, and foundered; in consequence of which he stumbled very much, and I every minute expected that he would fall and roll over me. I therefore proposed



to the guide to exchange with me; a favour which he had hitherto never refused, and for which I was the more anxious as the beast that he rode was of the very best kind. To my utter astonishment, he peremptorily refused; and as this had been a day of unusual taciturnity on his part, I attributed his refusal to peevishness and ill temper, and was resolved not to let the matter rest there. I therefore desired the interpreter to inform him, that as he had at Aleppo agreed to change horses with me as often as I pleased, I should consider our agreement infringed if he did not comply, and would write to the consul at Aleppo to that effect. As soon as this was conveyed to him, he seemed strongly agitated by anger, yet endeavoured to conceal his emotions under affected contempt and derision, which produced from him one of the most singular grins that ever yet marred the human physiognomy. At length he broke forth:--'You will write to Aleppo, will you? Foolish Frank! they will not believe you,' &c.--'Why do you not, then,' said I, interrupting him; 'why do you not perform your promise by changing horses, when you are convinced in your conscience (if you have any) that it was part of our agreement?'--'Once for all, I tell you,' interrupted he, 'I will not give up this horse. There is not,' said he gasconadingly, 'there is not a Mussulman that ever wore a beard, not to talk of a wretched Frank, who should get this horse from under me. I would not yield him to the Commander of the Faithful this minute, were he in your place; and I have my own reasons for it.'--'I dare say you have,' returned I, 'love of your ease, and fear of your bones.' At hearing this he grew quite outrageous; called Mohammed and Allah to witness, that he did not know what it was to fear any thing; declared that he was convinced some infernal spirit had that day got possession of me, &c. At length observing that I looked at him with sneering contemptuous defiance, he rode up alongside of me. I thought it was to strike, and prepared to defend myself. I was however mistaken: he snatched the reins out of my hand, and caught hold of them collected close at the horse's jaw, then began to flog my horse and to spur his own, till he got them both into full speed: nor did he stop there, but continued to belabour mine with his whip and to spur his own, driving headlong over every impediment that came in our way, till I really thought he had run mad, or designed to kill me. Several times I was on the point of striking him with my whip, in order to knock him off his horse; but as often patience providentially came in to my assistance, and whispered to me to forbear, and see it out. Meantime I considered myself as being in some danger; and yet such was the power which he had over the cattle, that I found it impossible to stop him. So, resigning the event to the direction of Providence, I suffered him, without a farther effort, to proceed. He continued this for some miles, over an uncultivated tract, here and there intersected with channels formed by rills of water in the periodical rains, thickly set with low furze, ferns, and other dwarf bushes, and broken up and down into little hills. His horse carried him clear over

all; and though mine was every minute stumbling and nearly down, yet, with a dexterity inexpressible and a vigour altogether amazing, he kept him up by the bridle, and, I may say, carried him gallantly over every thing. At all this I was very much astonished; and, toward the end, as much pleased as astonished; which he perceiving, cried out frequently and triumphantly, 'Behold, Frank, behold!' and at last, drawing in the horses, stopping short, and looking me full in the face, he exclaimed, 'Frank, what say you now?' For some time I was incapable of making him any answer, but continued surveying him from head to foot as the most extraordinary savage I had ever beheld; while he stroked his whiskers with great self-complacency and composure, and nodded his head every now and then, as much as to say, 'Look at me! Am I not a very capital fellow?' We alighted on the brow of a small hill, whence was to be seen a full and uninterrupted prospect of the country all round. The interpreter coming up, the Tartar called to him, and desired him to explain to me carefully the meaning of what he was about to say. 'You see those mountains,' said he, pointing to the east; 876 'they are in the province of Kurdestan, and inhabited by a vile race of robbers, who pay homage to a god of their own, and worship the devil from fear. They live by plunder; and often descend from those mountains, cross the Tigris which runs between them and us, and plunder and ravage this country in bands of great number and formidable strength, carrying away into slavery all they can catch, and killing all who resist them. This country therefore, for some distance round us, is very dangerous to travellers, whose only safety lies in flight. Now it was our misfortune this morning to get a very bad horse. Should we meet with a band of those Curds, what could we do but fly? And if you, Frank, rode this horse, and I that, we could never escape; for I doubt you could not keep him up from falling under ME, as I did under YOU. I should therefore come down and be taken; you would lose your guide and miss your way; and all of us would be undone.' As soon as the interpreter had explained this to me, 'Well,' continued the Tartar, 'what does he say to it now?'--'Why, I say,' returned I, 'that you have spoken good sense and sound reason; and I am obliged to you.' This, when fully interpreted, operated most pleasingly upon him, and his features relaxed into a broad look of satisfaction."

SUPERSTITION may be described to be either the careful and anxious observation of numerous and unauthorized ceremonies in religion, under the idea that they possess some virtue to propitiate God and obtain his favour, or, as among Pagans and others, the worship of imaginary deities, and the various means of averting evil by religious ceremonies, which a heart oppressed with fears, and a perverted fancy, may dictate to those ignorant of the true God, and the doctrines of salvation. Dr. Neander observes, The consideration of human nature and history shows us that the transition from unbelief to superstition is always easy. Both these

conditions of the human heart proceed from the self-same ground, the want of that which may be properly called faith, the want of a life in God, of a lively communion with divine things by means of the inward life; that is, by means of the feelings. Man, whose inward feelings are estranged from the divine nature, is inclined, sometimes to deny the reality of that of which he has nothing within him, and for the conception and application of which to himself he has no organ. Or else, the irresistible force of his inward nature impels man to recognize that higher power from which he would fain free himself entirely, and to seek that connection with it which he cannot but feel needful to his comfort; but, inasmuch as he is without any real inward sympathy of disposition with the Divinity, and wants a true sense of holiness, the Divinity appears to his darkened religious conscience only under the form of power and arbitrary rule. His conscience paints to him this power as an angry and avenging power. But as he has no idea of that which the Divinity really is, he cannot duly understand this feeling of estrangement from God, this consciousness of divine wrath; and, instead of seeking in moral things the source of this unquiet feeling, which leaves him no rest by day or night, and from which there is no escape, he fancies that by this or that action, which of itself is perfectly indifferent, he may have offended this higher power, and he seeks by outward observances again to reconcile the offended power. Religion here becomes a source, not of life, but of death; the source, not of consolation and blessing, but of the most unspeakable anxiety which torments man day and night with the spectres of his own imagination. Religion here is no source of sanctification, but may unite in man's heart with every kind of untruth, and serve to promote it. There is one kind of superstition in which, while man torments himself to the utmost, he still remains estranged from the true nature of inward holiness; and while he is restrained from many good works of charity by his constant attendance on mischievous, arbitrary, and outward observances, he is still actuated by a horror of any great sin, a superstition in which man avoids pleasure so completely that he falls into the opposite extreme; and even the most innocent enjoyments, which a childlike simplicity would receive with thankfulness from the hand of a heavenly Father, he dares not indulge in. But there is also another kind of superstition, which makes it easy for man, by certain outward observances, to silence his conscience under all kinds of sin, and which therefore serves as a welcome support to it.

SUPPER, Lord's, derives its name from having been instituted by Jesus, after he had supped with his Apostles, immediately before he went out to be delivered into the hands of his enemies. In Egypt, for every house of the children of Israel, a lamb was slain upon that night, when the Almighty punished the cruelty and obstinacy of the Egyptians by killing their first-born, but charged the destroying angel to pass over the houses upon which

the blood of the lamb was sprinkled. This was the original sacrifice of the passover. In commemoration of it, the Jews observed the annual festival of the passover, when all the males of Judea assembled before the Lord in Jerusalem. A lamb was slain for every house, the representative of that whose blood had been sprinkled in the night of the escape from Egypt. After the blood was poured under the altar by the priests, the lambs were carried home to be eaten by the people in their tents or houses at a domestic feast, where every master of a family took the cup of thanksgiving, and gave thanks with his family to the God of Israel. Jesus having fulfilled the law of Moses, to which in all things he submitted, by eating the paschal supper with his disciples, proceeded after supper to institute a rite, which, to any person that reads the words of the institution without having formed a previous opinion upon the subject, will probably appear to have been intended by him as a memorial of that event which was to happen not many hours after. "He took bread, and gave thanks, 877 and brake it, and gave it unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you," Luke xxii, 19, 20. He took the bread which was then on the table, and the wine, of which some had been used in sending round the cup of thanksgiving; and by saying, "This is my body, this is my blood, do this in remembrance of me," he declared to his Apostles that this was the representation of his death by which he wished them to commemorate that event. The Apostle Paul, not having been present at the institution, received it by immediate revelation from the Lord Jesus; and the manner in which he delivers it to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. xi, 23–26, implies that it was not a rite confined to the Apostles who were present when it was instituted, but that it was meant to be observed by all Christians till the end of the world. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." Whether we consider these words as part of the revelation made to St. Paul, or as his own commentary upon the nature of the ordinance which was revealed to him, they mark, with equal significancy and propriety, the extent and the perpetuity of the obligation to observe that rite which was first instituted in presence of the Apostles.

There is a striking correspondence between this view of the Lord's Supper, as a rite by which it was intended that all Christians should commemorate the death of Christ, and the circumstances attending the institution of the feast of the passover. Like the Jews, we have the original sacrifice: "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us," and by his substitution our souls are delivered from death. Like the Jews, we have a feast in which that sacrifice, and the deliverance purchased by it, are remembered. Hence the Lord's Supper was early called the eucharist, from its being said by St. Luke, "Jesus, when he took the bread, gave thanks;" and his disciples in all ages,

when they receive the bread, keep a feast of thanksgiving. To Christians, as to Jews, there is “a night to be much observed unto the Lord,” in all generations. To Christians, as to Jews, the manner of observing the night is appointed. To both it is accompanied with thanksgiving.

The Lord’s Supper exhibits, by a significant action, the characteristical doctrine of the Christian faith, that the death of its author, which seemed to be the completion of the rage of his enemies, was a voluntary sacrifice, so efficacious as to supersede the necessity of every other; and that his blood was shed for the remission of sins. By partaking of this rite, his disciples publish an event most interesting to all the kindreds of the earth; they declare that, far from being ashamed of the suffering of their Master, they glory in his cross; and, while they thus perform the office implied in that expression of the Apostle, “Ye do show forth the Lord’s death,” they at the same time cherish the sentiments by which their religion ministers to their own consolation and improvement. They cannot remember the death of Christ, the circumstances which rendered that event necessary, the disinterested love and the exalted virtues of their deliverer, without feeling their obligations to him. Unless the vilest hypocrisy accompany an action, which, by its very nature, professes to flow from warm affection, the love of Christ will constrain them to fulfil the purposes of his death, by “living unto him who died for them;” and we have reason to hope, that, in the places where he causes his name to be remembered, he will come and bless his people. As the object of faith is thus explicitly set before them in every commemoration, so the renewed exercise of that faith, which the ordinance is designed to excite, must bring renewed life, and a deeper experience of the “great salvation.” See Sacrament.

SURETY, in common speech, is one who gives security for another; and hence it has become prevalent among theological writers to confound it with the terms substitute and representative, when applied to Christ. In fact, the word “surety” occurs only once in our translation of the Scriptures, namely, Heb. vii, 22: “By so much was Jesus made the surety of a better covenant.” It is certainly true that the Son of God, in all that he has done or is still doing as Mediator, may be justly viewed as the surety of the new and everlasting covenant, and as affording the utmost security to believers that, as the Father hath given all things into his hands, they will be conducted with effect, and all the exceeding great and precious promises of that covenant assuredly be accomplished. But this does not appear to be the precise idea which the Apostle has in view in the above passage. This has been sufficiently evinced by many critics and commentators, particularly by Pierce, Macknight, and M’Lean, in their notes on the place. The substance of their remarks is, that the original term employed by the Apostle, and which occurs no where else in Scripture, is ἔγγυος, which is

derived from ἐγγύς, near, and signifies one who draws near, or who brings others near; which sense of the word will not very well accord with that of a substitute or representative. The Greek commentators very properly explain the word by μεσίτης, a mediator. Now, as in this passage a comparison is stated between Jesus, as a high priest, and the Levitical high priests; and as the latter were considered by the Apostle to be the mediators of the Sinai covenant, because through their mediation the Israelites worshipped God with sacrifices; it is evident that the Apostle in this passage terms Jesus the High Priest or Mediator of the better covenant, because, through his mediation, or in virtue of the sacrifice which he offered of himself to God, believers receive all the blessings of the new covenant. And as in verse 16 the Apostle had said that “by the introduction of a better hope we draw near to God,” he, in verse 22, very properly calls Jesus ἑγγυος, “he by whom we draw nigh,” thereby denoting the effect of his mediation. From the whole, therefore, it is plain that the word “surety” in this place is equivalent with that of mediator or high priest.

SWALLOWS, טִס, a bird too well known to need description. Our translators of the Bible have given this name to two different Hebrew words. The first, דָּרוֹר, in Psalm lxxxiv, 3, and Prov. xxvi, 2, is probably the bird which Forskal mentions among the migratory birds of Alexandria, by the name of dururi; and the second, עֲגוּר, Isa. xxxviii, 14, and Jer. viii, 7, is the crane; but the word טִס, in the two last places rendered in our version “crane,” is really the swallow. So the Septuagint, Vulgate, and two ancient manuscripts, Theodotion, and Jerom, render it, and Bochart and Lowth follow them. Bochart assigns the note of this bird for the reason of its name, and ingeniously remarks that the Italians about Venice call a swallow zizilla, and its twittering zizillare. The swallow being a plaintive bird, and a bird of passage, perfectly agrees with the meaning of Isaiah and Jeremiah. The annual migration of the swallow has been familiarly known in every age, and perhaps in every region of the earth. In Psalm lxxxiv, 3, it is said, “The sparrow hath found a house, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even thine altars, O Lord of hosts.” By the altars of Jehovah we are to understand the temple. The words probably refer to the custom of several nations of antiquity,--that birds which built their nests on the temples, or within the limits of them, were not suffered to be driven away, much less killed; but found a secure and uninterrupted dwelling. Hence, when Aristodicus disturbed the birds’ nests of the temple of Kumæ, and took the young from them, a voice, according to a tradition preserved by Herodotus, is said to have spoken these words from the interior of the temple: “Most villainous of men, how darest thou to drive away such as seek refuge in my temple?” The Athenians were so enraged at Atarbes, who had killed a sparrow which built on the temple of Æsculapius, that they killed him. Among the Arabs, who are more closely related to the Hebrews,

birds which build their nests on the temple of Mecca have been inviolable from the earliest times. In the very ancient poem of a Dschorhamidish prince, published by a Schulten, in which he laments that his tribe had been deprived of the protection of the sanctuary of Mecca, it is said,

“We lament the house, whose dove  
Was never suffer’d to be hurt:  
She remain’d there secure; in it, also,  
The sparrow built its nest.”

In another ancient Arabian poet, Nabega, the Dhobianit swears “by the sanctuary which affords shelter to the birds which seek it there.” Niebuhr says, “I will observe, that among the Mohammedans, not only is the kaba a refuge for the pigeons, but also on the mosques over the graves of Ali and Hassein, on the Dsjamea, or chief mosque, at Helle, and in other cities, they are equally undisturbed.” And Thevenot remarks: “Within a mosque at Oudjicum lies interred the son of a king, called Schah-Zadeh-Imam Dgiafer, whom they reckon a saint. The dome is rough cast over; before the mosque there is a court, well planted with many high plane trees, on which we saw a great many storks, that haunt thereabout all the year round.” See Sparrow.

SWAN, תנשמת, Lev. xi, 18; Deut. xiv, 16. The Hebrew word is very ambiguous, for in the first of these places, it is ranked among water-fowls; and by the Vulgate, which our version follows, rendered “swan,” and in the thirtieth verse, the same word is rendered “mole,” and ranked among reptiles. Some translate it in the former place, “the bat,” which they justify by the affinity which there is between the bat and the mole. The LXX. in the former verse render it πορφύριον, the porphyryon, or “purple bird,” probably the “flamingo;” and in the latter, “ibis.” Parkhurst shows that the name is given from the creature’s breathing in a strong and audible manner; and Michaëlis learnedly conjectures, that in verse eighteen, and Deut. xiv, 16, it may mean the “goose,” which every one knows is remarkable for its manner of “breathing out” or “hissing,” when approached.

SWEDENBORGIANs denote that particular denomination of Christians who admit the testimony of Baron Swedenborg, and receive the doctrines taught in the theological writings of that author. Emanuel Swedenborg was the son of a bishop of West Gothnia, in the kingdom of Sweden, whose name was Swedberg, a man of considerable learning and celebrity in his time. The son was born at Stockholm, January 29, 1688. He enjoyed early the advantages of a liberal education, and being naturally endowed with uncommon talents for the acquirement of learning, his progress in the sciences was rapid and extensive; and he soon distinguished himself by several publications in the Latin language, which gave proof of equal

genius and erudition. It may reasonably be supposed that under the care of his pious and reverend father our author's religious instruction was not neglected. This, indeed, appears plain from the general tenor of his life and writings, which are marked with strong and lively characters of a mind deeply impressed with a sense of the divine Being, and of all the relative duties thence resulting. He was ennobled in the year 1719, by Queen Ulrica Eleonora, and named Swedenborg, from which time he took his seat with the nobles of the equestrian order, in the triennial assembly of the states. The philosophical works, published in Latin, by Baron Swedenborg, are numerous; but his theological works are said to be still more so.

1. The first and principal distinguishing doctrine contained in the writings of Baron Swedenborg, and maintained by his followers, relates to the person and character of Jesus Christ, and to the redemption wrought by him. On this subject it is insisted that Jesus Christ is Jehovah, manifested in the flesh; and that he came into the world to glorify his human nature, by making it one with the divine. It is therefore insisted farther that the humanity of Jesus Christ is itself divine, by virtue of its indissoluble union with the indwelling Father, agreeably to the testimony of St. Paul, that, "in Jesus Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," Col. ii, 9; and that thus, as to his humanity, he is the Mediator between God and man, since there is now no other medium of God's access to man, or of man's access to God, but this divine humanity, which was assumed for this purpose. Thus it is taught, that in the person of Jesus Christ dwells the whole Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; the Father constituting the soul of the above humanity, while the humanity itself is the Son, and the divine virtue or operation proceeding from it is the Holy Spirit; forming altogether one God, just as the soul, the body, and operation of man, form one man. On the subject of the redemption wrought by this incarnate God, it is lastly taught that it consisted not in the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, but in the real subjugation of the powers of darkness and their removal from man, by continual combats and victories over them, during his abode in the world; and in the consequent descent to man of divine power and life, which was brought near to him in the thus glorified humanity of this victorious God. They who receive this testimony concerning Jesus Christ therefore acknowledge no other God but him; and believe that in approaching his divine humanity, they approach, at the same time, and have communication with, all the fulness of the Godhead, seeing and worshipping the invisible in the visible, agreeably to the tenor of those words of Jesus Christ: "He that believeth on me believeth not on me, but on him that sent me; and he that seeth me, seeth him that sent me," John xii, 44, 45.



2. A second doctrine taught by the same author relates to the sacred Scripture, or word of God, which is maintained to be divinely inspired throughout, and, consequently, to be the repository of the whole will and wisdom of the most high God. It is, however, insisted, that this will and wisdom are not in all places discoverable from the letter or history of the sacred pages, but lie deeply concealed under the letter. For it is taught by Baron Swedenborg, that the sense of the letter of the holy word is the basis, the continent, and the firmament, of its spiritual and celestial senses, being written according to the doctrine of correspondencies between things spiritual and things natural, and thus designed by the Most High as the vehicle of communication of the eternal spiritual truths of his kingdom to the minds of men. It is farther endeavoured to be shown that Jesus Christ spake continually according to this same doctrine, veiling divine and spiritual truths under natural images, especially in his parables, and thus communicating to man the most important mysteries relative to himself and his kingdom, under the most beautiful and edifying figures taken from the natural things of this world. Thus, according to Baron Swedenborg, even the historical parts both of the Old and New Testament contain vast stores of important and spiritual wisdom under the outward letter; and this consideration, as he farther asserts, justifies the pages of divine revelation, even in those parts which to a common observer appear trifling, nugatory, and contradictory. It is lastly maintained, on this subject, that the sacred Scripture, or word of God, is the only medium of communication and conjunction between God and man, and is likewise the only source of all genuine truth and knowledge respecting God, his kingdom, and operation, and the only sure guide for man's understanding, in whatever relates to his spiritual or eternal concerns.

3. The next branch of the system is practical, and relates to the life, or to that rule of conduct on the part of man which is truly acceptable to the Deity, and at the same time conducive to man's eternal happiness and salvation, by conjoining him with his God. This rule is taught to be simply this: to shun all known evils as sins against God, and at the same time to love, to cherish, and to practise whatsoever is wise, virtuous, and holy, as being most agreeable to the will of God, and to the spirit of his precepts. On this subject it is strongly and repeatedly insisted that evil must of necessity remain with man, and prove his eternal destruction, unless it be removed by sincere repentance, leading him to note what is disorderly in his own mind and life; and, when he has discovered it, to fight resolutely against its influence, in dependence on the aid and grace of Jesus Christ. It is insisted farther, that this opposition to evil ought to be grounded on the consideration that all evil is against God, since, if evil be combated from any inferior motive, it is not radically removed, but only concealed, and on that account is even more dangerous and destructive than before. It is

added, that when man has done the work of repentance, by shunning his hereditary evils as sins against God, he ought to set himself to the practice of what is wise and good by a faithful, diligent, and conscientious discharge of all the duties of his station; by which means his mind is preserved from a return of the power of disorder, and kept in the order of heaven, and the fulfilment of the great law of charity.

4. A fourth doctrine inculcated in the same writings, is the coöperation on the part of man with the divine grace or agency of Jesus Christ. On this subject it is insisted that man ought not indolently to hang down his hands, under the idle expectation that God will do every thing for him in the way of purification and regeneration, without any exertion of his own; but that he is bound by the above law of coöperation to exert himself, as if the whole progress of his purification and regeneration depended entirely on his own exertions; yet, in exerting himself, he is continually to recollect, and humbly to acknowledge, that all his power to do so is from above, agreeably to the declaration of Jesus Christ, "Without me ye can do nothing," John xv, 5.

5. A fifth and last distinguishing doctrine taught in the theological writings of our author, 880relates to man's connection with the other world, and its various inhabitants. On this subject, it is insisted, not only from his view of the sacred Scriptures, but also from the experience of the author himself, that every man is in continual association with angels and spirits, and that without such association he could not possibly think or exert any living faculty. It is insisted farther, that man, according to his life in the world, takes up his eternal abode, either with angels of light, or with the spirits of darkness; with the former, if he is wise to live according to the precepts of God's holy word; or with the latter, if, through folly and transgression, he rejects the counsel and guidance of the Most High.

Some other peculiar doctrines of minor importance might be enlarged on in this place if it was deemed necessary; such as the doctrine concerning the human soul, as being in a human form; concerning the marriage of the good and the true, as existing in the holy word, and in all things in nature. But it may be observed generally, that the fundamental error of the system is a denial of the divinity of Christ, while it appears to be acknowledged, and of the doctrine of the atonement. Many true things are said also of the figurative and typical character of the word of God; but the interpretation of it in this view runs into the wildest extravagance for want of principles; while the whole is clothed with mysticism on the one hand and gross and carnal conceptions of spiritual things on the other. There is, indeed, much in which this sect agrees with other Christians, and much, therefore, that is true in their strange system; but it is unconnected with other great and vital

truths of the Gospel; and is joined also with great errors. It is a dreamy delusion, which defies all rational defence: it rests upon the assumed experience of a man of genius, it is true, but one who was not always in his wits.

In London, and some of the other cities and great towns in England, places of public worship have been opened, for the express purpose of preaching the preceding doctrines. In all such places particular forms of prayer have been adopted, in agreement with the ideas of the worshippers, as grounded in the religious sentiments above stated, especially respecting the supreme object of adoration, who is acknowledged to be the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in his divine humanity. But in no place have any peculiar rites and ceremonies been introduced, the worshippers being content with retaining the celebration of the two sacraments of baptism and the holy supper, since no other rites are insisted on by the author whose testimony they receive. It is believed, by a large majority of them, that it was never his intention that any particular sect should be formed upon his doctrines, but that all who receive them, whether in the establishment, or in any other communion of Christians, should be at perfect liberty either to continue in their former communion, or to quit it, as their conscience dictates. England appears to be the country where the system has been most generally received. Baron Swedenborg had many eccentricities; but perhaps the most remarkable circumstance respecting him, was his asserting, that, during the uninterrupted period of twenty-seven years, he enjoyed open intercourse with the world of departed spirits, and during that time was instructed in the internal sense of the sacred Scriptures, hitherto undiscovered! This is a correspondence with the invisible world, to which few or no writers, before or since his time, ever pretended, if we except the Arabian prophet.

SWINE, חזיר, Lev. xi, 7; Deut. xiv, 8; Psalm lxxx, 13; Prov. xi, 22; Isaiah lxv, 4; lxvi, 3, 17; χοῖρος, Matt. vii, 6; viii, 30; Mark v, 14; Luke viii, 33; xv, 15; the plural of hog, an animal well known. In impurity and grossness of manners, this creature stands almost unrivalled among the order of quadrupeds; and the meanness of his appearance corresponds to the grossness of his manners. He has a most indiscriminate, voracious, and insatiable appetite. The Prophet Isaiah, lxv, 4, charges his degenerate people with eating swine's flesh, and having broth of abominable things in their vessels, Isaiah lxvi, 3. Conduct so contrary to their solemn engagements, so hateful in the sight of the Holy One, though long endured, was not always to pass with impunity. "They that sanctify themselves, and purify themselves in the gardens, behind one tree in the midst, eating swine's flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the Lord," Isaiah lxvi, 17. Such a sacrifice was an abomination to the Lord, because the eating of the blood was prohibited,

and because the sacrifice consisted of swine's flesh. To these precepts and threatenings, which were often enforced by severe judgments may be traced the habitual and unconquerable aversion of the latter Jews to the use of swine's flesh; an aversion which the most alluring promises and the most cruel sufferings have been found alike insufficient to subdue.

In such detestation was the hog held by the Jews that they would not so much as pronounce its name, but called it "the strange thing;" and we read in the history of the Maccabees, that Eleazer, a principal scribe, being compelled by Antiochus Epiphanes to open his mouth and receive swine's flesh, spit it forth, and went of his own accord to the torment, choosing rather to suffer death than to break the law of God, and give offence to his nation, 2 Mac. vi, 18; vii, 1. It is observed that when Adrian rebuilt Jerusalem, he set up the image of a hog, in bas-relief, upon the gates of the city, to drive the Jews away from it, and to express the greater contempt for that miserable people. It was avarice, a contempt of the law of Moses, and a design to supply the neighbouring idolaters with victims, that caused whole herds of swine to be fed on the borders of Galilee. Whence the reason is plain of Christ's permitting the devils to throw the swine headlong into the lake of Genesareth, Matthew viii, 32. We read, in Matthew vii, 6, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you." There is a similar maxim in the Talmudical writings: "Do not cast pearls before swine;" to which is added, by way of explanation, "Do not offer wisdom to one who knows not the value of it, but profanes its glory."

SYCAMINE, συκάμινος, in Arabic sokam, Luke xvii, 6. This is a different tree from the sycamore, mentioned Luke xix, 4. Dioscorides says that this tree is the mulberry, though he allows that some apprehend that it is the same with the sycamore. Galen has a separate article on the sycamorus, which he speaks of as rare, and mentions as having seen it at Alexandria in Egypt. The Greeks name the morus the sycamine. Grotius says the word συκάμινος has no connection with συκία, the fig-tree, but is entirely Syrian, שקמין, in Hebrew, שקמים. It should seem, indeed, to be very similar to the mulberry, as not only the Latin, but the Syriac and the Arabic, render it by morus; and thus Coverdale's, the Rheim's, and Purver's English translations render it by the mulberry; and so it is in Bishop Wilson's Bible.

SYCAMORE, 1 שקמות, שקמים Kings x, 27; 1 Chron. xxvii, 28; 2 Chron. i, 15; Psalm lxxviii, 47; Isa. ix, 9; Amos viii, 14; συκομορέα, Luke xix, 4; a large tree, according to the description of Theophrastus, Dioscorides, and Galen, resembling the mulberry-tree in the leaf, and the fig in its fruit; hence its name, compounded of συκία fig, and μόρος, mulberry; and some

have fancied that it was originally produced by ingrafting the one tree upon the other. Its fruit is palatable. When ripe it is soft, watery, somewhat sweet, with a little of an aromatic taste. The trees are very common in Palestine, Arabia, and Egypt; grow large, and to a great height; and though their grain is coarse are much used in building. To change sycamores into cedars, Isa. ix, 10, means, to render the buildings of cities, and the state of the nation, much more magnificent than before. Dr. Shaw remarks, that as the grain and texture of the sycamore is remarkably coarse and spongy, it could therefore stand in no competition at all with the cedar for beauty and ornament. We meet with the same opposition of cedars to sycamores in 1 Kings x, 27, where Solomon is said to have made silver as the stones, and cedars as the sycamores of the vale for abundance. "By this mashal, or figurative and sententious speech," says Bishop Lowth, "they boast, in this place of Isaiah, that they shall be easily able to repair their present losses, suffered, perhaps, by the first Assyrian invasion under Tiglath-Pileser, and to bring their affairs to a more flourishing condition than ever." The wood of this tree is very durable. "The mummy chests," says Dr. Shaw, "and whatever figures and instruments of wood are found in the catacombs, are all of them of sycamore, which, though spongy and porous to appearance, has, notwithstanding, continued entire and uncorrupted for at least three thousand years. From its value in furnishing wood for various uses, from the grateful shade which its wide-spreading branches afforded, and on account of the fruit which Mallet says the Egyptians hold in the highest estimation, we perceive the loss which the ancient inhabitants of Egypt must have felt when their vines were destroyed with hail, and their sycamore trees with frost," Psalm lxxviii, 47. "The sycamore," says Mr. Norden, "is of the height of a beech, and bears its fruit in a manner quite different from other trees; it has them on the trunk itself, which shoots out little sprigs, in form of grape stalks, at the end of which grow the fruit close to one another, almost like clusters of grapes. The tree is always green, and bears fruit several times in the year, without observing any certain seasons; for I have seen some sycamores that have given fruit two months after others. The fruit has the figure and smell of real figs, but is inferior to them in the taste, having a disgustful sweetness. Its colour is a yellow, inclining to an ochre, shadowed by a flesh colour. In the inside it resembles the common figs, excepting that it has a blackish colouring with yellow spots. This sort of tree is pretty common in Egypt; the people, for the greater part, live upon its fruit, and think themselves well regaled when they have a piece of bread, a couple of sycamore figs, and a pitcher of water." There might be many of these trees in Judea. David appointed a particular officer, whose sole duty it was to watch over the plantations of sycamore and olive-trees, 1 Chron. xxviii, 28; and being joined with the olive, the high estimation in which it was held is intimated; for the olive is considered as one of the most precious gifts which the God of nature has bestowed on

the oriental nations. There seem to have been great numbers of them in Solomon's time, 1 Kings x, 27; and in the Talmud they are mentioned as growing in the plains of Jericho.

One curious particular in the cultivation of the fruit must not be passed over. Pliny, Dioscorides, and Theophrastus observe that the fruit must be cut or scratched, either with the nail or with iron, or it will not ripen; but four days after this process it will become ripe. To this same purpose Jerom, on Amos vii, 14, says, that without this management the figs are excessively bitter. These testimonies, together with the Septuagint and Vulgate version, are adduced to settle the meaning of the word בולס, in Amos vii, 14, which must signify scraping, or making incisions in the sycamore fruit; an employment of Amos before he was called to the prophetic office: "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was a herdman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit." Hasselquist, describing the *ficus sycamorus*, or Scripture sycamore, says, "It buds the latter end of March, and the fruit ripens in the beginning of June. At the time when the fruit has arrived to the size of an inch diameter, the inhabitants pare off a part at the centre point. They say that without this paring it would not come to maturity." The figs thus prematurely ripened are called *djumeis* 882**ædri**, that is, "precocious sycamore figs." As the sycamore is a large spreading tree, sometimes shooting up to a considerable height, we see the reason why Zaccheus climbed up into a sycamore tree to get a sight of our Saviour. This incident also furnishes a proof that the sycamore was still common in Palestine; for this tree stood to protect the traveller by the side of the highway.

SYENE, a city of Egypt, now called Assouan, situated at its southern extremity. Ezekiel, xxix, 10, describing the desolation to be brought upon Egypt says, "Therefore thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will make the land of Egypt utterly desolate, from the tower of Syene even to the border of Cush," or Arabia, or, as some read it, "from Migdol to Syene," implying, according to either version of the passage, the whole length of the country from north to south. The latitude of Syene, according to Bruce, is 24° 0' 45''; that of Alexandria, 31° 11' 33''; difference 7° 10' 48'', equal to four hundred and thirty geographical miles on the meridian, or about five hundred British miles; but the real length of the valley of Egypt, as it follows the windings of the Nile, is full six hundred miles.

SYNAGOGUE, συναγωγή, "an assembly," Rev. ii, 9; iii, 9. The word often occurs in the Gospels and in the Acts, because Jesus Christ and his Apostles generally went to preach in those places. Although the sacrifices could not be offered, except in the tabernacle or the temple, the other exercises of religion were restricted to no particular place. Accordingly we find that the

praises of God were sung, at a very ancient period, in the schools of the prophets; and those who felt any particular interest in religion, were assembled by the seers on the Sabbath, and the new moons, for prayers and religious instruction, 1 Sam. x, 5–11; xix, 18–24; 2 Kings iv, 23. During the Babylonish captivity, the Jews, who were then deprived of their customary religious privileges, were wont to collect around some prophet or other pious man, who taught them and their children in religion, exhorted to good conduct, and read out of the sacred books, Ezek. xiv, 1; xx, 1; Dan. vi, 11; Neh. viii, 18. These assemblies, or meetings, became, in progress of time, fixed to certain places, and a regular order was observed in them. Such appears to have been the origin of synagogues.

In speaking of synagogues, it is worthy to be noticed, that there is nothing said in respect to the existence of such buildings in Palestine, during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. They are, therefore, by some supposed to have been first erected under the Maccabean princes, but that, in foreign countries, they were much more ancient. Whether this statement be correct or not, it is nevertheless certain, that in the time of the Apostles, there were synagogues wherever there were Jews. They were built, in imitation of the temple of Jerusalem, with a court and porches, as is the case with the synagogues in the east at the present day. In the centre of the court is a chapel, supported by four columns, in which, on an elevation prepared for it, is placed the book of the law, rolled up. This, on the appointed days, is publicly read. In addition to the chapel, there is erected within the court a large covered hall or vestry, into which the people retire, when the weather happens to be cold and stormy, and each family has its particular seat. The uppermost seats in the synagogue, that is, those which were nearest the chapel where the sacred books were kept, were esteemed peculiarly honourable, Matt. xxiii, 6; James ii, 3. The “proseuchæ,” *προσευχαί*, are understood by some to be smaller synagogues, but by others are supposed to be particular places under the open sky, where the Jews assembled for religious exercise. But Josephus calls the proseucha of Tiberias a large house, which held very many persons. See *Proseuchæ*. The Apostles preached the Gospel in synagogues and proseuchæ, and with their adherents performed in them all the religious services. When excluded, they imitated the Jews in those places, where they were too poor to erect these buildings, and held their religious meetings in the houses of individuals. Hence we not only hear of synagogues in houses in the Talmud, but of churches in houses in the New Testament, Rom. xvi, 5; 1 Cor. xvi, 19; Col. iv, 15; Phil. ii; Acts iii, 46; v, 42. The Apostles sometimes hired a house, in which they performed religious services, and taught daily, Acts xix, 9; xx, 8. *Συναγωγή* means literally a convention or assembly, but by metonymy, was eventually used for the place of assembling; in the same way, that *ἐκκλησία*, which means literally a calling together, or

convocation, signifies also at the present time the place of convocation. Synagogues were sometimes called by the Jews schools; but they were careful to make an accurate distinction between such, and the schools, properly so called, the מדרשים, or “sublimer schools,” in which the Talmud was read, while the law merely was read in the synagogues, which they placed far behind the Talmud.

The mode of conducting religious instruction and worship in the primitive Christian churches was derived for the most part from the practice which anciently prevailed in synagogues. But there were no regular teachers in the synagogues who were officially qualified to pronounce discourses before the people; although there were interpreters who rendered into the vernacular tongue, namely, the Hebræo-aramæan, the sections, which had been publicly read in the Hebrew.

The “synagogue preacher,” דרשן, whose business it is, in consequence of his office, to address the people, is an official personage that has been introduced in later times; at least we find no mention of such a one in the New Testament. On the contrary, in the time of Christ, the person who read the section for the Sabbath, or any other person who was respectable for learning and had a readiness of speech, addressed the people, Luke iv, 16–21; Acts xiii, 5, 15; xv, 21; Matt. iv, 23.

The other persons who were employed in the 883services and government of the synagogue, in addition to the one who read the Scriptures, and the person who rendered them into the vernacular tongue, were as follows: 1. “The ruler of the synagogue,” ἀρχισυνάγωγος, ראש הכנסת, who presided over the assembly, and invited readers and speakers, unless some persons who were acceptable voluntarily offered themselves, Mark v, 22, 35–38; Luke viii, 41; xiii, 14, 15; Acts xiii, 15. 2. “The elders of the synagogue,” ἄρχαι, ἄρχαι, רבנים, ἄρχαι, ἄρχαι, They appear to have been the counsellors of the head or ruler of the synagogue, and were chosen from among the most powerful and learned of the people, and are hence called ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, Acts xiii, 15. The council of elders not only took a part in the management of the internal concerns of the synagogue, but also punished transgressors of the public laws, either by turning them out of the synagogue, or decreeing the punishment of thirty-nine stripes, John xii, 42; xvi, 2; 2 Cor. xi, 24. 3. “The collectors of alms,” ἀναγίνσκοντες, גבאי צדקה, δάκονοι, “deacons.” Although every thing which is said of them by the Jews was not true concerning them in the time of the Apostles, there can be no doubt that there were such officers in the synagogues at that time, Acts vi. 4. “The servants of the synagogue,” ὑπηρέτης, ὑπηρέτης, Luke iv, 20; whose business it was to reach the book of the law to the person who was to read it, and to receive it back again, and to perform other services. The ceremonies which prevail in the synagogues at



the present day in presenting the law were not observed in the time of our Saviour. 5. “The messenger or legate of the synagogue,” שלייה צבור. This was a person who was sent from synagogues abroad, to carry alms to Jerusalem. The name, messenger of the synagogue, was applied likewise to any person, who was commissioned by a synagogue, and sent forth to propagate religious knowledge. A person likewise was denominated the messenger, or angel, ἄγγελος, τῆς ἄγγελος ἐκκλησίας, &c, who was selected by the assembly to recite for them the prayers; the same that is called by the Jews of modern times the synagogue singer, or cantilator, Rev. ii, 1, 8, 12, 18; iii, 1, 7, 14.

The Jews anciently called those persons who, from their superior erudition, were capable of teaching in the synagogue, פרנסים, “shepherds,” or “pastors.” They applied the same term, at least in more recent times, to the elders of the synagogue, and also to the collectors of alms, or deacons. The ground of the application of this term in such a way, is as follows: the word פרנס is, without doubt, derived from the Greek word σῦρνος, “bread,” or “a fragment of bread;” and, as it is used in the Targums, it corresponds to the Hebrew verb רעה, “to feed.” It is easy to see, therefore, how the word פרנס might be applied to persons who sustained offices in the synagogue, in the same way as רעה is applied to kings, &c.

We do not find mention made of public worship in the synagogues, except on the Sabbath, Matthew xii, 9; Mark i, 21; iii, 1; vi, 2; Luke iv, 16, 32, 33; vi, 6; xiii, 10; Acts xiii, 14; xv, 21; xvi, 13–25; xvii, 2; xviii, 4. What is said of St. Paul’s hiring the school of one Tyrannus at Ephesus, and teaching in it daily, is a peculiar instance, Acts xix, 9, 10. Yet there can be no doubt that those Jews who were unable to go to Jerusalem attended worship on their festival days, as well as on the Sabbath, in their own synagogues. Individuals sometimes offered their private prayers in the synagogue. When an assembly was collected together for worship, the services began, after the customary greeting, with a doxology. A section was then read from the Mosaic law. Then followed, after the singing of a second doxology, the reading of a portion from the prophets, Acts xv, 31; Luke iv, 16. The person whose duty it was to perform the reading, placed upon his head, as is done at the present day, a covering called tallith, to which St. Paul alludes, 2 Cor. iii, 15. The sections which had been read in the Hebrew were rendered by an interpreter into the vernacular tongue, and the reader or some other man then addressed the people, Luke iv, 16; Acts xiii, 15. It was on such occasions as these, that Jesus, and afterward the Apostles, taught the Gospel. The meeting, as far as the religious exercises, were concerned, was ended with a prayer, to which the people responded Amen, when a collection was taken for the poor.

The customs which prevail at the present day, and which Vitranga has treated of, were not all of them practised in ancient times. The readers, for instance, were not then, as they are at the present day, called upon to perform, but presented themselves voluntarily, Luke iv, 16; the persons also who addressed the people were not rabbins expressly appointed for that purpose, but were either invited from those present, or offered themselves, Acts xiii, 15; Luke iv, 17. The parts to be publicly read, likewise, do not appear to have been previously pointed out, although the book was selected by the ruler of the synagogue, Luke iv, 16. Furthermore, the forms of prayer that are used by the Jews at the present time do not appear to have been in existence in the time of Christ; unless this may perhaps have been the case in respect to the substance of some of them, especially the one called שמץ קרי, concerning which the Talmudists, at a very early period, gave many precepts.

It was by ministering in synagogues that the Apostles gathered the churches. They retained also essentially the same mode of worship with that of the synagogues, excepting that the Lord's Supper was made an additional institution, agreeably to the example of Christ, Acts ii, 42; xx, 7–11; 1 Cor. xi, 16–34. They were at length excluded from the synagogue and assembled at evening in the house of some Christian, which was lighted for the purpose with lamps, Acts xx, 7–11. The Apostle, with the elders, when engaged in public worship, took a position where they would be most likely to be heard by all. The first service was merely a salutation or blessing, namely, "The Lord be with you," or, "Peace be with you." Then followed the doxologies and prelexions, the same as in the synagogues. The Apostle then addressed the people on the subject of religion, and urged upon them that purity of life which it required. Prayer succeeded, which was followed by the commemoration of the Saviour's death in the breaking and distribution of bread. The meeting was ended by taking a collection for the poor, especially those at Jerusalem, 2 Cor. ix, 1–15.

Those who held some office in the church were the regularly qualified instructors in these religious meetings; and yet laymen had liberty to address their brethren on these occasions the same as in the synagogues; also to sing hymns, and to pray; which, in truth, many of them did, especially those who were supernaturally gifted, not excepting the women. Those females who were not under a supernatural influence were forbidden by the Apostle Paul to make an address on such occasions, or to propose questions; and it was enjoined on those who did speak, not to lay aside their veils, 1 Cor. xi, 5; xiv, 34–40. The reader and the speaker stood; the others sat; all arose in the time of prayer. Whatever was stated in a foreign tongue was immediately rendered by an interpreter into the speech in common use.

This was so necessary, that Paul enjoined silence on a person who was even endowed with supernatural gifts, provided an interpreter was not at hand, 1 Cor. xiv, 1–33. It was the practice among the Greek Christians to uncover their heads when attending divine service, 1 Cor. xi, 11–16; but in the east, the ancient custom of worshipping with the head covered was retained. Indeed, it is the practice among the oriental Christians to the present day, not to uncover their heads in their religious meetings, except when they receive the eucharist.

It is affirmed that in the city of Jerusalem alone there were no less than four hundred and sixty or four hundred and eighty synagogues. Every trading company had one of its own, and even strangers built some for those of their own nation. Hence we find synagogues of the Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Cilicians, and Asiatics, appointed for such as came up to Jerusalem from those countries, Acts vi, 9.

SYNODS, though actually synonymous with Councils, are in common historical parlance employed to designate minor ecclesiastical conventions. In virtue of this distinction councils have usually claimed for themselves the ample epithet of œcumenical or general, while synods have long been known only by the humbler term of local or provincial. In the apostolic age four local assemblies were held, which some have called councils and others synods. The first was convened for the election of a successor to Judas in the apostleship, Acts i, 26. At the second, seven deacons were chosen, Acts vi, 5. The third, like the two which preceded it, was held at Jerusalem, according to some authors, A. D. 47, but, according to others, A. D. 51; that is, at the latest, eighteen years after Christ's ascension. It originated in the attempt made to oblige the Gentile converts at Antioch to submit to the rite of circumcision. St. Paul and Barnabas opposed this attempt; and, after "no small dissension and disputation," it was determined, that the question should be referred to the judgment of the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem. Accordingly, some of the Apostles and several of the "elders came together" to deliberate on the propriety of dispensing with the ceremonial law. The result of their deliberations was, that the Mosaic ordinances, being too rigorous, should be abrogated; and that their decision should be communicated to "the brethren which were of the Gentiles," Acts xv, 1–30. The fourth apostolic synod was convened in reference to the toleration of legal rites, Acts xxi, 18. With respect to all these, the fact is, that, instead of being councils or synods in any proper sense, they were mere meetings of the church at Jerusalem, and all of them ordinary meetings except the third, when they assembled upon the request of the deputies from Antioch who came to ask advice.

Dr. Neander, speaking of the origin, use, and abuse of synods, says,--As a closer bond of union was early formed between the churches of the same province, so also the Christian catholic spirit introduced the custom that, in all pressing matters, controversies on doctrinal points, things relating to the ecclesiastical life, and very commonly in those relating to church discipline, general deliberations should be held by deputies from these churches. Such assemblies become familiar to us in the controversies about the time of celebrating Easter, and in the transactions about the Montanistic prophecies, in the last half of the second century. But these provincial synods appear, for the first time, as a constant and regular institution, fixed to definite times, about the end of the second or the beginning of the third century; and it was in this case a peculiarity of one country, where particular local causes may have introduced such an arrangement earlier than in other regions. This country was, in fact, exactly Greece, where, from the time of the Achaic league, the system of confederation had maintained itself; and as Christianity is able to connect itself with all the peculiarities of a people, provided they contain nothing immoral, and, entering into them, to take itself a peculiar form resembling them, so, also, it might easily happen that here the civil federal spirit which already existed worked upon the ecclesiastical catholic spirit, and gave it earlier than in other regions a tolerably good form, so that out of the representative assemblies of the civil communities, the Amphictyonic councils, were formed the representative assemblies of the ecclesiastical communities, that is, the provincial synods. As the Christians, in the consciousness that they are nothing, and can do nothing, without the Spirit from above, were accustomed to begin all important business with prayer, they prepared themselves here, also, for their general deliberations by common prayer, at the opening of these assemblies, to Him who has promised that he will enlighten and guide, by his Spirit, those who believe in him, if they will give themselves up to him wholly, and that he will be among them, where they are gathered together in his name. It appears that this regular institution met at first with opposition as an innovation, so that Tertullian felt himself called upon to stand up in its defence. Nevertheless, the ruling spirit of the church decided for this institution; and, down to the middle of the third century, the annual provincial synods appear to have been general in the church, as we may conclude, because we find them prevalent, at the same time, in parts of the church as far distant from each other as North Africa and Cappadocia.

These provincial synods might certainly become very useful for the churches; and, in many respects, they did become so. By means of a general deliberation, the views of individuals might mutually be enlarged and corrected; wants, abuses, and necessary reforms, might thus more easily be mutually communicated, and be deliberated on in many different points of

view; and the experience of every individual, by being communicated, might be made useful to all. Certainly, men had every right to trust that Christ would be among them, according to his promise, and would lead those who were assembled in his name by his Spirit. Certainly it was neither enthusiasm nor hierarchical presumption, if the deputies, collected together to consult upon the affairs of their churches, and the pastors of these churches, hoped that a higher Spirit than that of man, by his illumination, would show them what they could never find by their own reason, whose insufficiency they felt deeply, if it were left to itself. It would far rather have been a proud self-confidence, had they been so little acquainted with the shallowness of their own heart, the poverty of human reason, and the self-deceits of human wisdom, as to expect that without the influence of that higher Spirit of holiness and truth they could provide sufficiently for the advantage of their churches. But this confidence, in itself just and salutary, took a false and destructive turn, when it was not constantly accompanied by the spirit of humility and self-watchfulness, with fear and trembling; when men were not constantly mindful of the important condition under which alone man could hope to share in the fulfilment of that promise, in that divine illumination and guidance,—the condition, that they were really assembled in the name of Christ, in lively faith in him, and honest devotion to him, and prepared to sacrifice their own wills; and when the people gave themselves up to the fancy, that such an assembly, whatever might be the hearts of those who were assembled, had unalienable claims to the illumination of the Holy Spirit; for then, in the confusion and the intermixture of human and divine, men were abandoned to every kind of self-delusion; and the formula, “*Spiritu Sancto suggerente,*” “By the suggestion of the Holy Spirit,” might become a pretence and sanction for all the suggestions of man’s own will. And farther, the provincial synods would necessarily become prejudicial to the progress of the churches, if, instead of providing for the advantage of the churches according to the changing wants of each period, they wished to lay down unchanging laws in changeable things. Evil was it at last, that the participation of the churches was entirely excluded from these synods, that at length the bishops alone decided every thing in them, and that their power, by means of their connection with each other in these synods, was constantly on the increase. As the provincial synods were also accustomed to communicate their resolutions to distant bishops in weighty matters of general concernment, they were serviceable, at the same time, toward setting distant parts of the church in connection with each other, and maintaining that connection.

In the second century after the birth of Christ, eight local synods were held on church affairs, about which little information is now extant, except that they related to the heresy of Montanus, the rebaptizing of heretics, and the

time for celebrating the festival of Easter. In the third century eighteen synods were held; the principal of which were, that of Alexandria, against Origen; that of Africa, against the schismatic Novatus; that of Antioch, against the heresy of Sabellius, and another in the same city against Paul of Samosata; that of Carthage, against such persons as fell away in time of persecution; and that of Rome, against Novatian and other schismatics. Prior to the assembling of the first general council at Nice, A. D. 325, three synods were held at Sinuessa, Ciritha, and Alexandria, the subjects discussed in which are unworthy of notice. Others were held, the discussions in which are so far interesting as they show how desirous the Ante-Nicene fathers were to regulate the doctrine and practice of the church according to the apostolic model. The fourth was that of Elvira, which rejected by its thirty-sixth canon any use whatever even of pictures. "We would not," say they, "have pictures placed in churches, that the object of our worship and adoration should not be painted on their walls." The synod at Carthage not having brought the rival pretensions of Cæcilian and Majorinus to the episcopate of that city to a favourable issue, the Emperors Constantine appointed a commission (there being so few bishops present, it could not deserve any other title) to sit, first at Rome, and afterward at Arles, for the purpose of rehearing the matter. At Arles, it was decreed, that Easter should be celebrated on the same Sunday throughout the world; and that heretics, who had been baptized in the name of the Trinity, should not be rebaptized. The synods of Ancyra and Neo-Cæsarea followed. The tenth canon, decreed by the latter, shows the sense of the fathers on the subject of celibacy: namely, "If deacons declare at the time of their ordination that they would marry, they should not be deprived of their function if they did marry." Rigid decrees were passed generally against such of the clergy as ate meats 886 which had been sacrificed to idols. After the forementioned synods, two were convened at Alexandria, A. D. 322, against Arius. But their acts merge in the subsequent proceedings of the church. From the termination of the council of Nice to the next œcumenical council, A. D. 381, no fewer than forty-three synods, eastern and western were convened. The professed object of these meetings was the tranquillity of the church; yet, from the unhappy divisions which prevailed in these assemblies, their deliberations were conducted with much of the violence of party feeling; and, according as the one party or the other prevailed, they severally hurled spiritual thunder-bolts against their doctrinal rivals, as if against the enemies of God himself. Of the synod of Sardica a separate and more particular account will be subsequently given, because on the authority of that unimportant assembly the church of Rome grounds the right of appeal to itself before any other church. In the whole, no fewer than eighty-one synods were assembled throughout the universal church in this century. The principal subjects which engaged their attention related to Arianism, which was generally rejected by the western church; but experienced

various vicissitudes in the east, according to the view taken of it by the reigning power. Unfortunately for the peace of the church, this heresy gave birth to numerous others. Marcellus, Photinus, Macedonius, and Priscilian, were severally betrayed by their violence into systems no less revolting to reason and common sense than the Arian impieties. Of sixty synods which were convened to regulate the affairs of the church between the second and third general councils, A. D. 381–431, more than half of that number were assembled in Africa:--no inconsiderable proof of the vigilance exercised by the local bishops over the interests of that portion of the church universal committed to their care. In the latter part of the fifth century many synods were held, some eastern and others western, but none of them possessed peculiar interest. In the commencement of this century, Zosimus, bishop of Rome, absolved the heresiarchs, Pelagius and Cælestius, and by this act confirmed their errors. On the latter appealing to him for support, Zosimus sent the Sardican canon to a council held at the time in Carthage, as if that canon had been decreed by the council of Nice; because it allowed the right of appeal to the see of Rome. The African council rejected it with disdain, having found, on reference to the eastern patriarchs, that no such canons belonged to the Nicene council, or were ever before heard of. Thus was the reputed infallible head of an equally infallible church detected in a gross act of imposition; so gross as to compel our good Bishop Jewel to call Zosimus "a forger and falsifier of councils," The same pope pronounced his unerring judgment in the dispute between the bishops of Arles and Vincennes; while Boniface, his successor, under the influence of the same inerrant principle and in the plenitude of the same apostolic power, reversed that judgment. In the year 498, Symmachus and Laurentius were elected to the pontificate on the same day by different parties; and while they maintained the validity of their respective elections, they reciprocally denounced each other. Where, then, did infallibility reside before Theodoric, king of the Goths, gave it a supposed habitation in the person of Symmachus? Theodoric, an Arian, and consequently a heretic in the eyes of the Romish church, awarded the keys of St. Peter to Symmachus; a circumstance which must have vitiated the boasted apostolic succession in the bishops of Rome, and therefore have destroyed their title to infallibility! Cabals and intrigues for being elected to the popedom disgraced the commencement of the sixth century. Their prevention in future, however, was decreed; and certain rules, having in view the peace and order of the western church, were laid down by two synods convened at Rome about the same time. From this period to the middle of the century, upward of twenty local meetings of the clergy were held in different parts of Europe, fifteen in Asia, and only four in Africa. The directions for the married clergy, which occasionally present themselves to view in the proceedings of these synods, prove that celibacy was not at this period a general regulation; while communion in both kinds

appears to have been an established usage. The synods which were held during the remainder of the sixth century were confined to France and Spain. They amount in number to twenty-six; and, like the rest of the minor class which preceded them, canons are interspersed among their acts which have in view the security of church property, and the rights, privileges, and powers of the different ranks of the clergy. The remaining canons relate to discipline, with the exception of the few which were at different times ordained for the suppression of heretical opinions, for the regulation of both the married and celibate clergy, and of the fees to which they should be entitled on the performance of certain duties. In none of them is to be found the least authority for the distinguishing tenets of the modern church of Rome; so that, to the very close of the sixth century, she may be considered as being orthodox, pure, and uncorrupt. Whatever deference she might claim as an elder branch of the church of Christ, she raised no pretensions to a lordly preëminence over the rights and privileges of other churches. Her jurisdiction was circumscribed within her own diocesan boundaries; and, beyond them, none was demanded. After the commencement of the seventh century, however, a complete change took place in this respect, so that if a comparison be instituted between the tenets which the church of Rome held in the first ages, and those which she subsequently professed, the precise period at which the novelties commenced which now distinguish her from her former self might easily be ascertained. The order of St. Benedict, which served as a model for the other monastic fraternities that were subsequently instituted, was founded in the early part of this century

887As the history of synods after the sixth century dwindles down into a meagre narrative of the unjust incroachments and corrupt innovations of the church of Rome, and of the ineffectual struggles of Christian churches in various parts of Europe to resist his usurpation, we shall close this article with an account of the popish synod of Sardica and of the Protestant synod of Dort. After a long night of darkness, the glimmerings of a bright day were perceived at a distance, when, in the fourteenth century, our celebrated countryman, the immortal Wickliffe, appeared as the precursor of the reformation from popery. The light increased during the succeeding century, when those brave witnesses for the truth, John Huss and Jerome of Prague, suffered martyrdom; and the sixteenth century was favoured with the full blaze of day when Luther and Melancthon were encouraged and supported in their benevolent and arduous undertaking, and succeeded in putting down the shadowy forms of superstition and idolatry. Soon was the greatest part of irradiated Europe called upon to rejoice in this light; and to some of the best patriots in those countries that slighted such an opportunity, their own culpable supineness or neglect has been a source of deep national regret from one generation to another.



The Synod of Sardica was held A. D. 347. The Emperors Constans and Constantius, being anxious to restore that peace to the church of which it was deprived by the continuance of Arius's heresy, agreed to convene an ecclesiastical assembly in Sardica, a city of Mæsia on the verge of their respective empires. About a hundred western and seventy eastern bishops attended; but altercation, and not debate, ensued. The smaller party, apprehensive for their personal safety, withdrew to a town in Thrace; a circumstance that disclosed the first symptoms of discord and schism between the Greek and Latin churches. Before this period the right of appeal from all other churches to the see of Rome had not been claimed; but from it we date the first aspirations of Roman pontiffs to lordly preëminence, and they bent their restless energies to establish a spiritual tyranny over all the nations of the earth. Ecclesiastics, excommunicated by the oriental or African churches, fled to Rome for refuge, one after another; and as the bishop of that city afforded them his protection, gratified as he was at every occasion which made it necessary, they, in order to testify their gratitude, unwittingly compromised the rights of the clergy, when, to the extent of their individual sanction, they invested him with the appellat jurisdiction. Among the refugees at Rome was the celebrated bishop of Alexandria. Athanasius, persecuted by the Arian party in the east, knelt as a suppliant on the threshold of the Vatican. Julius gladly espoused his cause, and declared him to have been illegally condemned; a declaration that seemed to come with authority, but which the eastern bishops opposed as an usurpation of undue power. They went so far as even to excommunicate Hosius, Gaudentius, Julius the bishop of Rome, and others, on the alleged assumption of authority. They maintained the principle laid down in the canons, that the judgment passed on any individual, either by an eastern or western synod, ought to be confirmed by the other. And while they complained that the bishops of the west should disturb the whole church, on account of one or two troublesome fellows, they accused them of arrogantly attempting to establish a new law for the purpose of empowering themselves to reëxamine what had been already determined. Chrysostom, too, in his distress, implored, at a subsequent period, the interference of Innocent, the then occupant of the papal chair, with the emperor of the east, for the purpose of procuring a reversal of the sentence of deposition pronounced against him by an obscure synod in the suburbs of Chalcedon. But that father never once supposed that the Roman pontiff had any right to hear his cause. His appeal lay to the supreme tribunal of a free and general council, from a packed assembly which the empress Eudoxia had been instrumental in calling together, in order to effect his ruin. As these two cases of Athanasius and Chrysostom are pleaded by Romish writers in support of the appellat authority with which they invest the bishop of Rome, it is a matter of importance to examine the

stability of this ground-work, on which is laid the immense structure of papal supremacy. Hosius, who presided in the Sardican synod, as he did at every council where he happened to be present, is reported to have proposed that an appeal should be made to Rome out of respect to the chair of St. Peter, and not, as was ruled at the council of Nice, to the bishops of the neighbouring province, when any decision had been come to in a provincial synod. But what is the language of the proposition made by Hosius? "If it be a favourite object with you, let us honour the memory of Peter, so that a letter may be addressed to Julius, bishop of Rome, by those who decided on the matter; that, if necessary, the judgment may be reviewed by the bishops in his neighbourhood, and that he may appoint some to hear the cause." Here neither canon nor Scripture is referred to; while it is left optional with the assembly whether deference was or was not to be paid to Julius, who is simply styled *συνεπίσκοπος*, "a fellow bishop." The fourth canon of this synod ordains, "that an archbishop, &c, deposed by a provincial synod, must not be expelled, until the bishop of Rome shall determine whether the cause shall be reëxamined;" and the fifth canon decrees, "that the bishop of Rome, if he deem it proper, shall order a rehearing of the matter; that, if convenient, he shall send deputies for the purpose; if not, that he should leave the decision of the case to the synod itself." From the third and fourth canons it appears that a novelty in discipline is established, and made obligatory on the churches of both empires, but only by a handful of bishops belonging to one of them; and from the fifth, that the bishop of Rome, if he deemed a judgment erroneous, might convene a new council and send deputies to it, for the purpose of reconsidering the matter. These canons, no doubt, were very flattering to the ambition of the Roman pontiff, and, accordingly, they are pleaded in behalf of his supremacy; but how preposterous is it to ascribe that to a human law, which, it is asserted, belongs to him by the law of God! There are other canons regulating the intercourse between bishops and the imperial court; after such a manner, however, as to make the bishop of Rome the judge of the propriety of the petitions which they intended to prefer. Notwithstanding all this, they can never be rescued from the imputation of being forgeries. For, 1. They were never received by either the eastern or African church as general laws. At the sixth council of Carthage, Austin strenuously denied the right of appeal to the Roman see, although a letter has been forged in his name, strenuously contending for it, which is now deposited among the pious frauds of the Vatican. It happened, also, in the early part of the fifth century, that Appiarius, who had been excommunicated by the African bishops, applied to Zosimus, bishop of Rome. This pontiff forthwith sent them the Sardican canon, which conferred on him the right of appeal. This they indignantly rejected, inasmuch as their predecessors, who attended the council of Sardica, left no record of it; and because the eastern patriarchs, whom they consulted

on the occasion, not only disclaimed all knowledge of any such canon being in existence, but furnished their brethren with an exact copy of the Nicene canons, among which the Sardican one was not to be found. 2. The Sardican canons were not inserted in the code of canons approved of by the council of Chalcedon. 3. The council which passed them is not reckoned, even by the church of Rome, as one of the eighteen general councils, whose authority it acknowledges; nor does Bellarmine himself say that it is one of those councils which his church receives in part and rejects in part. 4. When the western bishops entreated the Emperor Theodosius to summon a council, A.D. 407, so far were they from making any allusion to the doctrine of an appeal to the Roman see, that they distinctly disclaimed the thought of such a prerogative, and only sought the fellowship of a common arbitration. 5. Lastly, if, as the historian Sozomen says, the Sardican synod wrote to Julius, bishop of Rome, to apprise him of what they had done, and of their decrees being drawn up in the spirit of the council of Nice, the purport of the letter was not so strong as that which they addressed to the church of Alexandria, in which they pray it to give its suffrage to the determination of the council, additional suspicions are created. From all these circumstances taken together, it is evident that no value is to be attached to the decrees of this obscure council; and that, although due respect was paid to St. Peter's chair, it was no acknowledgment of the superiority of its possessor as to ecclesiastical authority or jurisdiction.

The Synod of Dort. The Dutch churches forsook the communion of the corrupt church of Rome soon after the church of England had cast off the papal yoke; and they were generously aided in their endeavours to recover their civil and religious liberties by our good Queen Elizabeth and her wise counsellors. The first Christian teachers among them were Lutherans; but in process of time, the celebrity of Geneva as a place of public instruction for ministers of religion induced the majority of the candidates for the ministry to repair to that university; and, as might naturally be expected, they imported into the Low Countries the peculiar views of Calvin and Beza on the subject of predestination. It is justly observed by Le Vassor, "Some learned Hollanders had boldly defended this doctrine, before Arminius became a minister at Amsterdam and a professor at Leyden, and likewise before Gomarus had risen up against him. Their writings are still extant; although it is true that certain ministers, who were too hasty, exerted themselves to bring those authors and their productions into disrepute; but the states of Holland uniformly checked this impetuous zeal. The professors of Leyden were allowed a perfect liberty of teaching conformably to the sentiments of Melancthon; and when Arminius was called to that university, his opinions were generally known; for he had declared them in the church of Amsterdam, from the consistory of which

he received very honourable testimonials. Gomarus, and many others of the same opinion, having entered into conversation with Arminius, made no scruple of acknowledging immediately that the difference of sentiments which existed between them did not at all concern the foundations of the Reformation. True it is, that Gomarus did not remain long on good terms with Arminius. Whether he had taken umbrage at the reputation of his new colleague, or the enemies of Arminius had found means to provoke the anger of Gomarus by some artful insinuation or other; he violently set his face against a man whom, some time before, he looked upon as orthodox.” The struggles of the party of Arminius in Holland, after the death of that great man, to obtain a toleration for their opinions, are matters of history. The political circumstances of that country and of Europe in general were at that period very peculiar, and exercised great influence in the convening and conducting of that famous ecclesiastical assembly, the synod of Dort; but in a sketch like this, they can only be briefly mentioned. Frederic, the elector Palatine, married Elizabeth, the only daughter of our King James the First; he was nephew to Maurice the prince of Orange: and he sent his Heidelberg divines to the synod to assist his uncle in the condemnation of the Remonstrant party, as the Arminians were generally called, and to gratify his polemical father-in-law in the overthrow of the heretical Vorstius. In return, he naturally expected both of his relations to aid him in his grand enterprise of seizing on the crown of Bohemia; in which, soon after the banishment of the Remonstrants, he completely succeeded,-- though 889he subsequently lost that crown and all his hereditary possessions, and embroiled nearly the whole of Protestant Europe in the famous thirty years’ war.

The Remonstrants, according to Nichols, in the ample notes to his translation of the “Works of Arminius,” had long wished to have their “Five Points” of doctrine brought for adjudication either before a provincial synod, to prepare matters for a national one; or to have them brought at once before a general council of Protestant divines. But the Calvinists would listen to neither of these equitable proposals. If a provincial synod were convened, especially in that province (Holland) which most needed such a remedy, these men well knew, from trial, how difficult it would be to combat and refute the strong and popular arguments of the Remonstrants, when both parties were placed nearly on an equality in the same assembly; and if a general council of Protestants was summoned together, they were certain that the principles of Arminius would, without demur, be recognized as integral parts of Scripture verity, and consequently entitled not only to toleration, (which was all that the Remonstrants had desired,) but to the especial patronage of the civil authorities. The latter result was anticipated, from the immense preponderance which the Lutheran divines, from all the small states of Germany, and from other

parts of the north of Europe, would have had in such a council. Numerous state papers on this subject were written by the public functionaries of the different provinces in the year 1617; among which those of the composition of the learned Grotius, who conducted the arguments in favour of a general council, are very conspicuous for the superior ability which they display. A national synod was therefore the sole remedy which the wisdom, or rather the worldly prudence, of the Calvinists could discover for removing the maladies under which the churches of Holland were at that time labouring. In showing cause for their preference, they were placed in an awkward dilemma; for they perceived, that the strongest reasons to be adduced for the adoption of this measure would extend too far, and might, in the hands of their able antagonists, be made to apply with greater cogency to the convening of a general council.

The designs which Prince Maurice had long cherished against the ancient liberties and internal jurisdiction of the states, (each of which possessed by the act of union the complete management of its own affairs,) were then in a course of execution. By the forcible and illegal removal of the old burgomasters and governors, and the appointment of new ones; by the preponderance which these newly elected individuals gave to their own party in their election of persons to fill the higher offices of state in the various towns which had been ill-affected toward Calvinism and arbitrary power; and by the untrue and scandalous reports which were invented and industriously propagated respecting the alleged secret intentions of Barneveldt and the Arminians to deliver up their country to the Spaniards; the prince was enabled to succeed in his ambitious enterprises. To the party, therefore, that had forwarded his views he willingly gave all the weight of his influence, and that of the States General, the majority of whom, in virtue of the late unlawful changes effected in the provinces, were favourable, not only to Calvinism, but to any measure which the prince might think fit to propose. It was in allusion to the revolution, thus craftily completed, that Bogerman, as president of the synod of Dort, told Episcopius, in a sarcastic style, as Hales tells us, "You may remember what you told the foreign divines in your letter to them, that there had of late been a great metamorphosis in the state; you are no longer judges and men in power, but persons under citation." In such a state of affairs, an ordinance of government was easily obtained for convening a national synod, which was to consist of native divines appointed by the different classes and presbyteries, of civil deputies chosen out of each province by the states, and of foreign divines deputed by such churches as had adopted both the platform and the doctrine of Geneva. The temper and intolerant conduct of the various ecclesiastical meetings with whom rested the inland appointments, had been but too apparent; and time had not mollified their intolerant principles; for, under the new order of things, and with the

sanction of the fresh race of magistrates, they were emboldened to effect a schism in many of the chief towns, and forcibly to exclude the Arminian ministers from the churches which they occupied. In other towns, in which these bold practices could not be attempted with any probability of success, they employed the ecclesiastical arms of the classes, provincial synods, and other packed vestry-meetings, the members of which (consisting generally of Calvinists) summoned before them all the chief Arminian pastors in the various districts, accused them of holding heterodox opinions on the subject of predestination, and suspended or expelled them from the ministry. This work of expulsion and suspension was carried on by the dominant party, even during the time in which the fate of Arminianism was in a course of determination by the synod of Dort: so that, had that far-famed and reverend assembly decided in favour of a toleration of the Arminian doctrines, the minor church meetings had left few ministers of that persecuted denomination to profit from such a decision. The Calvinistic account of this summary and iniquitous process is thus given, in the preface to the acts of the National Synod: "And since there were several pastors in that province, [Guelderland,] some of whom had been suspected of many other errors beside the Five Points of the Remonstrants, others of them had illegally intruded into the office of the ministry, while others were men of profligate habits; certain persons of this description being cited before the [provincial] synod [of Guelderland and Zutphen, held at Arnheim, in July, 1618,] were suspended from the ministry for some of the before-mentioned reasons, and 890by no means on account of the opinion contained in the Five Points of the Remonstrants, which was reserved for the cognizance of the national synod. The trial of the rest of these men being dismissed in the name of the synod, was committed to a deputation from their body, to whom the states added certain of their own delegates. When they had fully investigated the cases of these men in their classes, they suspended some of them from the ministry, and entirely removed others." In the very able memorial which the Remonstrants, on their arrival at the synod, presented to the foreign members, it is justly observed, respecting those who were accused of having taught, beside the Five Points, those doctrines which were contrary to the fundamentals of faith: "Such particular cases do not in any manner affect the common cause of the Remonstrants, but concern those alone who may be found guilty of them. Nor are we adverse to the issuing of ecclesiastical censures against such persons, provided they be lawfully put upon their trials, and fairly heard in defence of themselves against such charges." Because the members of these Calvinistic provincial synods could not be long absent from their respective congregations, such galloping commissions as these, endowed with ample powers, were appointed to traverse every province in which Arminianism had been planted; and they soon showed to the world the most compendious method of rooting out reputed heresies. Their track

through the land resembled that of the angel of destruction; it was marked by anguish, mourning, and desolation. After this detail, established by the synodical documents themselves, few words will suffice to point out the purely Calvinistic constitution of the synod of Dort. When very few Remonstrant ministers remained in the land, except such as were ejected from the church or under suspension, it was no difficult matter to procure an assemblage of men that were of one heart respecting the main object that was then sought to be accomplished.

In the original order for holding the synod, and in the list appended to it, as they were both passed by the States General, no mention was made of inviting any other churches, except those of England, France, the Palatinate, Hesse, and Switzerland, and it was a matter postponed for farther deliberation, whether any invitation should be transmitted to the churches of Bremen, Brandenburg, Geneva, and Nassau. The clergy of the principality of Anhalt were not invited to the synod, because their opinions were understood to be similar to those of the Remonstrants, the ancient confession adopted by their churches being decided on the subject of conditional predestination. The divines of Bremen were viewed as men inclined too much to moderate counsels, and on that account improper representatives in an assembly that intended to carry every proposition with the unanimity of force. The divines of Brandenburg were the last of those invited. Indeed no invitation was transmitted to them, till the state and temper of their churches had been ascertained with tolerable accuracy; and when it was generally thought that the deputies from that electorate were tractable and would follow in the train of the Contra-Remonstrants, it was determined to summon them to the synod. It was for some time a matter of doubt with the leading men of Holland, whether they ought to invite the divines of Geneva and Nassau, two of the greatest nurseries of Calvinism, to be present at the synod. The cause of this demur was, to avoid the appearance of partiality, which they justly thought all the world would have imputed to them had they convened an assembly consisting only of Calvinistic doctors. To keep up this semblance of moderation, the synodical summons was not transmitted to those divines when they were sent to the churches of other states and countries. But when Prince Maurice's schemes of secular aggrandizement and political power had succeeded beyond his utmost wishes, they no longer studied to "avoid the appearance of evil," but boldly summoned all those divines about whose presence at the synod they had formerly hesitated. This was a most notable and certain method of procuring a strict Calvinian uniformity in the members. On this topic, Hales, in his letters from Dort, to the English ambassador at the Hague, says, "For a general confession of faith, at least so far as those churches stretch who have delegates here in the synod, I think his project very possible, there being no point of faith in which they

differ.” Great interest was made at the court of France, to procure the attendance of deputies from the reformed churches of that country; but the king of France prohibited the Protestant clergy within his dominions from becoming members of the synod, or assisting at its deliberations.

The letters of the States General, inviting the foreign divines to the national synod, were issued on the 25th of June, 1618; and the members were summoned to meet together in the city of Dort, on the first day of November in the same year. The letters of invitation to the divines of the united provinces were dated Sept. 20th, and the synod of Dort was formally opened Nov. 13th. Whosoever casts his eye over the list of the foreign divines that composed this last of Protestant councils, will find scarcely one man who had not distinguished himself by his decided opposition to the doctrine of conditional predestination, and who was not consequently disqualified from acting the part of an impartial judge of the existing religious differences, or that of a peace-maker. This caused the famous Daniel Tilenus to observe, that “no persons were summoned to Dort who were not well known to be zealous promoters of Calvin’s predestination. In former ages, men were accustomed, first to go to the councils, and then to declare their sentiments: just the reverse of this is the practice in our days; for no one could be admitted into the synod of Dort unless he had previously manifested the bearing of his opinions.”

It will be perceived from the preceding statement, by what kind of ecclesiastical management 891 the Remonstrants had been excluded from having any deputies in the synod of Dort. So completely had the Calvinistic plan of exclusion succeeded, that three of the members from Utrecht were the only Remonstrants in that synod. The reason of their being there at all, was, because that province was almost equally divided between Remonstrant and Calvinist churches, and it had been agreed that three of each denomination should be summoned. But so obnoxious were the persons as well as the doctrines of the Remonstrants to their adversaries, that they would not allow even those three individuals to have a place in the seat of judgment. In the twenty-fourth session, it was unanimously declared, that they could only be reputed as cited persons; however, as the Acts express it, “that this synod might not be exposed to calumnies, as if they wished to exclude them, it was allowed them to sit among the judges” on five conditions, the chief of which were, “that while the affairs of the Remonstrants were under discussion, they should not disturb the proceedings of the synod by unseasonable interruptions, and not acquaint their party with any thing done or said in the synod, which concerned their cause.” Two of them, after a day’s deliberation, united themselves with their suffering brethren; and the third, who was a layman, had seen enough of the partial conduct of that venerable assembly to induce him to absent



himself from their farther deliberations. As the Remonstrants formed no part of the members convened, it was debated, in the fourth session, how they ought to be summoned. It was proposed and resolved, that a letter should be composed and sent to the whole body, that they might depute three out of each province as deputies to the synod. The president Bogerman then inquired, if all the Remonstrants were to be admitted; the president of the lay commissioners answered, that the ecclesiastical president and the secretaries should receive a private explanation from him respecting their numbers. In the interview which the two presidents and the secretaries had together, they concerted matters so well, that next day the preceding resolution for writing to the whole body was withdrawn for amendment; and it was finally agreed, that it should be left to the determination of the lay commissioners, what persons, and how many, should be convened. These gentlemen selected thirteen of the Remonstrants, to each of whom they addressed a letter of citation, commanding them to appear before the synod, "within fourteen days after the receipt of it without any tergiversation, excuse, or exception, that in it they might freely propose, explain, and defend the before-mentioned five points as far as they were able and should deem to be necessary." In the mean time the Remonstrants, without knowing the resolution of the synod, had deputed three of their body from Leyden, to obtain leave for their appearance at the synod, in a competent number and under safe conduct to defend their cause. On making their request known to the lay commissioners, they were informed of the resolution which had passed the synod only the preceding day. To which they replied, that it was unreasonable to cite those to justify themselves who were both ready and willing to come of their own accord; and that if they persisted in proceeding with their plan of citation, they would by that act furnish just cause, not only to them, but to all good men, to entertain strange notions and suspicions of the synodical proceedings. Not being permitted to choose those men from their own body whom they deemed the best qualified to state and defend their cause, they accounted it an additional hardship, that their enemies should assume that unlawful authority to themselves. But neither at that time nor afterward, when they wished to add two of the most accomplished of the brethren to their number, were their representations of the least avail. On the sixth of December these valiant defenders of the truth arrived, and requested, by a deputation, to be allowed a few days to unpack their books, arrange their papers, &c. But they were commanded immediately to appear in a body before the synod, and to prefer their own request. They were introduced by their brethren of Utrecht, and ordered to sit down at a long table placed in the middle of the hall. Episcopius then, with the permission of the president, addressed an apostolic greeting to the synod; and, having repeated the request previously made, he said, that "the cited Remonstrants appeared there to defend their good and righteous

cause before that venerable assembly, by reasons and arguments drawn from the word of God,—or else to be confuted and better informed from the same word. In reference to the favour which they had asked, they left it to the discretion of the commissioners of the States General, being ready on their parts, immediately and without delay, to engage in a conference, if that should be required.” Then were they desired to withdraw into a chamber prepared for them adjoining the hall of the synod. After some time spent in deliberation, they were recalled, and informed by the president, that they would be expected at the synod next morning at nine o’clock. He added, according to Hales, “that they came not to conference, neither did the synod profess themselves an adverse party against them. Conferences had been heretofore held to no purpose. They ought to have heeded the words of the letters by which they were cited. They were called not to conference, but to propose their opinions with their reasons, and leave it with the synod to judge of them.” Episcopius replied, that it was not necessary so nicely to criticise the word conference, and that they had come there with no other view than to treat about the doctrines which were controverted, according to the summons which they had received. The next day, December 7th, the Remonstrants were called in, when after Episcopius had desired and obtained leave to speak, he uttered an oration, the delivery of which occupied nearly two hours, and which, on account of the noble sentiments contained in it, deserves to be recorded in letters of gold. The gracefulness, force, and energy with which it was spoken, made such an impression on the auditory as drew tears from several of them, and even from some of the states’ deputies. This effect gave mighty umbrage to the choleric Bogerman, who, as president, according to Mr. Hales’s account, “signified unto Episcopius, that, because there were in his speech many things considerable, he was therefore to deliver the copy of it. Episcopius replied, that he had none handsomely written: if the synod would have patience, he would cause a fair transcript to be drawn for them. But this excuse would not serve; fair or foul, deliver it up he must, and so he did.” In the session, December 10, after the president had ceased to speak, he desired the Remonstrants to proceed with their explanation and defence of the five points. They requested leave to have a paper read by Episcopius. Bogerman would not consent to this; but the lay president ordered another of the Remonstrants, Bernard Dwinglo, to read it. This very convincing document was addressed to the synod, and consisted of two parts. It may be seen at full length in the acts, and is in every respect worthy of the great men whose holy cause it defended. The first part declared, that the Remonstrants did not own the members of the synod for lawful judges, because the great majority of them, with the exception of the foreign divines, were their professed enemies; and that most of the inland divines then assembled, as well as those whose representatives they were, had been guilty of the unhappy schism which was made in the churches of Holland.

The second part contained the twelve qualifications, of which the Remonstrants thought a well constituted synod should consist. The observance of the stipulations proposed in it, they would gladly have obtained from the synod, averring that they were exceedingly equitable, and that the Protestants had offered similar conditions for the guidance of the Papists, and the Calvinists for the direction of the Lutherans. The production of such a mass of evidence from writers of the Calvinistic persuasion, in favour of a toleration and moderate measures, and against the principle of interested parties usurping the place of judges,--gave dreadful offence to that powerful body in the synod, and especially when they were charged with being at once plaintiff, judge, and jury. No one can form an adequate conception of the scene which followed the reading of this document. Bogerman, the Remonstrants, the lay president, and the commissioners, were warm interlocutors during that session and the succeeding one which was held in the afternoon of the same day. Bogerman laboured hard to show, that, by denying the competency and impartial constitution of the tribunal before which they were summoned, they in reality were guilty of disaffection to the higher powers, who had appointed and convened the synod; and that, by charging the majority of the members with being the authors of the schism, they had in effect accused the prince of Orange and the States General, because those great personages had frequented the separate meetings. In reference to the latter circumstance, which exceedingly galled him and the inland divines, he said, "The proper time has not yet arrived for discussing it. But when it shall have been proved to the synod, what kind of doctrine is sanctioned by the church, those who have departed from it, and who are consequently guilty of the schism, will appear in their true colours." Charles Niellius, one of the Walloon ministers, answered in behalf of the Remonstrants, that though they acknowledged the authority of the states, and held the synod in due estimation, yet it was as lawful for them to challenge this synod, as for several of the Christian fathers who challenged some of the ancient councils, and their ancestors that of Trent. The laws themselves allowed men for certain reasons to challenge even sworn judges. But it was never known, that any law allowed parties to be judges. Nor was it equitable, that those who had previously separated from the Remonstrants should sit in the synod to try them, after they had by such separation pre-judged their doctrine and entered into mutual engagements to procure its condemnation. Episcopius then said, "Mr. President, if you were in our places and we in yours, would you submit to our judgment?" Bogerman replied, "If it had so happened, we must have endured it; and since government has ordered matters in a different way, it becomes you to bear it with patience." Episcopius rejoined, "It is one thing to acknowledge a person for a judge, and it is another to bear with patience the sentence which he may impose. We also will endure it; but our consciences cannot be persuaded to

acknowledge you for the judges of our doctrines, since you are our sworn adversaries, and have churches totally separated from ours.”

On the morning of the next day, the Remonstrants, being called in, were urged by the synod to present their objections in writing against the Confession and Catechism. Before they proceeded to do that, they craved permission to read another document: after some demur, leave was granted, when Dwinglo read a paper which commenced thus: “The celebrated Paræus, in his *Irenicum*, prudently observes, that he would advise no man to approach any council in which the same persons had to appear in the character of both adversaries and judges.” The rest of the paper was occupied in wiping off the aspersions which had been cast upon them in the four preceding sessions, and particularly the foul charge of their want of respect for the constituted authorities of their country. They declared, that in case men of peaceable dispositions had been deputed to the synod, as the States General had intended, and such men as had never been concerned in making or promoting these unhappy divisions, they would have had little reason to offer exceptions against such a synod. This document concluded with a protest. After the delivery of this protest, the synod invented various methods to vex the cited Remonstrants and to impede the prosecution of their cause. Among those methods one of the most artful was, to ask them questions singly, and not in a body, with an evident design to entrap them in their answers. They had with the greatest injustice chosen those Remonstrants whom they thought proper, to be cited as guilty persons at the bar of the synod, without the least regard to the useful or splendid qualifications of the individuals thus selected. Of the six prudent and accomplished men who had represented the Remonstrant party at the celebrated Hague Conference in 1611, only three were summoned to the present synod; and though those who appeared on this occasion were generally men of good natural talents and sound understandings, and well versed in the matters under discussion, yet they were not all endowed with the gift of rendering a ready and extempore reply in Latin to every question that might be suddenly asked; and if they had possessed such a gift in an eminent degree, it would still have been necessary that they should have had time for reflection, and for each to compare his own views and reasons with those of his brethren. This request, however, which cannot be viewed as a favour but as an act of justice, was almost without exception refused. Having presented to the synod their opinions relative to the Five Points and their remarks on the Catechism and Confession, the Remonstrants wished to enter on the “proposing, explanation, and defence of them, as far as they were able or should think necessary,” according to the very terms of the letters by which they had been cited; but the synod in opposition to the plain and obvious meaning which those expressions conveyed, decided that it was a privilege

belonging to themselves alone to judge how far the Remonstrants might be permitted to enter into the explanation and defence of their doctrines. This was accounted an act of great injustice by the Remonstrants, who also alleged, that “they did not feel many scruples about the doctrine of election, but that it was reprobation in which the chief difficulty lay.” They were very desirous, therefore, of having reprobation discussed in the first instance: but the Calvinists of those days wished to keep unconditional reprobation enshrined in the dark penetralia of their temples, only to be produced, as opportunity might serve, for their own private purposes, either to terrify the careless among their hearers, or to quicken the occasionally sluggish current of congregational benevolence. It was not to be expected, therefore, that the Calvinists of the synod would allow the Remonstrants to give reprobation that prominence in their discussions to which it was justly entitled. In one of the debates which these two questions produced, Bogerman again took advantage of the disingenuous trickery which we have just exposed, and asked Pynakker, one of the cited ministers, “Do you imagine the synod will suffer the Remonstrants to examine the doctrine of reprobation?” Pynakker replied, “Yes, I do: because, as this is the chief source of the troubles of the church, it ought to be first discussed.” Perceiving either that his meaning was not correctly understood, or that he had expressed it in an imperfect manner, Pynakker immediately explained himself by adding, that by first he meant chiefly, (both of which significations the Latin word conveys,) and by acknowledging that election ought to have the precedence of discussion. When relating this occurrence, Poppius remarks, “This, being received in a wrong sense, was imputed to all of us, as though we were unanimously of opinion, that the discussion of the doctrine of reprobation ought to precede that of election. Upon this question the foreign divines and others were desired by the president to deliver their sentiments. However, the expression imputed to us was employed by none of us, much less by all. But this was their manner: if one of us, in the name of all, said any thing that proved advantageous to the rest, the president seemed much displeased at our unanimity: then we were told that we were cited singly and personally, and that we did not compose a society or corporation. But when any of us happened to employ a word that was capable of being wrested to our common injury and misconstrued, then what was said by one was certain to be imputed to all!” After gaining a favourable opportunity like this, Bogerman always hastily dismissed the cited persons; and on this occasion he dwelt largely, in their absence, on Pynakker’s expression, and persuaded the foreign divines that the proposal of the Remonstrants, to treat of reprobation before election, was a *sine qua non*, and that without it was granted to them they would not proceed. This alarmed all the Calvinistic brotherhood, who rose *vi et armis*, delivered *seriatim* their objections to such a bold proceeding, and thought, with the professor of Heidelberg, “that it was unreasonable for the Remonstrants to

disturb the consciences of the elect on account of God's judgments against the reprobated, and to plead the cause of the latter, as though they had been hired to undertake the defence of those who had by the just judgment of God been rejected; and that for these reasons the synod neither could nor ought to grant the Remonstrant brethren any farther liberty, unless the members designed to expose the orthodox doctrine of predestination to be openly ridiculed." Finding this great aversion in the synod to the precedence of reprobation, the Remonstrants proposed, since they were forbidden to explain or defend their sentiments *vivâ voce*, "to explain their doctrines in writing, beginning with the article of election, and proceeding to that of reprobation; to defend their doctrines, and to refute the contrary opinions of the Contra-Remonstrants and of those whom they consider orthodox: but that, in case this explanation or defence seems to be defective, they would answer in writing the questions which the president might think proper to propose to them, or in oral communications by those of their body whom they might judge best qualified for that purpose. And that the liberty which they desired might not appear unlimited, they bound themselves to proceed in such a manner as should not savour in the least of an insolent licentiousness: and that their discussions might not be extended too far, the lay commissioners were empowered to curtail them at pleasure." But these very equitable terms, which were much worse than those which the unsophisticated and grammatical sense of the citatory letters held out to them, were rejected by the synod, at the instigation and by the management of the president, who, after having had recourse to his old trick of propounding questions to each of the cited persons, and after procuring against them three or four synodical censures, had them at length, (Jan. 14th.) dismissed from the synod, with every mark of contumely and scorn which he could invent. Bogerman had previously busied himself in extracting the opinions of the Remonstrants from such writings of theirs as had been published long before, and in forming them into articles, to be separately discussed by the synod. This passing of judgment on the Remonstrants from the testimony of their own writings, was an employment which Deodatus and his colleague from Geneva had at one of the earliest sessions mentioned as very desirable, and in which they appeared eager to engage. Any one who attentively reads the Acts of the synod, and compares them with the private accounts both of Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants will find, that this had also been the intention of the president from the very commencement, and that all his shifting schemes and boisterous conduct was intended to irritate the Remonstrants, who possessed more patience than he had contemplated, and who were therefore to be removed from the synod by a greater exercise of art and with greater difficulty. But one of the greatest injuries of which the Remonstrants had to complain, was, that the book from which their supposed opinions were chiefly collected, was the production of a declared

enemy, who wrote a highly coloured account of a conference respecting the Five Points, in which he pretended that the Calvinists had obtained a complete victory. A Remonstrant author had also written an able statement of the same conference, and had claimed a triumph for his party. The latter would therefore have certainly been the most proper authority from which to extract the real opinions of his body.

But though dismissed from their farther attendance on the synod, the Remonstrants were not permitted to depart from Dort; the states' commissioners having charged them not to quit the town, without their special permission. The president, in his speech dimissory, had said, that they would receive an intimation when the synod had any farther occasion for them. When a Remonstrant deputy, by leave of the acting burgomaster of Dort, who was one of the commissioners, had hastily gone to Utrecht, to visit one of his children that was expected soon to die, he was on his return called to an account for his conduct, and the former order repeated. In the course of their detention at Dort during eight months, they were as strictly watched as if they had been condemned malefactors. One of them whose sister lay on her death-bed and earnestly desired to see him, could not obtain permission to visit her while she lived; and after her decease he was not allowed to attend her funeral. Another, whose wife was near the time of her accouchment, wished, like a good family man, to be at home for a few days at that critical period; but his request was refused. When the uncle of another of them was at the point of death, he longed for the presence of his nephew, to receive his dying commands, and to benefit him by his counsels and prayers; but the wishes of the good old man could not be gratified. After his death, the nephew was not allowed to look after the pressing concerns of his orphan cousins, although his uncle had appointed him their legal guardian. None of these favours, though reasonable and asked with much humility, could be obtained from the high bigots, in whose hands, at that time, was vested the personal liberty of the persecuted and cited Remonstrants. Toward the close of February, the magistrates of different towns deposed from the ministry three of the cited Remonstrant ministers who were present at the synod, and sent regular notices to their families, speedily to quit the parsonage houses which they severally occupied. These three good men, being heartily tired of the strict durance in which they had been held since their arrival at Dort, represented to the states' commissioners, that, as they were not now in the ministry, they could no longer be considered amenable to the jurisdiction of the synod: this was the very argument of the commissioners, when, at the commencement of the synod, the Remonstrants had wished to have associated with them the two recently deposed ministers, Grevinchovius and Goulart. Though, for very obvious reasons, at that early stage of the business, they would permit no Remonstrants to appear among the cited,

“except such as were actually in the exercise of the ministry;” yet they would not listen to the same argument when it militated against their favourite purposes: and the three ministers were commanded to remain at Dort with their brethren. One of the three, however, whose wife then far advanced in pregnancy, had been ordered to leave her house within eight days, ventured to return to Horn, and to assist her to remove from their former dwelling. But, on his arrival, he found her already removed to another house; and his return to Dort was speedily required by the higher powers. To expedite his departure, two or three of the Calvinist magistrates employed their official authority in a manner the most reprehensible: they placed him, like a criminal, in the town wagon openly before his own door, though he had provided a carriage for himself on the outside of the town, to which he wished to have retired privately and without noise. A tumult ensued between the populace who were attached to their good pastor, and the soldiers whom the magistrates had placed before his house two hours before his departure. On his 895return to Dort, he was severely examined before the commissioners respecting the unhappy commotion; but being convinced that he had not been at all to blame in that affair, they passed it over in silence. At different times the Remonstrants wished to depute a few of their small body to the Hague, to make a proper representation of the manner in which they were treated by the synod; but this indulgence was invariably refused. Their only resource then was, to write to their high mightinesses an account of their proceedings, and to implore their interference and protection. But such an attempt, in that posture of their affairs, was unavailing; for their doom was already sealed. Soon after their appearance at Dort, the magistrates of that city issued a proclamation, commanding the inhabitants, all of whom were celebrated for their attachment to Calvin, to refrain from insulting any of the foreign or native professors, divines, or other persons that were called to appear at the synod, on pain of summary punishment to the offenders. This document was not required for the protection of the Calvinists; but the persecuted Remonstrants were such objects of hatred to the populace, as scarcely to be allowed to pass along the streets without being maltreated. This bad spirit was excited and encouraged by the violent sermons which were fulminated against them, from the different pulpits in the city. Whenever these good men were required to be in attendance, (and they were liable to be summoned from their lodgings at a few minutes’ notice,) they were not permitted to enter the large hall in which the synodical sessions were held, but were ordered to wait the pleasure of that venerable body in an ante-chamber, the door of which was generally locked, and the passage leading to it guarded by two or three of the police, who hindered them from holding any communication with their friends, and kept them in as strict durance as if they had been convicted of some capital offence. At the formal conclusion of the principal business of the synod, May the 6th, when the



farther attendance of the foreign divines was declared to be no longer necessary, the Remonstrants were summoned from their lodgings, and waited upon the lay commissioners, at six o'clock in the evening, when the resolution and censure of the synod were read to them in Latin by Heinsius, the secretary; in which they were accused of "having corrupted the true religion, dissolved the unity of the church, given grievous cause of scandal, and shown themselves contumacious and disobedient: for these several reasons, the synod prohibited them from the farther exercise of their ministry, deprived them of their offices in the church and university, and declared them incapable of performing any ecclesiastical function, till, by sincere repentance, they should have given the church full satisfaction, and, being thus reconciled to her, should be re-admitted into her communion." They were then required to wait at Dort till farther orders from their high mightinesses; and when they requested to have a copy of the synodical censure and sentence against them, they were as usual refused. On the 24th of May, the cited Remonstrants were summoned to appear before three new commissioners whom the States General had deputed from their body, when each of them was called into the room and separately interrogated; after which, he who had been last called in was ordered into another room, and prevented from holding any communication with those who had not been ushered into the presence of the commissioners. The proposal and questions addressed to each of them were in substance the following: "Since you have been deprived by the synod, the States General have directed us to ask you the following questions: Whether you are, notwithstanding this decision, resolved to act as ministers? Or whether you will be content in future to lead quiet and peaceable lives in obedience to the government, as private burghers, without any place or office, abstaining from all ecclesiastical ministrations in any meeting of the people of your sect, from all manner of teaching and preaching, exhorting, reading, administering the sacraments, visiting the sick, writing letters, or transmitting papers?--It is the intention of their high mightinesses to allow to those who shall conform to these requisitions such a competency as may enable them to live comfortably either in or out of these united provinces, as their own choice may determine." In addition to these things, Episcopius was required to promise, "not to write either letters or books to confirm the people in the sentiments of the Remonstrants, or to seduce them from the doctrine of the synod." All of them professed their willingness to obey their governors in all such matters as might be performed with a safe conscience, to live peaceably themselves, and to exhort all others to the same practice. They also expressed their readiness to refrain from the exercise of their ecclesiastical functions in the public churches; but none of them, except Leo, could reconcile it to their consciences to abstain from feeding in smaller assemblies the flock of Christ over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers. The majority of them added, "Not only those who abuse

or squander away their talent will be punished, but those also who bury it in the earth, either through fear of trouble or hope of advantage. It is therefore our duty to place our lights on candlesticks, and not to hide or smother them under a bushel or an easy bed; and we hope your lordships will neither hinder us, nor be displeased with us for so doing." In a subsequent interview with the commissioners, the Remonstrants proved, that their reasons for continuing the exercise of their ministry had formerly received the sanction of the States General themselves: for at the treaty of Cologne, in 1579, their high mightinesses had insisted, "that subjects who professed any religion different from that which was established, could not satisfy their consciences by foregoing its exercise." But, after several unavailing conferences together, the commissioners left them in a state of suspense and confinement, about twenty days longer. During 896that time, several reports were brought to them from various quarters, "that some great calamity was impending;" and they were seriously advised to avoid it by a timely flight. They were likewise informed of Barneveldt's execution, and of the perpetual imprisonment to which Grotius and Hogerbeets had been sentenced; and that several of their brethren in the ministry, who had lately attended a meeting at Rotterdam about their affairs in general, had been taken into custody, and brought to the Hague, for that offence. They thought, however, that all these reports were only intended to create an artificial alarm, and to induce them to attempt an escape,--thus delivering their enemies from the hatred to which they would be exposed by their farther rigorous proceedings. But their firmness on that occasion corresponded with all their previous conduct, and they refused to dishonour their good cause by flight, or any other act of cowardice. On the 3d of July, after having been summoned from Dort to the Hague, they appeared before the States General, and when they had been called in singly before their lordships, some time was spent to induce each of them to sign the act of cessation from the ministry. But to these renewed solicitations they separately returned the same modest answer as that which they had delivered at Dort. After allowing them two days for farther deliberation, their lordships on the fifth of the same month, having heard a repetition of their refusal, passed a resolution to banish them "out of the united provinces and the jurisdiction thereof, without ever being allowed to return till the said states be fully satisfied that they are ready to subscribe the said act of cessation, and till they have obtained special leave from their high mightinesses for that purpose, on pain, in case of non-compliance, of being treated as disturbers of the public peace, for an example to others." Episcopius delivered a short speech, in which, among other matters, he reminded their high mightinesses, "that they had been invited to a free synod, and had received frequent verbal promises of a safe conduct." To this speech they did not deign a reply, but ordered the Remonstrants to be conducted into another room, and to have the door locked and bolted, while

the provost and his officers attended on the outside for purposes of intimidation. After being kept some time in this kind of imprisonment they were at length permitted to depute to their high mightinesses two of their body, who requested that they might have leave to adjust their domestic affairs, to collect what was owing to them, and to pay their debts, that their wives and children might not be rendered miserable and turned naked into the streets. They offered to give unexceptionable security for their return at such a period and to such places as their lordships might require. While they were preferring this request, the Heer Muis often interrupted them, and at last sarcastically told them “not to be so greatly concerned about their families; for if they had received an extraordinary call from God to serve his church, he would undoubtedly support them after an extraordinary manner.” But the only favour which the Remonstrants could obtain, was, the deferring of their departure till four o’clock the next morning, provided each of them would promise to retire to his lodgings without speaking to any body, and to be ready at the appointed early hour next day. Each of them had fifty guilders allowed for his travelling expenses, and a copy of the sentence of the States General. But it was between nine and ten o’clock the next day, before the magistrates removed them in nine wagons toward Walwick in Brabant, the place of banishment which they had desired, where they arrived after a journey of three days. The canons of Dort, as the grand test of Calvinism, were then carried triumphantly by the synodists throughout the land; and every clergyman, professor, and schoolmaster, that refused to sign them, was deprived of his benefice and compelled to lay aside his functions. Several of them, in addition to their deprivation, were also banished out of the country, to various parts on the continent. So ended these proceedings of the Synod of Dort as to these suffering men; proceedings which would have disgraced the worst age of popery!

While in a state of banishment, these excellent ministers of Christ Jesus provided for the spiritual wants of their destitute flocks; and, at the imminent hazard of life and liberty, discharged in person, as often as they found opportunity, the duties of the pastoral office. After the death of Prince Maurice, in 1631, they were permitted to return to their native country, and to resume the peaceable exercise of their ministry. But the immense literary labours in which they were compelled to engage during this troublous period have, by the admirably over-ruling acts of Divine Providence, been rendered most valuable blessings to the whole of Christendom. Such doctrines and principles were then brought under discussion, as served to enlighten every country in Europe on the grand subject of civil and religious liberty, the true nature of which has from that time been better understood, and its beneficial effects more generally appreciated and enjoyed.

We subjoin their opinions on the “Five Points” in dispute between them and the Contra-Remonstrants, translated from the Latin papers which they presented to the synod. It is, however, necessary for the reader to be apprized, that, in framing these doctrinal articles, which served them as texts or theses for some most valuable dissertations on various cognate subjects, they intended rather to expose the unguarded assertions and extravagant dogmas of their theological adversaries, than to exhibit a simple statement of their own sentiments.

I. On predestination. 1. God has not decreed to elect any one to eternal life or to reprobate any man from it, in an order prior to that by which he has decreed to create that man, without any insight into any antecedent obedience or disobedience, but according to his <sup>897</sup>own good pleasure, to demonstrate the glory of his mercy and justice, or of his power or absolute dominion. 2. As the decree of God concerning both the salvation and the destruction of every man is not the decree of an end absolutely [intenti] fixed, it follows that neither are such means subordinated to that decree as through them both the elect and the reprobate may efficaciously and inevitably be brought to the destined end. 3. Wherefore, neither did God with this design in one man Adam create all men in an upright condition, nor did he ordain the fall or even its permission, nor did he withdraw from Adam necessary and sufficient grace, nor does he now cause the Gospel to be preached and men to be outwardly called, nor does he confer on them the gifts of the Holy Spirit,--[he has done none of these things with the design] that they should be means by which he might bring some of mankind to life everlasting, and leave others of them destitute of eternal life. Christ the Mediator is not only the executor of election, but also the foundation of the very decree of election itself. The reason [causa] why some men are efficaciously called, justified, persevere in faith, and are glorified, is not because they are absolutely elected to life eternal: nor is the reason why others are deserted and left in the fall, have not Christ bestowed upon them, or, farther, why they are ineffaciously called, are hardened and damned, because these men are absolutely reprobated from eternal life. 4. God has not decreed, without the intervening of actual sins, to leave by far the greater part of mankind in the fall, and excluded from all hope of salvation. 5. God has ordained that Christ shall be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; and, in virtue of this decree, he has determined to justify and save those who believe in him, and to administer to men the means which are necessary and sufficient for faith, in such a manner as he knows to be befitting his wisdom and justice. But he has not in any wise determined, in virtue of an absolute decree, to give Christ as a Mediator for the elect only, and to endow them alone with faith through an effectual call, to justify them, to preserve them in the faith, and

to glorify them. 6. Neither is any man by some absolute antecedent decree rejected from life eternal, nor from means sufficient to attain it: so that the merits of Christ, calling, and all the gifts of the Spirit, are capable of profiting all men for their salvation, and are in reality profitable to all men, unless by an abuse of these blessings they pervert them to their own destruction. But no man whatever is destined to unbelief, impiety, or the commission of sin, as the means and causes of his damnation. 7. The election of particular persons is [peremptoria] absolute, from consideration of their faith in Jesus Christ and their perseverance, but not without consideration of their faith and of their perseverance in true faith as a prerequisite condition in electing them. 8. Reprobation from eternal life is made according to the consideration of preceding unbelief and perseverance in unbelief, but not without consideration of preceding unbelief or perseverance in unbelief. 9. All the children of believers are sanctified in Christ; so that not one of them perishes who departs out of this life prior to the use of reason. But some children of believers who depart out of this life in their infancy, and before they have in their own persons committed any sin, are on no account to be reckoned in the number of the reprobate: so that neither is the sacred laver of baptism, nor are the prayers of the church, by any means capable of profiting them to salvation. 10. No children of believers who have been baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and who live in the state of their infancy, are by an absolute decree numbered among the reprobate.

II. On the universality of the merit of Christ. 1. The price of redemption which Christ offered to his Father is in and of itself not only sufficient for the redemption of the whole human race, but it has also, through the decree, the will, and the grace of God the Father, been paid for all men and every man; and therefore no one is by an absolute and antecedent decree of God positively excluded from all participation in the fruits of the death of Christ. 2. Christ, by the merit of his death, has [hactenus] thus far reconciled God the Father to the whole of mankind,--that he can and will, without injury to his justice and truth, enter into and establish a new covenant of grace with sinners and men obnoxious to damnation. 3. Though Christ has merited for all men and for every man reconciliation with God and forgiveness of sins, yet, according to [pactum] the tenor or terms of the new and gracious covenant, no man is in reality made a partaker of the benefits procured by the death of Christ in any other way than through faith; neither are the trespasses and offences of sinful men forgiven prior to their actually and truly believing in Christ. 4. Those only for whom Christ has died are obliged to believe that Christ has died for them. But those whom they call reprobates, and for whom Christ has not died, can neither be obliged so to believe, nor can they be justly condemned

for the contrary unbelief; but if such persons were reprobates, they would be obliged to believe that Christ has not died for them.

III. & IV. On the operation of grace in the conversion of man. 1. Man has not saving faith from and of himself, nor has he it from the powers of his own free will; because in a state of sin he is able from and of himself to think, will, or do nothing that is good, nothing that is indeed saving good; of which description, in the first place, is saving faith. But it is necessary that, by God in Christ through his Holy Spirit, he should be regenerated and renewed in his understanding, affections, will, and in all his powers, that he may be capable of rightly understanding, meditating, willing, and performing such things as are savingly good. 2. We propound the grace of God to be the beginning, the progress, and the completion of every good thing; so that even the man who is born again is not able without this preceding and prevenient, this exciting and following, this accompanying and coöperating grace, to think, to will, or to perform any good, or to resist any temptations to evil: so that good works, and the good actions which any one is able to find out by thinking, are to be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. 3. Yet we do not believe that all the zeal, care, study, and pains, which are employed to obtain salvation, before faith and the Spirit of renovation, are vain and useless; much less do we believe that they are more hurtful to man than useful and profitable. But, on the contrary, we consider that to hear the word of God, to mourn on account of the commission of sin, and earnestly to seek and desire saving grace and the Spirit of renovation, (none of which is any man capable of doing without divine grace,) are not only not hurtful and useless, but that they are rather most useful and exceedingly necessary for obtaining faith and the Spirit of renovation. 4. The will of man in a lapsed or fallen state, and before the call of God, has not the capability and liberty of willing any good that is of a saving nature; and therefore we deny that the liberty of willing as well what is a saving good as what is an evil is present to the human will in every state or condition. 5. Efficacious grace, by which any man is converted, is not irresistible: and though God so affects the will of man by his word and the inward operation of his Spirit, as to confer upon him a capability of believing, or supernatural power, and actually [*faciat*] causes man to believe; yet man is of himself capable to spurn and reject this grace and not believe, and therefore, also, to perish through his own culpability. 6. Although, according to the most free and unrestrained will of God, there is very great disparity or inequality of divine grace, yet the Holy Spirit either bestows, or is ready to bestow, upon all and upon every one to whom the word of faith is preached, as much grace as is sufficient to promote [*suis gradibus*] in its gradations the conversion of men; and therefore grace sufficient for faith and conversion is conceded not only to those whom God is said to be willing to save according to his decree of

absolute election, but likewise to those who are in reality not converted. 7. Man is able, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, to do more good than he actually does, and to omit more evil than he actually omits. Neither do we believe that God [simpliciter] absolutely wills that man should do no more good than that which he does, and to omit no more evil than that which he omits; nor do we believe it to have been determinately decreed from all eternity that each of such acts should be so done or omitted. 8. Whomsoever God calls he calls them seriously, that is, with a sincere and not with a dissembled intention and will of saving them. Neither do we subscribe to the opinion of those persons who assert that God outwardly calls certain men whom he does not will to call inwardly, that is, whom he is unwilling to be truly converted, even prior to their rejection of the grace of calling. 9. There is not in God a secret will of that kind which is so opposed to his will revealed in his word, that according to this same secret will he does not will the conversion and salvation of the greatest part of those whom, by the word of his Gospel, and by his revealed will, he seriously calls and invites to faith and salvation. 10. Neither [hic] on this point do we admit of a holy dissimulation, as it is the manner of some men to speak, or of a twofold person in the Deity. 11. It is not true, that, through the force and efficacy of the secret will of God or of the divine decree, not only are all good things necessarily done, but likewise all evil things; so that whosoever commit sin, they are not able, in respect to the divine decree, to do otherwise than commit sin; and that God wills, decrees, and [procurat] is the manager of men's sins, and of their insane, foolish, and cruel actions, also of the sacrilegious blasphemy of his own name; that he moves the tongues of men to blaspheme, &c. 12. We also consider it to be a false and horrible dogma, that God by secret means impels men to the commission of those sins which he openly prohibits; that those who sin do not act in opposition to the true will of God and that which is properly so called; that what is unjust, that is, what is contrary to God's command, is agreeable to his will; nay, farther, that it is a real and capital fault to do the will of God.

V. On the perseverance of true believers in faith. 1. The perseverance of believers in faith is not the effect of that absolute decree of God by which he is said to have elected or chosen particular persons circumscribed with no condition of their obedience. 2. God furnishes true believers with supernatural powers or strength of grace, as much as according to his infinite wisdom he judges to suffice for their perseverance, and for their overcoming the temptations of the devil, the flesh, and the world; and on the part of God stands nothing to hinder them from persevering. 3. It is possible for true believers to fall away from true faith, and to fall into sins of such a description as cannot consist with a true and justifying faith; nor is it only possible for them thus to fall, but such lapses not unfrequently

occur. 4. True believers are capable by their own fault of falling into flagrant crimes and atrocious wickedness, to persevere and die in them, and therefore finally to fall away and to perish. 5. Yet though true believers sometimes fall into grievous sins, and such as destroy the conscience, we do not believe that they immediately fall away from all hope of repentance; but we acknowledge this to be an event not impossible to occur,—that God, according to the multitude of his mercies may again call them by his grace to repentance; nay, we are of opinion that such a recalling has often occurred, although such fallen believers cannot be “most fully persuaded” about this matter that it will certainly and undoubtedly take place. 6. Therefore do we with our whole heart and soul reject the following dogmas, which are daily affirmed in various publications extensively circulated among the people: namely, (1.) “True believers cannot possibly sin with deliberate counsel and design, but only through ignorance and infirmity.” (2.) “It is impossible for true believers, through any sins of theirs, to fall away from the grace of God.” (3.) “A thousand sins, nay, all the sins of the whole world, are not capable of rendering election vain and void.” If to this be added, “Men of every description are bound to believe that they are elected to salvation, and therefore are incapable of falling from that election,” we leave men to think what a wide window such a dogma opens to carnal security. (4.) “No sins, however great and grievous they may be, are imputed to believers; nay, farther, all sins, both present and future, are remitted to them.” (5.) “Though true believers fall into destructive heresies, into dreadful and most atrocious sins, such as adultery and murder, on account of which the church, according to the institution of Christ, is compelled to testify that it cannot tolerate them in its outward communion, and that unless such persons be converted, they will have no part in the kingdom of Christ; yet it is impossible for them totally and finally to fall away from faith.” 7. As a true believer is capable at the present time of being assured concerning the integrity of his faith and conscience, so he is able and ought to be at this time assured of his own salvation and of the saving good will of God toward him. On this point we highly disapprove of the opinion of the papists. 8. A true believer, respecting the time to come, can and ought, indeed, to be assured that he is able, by means of watching, prayer, and other holy exercises, to persevere in the true faith; and that divine grace will never fail to assist him in persevering. But we cannot see how it is possible for him to be assured that he will never afterward be deficient in his duty, but that he will persevere, in this school of Christian warfare, in the performance of acts of faith, piety, and charity, as becomes believers; neither do we consider it to be a matter of necessity that a believer should be assured of such perseverance.

Under the article Pelagians has been shown the line of distinction which the Remonstrants drew between their doctrines and those of Pelagius; and



the following are the just distinctions, which they presented to the synod of Dort, between Semi-Pelagianism and Arminianism: “But we must declare, likewise, what our judgment is respecting Semi-Pelagianism. The Massilians, after the time of Pelagius, partly corrected his error and partly retained it; on which account they received from Prosper the appellation of the relics or remains of Pelagius, and are commonly styled Semi-Pelagians. They allowed the existence of prevenient grace, but only that which precedes or goes before good works; not that also which precedes the commencement of faith and of a good will, by which they believed that man preceded God,—yet this not always, but only sometimes: On the contrary we say, that God precedes or goes before the beginning of faith and of a good will; and that it is of grace both that our will be excited to begin well, and likewise, that, being thus prepared, it be led through to the grace of regeneration. The Semi-Pelagians asserted, that man, through the previous dispositions which had been implanted in his nature, obtained grace as a reward; and, however they might sometimes decline the use of the term merit, they by no means excluded merit itself: But we deny, that, through the endeavours of nature, man merits grace. The opinion of the Semi-Pelagians was, that, for the preservation of the grace of the Holy Spirit, we want nothing more than that which either by nature we may have, or that which we may once obtain in conjunction with grace: But we acknowledge, that, in order to our perseverance in good, special grace is likewise required.

“Wherefore we are unjustly accused of Semi-Pelagianism by the Contra-Remonstrants, since we condemn in the Semi-Pelagians those things which the church universal formerly condemned in them. Yet these are great signs of inconstancy and consequently of a false judgment,—that while some among them fasten Pelagianism upon us and others Semi-Pelagianism, there are others who declare that we are nearly and almost Semi-Pelagians, all of them having chosen and employed these epithets only for purposes of odium. Our conclusion therefore is, that we derogate nothing from divine grace, but acknowledge its supernatural and unmerited acts, and their absolute necessity for the work of conversion. But, on the other hand, we frankly confess, that the indifferency or liberty of the will is not taken away by grace, but that it is perfected for the better; and that the will is not necessitated, or so determined toward good as not to be able to do the opposite.

“This was also the judgment of all antiquity and of the church universal; and the orthodox accounted this way to be the safest, which lay between two precipices, the one that of the Manichees, the other that of the Pelagians. St. Jerom says, ‘We thus preserve free will, that we do not deny to it the help which it requires in every thing which it performs,’ Dialog.

adversus Pelagium. And St. Augustine, who was at other times a most fierce defender of absolute election, judiciously observes, in his forty-sixth letter to Valentinus, 'If there be no grace of God, how does he save the world? And if there be no free will, how does he judge the world?' And, as St. Bernard says, in the commencement of his book *On Grace and Free Will*, 'Take away free will, and there will be nothing to be saved; take away grace, and there will then be nothing from which salvation can come.' We have had regard to both of them; lest, if we denied the existence of freedom in the will, we should encourage the sloth and listlessness of men; or if the existence of grace, we should give up the reins to pride and haughtiness.-- From these quotations [and others which they give] it is evident that the opinion of the fathers was, that free will and grace so completely conspire together, that free will is perfected by grace, and not destroyed; the destruction of the will in this case being a calumny invented by the Pelagians, which was generally refuted by the patrons of grace."

For other particulars relating to general redemption consult the articles *Arminianism*, *Baxterianism*, *Calvinism:CALVINISM*, *#Church of England*, and *Lutherans*.

*SYRACUSE*, a famous city of Sicily, seated on the east side of the island, *Acts xxviii, 12*.

*SYRIA*, that part of Asia which, bathed by the Mediterranean on the west, had to the north Mount Taurus, to the east the Euphrates and a small portion of Arabia, and to the south Judea, or Palestine. The orientals called it *Aram*. The name, which has been transmitted to us by the Greeks, is a corruption or abridgment of *Assyria*, which was first adopted by the Ionians, who frequented these coasts after the Assyrians of Nineveh had reduced that country to be a province of their empire, about B. C. 750. By the appellation of *Syria* is ordinarily meant the kingdom of *Syria*, of which, since the reign of the *Seleucidæ*, *Antioch* has been the capital. The government of *Syria* was for a long time monarchical; but some of its towns, which formed several states, were republics. With regard to religion, the *Syrians* were idolaters. The central place of their worship was *Hieropolis*, in which was a magnificent temple, and near the temple a lake that was reputed sacred. In this temple was an oracle, the credit of which the priests used every method to support. The priests were distributed into various classes, and among them were those who were denominated *Galli*, and who voluntarily renounced the power of transmitting the succession in their own families. The *Syrians* had bloody sacrifices. Among the religious ceremonies of the *Syrians*, one was that any one who undertook a journey to *Hieropolis* began with shaving his head and eye-brows. He was not allowed to bathe, except in cold water, to drink any liquor, nor to lie on any

but a hard bed, before the term of his pilgrimage was finished. When the pilgrims arrived, they were maintained at the public expense, and lodged with those who engaged to instruct them in the sacred rites and ceremonies. All the pilgrims were marked on the neck and wrists. The youth consecrated to the goddess the first-fruits of their beard and hair, which was preserved in the temple, in a vessel of gold or silver, on which was inscribed the name of the person who made the offering. The sight of a dead person rendered it unfit for any one to enter into the temple during the whole day. The dynasties of Syria may be distributed into two classes; those that are made known to us in the sacred writings, or in the works of Josephus, acknowledged by the orientals; and the Seleucidan kings, successors of Alexander, with whom we are acquainted by Greek authors. The monarchy of Syria continued two hundred and fifty-seven years.

SYRO-PHENICIA, or PHENICIA PROPER, called Syro or Syrian Phenicia from being included in the kingdom of Syria. It implies that part of the coast of Canaan on the Mediterranean in which the cities of Tyre and Sidon were situated; and this same country, called Syro-Phenicia in the Acts, is in the Gospels called the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. The woman also called a Syro-Phenician in Mark vii, 26, is in Matt. xv, 22, called a Canaanitish woman, because that country was still inhabited by the descendants of Canaan, of whom Sidon was the eldest son.

TABERNACLE, in Hebrew, *לֵּוּאָה*, in Greek, *σκηνή*, a word which properly signifies a tent, but is particularly applied by the Hebrews to a kind of building in the form of a tent, set up by the express command of God, for the performance of religious worship, sacrifices, &c, during the journeyings of the Israelites in the wilderness; and after their settlement in the land of Canaan made use of for the same purpose, till the temple was built in Jerusalem. The tabernacle was covered with curtains and skins. It was divided into two parts, the one covered, and properly called the tabernacle, and the other open, called the court. The covered part was again divided into two parts, the one called holy, and the other called the holy of holies. The curtains which covered it were made of linen of several colours embroidered. There were ten curtains, twenty-eight cubits long, and four in breadth. Five curtains together made two coverings, which, being made fast together, enveloped all the tabernacle. Over the rest there were two other coverings, the one of goat's hair, and the other of sheep skins. These vails or coverings were laid on a square frame of planks, resting on bases. There were forty-eight large planks, each a cubit and a half wide, and ten cubits high; twenty of them on each side, and six at one end to the westward; each plank was supported by two silver bases; they were let into one another, and held by bars running the length of the planks. The holy of holies was parted from the rest of the tabernacle by a curtain, made fast to

four pillars standing ten cubits from the end. The whole length of the tabernacle was thirty-two cubits, that is, about fifty feet; and the breadth twelve cubits, or nineteen feet. The end was thirty cubits high; the upper curtain hung on the north and south sides eight cubits, and on the east and west four cubits. The court was a place a hundred cubits long, and fifty in breadth, inclosed by twenty columns, each of them twenty cubits high, and ten in breadth, covered with silver, and standing on copper bases, five cubits distant from each other, between which there were curtains drawn, and fastened with hooks. At the east end was an entrance twenty cubits wide, covered with a curtain hanging loose. In the tabernacle was the ark of the covenant, the table of shew bread, the golden candlestick, and the altar of incense; and in the court opposite to the entrance of the tabernacle, or holy place, stood the altar of burnt-offerings, and the laver or bason for the use of the priests.

The tabernacle was finished on the first day of the first month of the second year after the 901 departure out of Egypt, A. M. 2514. When it was set up, a dark cloud covered it by day, and a fiery cloud by night. Moses went into the tabernacle to consult the Lord. It was placed in the midst of the camp, and the Hebrews were ranged in order about it, according to their several tribes. When the cloud arose from off the tabernacle, they decamped; the priests carried those things which were most sacred, and the Levites all the several parts of the tabernacle. Part of the tribes went before, and the rest followed after, and the baggage of the tabernacle marched in the centre. The tabernacle was brought into the land of Canaan by Joshua, and set up at Gilgal. Here it rested till the land was conquered. Then it was removed to Shiloh, and afterward to Nob. Its next station was Gibeah, and here it continued till the ark was removed to the temple.

The word also means a frail dwelling, Job xi, 14; and is put for our bodies, 2 Cor. v, 1.

TABERNACLES, Feast of, a solemn festival of the Hebrews, observed after harvest, on the fifteenth day of the month Tisri, Lev. xxiii, 34–44. It was one of the three great solemnities, wherein all the males of the Israelites were obliged to present themselves before the Lord; and it was instituted to commemorate the goodness of God, who protected them in the wilderness, and made them dwell in tents or booths after they came out of Egypt. (See Feasts.) This feast continued eight days, of which the first and last days were the most solemn, Lev. xxiii, 34, &c. It was not allowed to do any labour on this feast, and particular sacrifices were offered, which, together with the other ceremonies used in celebrating this festival, were as follows: The first day of the feast, they cut down branches of the handsomest trees, with their fruit, branches of palm trees, and such as were

fullest of leaves, and boughs of the willow trees that grew upon the sides of brooks, Neh. viii, 16. These they brought together, and waved them toward the four quarters of the world, singing certain songs. These branches were also called hosanna, because when they carried them and waved them, they cried Hosanna; not unlike what the Jews did at our Saviour's entry into Jerusalem, Matthew xxi, 8, 9. On the eighth day they performed this ceremony oftener, and with greater solemnity, than upon the other days of the feast. They called this day hosanna rabba, or "the great hosanna."

**TABLES OF THE LAW.** Those that were given to Moses upon Mount Sinai were written by the finger of God, and contained the decalogue or ten commandments of the law, as they are rehearsed in Exodus xx. Many questions have been started about these tables; about their matter, their form, their number, he that wrote them, and what they contained. Some oriental authors make them amount to ten in number, others to seven; but the Hebrews reckon but two. Some suppose them to have been of wood, and others of precious stones. Moses observes, Exod. xxxii, 15, that these tables were written on both sides. Many think they were transparent, so that they might be read through; on one side toward the right, and on the other side toward the left. Others will have it, that the lawgiver only makes this observation, that the tables were written on both sides, because generally in writing tables they only wrote on one side. Others thus translate the Hebrew text: "They were written on the two parts that were contiguous to each other;" because, being shut upon one another, the two faces that were written upon touched one another, so that no writing was seen on the outside. Some think that the same ten commandments were written on each of the two tables, others that the ten were divided, and only five on one table, and five on the other. The words which intimate that the tables were written by the finger of God, some understand simply and literally; others, of the ministry of an angel; and others explain them merely to signify an order of God to Moses to write them. The expression, however, in Scripture always signifies immediate divine agency. See Decalogue.

**TABOR,** a mountain not far from Kadesh, in the tribe of Zebulun, and in the confines of Issachar and Naphtali. It has its name from its eminence, because it rises up in the midst of a wide champaign country, called the Valley of Jezreel, or the great plain. Maundrell tells us that the area at the top of this mountain is enclosed with trees, except to the south, from whence there is the most agreeable prospect in the world. Many have believed that our Lord's transfiguration took place on this mountain. This place is mentioned, 1 Sam. x, 3. It is minutely described by both Pococke and Maundrell. The road from Nazareth lies for two hours between low

hills; it then opens into the plain of Esdraelon. At about two or three furlongs within the plain, and six miles from Nazareth, rises this singular mount, which is almost entirely insulated, its figure representing a half sphere. "It is," says Pococke, "one of the finest hills I ever beheld, being a rich soil that produces excellent herbage, and is most beautifully adorned with groves and clumps of trees. The ascent is so easy, that we rode up the north side by a winding road. Some authors mention it as near four miles high, others as about two: the former may be true, as to the winding ascent up the hill. The top of it, about half a mile long, and near a quarter of a mile broad, is encompassed with a wall, which Josephus says was built in forty days: there was also a wall along the middle of it, which divided the south part, on which the city stood, from the north part, which is lower, and is called the meidan, or place, being probably used for exercises when there was a city here, which Josephus mentions by the name of Ataburion. Within the outer wall on the north side are several deep fosses, out of which, it is probable, the stones were dug to build the walls; and these fosses seem to have answered the end of cisterns, to preserve the rain water, and were also some defence to the city. There are likewise a great number of cisterns under ground for preserving the rain water. To the south, where the ascent was most easy, there are fosses cut on the outside, to render the access to the walls more difficult. Some of the gates, also, of the old city remain, as Bab-el-houah, 'the gate of the winds,' to the west; and Babel-kubbe, 'the arched gate,' a small one to the south. Antiochus, king of Syria, took the fortress on the top of this hill. Vespasian, also, got possession of it; and, after that, Josephus fortified it with strong walls. But what has made it more famous than any thing else is the common opinion, from the time of St. Jerom, that the transfiguration of our Saviour was on this mountain." Van Egmont and Heyman give the following account: "This mountain, though somewhat rugged and difficult, we ascended on horseback, making several circuits round it, which took us up about three quarters of an hour. It is one of the highest in the whole country, being thirty stadia, or about four English miles, a circumstance that rendered it more famous. And it is the most beautiful I ever saw, with regard to verdure, being every where decorated with small oak trees, and the ground universally enamelled with a variety of plants and flowers, except on the south side, where it is not so fully covered with verdure. On this mountain are great numbers of red partridges, and some wild boars; and we were so fortunate as to see the Arabs hunting them. We left, but not without reluctancy, this delightful place, and found at the bottom of it a mean village, called Deboura, or Tabour, a name said to be derived from the celebrated Deborah mentioned in Judges."

Pococke notices this village, which stands on a rising ground at the foot of Mount Tabor westward; and the learned traveller thinks, that it may be the

same as the Daberath, or Daberah mentioned in the book of Joshua, as on the borders of Zabulon and Issachar. "Any one," he adds, "who examines the fourth chapter of Judges, may see that this is probably the spot where Barak and Deborah met at Mount Tabor with their forces, and went to pursue Sisera; and on this account, it might have its name from that great prophetess, who then judged and governed Israel; for Josephus relates, that Deborah and Barak gathered the army together at this mountain."

"From the top of Tabor," says Maundrell, "you have a prospect which, if nothing else, will reward the labour of ascending it. It is impossible for man's eyes to behold a higher gratification of this nature. On the northwest you discern at a distance the Mediterranean, and all round you have the spacious and beautiful plains of Esdraelon and Galilee. Turning a little southward, you have in view the high mountains of Gilboa, fatal to Saul and his sons. Due east you discover the sea of Tiberias, distant about one day's journey. A few points to the north appears that which they call the mount of Beatitudes. Not far from this little hill is the city Saphet: it stands upon a very eminent and conspicuous mountain, and is seen far and near." Beyond this is seen a much higher mountain, capped with snow, a part of the chain of Antilibanus. To the south-west is Carmel, and on the south the hills of Samaria.

TADMOR, a city built by Solomon, 1 Kings ix, 18, afterward called Palmyra; situated in a wilderness of Syria, upon the borders of Arabia Deserta, inclining toward the Euphrates. Josephus places it two days' journey from the Euphrates, and six days' journey from Babylon. He says there is no water any where else in the wilderness, but in this place. At the present day there are to be seen vast ruins of this city. There was nothing more magnificent in the whole east. There are still found a great number of inscriptions, the most of which are Greek, and the other in the Palmyrenian character. Nothing relating to the Jews is seen in the Greek inscriptions; and the Palmyrenian inscriptions are entirely unknown, as well as the language and the character of that country. The city of Tadmor preserved this name to the time of the conquest by Alexander the Great: then it had the name of Palmyra given to it, which it preserved for several ages. About the middle of the third century, it became famous, because Odenatus and Zenobia, his queen, made it the seat of their empire. When the Saracens became masters of the east, they restored its ancient name of Tadmor to it again, which it has always preserved since. It is surrounded by sandy deserts on all sides. It is not known when, nor by whom, it was reduced to the ruinous condition in which it is now found. It may be said to consist at present of a forest of Corinthian pillars, erect and fallen. So numerous are these, consisting of many thousands, that the spectator is at a loss to connect or arrange them in any order or symmetry, or to conceive

what purpose or design they could have answered. "In the space covered by these ruins," says Volney, "we sometimes find a palace of which nothing remains but the court and walls; sometimes a temple, whose peristyle is half thrown down; and now a portico, a gallery, or triumphal arch. Here stand groups of columns, whose symmetry is destroyed by the fall of many of them; there we see them ranged in rows of such length, that, similar to rows of trees, they deceive the sight, and assume the appearance of continued walls. If from this striking scene we cast our eyes upon the ground, another almost as varied presents itself On all sides we behold nothing but subverted shafts, some whole, others shattered to pieces or dislocated in their joints; and on which side soever we look, the earth is strewn with vast stones half buried, with broken entablatures, mutilated friezes, disfigured reliefs, effaced sculptures, violated tombs, and altars defiled by dust."

It is probable, says Mansford, that, although Tadmor is said to have been built by Solomon, or, in other words, to have been erected by him into a city, it was a watering station between Syria and Mesopotamia before; with perhaps accommodations suited to the mode of travelling in those times, as we read of palm-trees being found there, which are not trees that come by chance in these desert regions. 903The mere circumstance of wholesome water being afforded by any spot in such a country was sufficient to give it importance, and to draw toward it the stream of communication, for whatever purpose. This was probably the condition of Tadmor long before it received its name and its honours from Solomon. But, after all, what motive could there be to induce a peaceable king, like Solomon, to undertake a work so distant, difficult, and dangerous? There is but one which at all accords with his character, or the history of the times,--commercial enterprise. Solomon was at great pains to secure himself in the possession of the ports of Elath and Ezion-Geber on the Red Sea, and to establish a navy for his Indian commerce, or trade to Ophir,--in all ages the great source of wealth. The riches of India, thus brought into Judea, were from thence disseminated over those countries of the north and west at that time inhabited or known; while the same country, Judea, became, for a season, like Tyre, the point of return and exchange of the money and the commodities of those countries, the centre of communication between the east and the west.

TALENT, a measure of weight among the ancients, equivalent to sixty maneh, or one hundred and thirteen pounds ten ounces one pennyweight and ten grains. The value of a talent of silver was three hundred and forty-two pounds three shillings and nine-pence, and a talent of gold was equal to five thousand four hundred and seventy-five pounds sterling. In the writings of the evangelists, the term is employed to denote the various gifts



or opportunities for usefulness which the Lord of heaven confers upon his servants, and for which he will call them to give in their account at the last day, Matt. xxv, 15; Luke xix, 12.

TALITHA-CUMI, the words that Jesus Christ made use of when he raised up the daughter of Jairus, chief of the synagogue of Capernaum. They are not pure Hebrew, but Syriac, and signify, "My daughter, arise," Mark v, 41.

TALMUD. See Jews.

TARE, Matt. xiii, 25–27, 29, 30, 36, 38, 40. It is not easy to determine what plant or weed is here intended, as the word zizania is neither mentioned in any other part of Scripture, nor in any ancient Greek writer. Some Greek and Latin fathers have made use of it, as have also Suidas and Phavorinus: but it is probable that they have all derived it from this text. As this Gospel was first written in Syriac, it is probably a word belonging to that language. Buxtorf gives several interpretations, but at last concludes with submitting it to the decision of others. In a treatise in the Mishna, called "Kilayim," which treats expressly of different kinds of seeds, a bastard or degenerate wheat is mentioned by the name of זונים, which the very sound, in pronouncing, proves to be the same as the zizania; and which may lead to the true derivation of the word, that is, from the Chaldee זן, "a kind," or "species" of grain, namely, whence the corrupt Hebrew or Syriac זניא, which in the ancient Syriac version answers to the Greek ζιζανία, Matt. xiii, 25, &c. In Psalm cxliv, 13, the words מזן אל-זון, are translated, "all manner of store;" but they properly signify "from species to species." Might not the Chaldee word זונין, and the Greek word ζιζάνιον, come from the psalmist's זנין, which might have signified a "mixture" of grain of any kind, and be here used to point out the mixing bastard or degenerate wheat among the good seed-wheat? Mintert says, that "it is a kind of plant, not unlike corn or wheat, having at first the same sort of stalk, and the same viridity, but bringing forth no fruit, at least none good:" and he adds, from John Melchior, "ζιζάνιον does not signify every weed in general which grows among corn, but a particular seed, known in Canaan, which was not unlike wheat, but, being put into the ground, degenerated, and assumed another nature and form." Parkhurst, and Dr. Campbell, render it "the darnel," "lolium temulentum." The same plant is called "zizana" by the Spaniards; as it appears to be zuvan, by the Turks and Arabs. "It is well known to the people at Aleppo," says M. Forskal; "it grows among corn. If the seeds remain mixed with the meal, they occasion dizziness to those who eat of the bread. The reapers do not separate the plant; but after the threshing, they reject the seeds by means of a van or sieve." Other travellers mention, that in some parts of Syria, the plant is drawn up by the hand in the time of harvest, along with the wheat, and is then gathered out, and

bound up in separate bundles. In the parable of the tares, our Lord states the very same circumstances. They grew among the grain; they were not separated by the tillers, but suffered to grow up together till the harvest; they were then gathered from among the wheat with the hand, and bound up in bundles.

TARGUM. See Jews.

TARSHISH, a country of this name, whither Solomon sent his fleets, 1 Kings x, 22; 2 Chron. ix, 11. There is a multitude of different opinions concerning this country. Josephus, and the Chaldee and Arabic paraphrasts, explain it of Tarsus, a city of Cilicia; the Septuagint, St. Jerom, and Theodoret, understand it of Carthage. The Arabian geographer will have it to be Tunis in Africa. Bochart makes it to be Tartessus, an island in the Straits of Gades. By Tarshish, M. Le Clerc understands Thassus, an island and city in the Ægean sea. Grotius thinks that the whole ocean was called Tarshish, because of the famous city of Tartessus, now mentioned. Sanctius believes the sea in general to be called Tarshish, and that the ships of Tarshish were those that are employed in voyages at sea, in opposition to the small vessels that are used only in most navigable rivers. The LXX. translate Tarshish sometimes by “the sea;” and the Scripture gives the names of ships of Tarshish to those that were fitted out at Ezion-Geber, on the Red Sea, and which sailed upon the ocean, as well as to those that were fitted out at Joppa, and in the ports of the Mediterranean. Therefore, when we see ships fitted out upon the Red Sea, or at Ezion-Geber, in order to go to Tarshish, we must conclude one of these two things, either that there were two countries called Tarshish, one upon the ocean, and another upon the Mediterranean, or that ships of Tarshish in general signifies nothing else but ships able to bear a long voyage; large merchant ships, in opposition to the small craft intended for a home trade in navigable rivers.

TARSUS, the capital of Cilicia, and the native city of St. Paul, Acts ix, 11; xxi, 39. Some think it obtained the privileges of a Roman colony because of its firm adherence to Julius Cæsar; and this procured the inhabitants the favour of being acknowledged citizens of Rome, which St. Paul enjoyed by being born in it. Others maintain that Tarsus was only a free city, but not a Roman colony, in the time of St. Paul, and that his privilege as a Roman citizen was founded upon some other right, perhaps gained by his ancestors.

TEARS. The prayer of David, “Put my tears into thy bottle,” is unintelligible without an acquaintance with ancient customs. “This passage,” says Burder, “seems to intimate that the custom of putting tears into the ampullæ, or urnal lachrymales, so well known among the Romans,

was more anciently in use among the eastern nations, and particularly the Hebrews. These urns were of different materials, some of glass, some of earth; as may be seen in the work of Montfaucon, where also may be seen the various forms or shapes of them. These urns were placed on the sepulchres of the deceased, as a memorial of the distress and affection of their surviving relations and friends. It will be difficult to account for this expression of the psalmist, but upon this supposition. If this be allowed, the meaning will be, ‘Let my distress, and the tears I shed in consequence of it, be ever before thee, excite thy kind remembrance of me, and plead with thee to grant the relief I stand in need of.’”

TEMPLE, the house of God; properly the temple of Solomon. David first conceived the design of building a house somewhat worthy of the divine majesty, and opened his mind to the Prophet Nathan, 2 Sam. vii; 1 Chron. xvii; xxii, 8, &c. God accepted of his good intentions, but refused him the honour. Solomon laid the foundation of the temple, A. M. 2992, completed it in 3000, and dedicated it in 3001, 1 Kings viii, 2; 2 Chron. v, vi, vii. According to the opinion of some writers, there were three temples, namely, the first, erected by Solomon; the second, by Zerubbabel, and Joshua the high priest; and the third, by Herod, a few years before the birth of Christ. But this opinion is, very properly, rejected by the Jews; who do not allow the third to be a new temple, but only the second temple repaired and beautified: and this opinion corresponds with the prophecy of Haggai, ii, 9, “that the glory of this latter house,” the temple built by Zerubbabel, “should be greater than that of the former;” which prediction was uttered with reference to the Messiah’s honouring it with his presence and ministry. The first temple is that which usually bears the name of Solomon; the materials for which were provided by David before his death, though the edifice was raised by his son. It stood on Mount Moriah, an eminence of the mountainous ridge in the Scriptures termed Mount Zion, Psalm cxxxii, 13, 14, which had been purchased by Araunah, or Ornan, the Jebusite, 2 Sam. xxiv, 23, 24; 1 Chron. xxi, 25. The plan, and the whole model of this superb structure, were formed after that of the tabernacle, but of much larger dimensions. It was surrounded, except at the front or east end, by three stories of chambers, each five cubits square, which reached to half the height of the temple; and the front was ornamented with a magnificent portico, which rose to the height of one hundred and twenty cubits: so that the form of the whole edifice was not unlike that of some ancient churches, which have a lofty tower in the front, and a low aisle running along each side of the building. The utensils for the sacred service were the same; excepting that several of them, as the altar, candlestick, &c, were larger, in proportion to the more spacious edifice to which they belonged. Seven years and six months were occupied in the erection of the superb and magnificent temple of Solomon, by whom it was dedicated, A. M. 3001,

B. C. 999, with peculiar solemnity, to the worship of the Most High; who on this occasion vouchsafed to honour it with the Shechinah, or visible manifestation of his presence. Various attempts have been made to describe the proportions and several parts of this structure; but as scarcely any two writers agree on this subject, a minute description of it is designedly omitted. It retained its pristine splendour only thirty-three or thirty-four years, when Shishak, king of Egypt, took Jerusalem, and carried away the treasures of the temple; and after undergoing subsequent profanations and pillages, this stupendous building was finally plundered and burnt by the Chaldeans under Nebuchadnezzar, A. M. 3416, or B. C. 584, 2 Kings xxv, 13–15; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 17–20.

After the captivity, the temple emerged from its ruins being rebuilt by Zerubbabel, but with vastly inferior and diminished glory; as appears from the tears of the aged men who had beheld the former structure in all its grandeur, Ezra iii, 12. The second temple was profaned by order of Antiochus Epiphanes, A. M. 3837, B. C. 163, who caused the daily sacrifices to be discontinued, and erected the image of Jupiter Olympus on the altar of burnt-offering. In this condition it continued three years, 1 Mac. iv, 42, when Judas Maccabæus purified and repaired it, and restored the sacrifices and true worship of Jehovah. Some years before the birth of our Saviour, the repairing and beautifying of this second temple, which had become decayed in the lapse of five centuries, was undertaken by Herod the Great, who for nine years employed eighty thousand workmen upon it, and spared no expense to render it equal, if not superior, in magnitude, splendour, and beauty, to any thing among mankind. Josephus calls it a work the most admirable of any that had ever been seen or heard of, both for its curious structure and its magnitude, and also for the vast wealth expended upon it, as well as for the universal reputation of its sanctity. But though Herod accomplished his original design in the time above specified, yet the Jews continued to ornament and enlarge it, expending the sacred treasure in annexing additional buildings to it; so that they might with great propriety assert, that their temple had been forty and six years in building, John ii, 20.

Before we proceed to describe this venerable edifice, it may be proper to remark, that by the temple is to be understood not only the fabric or house itself, which by way of eminence is called the temple, namely, the holy of holies, the sanctuary, and the several courts both of the priests and Israelites, but also all the numerous chambers and rooms which this prodigious edifice comprehended; and each of which had its respective degree of holiness, increasing in proportion to its contiguity to the holy of holies. This remark it will be necessary to bear in mind, lest the reader of Scripture should be led to suppose, that whatever is there said to be

transacted in the temple was actually done in the interior of that sacred edifice. To this infinite number of apartments, into which the temple was disposed, our Lord refers, John xiv, 2; and by a very striking and magnificent simile, borrowed from them, he represents those numerous seats and mansions of heavenly bliss which his Father's house contained, and which were prepared for the everlasting abode of the righteous. The imagery is singularly beautiful and happy, when considered as an allusion to the temple, which our Lord not unfrequently called his Father's house.

The second temple, originally built by Zerubbabel after the captivity, and repaired by Herod, differed in several respects from that erected by Solomon, although they agreed in others.

The temple erected by Solomon was more splendid and magnificent than the second temple, which was deficient in five remarkable things that constituted the chief glory of the first: these were, the ark and the mercy seat; the shechinah, or manifestation of the divine presence, in the holy of holies; the sacred fire on the altar, which had been first kindled from heaven; the urim and thummim; and the spirit of prophecy. But the second temple surpassed the first in glory; being honoured by the frequent presence of our divine Saviour, agreeably to the prediction of Haggai, ii, 9. Both, however, were erected upon the same site, a very hard rock, encompassed by a very frightful precipice; and the foundation was laid with incredible expense and labour. The superstructure was not inferior to this great work: the height of the temple wall, especially on the south side, was stupendous. In the lowest places it was three hundred cubits, or four hundred and fifty feet, and in some places even greater. This most magnificent pile was constructed with hard white stones of prodigious magnitude. The temple itself, strictly so called, which comprised the portico, the sanctuary, and the holy of holies formed only a small part of the sacred edifice on Mount Moriah, being surrounded by spacious courts, making a square of half a mile in circumference. It was entered through nine gates, which were on every side thickly coated with gold and silver; but there was one gate without the holy house, which was of Corinthian brass, the most precious metal in ancient times, and which far surpassed the others in beauty. For while these were of equal magnitude, the gate composed of Corinthian brass was much larger; its height being fifty cubits, and its doors forty cubits, and its ornaments both of gold and silver being far more costly and massive. This is supposed to have been the "gate called Beautiful" in Acts iii, 2, where Peter and John, in the name of Christ, healed a man who had been lame from his birth. The first or outer court, which encompassed the holy house and the other courts, was named the court of the Gentiles; because the latter were allowed to enter into it, but were prohibited from advancing farther. It was surrounded by a range of

porticoes, or cloisters, above which were galleries, or apartments, supported by pillars of white marble, each consisting of a single piece, and twenty-five cubits in height. One of these was called Solomon's porch, or piazza, because it stood on a vast terrace, which he had originally raised from a valley beneath, four hundred cubits high, in order to enlarge the area on the top of the mountain, and make it equal to the plan of his intended building; and as this terrace was the only work of Solomon that remained in the second temple, the piazza which stood upon it retained the name of that prince. Here it was that our Lord was walking at the feast of dedication, John x, 23; and that the lame man, when healed by Peter and John, glorified God before all the people, Acts iii, 11. This superb portico is termed the royal portico by Josephus, who represents it as the noblest work beneath the sun, being elevated to such a prodigious height, that no one could look down from its flat roof to the valley below, without being seized with dizziness; the sight not reaching to such an immeasurable depth. The south-east corner of the roof of this portico, where the height was the greatest, is supposed to have been the *στερούγιον*, pinnacle, or extreme angle, whence Satan tempted our Saviour to precipitate himself, Matt, iv, 5; Luke iv, 9. This also was the spot where it was predicted that the abomination of desolation, or the Roman ensigns, should stand, Daniel ix, 27; Matt, xxiv, 15. Solomon's portico was situated in the eastern front of the temple, opposite to the mount of Olives, where our Saviour is said to have sat when his disciples came to show him the grandeur of its various buildings, of which, grand as they were, he said, the time was approaching when one stone should not be left upon another, Matt, xxiv, 1–3. This outer court being assigned to the Gentile proselytes, the Jews, who did not worship in it themselves, conceived that it might lawfully be put to profane uses: for here we find that the buyers and sellers of animals for sacrifices, and also the moneychangers, had stationed themselves; until Jesus Christ, awing them into submission by the grandeur and dignity of his person and behaviour, expelled them; telling them that it was the house of prayer for all nations, and was not to be profaned, Matt. xxi, 12, 13; Mark xi, 15–17. Within the court of the Gentiles stood the court of the Israelites, divided into two parts, or courts; the outer one being appropriated to the women, and the inner one to the men. The court of the women was separated from that of the Gentiles by a low stone wall, or partition, of elegant construction, on which stood pillars at equal distances, with inscriptions in Greek and Latin, importing that no alien should enter into the holy place. To this wall St. Paul most evidently alludes in Eph. ii, 13, 14: "But now in Christ Jesus, ye, who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ: for he is our peace, who hath made both one, (united both Jews and Gentiles into one church,) and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;" having abolished the law of ordinances, by which, as by the wall of separation, both Jews and Gentiles were not only kept

asunder, but also at variance. In this court was the treasury, over against which Christ sat, and beheld how the people threw their voluntary offerings into it, for furnishing the victims and other things necessary for the sacrifices, Mark xii, 41; John viii, 20. From the court of the women, which was on higher ground than that of the Gentiles, there was an ascent of fifteen steps into the inner or men's court: and so called because it was appropriated to the worship of the male Israelites. In these two courts, collectively termed the court of the Israelites, were the people praying, each apart by himself, for the pardon of his sins, while Zacharias was offering incense within the sanctuary, Luke i, 10. Within the court of the Israelites was that of the priests, which was separated from it by a low wall, one cubit in height. This enclosure surrounded the altar of burnt-offerings, and to it the people brought their oblations and sacrifices; but the priests alone were permitted to enter it. From this court twelve steps ascended to the temple, strictly so called; which was divided into three parts, the portico, the outer sanctuary, and the holy place. In the portico was suspended the splendid votive offerings made by the piety of various individuals. Among other treasures, there was a golden table given by Pompey, and several golden vases of exquisite workmanship, as well as of immense size; for Josephus relates, that there were clusters as tall as a man. And he adds, that all around were fixed up and displayed the spoils and trophies taken by Herod from the barbarians and Arabians. These votive offerings, it should seem, were visible at a distance; for when Jesus Christ was sitting on the mount of Olives, and his disciples called his attention to the temple, they pointed out to him the gifts with which it was adorned, Luke xxi, 5. This porch had a very large portal or gate, which, instead of folding doors, was furnished with a costly Babylonian veil, of many colours, that mystically denoted the universe. From this the sanctuary, or holy place, was separated from the holy of holies by a double veil, which is supposed to have been the veil that was rent in twain at our Saviour's crucifixion; thus emblematically pointing out that the separation between Jews and Gentiles was abolished; and that the privilege of the high priest was communicated to all mankind, who might henceforth have access to the throne of grace through the one great Mediator, Jesus Christ, Heb. x, 19–22. The holy of holies was twenty cubits square: into it no person was admitted but the high priest, who entered it once a year on the great day of atonement, Exod. xxx, 10; Lev. xvi, 2, 15, 34; Heb. ix, 2–7.

Magnificent as the rest of the sacred edifice was, it was infinitely surpassed in splendour by the inner temple, or sanctuary. Its appearance, according to Josephus, had every thing that could strike the mind, or astonish the sight: for it was covered on every side with plates of gold; so that when the sun rose upon it, it reflected so strong and dazzling an effulgence, that the eye of the spectator was obliged to turn away, being no more able to sustain

its radiance than the splendour of the sun. To strangers who were approaching, it appeared at a distance like a mountain covered with snow; for where it was not decorated with plates of gold, it was extremely white and glistening. On the top it had sharp-pointed spikes of gold, to prevent any bird from resting upon it, and polluting it. There were, continues the Jewish historian, in that building, several stones which were forty-five cubits in length, five in height, and six in breadth. "When all these things are considered," says Harwood, "how natural is the exclamation of the disciples, when viewing this immense building at a distance: 'Master, see what manner of stones' (ποταποὶ λίθοι, 'what very large ones') 'and what buildings are here!' Mark xiii, 1: and how wonderful is the declaration of our Lord upon this, how unlikely to be accomplished before the race of men who were then living should cease to exist! 'Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down.' Improbable as this prediction must have appeared to the disciples at that time, in the short space of about thirty years after it was exactly accomplished; and this most magnificent temple, which the Jews had literally turned into a den of thieves, through the righteous judgment of God upon that wicked and abandoned nation, was utterly destroyed by the Romans A. D. 70, or 73 of the vulgar era, on the same month, and on the same day of the month, when Solomon's temple had been razed to the ground by the Babylonians!"

Both the first and second temples were contemplated by the Jews with the highest reverence. Of their affectionate regard for the first temple, and for Jerusalem, within whose walls it was built, we have several instances in those Psalms which were composed during the Babylonish captivity; and of their profound veneration for the second temple we have 907 repeated examples in the New Testament. They could not bear any disrespectful or dishonourable thing to be said of it. The least injurious slight of it, real or apprehended, instantly awakened all the choler of a Jew, and was an affront never to be forgiven. Our Saviour, in the course of his public instructions, having said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again," John ii, 19, it was construed into a contemptuous disrespect, designedly thrown out against the temple; his words instantly descended into the heart of the Jews, and kept rankling there for some years; for, upon his trial, this declaration, which it was impossible for a Jew ever to forget or to forgive, was immediately alleged against him, as big with the most atrocious guilt and impiety: they told the court they had heard him publicly assert, "I am able to destroy this temple," Matt. xxvi, 61. The rancour and virulence they had conceived against him for this speech, was not softened by all the affecting circumstances of that wretched death they saw him die; even as he hung upon the cross, with triumph, scorn, and exultation, they upbraided him with it, contemptuously shaking their heads, and saying, "Thou that



destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself! If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross!" Matt. xxvii, 40. It only remains to add, that it appears, from several passages of Scripture, that the Jews had a body of soldiers who guarded the temple, to prevent any disturbances during the ministration of such an immense number of priests and Levites. To this guard Pilate referred, when he said to the chief priests and Pharisees who waited upon him to desire he would make the sepulchre secure, "Ye have a watch, go your way, and make it as secure as ye can," Matt. xxvii, 65. Over these guards one person had the supreme command, who in several places is called the captain of the temple, or officer of the temple guard. "And as they spake unto the people, the priests and the captain of the temple and the Sadducees came upon them," Acts iv, 1; v, 25, 26; John xviii, 12. Josephus mentions such an officer.

**TENT MAKER.** St. Paul, according to the practice of the Jews, who, however opulent, always taught their children some trade, appears to have been a tent maker. This, however, is understood by some moderns to mean a maker of tent cloth, St. Paul being a Cilician, a country which produced a species of rough-haired goats, from which the Cilicians manufactured a thick and coarse cloth, much used for tents. The fathers, however, say that he made military tents, the material of which was skins.

**TERAPHIM.** It is said, Gen. xxxi, 19, that Rachel had stolen the images (teraphim) of her father. What then were these teraphim? The Septuagint translate this word by "oracle," and sometimes by "vain figures." Aquila generally translates it by "figures." It appears, indeed, from all the passages in which this word is used, that they were idols or superstitious figures. Some Jewish writers tell us the teraphim were human heads placed in niches, and consulted by way of oracles. Others think they were talismans or figures of metal cast and engraven under certain aspects of the planets, to which they ascribed extraordinary effects. All the eastern people are much addicted to this superstition, and the Persians still call them telefin, a name nearly approaching to teraphim. M. Jurieu supposes them to have been a sort of dii penates, or household gods; and this appears to be, perhaps, the most probable opinion.

**TESTAMENT.** The property or estate of the father fell, after his decease, into the possession of his sons, who divided it among themselves equally, with this exception, that the eldest son had two portions. The father expressed his last wishes or will in the presence of witnesses, and probably in the presence of the heirs, 2 Kings xx, 1. At a more recent period the will was made out in writing. The portion that was given to the sons of concubines depended altogether upon the feelings of the father. Abraham gave presents to what amount is not known, both to Ishmael and to the sons

whom he had by Keturah, and sent them away before his death. It does not appear that they had any other portion in the estate. But Jacob made the sons whom he had by his concubines heirs as well as the others, Gen. xxi, 8–21; xxv, 1–6; xlix, 1–27. Moses laid no restrictions upon the choice of fathers in this respect; and we should infer that the sons of concubines, for the most part, received an equal share with the other sons, from the fact, that Jephtha, the son of a concubine, complained that he was excluded without any portion from his father's house, Judg. xi, 1–7. The daughters not only had no portion in the estate, but, if they were unmarried, were considered as making a part of it, and were sold by their brothers into matrimony. If they had no brothers, or if they had died, the daughters then took the estate, Num. xxvii, 1–8. If any one died intestate, and without offspring, the property was disposed of according to Num. xxvii, 8–11. The servants or the slaves in a family could not claim any share in the estate as a right; but the person who made a will, might, if he chose, make them his heirs, Gen. xv, 3. Indeed, in some instances, those who had heirs, recognized as such by law, did not deem it unbecoming to bestow the whole or a portion of their estates on faithful and deserving servants, Prov. xvii, 2. The widow of the deceased, like his daughters, had no legal right to a share in the estate. The sons, however, or other relations, were bound to afford her an adequate maintenance, unless it had been otherwise arranged in the will. She sometimes returned back again to her father's house, particularly if the support which the heirs gave her was not such as had been promised, or was not sufficient, Gen. xxxviii, 11. See also the story of Ruth. The prophets very frequently, and undoubtedly not without cause, exclaim against the neglect and injustice shown to widows, Isa. i, 17; x, 2; Jer. vii, 6; xxii, 3; Ezek. xxii, 7; Exod. xxii, 22–24; Deut. x, 18; xxiv, 17.

908TESTIMONY, a witnessing, evidence, or proof, Acts xiv, 3. The whole Scripture or word of God, which declares what is to be believed, practised, and expected by us, is called God's "testimony," and sometimes in the plural "testimonies," Psalm xix, 7. The two tables of stone on which the law or ten commandments were written, which were witnesses of that covenant made between God and his people, and testified what it was that God had required of them, have the same title, Exod. xxv, 16, 21; xxxi, 18.

TETRARCH, a sovereign prince that has the fourth part of a state, province, or kingdom under his dominion, without wearing the diadem, or bearing the title of king, Matt. xiv, 1; Luke iii, 1, 19; ix, 7; Acts xiii, 1.

THEOPHILUS, one to whom St. Luke addresses the books of his Gospel and Acts of the Apostles, which he composed, Acts i, 1; Luke i, 3. It is doubted whether the name Theophilus be here the proper name of a man, or an appellative or common name, which, according to its etymology, may

stand for any good man, or a lover of God. Some think this name is generic, and that St. Luke's design here is to address his work to those that love God; but it is much more probable that this Theophilus was a Christian to whom the evangelist has dedicated those two works; and the epithet of "most excellent," which is given to him, shows him to have been a man of great quality. Œcumenius concludes from thence that he was governor or intendant of some province, because such a personage had generally the title of "most excellent" given to him. Grotius conjectures he might be a magistrate of Achaia, converted by St. Luke.

**THERAPEUTÆ.** One particular phenomenon which resulted from the theosophico-ascetic spirit among the Alexandrian Jews, was the sect of the Therapeutæ. Their head quarters were at no great distance from Alexandria, in a quiet pleasant spot on the shores of the Lake Mœris, where they lived, like the anchorites in later periods, shut up in separate cells, and employed themselves in nothing but prayer, and the contemplation of divine things. An allegorical interpretation of Scripture was the foundation of their speculations; and they had old theosophical writings which gave them this turn. They lived only on bread and water, and accustomed themselves to fasting. They only ate in the evening, and many fasted for several days together. They met together every Sabbath day, and every seven weeks they held a still more solemn assembly, because the number seven was peculiarly holy in their estimation. They then celebrated a simple love-feast, consisting of bread with salt and hyssop; theosophical discussions were held, and the hymns which they had from their old traditions were sung; and mystical dances, bearing reference to the wonderful works of God with the fathers of their people, were continued, amidst choral songs, to a late hour in the night. Many men of distinguished learning have considered this sect as nothing but a scion of the Essenes, trained up under the peculiar influence of the Egyptian spirit.

**THESSALONIANS,** Christians of Thessalonica, to whom St. Paul sent two epistles. It is recorded in the Acts, that St. Paul, in his first journey upon the continent of Europe, preached the Gospel at Thessalonica, at that time the capital of Macedonia, with considerable success; but that after a short stay he was driven thence by the malice and violence of the unbelieving Jews. From Thessalonica St. Paul went to Berea, and thence to Athens, at both which places he remained but a short time. From Athens he sent Timothy to Thessalonica, to confirm the new converts in their faith, and to inquire into their conduct. Timothy, upon his return, found St. Paul at Corinth. Thence, probably in A. D. 52, St. Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Thessalonians; and it is to be supposed that the subjects of which it treats, were suggested by the account which he received from Timothy. It is now generally believed that this was written the first of all St. Paul's

epistles, but it is not known by whom it was sent to Thessalonica. The church there consisted chiefly of Gentile converts, 1 Thess. i, 9. St. Paul, after saluting the Thessalonian Christians in the name of himself, Silas, and Timothy, assures them that he constantly returned thanks to God on their account, and mentioned them in his prayers; he acknowledges the readiness and sincerity with which they embraced the Gospel, and the great reputation which they had acquired by turning from idols to serve the living God, 1 Thess. i; he reminds them of the bold and disinterested manner in which he had preached among them; comforts them under the persecutions which they, like other Christians, had experienced from their unbelieving countrymen, and informs them of two ineffectual attempts which he had made to visit them again, 1 Thess. ii; and that, being thus disappointed, he had sent Timothy to confirm their faith, and inquire into their conduct; he tells them that Timothy's account of them had given him the greatest consolation and joy in the midst of his affliction and distress, and that he continually prayed to God for an opportunity of seeing them again, and for their perfect establishment in the Gospel, 1 Thess. iii; he exhorts to purity, justice, love, and quietness, and dissuades them against excessive grief for their deceased friends, 1 Thess. iv; hence he takes occasion to recommend preparation for the last judgment, the time of which is always uncertain; and adds a variety of practical precepts. He concludes with his usual benediction. This epistle is written in terms of high commendation, earnestness, and affection.

It is generally believed that the messenger who carried the former epistle into Macedonia, upon his return to Corinth, informed St. Paul that the Thessalonians had inferred, from some expressions in it, that the coming of Christ and the final judgment were near at hand, and would happen in the time of many who were then alive, 1 Thess. iv, 15, 17; v, 6. The principal design of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians was to correct that error, and prevent the mischief which it would naturally occasion. It was written from Corinth, probably at the end of A. D. 52. St. Paul begins with the same salutation as in the former epistle, and then expresses his devout acknowledgments to God for the increasing faith and mutual love of the Thessalonians in the midst of persecution; he represents to them the rewards which will be bestowed upon the faithful, and the punishment which will be inflicted upon the disobedient, at the coming of Christ, 2 Thess. i; he earnestly entreats them not to suppose, as upon authority from him, or upon any other ground, that the last day is at hand; he assures them, that before that awful period a great apostasy will take place, and reminds them of some information which he had given them upon that subject when he was at Thessalonica; he exhorts them to steadfastness in their faith, and prays to God to comfort their hearts, and establish them in every good word and work, 2 Thess. ii; he desires their

prayers for the success of his ministry, and expresses his confidence in their sincerity; he cautions them against associating with idle and disorderly persons, and recommends diligence and quietness. He adds a salutation in his own hand, and concludes with his usual benediction.

THESSALONICA, a celebrated city in Macedonia, and capital of that kingdom, standing upon the Thesmaic Sea. Stephen of Byzantium says that it was improved and beautified by Philip, king of Macedon, and called Thessalonica in memory of the victory that he obtained over the Thessalians. Its old name was Thesma. The Jews had a synagogue here, and their number was considerable, Acts xvii.

THIEF. Among the Hebrews theft was not punished with death: "Men do not despise a thief if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry. But if he be found, he shall restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house," Prov. vi, 30, 31. The law allowed the killing of a night-robber, because it was supposed his intention was to murder as well as to rob, Exod. xxii, 2. It condemned a common thief to make double restitution, Exod. xxii, 4. If he stole an ox he was to restore it fivefold; if a sheep, only fourfold, Exod. xxii, 1; 2 Sam. xii, 6. But if the animal that was stolen was found alive in his house he only rendered the double of it. If he did not make restitution, they seized what was in his house, put it up to sale, and even sold the person himself if he had not wherewithal to make satisfaction, Exod. xxii, 3.

THOMAS, the Apostle, otherwise called Didymus, which in Greek signifies a twin, Matt. x, 3; Luke vi, 15. We know no particulars of his life till A. D. 33, John xi, 16; xiv, 5, 6; xx, 24–29; xxi, 1–13. Ancient tradition says, that in the distribution which the Apostles made of the several parts of the world, wherein they were to preach the Gospel, the country of the Parthians fell to the share of St. Thomas. It is added, that he preached to the Medes, Persians, Carmanians, Hircanians, Bactrians, &c. Several of the fathers inform us that he also preached in the East Indies, &c.

THORN. A general name for several kinds of prickly plants. 1. In the curse denounced against the earth, Gen. iii, 18, its produce is threatened to be "thorns and thistles," קוץ ודרדר, in the Septuagint ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους. St. Paul uses the same words, Heb. vi, 8, where the last is rendered "briers;" they are also found Hos. x, 8. The word kutz is put for "thorns," in other places, as Exod. xxii, 6; Judges viii, 7; Ezek. ii, 6; xxviii, 24; but we are uncertain whether it means a specific kind of thorn, or may be a generic name for all plants of a thorny kind. In the present instance it seems to be general for all those obnoxious plants, shrubs, &c, by which the labours of the husbandman are impeded, and which are only fit for burning. If the

word denotes a particular plant, it maybe the “rest-harrow,” a pernicious prickly weed, which grows promiscuously with the large thistles in the uncultivated grounds, and covers entire fields and plains, in Egypt and Palestine. From the resemblance of the Hebrew dardar, to the Arabic word dardargi, Scheuchzer supposes the cnicus to be intended. 2. תות, from its etymology, must be a kind of thorn, with incurvated spines, like fish hooks, similar to those of the North American “witch hazel.” Celsius says that the same word, and of the same original in Arabic, is the “black thorn,” or “sloe tree,” the *prunus spinosa* of Linnæus. 3. סיריים. It is impossible to determine what plants are intended by this word. Meninski says that serbin, in the Persic language, is the name of a tree bearing thorns. In Eccles. vii, 6, and Nahum i, 10, they are mentioned as fuel which quickly burns up; and in Hosea ii, 6, as obstructions or hedges; it may be the *lycium Afrum*. 4. סלון, mentioned Josh. xxiii, 13; Ezek. ii, 6, xxviii, 24. From the vexatious character ascribed to this thorn in the places just referred to, compared with Num. xxxiii, 55; Judges ii, 3; it is probably the *kantuffa*, as described by Bruce. 5. By שבים, Num. xxxiii, 55, may be intended goads, or sharp-pointed sticks, like those with which cattle were driven. 6. The שית, Isa. v, 6; x, 17, must mean some noxious plant that overruns waste grounds. 7. The word צנים, Num. xxxiii, 55; Josh. xxiii, 13; Isa. v, 5. It seems, from its application, to describe a bad kind of thorn. Hiller supposes it to be the *vepris*. Perhaps it is the *rhamnus paliurus*, a deciduous plant or tree, a native of Palestine, Spain, and Italy. It will grow nearly to the height of fourteen feet, and is armed with sharp thorns, two of which are at the insertion of each branch, one of them straight and upright, the other bent backward. 8. כרקנים, translated “briers,” Judges viii, 16. “There is no doubt but this word means a sharp, jagged kind of plant: the difficulty is to fix on one, where so many offer themselves. The Septuagint preserves the original word. We should hardly think Gideon went far to seek these plants. The thorns are expressly said to be from the wilderness, 910 or common hard by; probably the *barkanim* were from the same place. In our country this would lead us to the blackberry bushes on our commons; but it might not be so around Succoth. There is a plant mentioned by Hasselquist, whose name and properties somewhat resemble those which are required in the *barkanim* of this passage: “*Nabka paliurus Athenæi*, is the *nabka* of the Arabs. There is every appearance that this is the tree which furnished the crown of thorns which was put on the head of our Lord. It is common in the east. A plant more proper for this purpose could not be selected; for it is armed with thorns, its branches are pliant, and its leaf of a deep green like that of ivy. Perhaps the enemies of Christ chose this plant, in order to add insult to injury by employing a wreath approaching in appearance that which was used to crown emperors and generals.” In the New Testament, the Greek word translated “thorn,” is ἄκανθα; Matt. vii, 16, xiii, 7, xxvii, 29, John xix, 2. The note of Bishop Pearce on Matt. xxvii, 29, is this: “The word

ἀκανθῶν may as well be the plural genitive case of the word ἄκανθος, as of ἄκανθα; if of the latter, it is rightly translated ‘of thorns,’ but the former would signify what we call ‘bear’s foot,’ and the French *branche ursine*. This is not of the thorny kind of plants, but is soft and smooth. Virgil calls it *mollis acanthus*. So does Pliny: and Pliny the elder says that it is *lævis*, “smooth;” and that it is one of those plants that are cultivated in gardens. I have somewhere read, but cannot at present recollect where, that this soft and smooth herb was very common in and about Jerusalem. I find nothing in the New Testament concerning this crown which Pilate’s soldiers put on the head of Jesus, to incline one to think that it was of thorns, and intended, as is usually supposed, to put him to pain. The reed put into his hand, and the scarlet robe on his back, were meant only as marks of mockery and contempt. One may also reasonably judge by the soldiers being said to plait this crown, that it was not composed of such twigs and leaves as were of a thorny nature. I do not find that it is mentioned by any of the primitive Christian writers as an instance of the cruelty used toward our Saviour before he was led to crucifixion, till the time of Tertullian, who lived after Jesus’ death at the distance of above one hundred and sixty years. He indeed seems to have understood ἀκανθῶν in the sense of thorns, and says, ‘*Quale oro te, Jesus Christus sertum pro utroque sexu subiit? Ex spinis, opinor, et tribulis.*’ [What kind of a crown, I beseech you, did Jesus Christ sustain? One made of thorns and thistles, I think.] The total silence of Polycarp, Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, and all the other Christian writers whose works are now extant, and who wrote before Tertullian, in particular, will give some weight to incline one to think that this crown was not platted with thorns. But as this is a point on which we have not sufficient evidence, I leave it almost in the same state of uncertainty in which I found it.” See *Garden*.

THRESHING FLOORS, among the ancient Jews, were only, as they are to this day in the east, round level plats of ground in the open air, where the corn was trodden out by oxen, the *libycæ areæ* of Horace. Thus, Gideon’s floor, Judges vi, 37, appears to have been in the open air; as was likewise that of Araunah the Jebusite; else it would not have been a proper place for erecting an altar and offering sacrifice. In Hosea xiii, 3, we read of the chaff which is driven by the whirlwind from the floor. This circumstance of the threshing floor’s being exposed to the agitation of the wind seems to be the principal reason of its Hebrew name; which may be farther illustrated by the direction which Hesiod gives his husbandman to thresh his corn in a place well exposed to the wind. From the above account it appears that a threshing floor (rendered in our textual translation “a void place”) might well be near the entrance of the gate of Samaria, and that it might afford no improper place in which the kings of Israel and Judah could hear the prophets, 1 Kings xxii, 10; 2 Chron. xviii, 9; Psalm i, 4.

THRONE is used for that magnificent seat on which sovereign princes usually sit to receive the homage of their subjects, or to give audience to ambassadors; where they appear with pomp and ceremony, and from whence they dispense justice; in a word, the throne, the sceptre, the crown, are the ordinary symbols of royalty and regal authority. The Scripture commonly represents the Lord as sitting upon a throne; sometimes it is said that the heaven is his throne, and the earth his footstool, Isaiah lxvi, 1. The Son of God is also represented as sitting upon a throne, at the right hand of his Father, Psalm cx, 1; Heb. i, 8; Rev. iii, 21. And Jesus Christ assures his Apostles that they should sit upon twelve thrones, to judge the twelve tribes of Israel, Luke xxii, 30. Though a throne and royal dignity seem to be correlatives, or terms that stand in reciprocal relation to each other, yet the privilege of sitting on a throne has been sometimes granted to those that were not kings, particularly to some governors of important provinces. We read of the throne of the governor of this side the river; the throne, in other words, of the governor for the king of Persia of the provinces belonging to that empire on the west of the Euphrates. So D'Herbelot tells us that a Persian monarch of aftertimes gave the governor of one of his provinces permission to seat himself in a gilded chair, when he administered justice; which distinction was granted him on account of the importance of that post, to which the guarding a pass of great consequence was committed. This province, he tells us, is now called Shirvan, but was formerly named Serir-aldhab, which signifies, in Arabic, "the throne of gold." To which he adds, that this privilege was granted to the governor of this province, as being the place through which the northern nations used to make their way into Persia; on which account, also, a mighty rampart or wall was raised there.

911 In the Revelation of St. John, we find the twenty-four elders sitting upon as many thrones in the presence of the Lord; "and they fall down before him that sat on the throne, &c, and cast their crowns before the throne." Many of the travellers in eastern countries have given descriptions highly illustrative of this mode of adoration. Thus Bruce, in his Travels, says, "The next remarkable ceremony in which these two nations (of Persia and Abyssinia) agreed is that of adoration, inviolably observed in Abyssinia to this day, as often as you enter the sovereign's presence. This is not only kneeling, but absolute prostration; you first fall upon your knees, then upon the palms of your hands, then incline your head and body till your forehead touches the ground; and, in case you have an answer to expect, you lie in that posture till the king, or somebody from him, desires you to rise." And Stewart observes, "We marched toward the emperor with our music playing, till we came within about eighty yards of him, when the old monarch, alighting from his horse, prostrated himself on the earth to



pray, and continued some minutes with his face so close to the earth, that, when we came up to him, the dust remained upon his nose.”

The circumstance of “casting their crowns before the throne” may be illustrated by several cases which occur in history. That of Herod, in the presence of Augustus, has been already mentioned. (See Herod.) Tiridates, in this manner, did homage to Nero, laying the ensigns of his royalty at the statue of Cæsar, to receive them again from his hand. Tigranes, king of Armenia, did the same to Pompey. In the inauguration of the Byzantine Cæsars, when the emperor comes to receive the sacrament, he puts off his crown. “This short expedition,” says Malcolm, “was brought to a close by the personal submission of Abool Fyze Khan, who, attended by all his court, proceeded to the tents of Nadir Shah, and laid his crown, and other ensigns of royalty, at the feet of the conqueror, who assigned him an honourable place in his assembly, and in a few days afterward restored him to his throne.”

THYATIRA, a city of Lydia, in Asia Minor, and the seat of one of the seven churches in Asia. It was situated nearly midway between Pergamos and Sardis, and is still a tolerable town, considering that it is in the hands of the Turks, and enjoys some trade, chiefly in cottons. It is called by that people Ak-hisar, or White Castle.

TIBERIAS, a city situated in a small plain, surrounded by mountains, on the western coast of the sea of Galilee, which, from this city, was also called the sea of Tiberias. Tiberias was erected by Herod Antipas, and so called in honour of Tiberius Cæsar. He is supposed to have chosen, for the erection of his new city, a spot where before stood a more obscure place called Chenereth or Cinnereth, which also gave its name to the adjoining lake or sea.

TIMBRELS. See Music.

TIMOTHEUS, commonly called Timothy, a disciple of St. Paul. He was a native of Lystra in Lycaonia. His father was a Gentile; but his mother, whose name was Eunice, was a Jewess, Acts xvi, 1, and educated her son with great care in her own religion, 2 Tim. i, 5; iii, 15. To this young disciple St. Paul addressed two epistles; in the first of which he calls him his “own son in the faith,” 1 Tim. i, 2; from which expression it is inferred that St. Paul was the person who converted him to the belief of the Gospel; and as, upon St. Paul’s second arrival at Lystra, Timothy is mentioned as being then a disciple, and as having distinguished himself among the Christians of that neighbourhood, his conversion, as well as that of Eunice his mother, and Lois his grandmother, must have taken place when St. Paul

first preached at Lystra, A. D. 46. Upon St. Paul's leaving Lystra, in the course of his second apostolical journey, he was induced to take Timothy with him, on account of his excellent character, and the zeal which, young as he was, he had already shown in the cause of Christianity; but before they set out, St. Paul caused him to be circumcised, not as a thing necessary to his salvation, but to avoid giving offence to the Jews, as he was a Jew by the mother's side, and it was an established rule among the Jews that *partus sequitur ventrem*. Timothy was regularly appointed to the ministerial office by the laying on of hands, not only by St. Paul himself, but also by the presbytery, 1 Tim. iv, 14; 2 Tim. i, 6. From this time Timothy acted as a minister of the Gospel; he generally attended St. Paul, but was sometimes employed by him in other places; he was very diligent and useful, and is always mentioned with great esteem and affection by St. Paul, who joins his name with his own in the inscription of six of his epistles. He is sometimes called bishop of Ephesus, and it has been said that he suffered martyrdom in that city, some years after the death of St. Paul.

The principal design of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy was to give him instructions concerning the management of the church of Ephesus; and it was probably intended that it should be read publicly to the Ephesians, that they might know upon what authority Timothy acted. After saluting him in an affectionate manner, and reminding him of the reason for which he was left at Ephesus, the Apostle takes occasion, from the frivolous disputes which some Judaizing teachers had introduced among the Ephesians, to assert the practical nature of the Gospel, and to show its superiority over the law; he returns thanks to God for his own appointment to the apostleship, and recommends to Timothy fidelity in the discharge of his sacred office; he exhorts that prayers should be made for all men, and especially for magistrates; he gives directions for the conduct of women, and forbids their teaching in public; he describes the qualifications necessary for bishops and deacons, and speaks of the mysterious nature of the Gospel dispensation; he foretels that there will be apostates from the truth, and false teachers in the latter times, and recommends to Timothy purity of manners and improvement of his spiritual gifts; he gives him particular directions for his behaviour toward persons in different situations in life, and instructs him in several points of Christian discipline; he cautions him against false teachers, gives him several precepts, and solemnly charges him to be faithful to his trust.

That the Second Epistle to Timothy was written while St. Paul was under confinement at Rome, appears from the two following passages: "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner," 2 Timothy i, 8. "The Lord give mercy unto the house of

Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain; but when he was at Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found me," 2 Tim. i, 16, 17. The epistle itself will furnish us with several arguments to prove that it could not have been written during St. Paul's first imprisonment. 1. It is universally agreed that St. Paul wrote his epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and to Philemon, while he was confined the first time at Rome. In no one of these epistles does he express any apprehension for his life; and in the two last mentioned we have seen that, on the contrary, he expresses a confident hope of being soon liberated; but in this epistle he holds a very different language: "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day," 2 Tim. iv, 6, &c. The danger in which St. Paul now was, is evident from the conduct of his friends, when he made his defence: "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me," 2 Tim. iv, 16. This expectation of death, and this imminent danger, cannot be reconciled either with the general tenor of his epistles written during his first confinement at Rome, with the nature of the charge laid against him when he was carried thither from Jerusalem, or with St. Luke's account of his confinement there; for we must remember that in A. D. 63, Nero had not begun to persecute the Christians; that none of the Roman magistrates and officers who heard the accusations against St. Paul at Jerusalem thought that he had committed any offence against the Roman government; that at Rome St. Paul was completely out of the power of the Jews; and, so little was he there considered as having been guilty of any capital crime, that he was suffered to dwell "two whole years," that is, the whole time of his confinement, "in his own hired house, and to receive all that came in unto him, preaching the word of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, no man forbidding him," Acts xxviii, 30, 31. 2. From the inscriptions of the epistles to the Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon, it is certain that Timothy was with St. Paul in his first imprisonment at Rome; but this epistle implies that Timothy was absent. 3. St. Paul tells the Colossians that Mark salutes them, and therefore he was at Rome with St. Paul in his first imprisonment; but he was not at Rome when this epistle was written, for Timothy is directed to bring him with him, 2 Tim. iv, 11. 4. Demas, also, was with St. Paul when he wrote to the Colossians: "Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas, greet you," Col. iv, 14. In this epistle he says, "Demas has forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed into Thessalonica," 2 Tim. iv, 10. It may be said that this epistle might have been written before the others, and that in the intermediate time Timothy and Mark might have come to Rome, more especially as St. Paul desires Timothy to come shortly, and bring Mark with him. But this hypothesis is not consistent with

what is said of Demas, who was with St. Paul when he wrote to the Colossians, and had left him when he wrote this second epistle to Timothy; consequently the epistle to Timothy must be posterior to that addressed to the Colossians. The case of Demas seems to have been, that he continued faithful to St. Paul during his first imprisonment, which was attended with little or no danger; but deserted him in the second, when Nero was persecuting the Christians, and St. Paul evidently considered himself in great danger. 5. St. Paul tells Timothy, "Erastus abode at Corinth, but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick," 2 Tim. iv, 20. These were plainly two circumstances which had happened in some journey which St. Paul had taken not long before he wrote this epistle, and since he and Timothy had seen each other; but the last time St. Paul was at Corinth and Miletum, prior to his first imprisonment at Rome, Timothy was with him at both places; and Trophimus could not have been then left at Miletum, for we find him at Jerusalem immediately after St. Paul's arrival in that city; "for they had seen before with him in the city Trophimus, an Ephesian, whom they supposed that Paul had brought into the temple," Acts xxi, 29. These two facts must therefore refer to some journey subsequent to the first imprisonment; and, consequently, this epistle was written during St. Paul's second imprisonment at Rome, and probably in A. D. 65, not long before his death. It is by no means certain where Timothy was when this epistle was written to him. It seems most probable that he was somewhere in Asia Minor, since St. Paul desires him to bring the cloak with him which he had left at Troas, 2 Tim. iv, 13; and also at the end of the first chapter, he speaks of several persons whose residence was in Asia. Many have thought that he was at Ephesus; but others have rejected that opinion, because Troas does not lie in the way from Ephesus to Rome, whither he was directed to go as quickly as he could. St. Paul, after his usual salutation, assures Timothy of his most affectionate remembrance; he speaks of his own apostleship and of his sufferings; exhorts Timothy to be steadfast in the true faith, to be constant and diligent in the discharge of his ministerial office, to avoid foolish and unlearned questions, and to practise and inculcate the great duties of the Gospel; he describes the apostasy and general wickedness of the last days, and highly commends the Holy Scriptures; he again solemnly exhorts Timothy to diligence; speaks of his own danger, and of his hope of future reward; and concludes with several private directions, and with salutations.

TIN, כֶּסֶף, Num. xxxi, 22; Isa. i, 25; Ezek. xxii, 18, 20; xxvii, 12; a well-known coarse metal, harder than lead. Mr. Parkhurst observes, that Moses, in Num. xxxi, 22, enumerates all the six species of metals. The Lord, by the Prophet Isaiah, having compared the Jewish people to silver, declares, "I will turn my hand upon thee, and purge away thy dross, and remove all כֶּסֶף, thy particles of tin:" where Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion

have κασσίτερον σου, and the Vulgate stannum tuum, “thy tin;” but the LXX. ἀνόμους, wicked ones. This denunciation, by a comparison of the preceding and following context, appears to signify that God would, by a process of judgment, purify those among the Jews who were capable of purification, as well as destroy the reprobate and incorrigible, Jer. vi, 29, 30; ix, 7; Mal. iii, 3; Ezek. xii, 18, 20. In Ezek. xxvii, 12, Tarshish is mentioned as furnishing כְּדִיל; and Bochart proves from the testimonies of Diodorus, Pliny, and Stephanus, that Tartessus in Spain, which he supposes the ancient Tarshish, anciently furnished tin. As Cornwall in very ancient times was resorted to for this metal, and probably first by the Phenicians, some have thought that peninsula to be the Tarshish of the Scriptures; a subject which, however, from the vague use of the word, is involved in much uncertainty. See Tarshish.

TITHES. We have nothing more ancient concerning tithes, than what we find in Gen. xiv, 20, that Abraham gave tithes to Melchisedec, king of Salem, at his return from his expedition against Chedorlaomer, and the four kings in confederacy with him. Abraham gave him tithes of all the booty he had taken from the enemy. Jacob imitated this piety of his grandfather, when he vowed to the Lord the tithes of all the substance he might acquire in Mesopotamia, Gen. xxviii, 22. Under the law, Moses ordained, “All the tithes of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord’s; it is holy unto the Lord. And if a man will at all redeem ought of his tithes, he shall add thereto the fifth part thereof. And concerning the tithes of the herd, or of the flock, even of whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be wholly unto the Lord,” Lev. xxvii, 30–32. The Pharisees, in the time of Jesus Christ, to distinguish themselves by a more scrupulous observance of the law, did not content themselves with paying the tithes of the grain and fruits growing in the fields; but they also paid tithes of the pulse and herbs growing in their gardens, which was more than the law required of them. The tithes were taken from what remained, after the offerings and first fruits were paid. They brought the tithes to the Levites in the city of Jerusalem, as appears from Josephus and Tobit, i, 6. The Levites set apart the tenth part of their tithes for the priest; because the priests did not receive them immediately from the people, and the Levites were not to meddle with the tithes they had received, before they had given the priests such a part as the law assigned them. Of those nine parts that remained to the proprietors, after the tithes were paid to the Levites, they took still another tenth part, which was either sent to Jerusalem in kind, or, if it was too far, they sent the value in money; adding to it a fifth from the whole as the rabbins inform us. This tenth part was applied toward celebrating the festivals in the temple, which bore a near resemblance to the agapæ, or love feasts of the first Christians. Thus are those words of Deuteronomy understood by the rabbins: “Thou shalt truly tithe all the

increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth year by year. And thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thy oil, and of the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks: that thou mayest learn to fear the Lord thy God always," Deut. xiv, 22, 23. Tobit i, 6, says, that every three years he punctually paid his tithe to strangers and proselytes. This was probably because there were neither priests nor Levites in the city where he dwelt. Moses speaks of this last kind of tithe: "At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates. And the Levite, (because he hath no part nor inheritance with thee,) and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, which are within thy gates, shall come, and shall eat and be satisfied; that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou doest," Deut. xiv, 28; xxvi, 12. It is thought that this tithe was not different from the second kind before noticed, except that in the third year it was not brought to the temple, but was used upon the spot by every one in the city of his habitation. So, properly speaking, there were only two sorts of tithes, that which was given to the Levites and priests, and that which was applied to making feasts of charity, either in the temple of Jerusalem, or in other cities. Samuel tells the children of Israel, that the king they had a mind to have over them would "take the tenth of their seed, and of their vineyards, and give to his officers, and his servants. He will take the tenth of your sheep, and ye shall be his servants," 1 Sam. viii, 15, 17. Yet it does not clearly appear from the history of the Jews, that they regularly paid any tithe to their princes. But the manner in which Samuel expresses himself, seems to insinuate that it was looked upon as a common right among the kings of the east. At this day, the Jews no longer pay any tithe; at least they do not think themselves obliged to do it, except it be those who are settled in the territory of Jerusalem, and the ancient Judea. For there are few Jews now that have any lands of their own, or any flocks. They only give something for the redemption of the first-born, to those who have any proofs of their being descended from the race of the priests or Levites. However, we are assured, that such among the Jews as would be thought to be very strict and religious give the tenth part of their whole income to the poor.

**TITUS.** It is remarkable that Titus is not mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. The few particulars which are known of him, are collected from the epistles of St. Paul. We learn from them that he was a Greek, Gal. ii, 3; but it is not recorded to what city or country he belonged. From St. Paul's calling him "his own son according to the common faith," Titus i, 4, it is concluded that he was converted by him; but we have no account of the time or place of his conversion. He is first mentioned as going from Antioch to the council at Jerusalem, A. D. 49, Gal. ii, 1, &c; and upon that

occasion St. Paul says that he would not allow him to be circumcised, because he was born of Gentile parents. He probably accompanied St. Paul in his second apostolical journey, and from that time he seems to have been constantly employed by him in the propagation of the Gospel; he calls him his partner and fellow-helper, 2 Cor. viii, 23. St. Paul sent him from Ephesus with his First Epistle to the Corinthians, and with a commission to inquire into the state of the church at Corinth; and he sent him thither again from Macedonia with his Second Epistle, and to forward the collections for the saints in Judea. From this time we hear nothing of Titus till he was left by St. Paul in Crete, after his first imprisonment at Rome, to "set in order the things that were wanting, and to ordain elders in every city," Titus i, 5. It is probable that he went thence to join St. Paul at Nicopolis, Titus iii, 12; that they went together to Crete to visit the churches there, and thence to Rome. During St. Paul's second imprisonment at Rome Titus went into Dalmatia, 2 Tim. iv, 10; and after the apostle's death, he is said to have returned into Crete, and to have died there in the ninety-fourth year of his age: he is often called bishop of Crete by ecclesiastical writers. St. Paul always speaks of Titus in terms of high regard, and intrusted him, as we have seen, with commissions of great importance. It is by no means certain from what place St. Paul wrote this epistle; but as he desires Titus to come to him at Nicopolis, and declares his intention of passing the winter there, some have supposed that, when he wrote it he was in the neighbourhood of that city, either in Greece or Macedonia; others have imagined that he wrote it from Colosse, but it is difficult to say upon what ground. As it appears that St. Paul, not long before he wrote this epistle, had left Titus in Crete for the purpose of regulating the affairs of the church, and at the time he wrote it had determined to pass the approaching winter at Nicopolis, and as the Acts of the Apostles do not give any account of St. Paul's preaching in that island, or of visiting that city, it is concluded that this epistle was written after his first imprisonment at Rome, and probably in A. D. 64. It may be considered as some confirmation of that opinion, that there is a great similarity between the sentiments and expressions of this epistle and of the First Epistle to Timothy, which was written in that year. It is not known at what time a Christian church was first planted in Crete; but as some Cretans were present at the first effusion of the Holy Ghost at Jerusalem, Acts ii, 11, it is not improbable that, upon their return home, they might be the means of introducing the Gospel among their countrymen. Crete is said to have abounded with Jews; and from the latter part of the first chapter of this epistle it appears that many of them were persons of very profligate lives, even after they had embraced the Gospel. The principal design of this epistle was to give instructions to Titus concerning the management of the churches in the different cities of the island of Crete, and it was probably intended to be read publicly to the Cretans, that they might know upon

what authority Titus acted. St. Paul, after his usual salutation, intimates that he was appointed an apostle by the express command of God, and reminds Titus of the reason of his being left in Crete; he describes the qualifications necessary for bishops, and cautions him against persons of bad principles, especially Judaizing teachers, whom he directs Titus to reprove with severity; he informs him what instructions he should give to people in different situations of life, and exhorts him to be exemplary in his own conduct; he points out the pure and practical nature of the Gospel, and enumerates some particular virtues which he was to inculcate, avoiding foolish questions and frivolous disputes; he instructs him how he is to behave toward heretics and concludes with salutations.

TIZRI, or TISRI, the first Hebrew month of the civil year, and the seventh of the sacred year, answering to the moon of September. On the first day of this month was kept the feast of trumpets, because the beginning of the civil year was proclaimed with the sound of trumpets.

TOB, a country of Palestine, lying beyond Jordan, in the northern part of the portion of Manasseh. To this district Jephthah retired, when he was driven away by his brethren, Judges xi, 3, 5. It is also called Tobie, or Tubin, 1 Mac. v, 13; and the inhabitants of this canton were called Tubieni. It is supposed to be the same as Ishtob, one of the small principalities of Syria, which appears, like the other little kingdoms in its neighbourhood, to have been swallowed up in the kingdom of Damascus. This principality furnished twelve thousand men to the confederacy formed by the Syrians and Ammonites against David, 2 Sam. x.

TOBIAH, an Ammonite, an enemy to the Jews. He was one of those who strenuously opposed the rebuilding of the temple, after the return from the captivity of Babylon, Neh. ii, 10; iv, 3; v, 1, 12, 14. This Tobiah is called "the servant," or "slave," in some parts of Nehemiah; probably because he was of a servile condition. However, he was of great consideration in the land of the Samaritans, 915 of which he was governor with Sanballat. This Tobiah married the daughter of Shechaniah, one of the principal Jews of Jerusalem, Neh. vi, 18, and had a powerful party in Jerusalem itself, who were opposed to that of Nehemiah. He maintained a correspondence by letter with this party against the interest of Nehemiah, vi, 17–19; but that prudent governor, by his wisdom and moderation, defeated all their machinations. After some time, Nehemiah was obliged to return to Babylon, subsequent to having repaired the walls of Jerusalem. Tobiah took this opportunity to come and dwell at Jerusalem; and even obtained of Eliashib, who had the care of the house of the Lord, to have an apartment in the temple. But at Nehemiah's return from Babylon, some years after, he drove Tobiah out of the courts of the temple, and threw his goods out of



the holy place, Neh. xiii, 4–8. From this time the Scripture makes no farther mention of Tobiah. It is probable he retired to Sanballat at Samaria.

TOGARMAH, the third son of Gomer, Gen. x, 4. The learned are divided as to what country he peopled. Josephus and St. Jerom were of opinion, that Togarmah was the father of the Phrygians: Eusebius, Theodoret, and Isidorus of Seville, that he peopled Armenia: the Chaldee and the Talmudists are for Germany. Several moderns believe that the children of Togarmah peopled Turcomania in Tartary and Scythia. Bochart is for Cappadocia: he builds upon what is said in Ezekiel xxvii, 14, “They of the house of Togarmah traded in thy fairs,” that is, at Tyre, “with horses and horsemen and mules.” He proves that Cappadocia was famous for its excellent horses and its asses. He observes also, that certain Gauls, under the conduct of Trocmus, made a settlement at Cappadocia, and were called Trocmi, or Throgmi. The opinion, says Calmet, which places Togarmah in Scythia and Turcomania, seems to stand upon the best foundation.

TOKENS, TESSERÆ, or TICKETS, were written testimonials to character, much in use in the primitive church. By means of letters, and of brethren who travelled about, even the most remote churches of the Roman empire were connected together. When a Christian arrived in a strange town, he first inquired for the church; and he was here received as a brother, and provided with every thing needful for his spiritual or corporeal sustenance. But since deceivers, spies with evil intentions, and false teachers abused the confidence and the kindness of Christians, some measure of precaution became necessary, in order to avert the many injuries which might result from this conduct. An arrangement was therefore introduced, that only such travelling Christians should be received as brethren into churches where they were strangers, as could produce a testimonial from the bishop of the church from which they came. They called these church letters, which were a kind of tesseræ hospitalæ, [tickets of hospitality,] by which the Christians of all quarters of the world were brought into connection, epistolæ, or literæ formatae, [formal letters,] γράμματα τετυπόμενα, because, in order to avoid forgery, they were made after a certain schema, (τυπός, forma,) or else, epistolæ communicatoriæ, [epistles of fellowship,] γράμματα κοινωνικά, because they contained a proof that those who brought them were in the communion of the church, as well as that the bishops, who mutually sent and received such letters, were in connection together by the communion of the church; and afterward these church letters, epistolæ clericæ, were divided into different classes, according to the difference of their purposes.

TONGUE. This word is taken in three different senses. 1. For the material tongue, or organ of speech, James iii, 5. 2. For the tongue or language that

is spoken in any country, Deut. xxviii, 49. (See Language.) 3. For good or bad discourses, Prov. xii, 18; xvii, 20. Tongue of the sea signifies a gulf. To gnaw the tongue, Rev. xvi, 10, is a token of fury, despair, and torment. The gift of tongues was that which God granted to the apostles and disciples assembled at Jerusalem on the day of pentecost, Acts ii. The tongue of angels, a kind of hyperbole made use of by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii, 1.

**TOOTH.** It was ordered by the law of retaliation, that they should give tooth for tooth, Exod. xxi, 24. The opinion that it is every man's right and duty to do himself justice, and to revenge his own injuries, is by no means eradicated from among the Afghans, a people of India, to the southward of Cashmere, and according to a paper in the Asiatic Researches, supposed to be descended from the Jews; and the right of society, even to restrain the reasonable passions of individuals, and to take the redress of wrongs and the punishment of crimes into its own hands, is still very imperfectly understood; or, if it is understood, is seldom present to the thoughts of the people; for although, in most parts of their country, justice might now be obtained by other means, and though private revenge is every where preached against by the mollahs, priests, and forbidden by the government, yet it is still lawful, and even honourable in the eyes of the people, to seek that mode of redress. The injured party is considered to be entitled to strict retaliation on the aggressor. If the offender be out of his power, he may wreak his vengeance on a relation, and, in some cases, on any man in the tribe. If no opportunity of exercising this right occurs, he may defer his revenge for years; but it is disgraceful to neglect or abandon it entirely; and it is incumbent on his relations, and sometimes on his tribe, to assist him in his retaliation. To gnash the teeth is a token of sorrow, rage, despair, Psalm xxxv, 16, &c. God breaks the teeth of the wicked, Psalm iii, 7. Cleanness of teeth denotes famine, Amos iv, 6. The wicked complain, that the "fathers have eaten sour grapes, and their children's teeth are set on edge," Ezek. xviii, 2, to signify, that the children have suffered for their transgressions.

**TOPAZ,** *הטז*, Exod. xxviii, 17; xxxix, 10; Job xxviii, 19; Ezek. xxviii, 13; *τοπάζιον*, Rev. 9:16, 20; a precious stone of a pale dead green, with a mixture of yellow; and sometimes of fine yellow, like gold. It is very hard, and takes a fine polish. We have the authority of the Septuagint and Josephus for ascertaining this stone. The oriental topazes are most esteemed. Those of Ethiopia were celebrated for their wonderful lustre, Job xxviii, 19.

**TOPHET.** It is thought that Tophet was the butchery, or place of slaughter, at Jerusalem, lying to the south of the city, in the valley of the children of

Hinnom. It is also said, that a large fire was constantly kept there for burning carcasses, garbage, and other filth brought thither from the city. It was the place where they burned the remains of images and false gods, &c, Isa. xxx, 33. Others think the name Tophet was given to the valley of Hinnom, from the beating of drums, (the word *toph* signifying a drum,) which accompanied the sacrifices of infants that were offered there to the god Moloch. For the manner of performing those sacrifices in Tophet, see Moloch.

TOWER. "The tower of the flock," or the tower of Ader, Micah iv, 8. It is said this tower was in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem, Gen. xxxv, 21, and that the shepherds, to whom the angel revealed the birth of our Saviour, were near to this tower, Luke ii, 8, 15. Many interpreters assert, that the passage of Micah, in which mention is made of the tower of the flock: "And thou tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion," is to be understood of the city of Bethlehem, out of which our Saviour was to come. Others maintain, that the prophet speaks of the city of Jerusalem, in which there was a tower of this name, through which the flocks of sheep were driven to the sheep-market. "From the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city," 2 Kings xvii, 9. This form of speaking expresses in general all the places of the country, from the least to the greatest. The towers of the watchmen, or of the shepherds, stood alone in the midst of the plain, in which the shepherds and herdsmen who looked after the flocks, or watchmen, might lodge. King Uzziah caused several towers to be built for the shepherds in the desert, and made many cisterns there, because he had a great number of flocks, 2 Chronicles xxvi, 10. The tower of the flock, and that which Isaiah, v, 2, notices, which was built in the midst of a vineyard, were of the same kind.

Tower of Babel. See Babel.

Tower of Shechem was a citadel, or fortress, standing upon a higher ground than the rest of the city, and capacious enough to contain above a thousand persons. This tower, filled with the inhabitants of Shechem, was burned by Abimelech down to the very ground, together with those who had taken refuge in it.

TRACHONITIS, Luke iii, 1. This province had Arabia Deserta to the east, Batanea to the west, Iturea to the south, and the country of Damascus to the north. It belonged rather to Arabia than Palestine; was a rocky province, and served as a shelter for thieves and depredators.

TRADITION. See Cabbala.

TRANSFIGURATION OF CHRIST. This event relates to a very remarkable occurrence in the history of our Lord's life, which is recorded by three of the evangelists, Matthew xvii; Mark ix; Luke ix. The substance of what we learn from their accounts is, that upon a certain occasion Jesus took Peter, James, and John, into a high mountain apart from all other society, and that he was there transfigured before them; his face shining as the sun, and his raiment white as the light; that moreover there appeared unto them Moses and Elias, conversing with him; and that while they spake together on the subject of his death, which was soon afterward to take place at Jerusalem, a bright cloud overshadowed them, and a voice out of the cloud proclaimed, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The Apostle Peter, adverting to this memorable occurrence, says, "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount," 2 Peter i, 16-18. This event is to be considered: 1. As a solemn confirmation of the prophetic office of Christ. 2. As designed to support the faith of the disciples, which was to be deeply tried by his approaching humiliations; and to afford consolation to the human nature of our Lord himself, by giving him a foretaste of "the joy set before him." 3. As an emblem of humanity glorified at the resurrection. 4. As declaring Christ to be superior to Moses and Elias, the giver and the restorer of the law. 5. As an evidence to the disciples of the existence of a separate state, in which good men consciously enjoy the felicity of heaven. 6. As a proof that the bodies of good men shall be so refined and changed, as, like Elias, to live in a state of immortality, and in the presence of God. 7. As exhibiting the sympathy which exists between the church in heaven and the church on earth, and the instruction which the former receives from the events which take place in the latter:--Moses and Elias conversed with our Lord on his approaching death, doubtless to receive, not to convey information. 8. As maintaining the grand distinction, the infinite difference, between Christ and all other prophets: he is "THE SON." "This is my beloved Son, hear him." It has been observed, with much truth, that the condition in which Jesus Christ appeared among men, humble, weak, poor, and despised, was a true and continual transfiguration; whereas, the transfiguration itself, in which he showed himself in the real splendour of his glory, was his true and natural condition.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION. The Lord's Supper being observed in commemoration of the death of Christ, which was the sacrifice offered for the sins of men, the idea of a sacrifice was early conjoined with it; and finally, it came to be regarded not merely as the symbol of a sacrifice, but

in some sense a sacrifice itself. There was also another cause which contributed to this belief. It was the anxious wish of some of the fathers to give to their religion a degree of splendour, which might make a powerful impression upon the senses. Under the Jewish economy, the numerous sacrifices that were offered, in a remarkable degree riveted the attention; and, with reference to this, it became customary to hold forth the Lord's Supper as the great sacrifice in the Christian church. This mode of speaking quickly gained ground; it is often used by Cyprian, although he plainly understood it in a mystical sense; and the ordinance of the supper was not unfrequently styled the eucharistical sacrifice. It was very early the practice to hold up the elements, previous to their being distributed, to the view of the people, probably to excite in them more effectually devout and reverential feelings; and this laid the foundation for that adoration of them which was, at a subsequent period, as we shall soon find, extensively introduced.

For several ages, says Dr. Cook, the state of opinion respecting the sacramental elements was, that they were memorials of Christ's death, but that, agreeably to his own declaration, his body and blood were, in some sense, present with them. The questions, however, what was the nature of that presence? and what were the physical consequences as to the bread and the wine? however much we may conceive these points to have been involved in the opinion actually held, or the language actually used, seem not to have been for a long period much agitated, or, at all events, not authoritatively decided, although the Roman Catholic writers gladly and triumphantly bring forward the expressions that were so often used from the earliest age, in support of the tenet which their church at length espoused. But it was not to be supposed that the curiosity of man would be permanently arrested at the threshold of this most mysterious inquiry; and accordingly a definite theory, with respect to it, was, in the ninth century, avowed, and zealously defended. Pascasius Radbert, a monk, and afterward abbot of Corbey in Picardy, published a treatise concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, in which he did not hesitate to maintain the following most extraordinary positions: "That after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, nothing remained of these symbols but the outward form or figure under which the body and blood of Christ were really and locally present; and that this body so present was the identical body that had been born of the Virgin Mary, had suffered on the cross, and had been raised from the dead." The publication of notions so decidedly at war with all which human beings must credit, excited, as might have been expected, astonishment and indignation; and, accordingly, many writers exerted their talents against it. Among these was the celebrated Johannes Scotus, who laid the axe to the root of the tree, and, shaking off all that figurative language which had been so sadly

abused, distinctly and powerfully stated, that the bread and wine used in the eucharist were the signs or symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ. The light of reason and truth was, however, too feeble to penetrate through the darkness which during this age was spread over the minds and understandings of men. No public declaration, indeed, as to the nature of the sacramental elements was made; and even the popes did not interpose their high and revered authority with regard to it; but there seems little doubt that the opinion of Pascasius was adopted by the greater part of the western church, although it is not likely that much deference was paid to his explanations of it. The question was again agitated, and attracted more notice than it had ever before done, in the course of the eleventh century. Several theologians, distinguished for the period at which they lived, shocked with the grossness and absurdity of the conversion which had been defended, strenuously opposed it. Among these Berenger holds the most conspicuous place, both on account of the zeal and ability which he displayed, and the cruel and unchristian manner in which he was resisted. About the commencement of the century, he began to inculcate that the bread and wine of the eucharist were not truly and actually, but only figuratively, and by similitude, the body and blood of Christ; and a doctrine so rational obtained many adherents in France, Italy, and England. He was, however, encountered by a host of opponents, numbers of whom possessed the highest situations in the church; and the church itself, either from having perceived that the doctrine which he laboured to confute was grateful to the people, or, what is more likely, tended to exalt the powers and to increase the influence and wealth of the priesthood, declared against him, various councils having been assembled, and having pronounced their solemn decrees in condemnation of what he taught. The councils did not rest their hope of overcoming Berenger upon the strength of the reasoning which they could urge against him: they took a much more summary method, and threatened to put him to death if he did not recant. At one synod held at Rome, under the immediate eye of the pope, the fathers of whom it consisted so successfully alarmed Berenger, that, not having sufficient vigour of mind to stand firm against their cruelty, he confessed that he had been in error, and subscribed the following declaration composed by one of the cardinals: "The bread and wine which are placed on the altar are, after consecration, not merely a sacrament, symbol, or figure, but even the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is handled by the hands of the priests, and broken and chewed by the teeth of the faithful." He had no sooner escaped from the violence which he had dreaded, than he shrunk from the tenet to which he had been forced to give his assent, and he again avowed his original sentiments; but he was afterward turned aside from his integrity by the arts and the infamous persecution of new councils, although he died adhering to the spirituality of Christ's presence in the eucharist. From this time the strange opinion of

Pascasius rapidly gained ground, being supported by all the influence of popes and councils; but there had not yet been devised a term which clearly expressed what was really implied in that opinion. In the next century, the ingenuity of some theologian invented what was wanting; the change that takes place on the elements after consecration having been denominated by him transubstantiation. Still, however, some latitude was afforded to those who interpreted the epithet; but this in the thirteenth century was taken away, a celebrated council of the Lateran, attended by no fewer than four hundred and twelve bishops, and eight hundred abbots and priors, having, at the instigation of Innocent the Third, one of the most arrogant and presumptuous of the pontiffs, explicitly adopted transubstantiation as an article of faith, in the monstrous form in which it is now held in the popish church, and denounced anathemas against all who hesitated to give their assent. The opposition which after this was made to a doctrine so revolting to the senses and the reason, was very feeble, insomuch that it may, in consequence of the decree of the Lateran council, be considered as having become the established faith of the western church. In the Greek church it was long resisted, and, indeed, was not embraced till the seventeenth century, a time at which it might have been thought that it could not have extended the range of its influence.

After transubstantiation was thus sanctioned, a change necessarily took place with respect to various parts of the service used in administering the eucharist. That solemn service was now viewed as an actual sacrifice or offering of the body of Christ for the sins of men, and the elevation of the host was held forth as calling for the adoration and worship of believers; so that an ordinance mercifully designed to preserve the pure influence of the most spiritual and elevated religion, became the instrument, in the hands of ignorant or corrupt men, of introducing the most senseless and degrading idolatry. When the Reformation shook the influence of the church, and brought into exercise the intellectual faculties of man, the subject of the eucharist demanded and received the closest and most anxious attention. It might have been naturally supposed, that when Luther directed his vigorous mind to point out and to condemn the abuses which had been sanctioned in the popish church, he would not have spared a doctrine the most irrational and objectionable which that church avows, and that he would have vindicated the holy ordinance of the Lord's Supper from the abomination with which it had been associated. He did, indeed, object to transubstantiation, but he did so with a degree of hesitation truly astonishing, although that hesitation was displayed by many of the first reformers. He declared that he saw no warrant for believing that the bread and wine were actually changed into the body and blood of Christ; but he adhered to the literal import of our Saviour's words, teaching that his body and blood were received, and that they were in some incomprehensible

manner conjoined or united with the bread and wine. It is quite evident, that although this system got rid of one difficulty by leaving the testimony of the senses as to the bread and wine unchallenged, yet it is just as incomprehensible as the other, assumes as a fact what the senses cannot discern, and involves in it difficulties equally repugnant to the plainest dictates of reason. Powerful accordingly as most deservedly was his ascendancy, and great as was the veneration with which he was contemplated, he was upon this point happily opposed; his colleague, the celebrated Carlostadt, openly avowing, that when our Lord said of the bread, "This is my body," he pointed to his own person, and thus taught that the bread was merely the sign or emblem of it. Luther warmly resisted this opinion; Carlostadt was obliged, surely in little consistency with the fundamental principle of Protestantism, in consequence of having professed it, to leave Wirtemberg; and although it procured some adherents, yet as it rested upon an assertion of which there could be no proof, it was never extensively disseminated, and was ultimately abandoned by Carlostadt himself. The discussion, however, which he had commenced stimulated others to the consideration of the subject, and led Zuinglius, who had previously often meditated upon it, and Œcolampadius, two of the most distinguished reformers, to submit to the public the doctrine, that the bread and wine are only symbols of Christ's body and blood, but that the body of our Lord was in heaven, to which after his resurrection he had ascended. Luther composed several works to confute the opinions of Zuinglius. At the commencement of the controversy respecting the eucharist among the defenders of the Protestant faith, there seem to have been only two opinions, that of Luther, asserting that the body and blood of Christ were actually with the bread and wine, and that of Zuinglius, Œcolampadius, and Bucer, that the bread and wine were the emblems or signs of Christ's body and blood, no other advantage being derived from partaking of them than the moral effect naturally resulting from the commemoration of an event so awful and so deeply interesting as the crucifixion of our Redeemer. Calvin soon published what may be regarded as a new view of the subject. Admitting the justness of the interpretation of our Lord's words given by Zuinglius, he maintained that spiritual influence was conveyed to worthy partakers of the Lord's Supper, insomuch that Christ may be said to be spiritually present with the outward elements. The sentiments of this most eminent theologian made a deep impression upon the public mind; and although the churches of Zurich and Berne long adhered to the creed of Zuinglius, yet, through the perseverance and dexterity of Calvin, the Swiss Protestant churches at length united with that of Geneva in assenting to the spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In other countries, too, he saw many adhering to what he had taught, and carrying to as great length as it could be carried what, under his system, must be termed the allegorical language



which he recommended. The French Protestants in their confession thus express themselves: "We affirm that the holy supper of our Lord is a witness to us of our union with the Lord Jesus Christ, because that he is not only once dead and raised up again from the dead for us, but also he doth indeed feed and nourish us with his flesh and blood. And although he be now in heaven, and shall remain there till he come to judge the world, yet we believe that, by the secret and incomprehensible virtue of his Spirit, he doth nourish and quicken us with the substance of his body and blood. But we say that this is done in a spiritual manner; nor do we hereby substitute in place of the effect and truth an idle fancy and conceit of our own; but rather, because this mystery of our union with Christ is so high a thing that it surmounteth all our senses, yea and the whole order of nature, and in short, because it is celestial, it cannot be comprehended but by faith." Knox, who revered Calvin, carried into Scotland the opinions of that reformer; and in the original Scottish confessions, similar language, though somewhat more guarded than that which has been just quoted, is used: "We assuredly believe that in the supper rightly used, Christ Jesus is so joined with us, that he becometh the very nourishment and food of our souls. Not that we imagine any transubstantiation,--but this union and communion which we have with the body and blood of Christ Jesus in the right use of the sacrament, is wrought by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who by true faith carrieth us above all things that are visible, carnal, and earthly, and maketh us to feed upon the body and blood of Christ Jesus. We most assuredly believe that the bread which we break is the communion of Christ's body, and the cup which we bless is the communion of his blood; so that we confess and undoubtedly believe, that the faithful in the right use of the Lord's table so do eat the body and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus, that he remaineth in them and they in him; yea, that they are so made flesh of his flesh, and bones of his bones, that as the eternal Godhead hath given to the flesh of Christ Jesus life and immortality, so doth Christ Jesus's flesh and blood, eaten and drunken by us, give to us the same prerogatives." The church of Scotland, which did not long use this first confession, seems to have seen, in the course of the following century, the propriety, if not of relinquishing, yet of more cautiously employing the phraseology now brought into view; for in the Westminster confession, which is still the standard of faith in that church, there is unquestionably a great improvement in the style which has been adopted in treating of this subject. In it the compilers declare, that "the outward elements in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent; namely the body and blood of Christ, albeit in substance and nature they still remain truly and only bread and wine, as they were before." Then after most powerfully exposing the absurdity of transubstantiation, representing it as repugnant

not to Scripture alone, but to reason and common sense, they proceed: "Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine, yet as really but spiritually present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses." The church of England was in its first reformation from popery inclined to adhere to the Lutherans; but in the time of Edward the Sixth, a more correct and Scriptural view seems to have been taken. In the thirty-nine articles, the present creed of the English church, it is said of this ordinance: "The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup is a partaking of the blood of Christ." This strong language is, however, in the same article, so modified, as to show that all which was intended by it was to represent the spiritual influence conveyed through the Lord's Supper; for it is taught, "that the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." The idea of Zuinglius, that the Lord's Supper is merely a commemoration of Christ's death, naturally producing a moral effect upon the serious and considerate mind, has been held by members of both the established churches in Great Britain. It was vigorously defended, about the beginning of last century, by Bishop Hoadly, in a work which he entitled, "A plain Account of the Nature and Ends of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper;" and it has more recently been supported by Dr. Bell, in a treatise denominated "An Attempt to ascertain the Authority, Nature, and Design of the Lord's Supper." The ingenuity of particular individuals has been exerted in giving other peculiar illustrations of the subject. Cudworth and Bishop Warburton, for example, represented the sacrament of the supper under the view of a feast upon a sacrifice; but such speculations have not influenced the faith of any large denomination of Christians.

TRAVELLING. The mode in which the patriarchs performed their pastoral migrations will be illustrated, with several differences in circumstances, by the following extract from Parsons' Travels: "It was entertaining enough to see the horde of Arabs decamp, as nothing could be more regular. First went the sheep and goat herds, each with their flocks in divisions, according as the chief of each family directed; then followed the camels and asses, loaded with the tents, furniture, and kitchen utensils; these were followed by the old men, women, boys, and girls, on foot. The

children that cannot walk are carried on the backs of the young women, or the boys and girls; and the smallest of the lambs and kids are carried under the arms of the children. To each tent belong many dogs, among which are some greyhounds; some tents have from ten to fourteen dogs, and from twenty to thirty men, women, and children, belonging to it. The procession is closed by the chief of the tribe, whom they call emir and father, (emir means prince,) mounted on the very best horse, and surrounded by the heads of each family, all on horses, with many servants on foot. Between each family is a division or space of one hundred yards, or more, when they migrate; and such great regularity is observed, that neither camels, asses, sheep, nor dogs, mix, but each keeps to the division to which it belongs, without the least trouble. They had been here eight days, and were going four hours' journey to the north-west, to another spring of water. This tribe consisted of about eight hundred and fifty men, women, and children. Their flocks of sheep and goats were about five thousand, beside a great number of camels, horses, and asses. Horses and greyhounds they breed and train up for sale: they neither kill nor sell their ewe lambs. At set times a chapter in the Koran is read by the chief of each family, either in or near each tent, the whole family being gathered round, and very attentive." Instead of the Koran of modern times, let us conceive of Abraham, and other patriarchal emirs, collecting their numerous dependents and teaching them the true religion, and we then see with what truth they are called the Lord's "prophets."

**TREASURE.** The Hebrew word signifies any thing collected together, provisions, or magazines. So they say, a treasure of corn, of wine, of oil, of honey, Jer. xli, 8; treasures of gold, silver, brass, Ezek. xxviii, 4; Dan. xi, 43. Snow, winds, hail, rain, waters, are in the treasures of God, Psalm cxxxv, 7; Jer. li, 16. The wise men opened their treasures, Matt. ii, 11, that is, their packets, or bundles, to offer presents to our Saviour. Joseph acquainted his brethren, when they found their money returned in their sacks, that God had given them treasures, Genesis xliiii, 23. The treasures of the house of God, whether in silver, corn, wine, or oil, were under the care of the Levites. The kings of Judah had also keepers of the treasures both in city and country, 1 Chron. xxvii, 25; and the places where these magazines were laid up were called treasure cities. Pharaoh compelled the Hebrews to build him treasure cities, or magazines.

**TREE** is the first and largest of the vegetable kind, consisting of a single trunk, out of which spring forth branches and leaves. Heat is so essential to the growth of trees, that we see them grow larger and smaller in a sort of gradation as the climates in which they stand are more or less hot. The hottest countries yield, in general, the largest and tallest trees, and those, also, in much greater beauty and variety than the colder do; and even those

plants which are common to both arrive at a much greater bulk in the southern than in the northern climates; nay, there are some regions so bleak and chill, that they raise no vegetables at all to any considerable height. Greenland, Iceland, and similar places, afford no trees at all; and the shrubs which grow in them are always little and low. In the warmer climates, where trees grow to a moderate size, any accidental diminution of the common heat is found very greatly to impede vegetation; and even in England the cold summers we sometimes have give us an evident proof of this in the scarcity of produce from all our large fruit trees. Heat, whatever be the producing cause, acts as well upon vegetation one way as another. Thus the heat of manure, and the artificial heat of coal fires in stoves, are found to supply the place of the sun. Great numbers of the eastern trees, in their native soil, flower twice in a year, and some flower and bear ripe fruit all the year round; and it is observed of these last, that they are at once the most frequent and the most useful to the inhabitants; their fruits, which always hang on them in readiness, containing cool juices, which are good in fevers, and other of the common diseases of hot countries. The umbrageous foliage, with which the God of providence has generally furnished all trees in warm climates, affords a most refreshing and grateful shade to those who seek relief from the direct and hurtful rays of a tropical sun.

The Land of Promise cannot boast, like many other countries, of extensive woods; but considerable thickets of trees and of reeds sometimes arise to diversify and adorn the scene. Between the Lake Samochonites and the sea of Tiberias, the river Jordan is almost concealed by shady trees from the view of the traveller. When the waters of the Jordan are low, the Lake Samochonites is only a marsh, for the most part dry and overgrown with shrubs and reeds. In these thickets, among other ferocious animals, the wild boar seeks a covert from the burning rays of the sun. Large herds of them are sometimes to be seen on the banks of the river, near the sea of Tiberias, lying among the reeds, or feeding under the trees. Such moist and shady places are in all countries the favourite haunts of these fierce and dangerous animals. Those marshy coverts are styled woods in the sacred Scriptures; for the wild boar of the wood is the name which that creature receives from the royal psalmist: "The boar out of the wood doth waste it; and the wild beast of the field doth devour it," Psalm lxxx, 13. The wood of Ephraim, where the battle was fought between the forces of Absalom and the servants of David, was probably a place of the same kind; for the sacred historian observes, that the wood devoured more people that day than the sword, 2 Sam. xviii, 8. Some have supposed the meaning of this passage to be, that the soldiers of Absalom were destroyed by the wild beasts of the wood; but it can scarcely be supposed, that in the reign of David, when the Holy Land was crowded with inhabitants, the wild beasts could be so

numerous in one of the woods as to cause such a destruction. But, supposing the wood of Ephraim to have been a morass covered with trees and bushes, like the haunts of the wild boar near the banks of Jordan, the difficulty is easily removed. It is certain that such a place has more than once proved fatal to contending armies, partly by suffocating those who in the hurry of flight inadvertently venture over places incapable of supporting them, and partly by retarding them till their pursuers come up and cut them to pieces. In this manner a greater number of men than fell in the heat of battle may be destroyed. It is probable, however, that nothing more is intended by the sacred historian, than the mention of a fact familiar to military men in all ages, and whatever kind of weapons were then employed in warfare,—that forests, especially such thick and impassable forests as are common in warm countries, constitute the very worst ground along which a discomfited army can be compelled to retreat. Their orderly ranks are broken; the direction which each warrior for his own safety must take is uncertain; and while one tumultuous mass is making a pass for itself through intervening brushwood and closely matted jungle, and another is hurrying along a different path and encountering similar or perhaps greater impediments, the cool and deliberate pursuers, whether archers or sharp shooters, enjoy an immense advantage in being able to choose their own points of annoyance, and by flank or cross attacks to kill their retreating foes, with scarcely any risk to themselves, but with immense carnage to the routed army.

Several critics imagine that by עץ חדר, rendered “goodly trees,” Lev. xxiii, 40, the citron tree is intended. עץ-עבת, rendered “thick trees” in the same verse, and in Neh. viii, 15; Ezek. xx, 28, is the myrtle, according to the rabbins, the Chaldee paraphrase, Syriac version, and Deodatus. The word אשל, translated “grove” in Gen. xxi, 33, has been variously translated. Parkhurst renders it an oak, and says, that from this word may be derived the name of the famous asylum, opened by Romulus between two groves of oak at Rome. On the other hand, Celsius, Michaëlis, and Dr. Geddes render it the tamarisk, which is a lofty and beautiful tree, and grows abundantly in Egypt and Arabia. The same word in 1 Sam. xxii, 6; xxxi, 13, is rendered “a tree.” It must be noted too, that in the first of these places, the common version is equally obscure and contradictory, by making ramah a proper name: it signifies hillock or bank. Of the trees that produced precious balsams there was one in particular that long flourished in Judea, having been supposed to have been an object of great attention to Solomon, which was afterward transplanted to Matarea, in Egypt, where it continued till about two hundred and fifty years ago, according to Maillet, who gives a description of it, drawn, it is supposed, from the Arabian authors, in which he says, “This shrub had two very differently coloured barks, the one red, the other perfectly green; that they tasted strongly like incense and

turpentine, and when bruised between the fingers they smelt very nearly like cardamoms. This balsam, which was extremely precious and celebrated, and was used by the Coptic church in their chrism, was produced by a very low shrub; and it is said, that all those shrubs that produced balsams are every where low, and do not exceed two or three cubits in height.”

Descriptions of the principal trees and shrubs mentioned in Holy Writ the reader will find noticed in distinct articles under their several denominations.

TRIBE. Jacob having twelve sons, who were the heads of so many great families, which altogether formed a great nation; every one of these families was called a tribe. But Jacob on his death bed adopted Ephraim and Manasseh, the sons of Joseph, and would have them also to constitute two tribes of Israel, Gen. xlvi, 5. Instead of twelve tribes, there were now thirteen, that of Joseph being divided into two. However, in the distribution of lands to each which Joshua made by the order of God, they counted but twelve tribes, and made but twelve lots. For the tribe of Levi, which was appointed to the service of the tabernacle of the Lord, had no share in the distribution of the land, but only some cities in which to dwell, and the first fruits, tithes, and oblations of the people, which was all their subsistence. The twelve tribes continued united under one head, making but one state, one people, and one monarchy, till after the death of Solomon. Then ten of the tribes of Israel revolted from the house of David, and received for their king Jeroboam, the son of Nebat; and only the tribes of Judah and Benjamin continued under the government of Rehoboam. This separation may be looked upon as the chief cause of those great misfortunes that afterward happened to those two kingdoms, and to the whole Hebrew nation. For, first, it was the cause of the alteration and change of the old religion, and of the ancient worship of their forefathers. Jeroboam the son of Nebat substituted the worship of golden calves for the worship of the true God; which was the occasion of the ten tribes forsaking the temple of the Lord. Secondly, this schism caused an irreconcilable hatred between the ten tribes, and those of Judah and Benjamin, and created numerous wars and disputes between them. The Lord, being provoked, delivered them up to their enemies. Tiglath-Pileser first took away captive the tribes of Reuben, Gad, Naphtali, and the half tribe of Manasseh, which were beyond Jordan, and carried them beyond the Euphrates, 2 Kings xv, 29; 1 Chron. v, 26; A. M. 3264. Some years after, Shalmaneser 922king of Assyria took the city of Samaria, destroyed it, took away the rest of the inhabitants of Israel, carried them beyond the Euphrates, and sent other inhabitants into the country to cultivate and possess it, 2 Kings xvii, 6; xviii, 10, 11. Thus ended the kingdom of the ten tribes of Israel, A. M. 3283. As to the tribes of Judah

and Benjamin, who remained under the government of the kings of the family of David, they continued a much longer time in their own country. But at last, after they had filled up the measure of their iniquity, God delivered them all into the hands of their enemies. Nebuchadnezzar took the city of Jerusalem, entirely ruined it, and took away all the inhabitants of Judah and Benjamin to Babylon, and the other provinces of his empire, A. M. 3416. The return from this captivity is stated in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. See Jews.

TRIBUTE. The Hebrews acknowledged none for sovereign over them but God alone; whence Josephus calls their government a theocracy, or divine government. They acknowledged the sovereign dominion of God by a tribute, or capitation tax, of half a shekel a head, which every Israelite paid yearly, Exod. xxx, 13. Our Saviour, in the Gospel, thus reasons with St. Peter: "What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers?" Matt. xvii, 25, meaning, that as he was the Son of God, he ought to be exempt from this capitation tax. We do not find that either the kings or the judges of the Hebrews, when they were themselves Jews, demanded any tribute of them. Solomon, at the beginning of his reign, 1 Kings xi, 22, 33; 2 Chron. viii, 9, compelled the Canaanites, who were left in the country, to pay him tribute, and to perform the drudgery of the public works he had undertaken. As to the children of Israel, he would not suffer one of them to be employed upon them, but made them his soldiers, ministers, and chief officers, to command his armies, his chariots, and his horsemen. Yet, afterward, toward the end of his reign, he imposed a tribute upon them, and made them work at the public buildings, 1 Kings v, 13, 14; ix, 15; xi, 27; which much alienated their minds from him, and sowed the seeds of that discontent which afterward appeared in an open revolt, by the rebellion of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat; who was at first indeed obliged to take shelter in Egypt. But afterward the defection became general, by the total revolt of the ten tribes. Hence it was, that the Israelites said to Rehoboam the son of Solomon, "Thy father made our yoke grievous; now therefore, make thou the grievous service of thy father, and the heavy yoke which he put upon us, lighter, and we will serve thee," 1 Kings xii, 4. It is needless to observe, that the Israelites were frequently subdued by foreign princes, who laid great taxes and tribute upon them, to which fear and necessity compelled them to submit. Yet in the latter times, that is, after Archelaus had been banished to Vienne in France, in the sixth year of the vulgar era, and after Judea was reduced to a province, Augustus sent Quirinius into this country to take a new poll of the people, and to make a new estimate of their substance, that he might thereby regulate the tribute that every one was to pay to the Romans. Then Judas, surnamed the Galilean, formed a sedition, and made an insurrection, to oppose the levying of this tribute.

See in St. Matthew xxii, 16, 17, &c, the answer that Jesus Christ returned to the Pharisee, who came with an insidious design of tempting him, and asked him, whether or not it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar? and in John viii, 33, where the Jews boast of having never been slaves to any body, of being a free nation, that acknowledged God only for master and sovereign.

TRINITY. That nearly all the Pagan nations of antiquity, says Bishop Tomline, in their various theological systems, acknowledged a kind of Trinity, has been fully evinced by those learned men who have made the Heathen mythology the subject of their elaborate inquiries. The almost universal prevalence of this doctrine in the Gentile kingdoms must be considered as a strong argument in favour of its truth. The doctrine itself bears such striking internal marks of a divine original, and is so very unlikely to have been the invention of mere human reason, that there is no way of accounting for the general adoption of so singular a belief, but by supposing that it was revealed by God to the early patriarchs, and that it was transmitted by them to their posterity. In its progress, indeed, to remote countries, and to distant generations, this belief became depraved and corrupted in the highest degree; and he alone who brought "life and immortality to light," could restore it to its original simplicity and purity. The discovery of the existence of this doctrine in the early ages, among the nations whose records have been the best preserved, has been of great service to the cause of Christianity, and completely refutes the assertion of infidels and skeptics, that the sublime and mysterious doctrine of the Trinity owes its origin to the philosophers of Greece. "If we extend," says Mr. Maurice, "our eye through the remote region of antiquity, we shall find this very doctrine, which the primitive Christians are said to have borrowed from the Platonic school, universally and immemorially flourishing in all those countries where history and tradition have united to fix those virtuous ancestors of the human race, who, for their distinguished attainments in piety, were admitted to a familiar intercourse with Jehovah and the angels, the divine heralds of his commands." The same learned author justly considers the first two verses of the Old Testament as containing very strong, if not decisive, evidence in support of the truth of this doctrine: Elohim, a noun substantive of the plural number, by which the Creator is expressed, appears as evidently to point toward a plurality of persons in the divine nature, as the verb in the singular, with which it is joined, does to the unity of that nature: 923 "In the beginning God created;" with strict attention to grammatical propriety, the passage should be rendered, "In the beginning Gods created," but our belief in the unity of God forbids us thus to translate the word Elohim. Since, therefore, Elohim is plural, and no plural can consist of less than two in number, and since creation can alone be the work of Deity, we are to understand by this term so particularly used



in this place, God the Father, and the eternal Logos, or Word of God; that Logos whom St. John, supplying us with an excellent comment upon this passage, says, was in the beginning with God, and who also was God. As the Father and the Son are expressly pointed out in the first verse of this chapter, so is the Third Person in the blessed Trinity not less decisively revealed to us in Gen. i, 2: "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters:" "brooded upon" the water, incubavit, as a hen broods over her eggs. Thus we see the Spirit exerted upon this occasion an active effectual energy, by that energy agitating the vast abyss, and infusing into it a powerful vital principle.

Elohim seems to be the general appellation by which the Triune Godhead is collectively distinguished in Scripture; and in the concise history of the creation only, the expression, bara Elohim, "the Gods created," is used above thirty times. The combining this plural noun with a verb in the singular would not appear so remarkable, if Moses had uniformly adhered to that mode of expression; for then it would be evident that he adopted the mode used by the Gentiles in speaking of their false gods in the plural number, but by joining with it a singular verb or adjective, rectified a phrase that might appear to give a direct sanction to the error of polytheism. But, in reality, the reverse is the fact; for in Deut. xxxii, 15, 17, and other places, he uses the singular number of this very noun to express the Deity, though not employed in the august work of creation: "He forsook God," Eloah; "they sacrificed to devils not to God," Eloah. But farther, Moses himself uses this very word Elohim with verbs and adjectives in the plural. Of this usage Dr. Allix enumerates many other striking instances that might be brought from the Pentateuch; and other inspired writers use it in the same manner in various parts of the Old Testament, Job xxxv, 10; Joshua xxiv, 19; Psalm cix, 1; Ecclesiastes xii, 3; 2 Samuel vii, 23. It must appear, therefore, to every reader of reflection, exceedingly singular, that when Moses was endeavouring to establish a theological system, of which the unity of the Godhead was the leading principle, and in which it differed from all other systems, he should make use of terms directly implicative of a plurality in it; yet so deeply was the awful truth under consideration impressed upon the mind of the Hebrew legislator, that this is constantly done by him; and, indeed, as Allix has observed, there is scarcely any method of speaking from which a plurality in Deity may be inferred, that is not used either by himself in the Pentateuch, or by the other inspired writers in various parts of the Old Testament. A plural is joined with a verb singular, as in the passage cited before from Genesis i, 1; a plural is joined with a verb plural, as in Gen. xxxv, 7, "And Jacob called the name of the place El-beth-el, because the Gods there appeared to him;" a plural is joined with an adjective plural, Joshua xxiv, 19, "You cannot serve the Lord; for he is the holy Gods." To these passages, if we add that remarkable

one from Ecclesiastes, "Remember thy Creators in the days of thy youth," and the predominant use of the terms, Jehovah Elohim, or, the "Lord thy Gods," which occur a hundred times in the law, (the word Jehovah implying the unity of the essence, and Elohim a plurality in that unity,) we must allow that nothing can be more plainly marked than this doctrine in the ancient Scriptures.

Though the august name of Jehovah in a more peculiar manner belongs to God the Father, yet is that name, in various parts of Scripture, applied to each person in the holy Trinity. The Hebrews considered that name in so sacred a light, that they never pronounced it, and used the word Adonai instead of it. It was, indeed, a name that ranked first among their profoundest cabala; a mystery, sublime, ineffable, incommunicable. It was called tetragrammaton, or the name of four letters, and these letters are jod, he, vau, he, the proper pronounciation of which, from long disuse, is said to be no longer known to the Jews themselves. This awful name was first revealed by God to Moses from the centre of the burning bush; and Josephus, who, as well as Scripture, relates this circumstance, evinces his veneration for it, by calling it the name which his religion did not permit him to mention. From this word the Pagan title of Iao and Jove is, with the greatest probability, supposed to have been originally formed; and in the Golden Verses of Pythagoras, there is an oath still extant to this purpose, "By Him who has the four letters." As the name Jehovah, however, in some instances applied to the Son and the Holy Spirit, was the proper name of God the Father, so is Logos in as peculiar a manner the appropriated name of God the Son. The Chaldee Paraphrasts translate the original Hebrew text by Mimra da Jehovah, literally, "the Word of Jehovah," a term totally different, as Bishop Kidder has incontestably proved, in its signification, and in its general application among the Jews, from the Hebrew dabar, which simply means a discourse or decree, and is properly rendered by pithgam. In the Septuagint translation of the Bible, a work supposed by the Jews to have been undertaken by men immediately inspired from above, the former term is universally rendered Λόγος, and it is so rendered and so understood by Philo and all the more ancient rabbins. The name of the third person in the ever blessed Trinity has descended unaltered from the days of Moses to our own time; for, as well in the sacred writings as by the Targumists, and by the modern doctors of the Jewish church, he is styled Ruach Hakhodesh, the Holy Spirit. 924He is sometimes, however, in the rabbinical books, denominated by Shechinah, or glory of Jehovah; in some places he is called Sephirah, or Wisdom; and in others the Binah, or Understanding. From the enumeration of these circumstances, it must be sufficiently evident to the mind which unites piety and reflection, that so far from being silent upon the subject, the ancient Scriptures commence

with an avowal of this doctrine, and that, in fact, the creation was the result of the joint operations of the Trinity.

If the argument above offered should still appear inconclusive, the twenty-sixth verse of the first chapter of Genesis contains so pointed an attestation to the truth of it, that, when duly considered, it must stagger the most hardened skeptic; for in that text not only the plurality is unequivocally expressed, but the act which is the peculiar prerogative of Deity is mentioned together with that plurality, the one circumstance illustrating the other, and both being highly elucidatory of this doctrine: "And God (Elohim) said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Why the Deity should speak of himself in the plural number, unless that Deity consisted of more than one person, it is difficult to conceive; for the answer given by the modern Jews, that this is only a figurative mode of expression, implying the high dignity of the speaker, and that it is usual for earthly sovereigns to use this language by way of distinction, is futile, for two reasons. In the first place it is highly degrading to the Supreme Majesty to suppose he would take his model of speaking and thinking from man, though it is highly consistent with the vanity of man to arrogate to himself, as doubtless was the case in the licentiousness of succeeding ages, the style and imagined conceptions of Deity; and it will be remembered, that these solemn words were spoken before the creation of any of those mortals, whose false notions of greatness and sublimity the Almighty is thus impiously supposed to adopt. In truth, there does not seem to be any real dignity in an expression, which, when used by a human sovereign in relation to himself, approaches very near to absurdity. The genuine fact, however, appears to be this. When the tyrants of the east first began to assume divine honours, they assumed likewise the majestic language appropriated to, and highly becoming, the Deity, but totally inapplicable to man. The error was propagated from age to age through a long succession of despots, and at length Judaic apostasy arrived at such a pitch of profane absurdity, as to affirm that very phraseology to be borrowed from man which was the original and peculiar language of the Divinity. It was, indeed, remarkably pertinent when applied to Deity; for, in a succeeding chapter, we have more decisive authority for what is thus asserted, where the Lord God himself says, "Behold, the man is become as one of us;" a very singular expression, which some Jewish commentators, with equal effrontery, contend was spoken by the Deity to the council of angels, that, according to their assertions, attended him at the creation. From the name of the Lord God being used in so emphatical a manner, it evidently appears to be addressed to those sacred persons to whom it was before said, "Let us make man;" for would indeed the omnipotent Jehovah, presiding in a less dignified council, use words that have such an evident tendency to place the Deity on a level with created beings?

The first passage to be adduced from the New Testament in proof of this important doctrine of the Trinity, is, the charge and commission which our Saviour gave to his apostles, to “go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” Matt. xxviii, 19. The Gospel is every where in Scripture represented as a covenant or conditional offer of eternal salvation from God to man; and baptism was the appointed ordinance by which men were to be admitted into that covenant, by which that offer was made and accepted. This covenant being to be made with God himself, the ordinance must of course be performed in his name; but Christ directed that it should be performed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and therefore we conclude that God is the same as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Since baptism is to be performed in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, they must be all three persons; and since no superiority or difference whatever is mentioned in this solemn form of baptism, we conclude that these three persons are all of one substance, power, and eternity. Are we to be baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and is it possible that the Father should be self-existent, eternal, the Lord God Omnipotent; and that the Son, in whose name we are equally baptized, should be a mere man, born of a woman, and subject to all the frailties and imperfections of human nature? or, is it possible that the Holy Ghost, in whose name also we are equally baptized, should be a bare energy or operation, a quality or power, without even personal existence? Our feelings, as well as our reason, revolt from the idea of such disparity.

This argument will derive great strength from the practice of the early ages, and from the observations which we meet with in several of the ancient fathers relative to it. We learn from Ambrose, that persons at the time of their baptism, declared their belief in the three persons of the Holy Trinity, and that they were dipped in the water three times. In his Treatise upon the Sacraments he says, “Thou wast asked at thy baptism, Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty? and thou didst reply, I believe, and thou wast dipped; and a second time thou wast asked, Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ the Lord? thou didst answer again, I believe, and thou wast dipped; a third time the question was repeated, Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost? and the answer was, I believe, then thou wast dipped a third time.” It is to be noticed, that the belief, here expressed separately, in the three persons of the Trinity, is precisely the same in all. Tertullian, 925Basil, and Jerom, all mention this practice of trine immersion as ancient; and Jerom says, “We are thrice dipped in the water, that the mystery of the Trinity may appear to be but one. We are not baptized in the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in one name, which is God’s; and, therefore, though we be

thrice put under water to represent the mystery of the Trinity, yet it is reputed but one baptism." Thus the mysterious union of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as one God, was, in the opinion of the purer ages of the Christian church, clearly expressed in this form of baptism. By it the primitive Christians understood the Father's gracious acceptance of the atonement offered by the Messiah; the peculiar protection of the Son, our great High Priest and Intercessor; and the readiness of the Holy Ghost to sanctify, to assist, and to comfort all the obedient followers of Christ, confirmed by the visible gift of tongues, of prophecy, and divers other gifts to the first disciples. And as their great Master's instructions evidently distinguished these persons from each other, without any difference in their authority or power, all standing forth as equally dispensing the benefits of Christianity, as equally the objects of the faith required in converts upon admission into the church, they clearly understood that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, were likewise equally the objects of their grateful worship: this fully appears from their prayers, doxologies, hymns, and creeds, which are still extant.

The second passage to be produced in support of the doctrine now under consideration, is, the doxology at the conclusion of St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you." The manner in which Christ and the Holy Ghost are here mentioned, implies that they are persons, for none but persons can confer grace or fellowship; and these three great blessings of grace, love, and fellowship, being respectively prayed for by the inspired apostle from Jesus Christ, God the Father, and the Holy Ghost, without any intimation of disparity, we conclude that these three persons are equal and Divine. This solemn benediction may therefore be considered as another proof of the Trinity, since it acknowledges the divinity of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Ghost. The third passage is the following salutation or benediction in the beginning of the Revelation of St. John: "Grace and peace from Him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ." Here the Father is described by a periphrasis taken from his attribute of eternity; and "the seven spirits" is a mystical expression for the Holy Ghost, used upon this occasion either because the salutation is addressed to seven churches, every one of which had partaken of the Spirit, or because seven was a sacred number among the Jews, denoting both variety and perfection, and in this case alluding to the various gifts, administrations, and operations of the Holy Ghost. Since grace and peace are prayed for from these three persons jointly and without discrimination, we infer an equality in their power to dispense those blessings; and we farther conclude that these three persons together constitute the Supreme Being, who is alone the object of prayer, and is alone the Giver of every

good and of every perfect gift. It might be right to remark, that the seven spirits cannot mean angels, since prayers are never in Scripture addressed to angels, nor are blessings ever pronounced in their name. It is unnecessary to quote any of the numerous passages in which the Father is singly called God, as some of them must be recollected by every one, and the divinity of the Father is not called in question by any sect of Christians; and those passages which prove the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost separately, will be more properly considered under those heads. In the mean time we may observe, that if it shall appear from Scripture, that Christ is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, it will follow, since we are assured that there is but one God, that the three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, by a mysterious union, constitute the one God, or, as it is expressed in the first article of the church of England: "There is a Trinity in Unity; and in the unity of this Godhead there be three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

The word Trinity does not occur in Scripture, nor do we find it in any of the early confessions of faith; but this is no argument against the doctrine itself, since we learn from the fathers of the first three centuries, that the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost was, from the days of the Apostles, acknowledged by the catholic church, and that those who maintained a contrary opinion were considered as heretics; and as every one knows that neither the divinity of the Father, nor the unity of the Godhead, was ever called in question at any period, it follows that the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity has been in substance, in all its constituent parts, always known among Christians. In the fourth century it became the subject of eager and general controversy; and it was not till then that this doctrine was particularly discussed. While there was no denial or dispute, proof and defence were unnecessary: *Nunquid enim perfecté de Trinitate tractatum est, antequam oblatrarent Ariani?* But this doctrine is positively mentioned as being admitted among catholic Christians, by writers who lived long before that age of controversy. Justin Martyr, in refuting the charge of atheism urged against Christians, because they did not believe in the gods of the Heathen, expressly says, "We worship and adore the Father, and the Son who came from him and taught us these things, and the prophetic Spirit;" and soon after, in the same apology, he undertakes to show the reasonableness of the honour paid by Christians to the Father in the first place, to the Son in the second, and to the Holy Ghost in the third; and says, that their assigning the second place to a crucified man, was, by unbelievers, denominated madness, because they were ignorant of the mystery, which he then proceeds to explain. Athenagoras, in replying to the same charge of atheism urged against Christians, because they refused to worship the false gods of the Heathen, says, "Who would not wonder, when

he knows that we, who call upon God the Father, and God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, showing their power in the unity, and their distinction in order, should be called atheists?" Clement of Alexandria not only mentions three divine persons, but invokes them as one only God. Praxeas, Sabellius, and other Unitarians, accused the orthodox Christians of tritheism, which is of itself a clear proof that the orthodox worshipped the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and though in reality they considered these three persons as constituting the one true God, it is obvious that their enemies might easily represent that worship as an acknowledgment of three Gods. Tertullian, in writing against Praxeas, maintains, that a Trinity rationally conceived is consistent with truth, and that unity irrationally conceived forms heresy. He had before said, in speaking of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that "there are three of one substance, and of one condition, and of one power, because there is one God:" and he afterward adds, "The connection of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Comforter, makes three united together, the one with the other; which three are one thing, not one person; as it is said, I and the Father are one thing, with regard to the unity of substance, not to the singularity of number:" and he also expressly says, "The Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God;" and again, "The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, believed to be three, constitute one God." And in another part of his works he says, "There is a Trinity of one Divinity, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." And Tertullian not only maintains these doctrines, but asserts that they were prior to any heresy, and had, indeed, been the faith of Christians from the first promulgation of the Gospel. To these writers of the second century, we may add Origen and Cyprian in the third; the former of whom mentions baptism (alluding to its appointed form) as "the source and fountain of graces to him who dedicates himself to the divinity of the adorable Trinity." And the latter, after reciting the same form of baptism, says that "by it Christ delivered the doctrine of the Trinity, unto which mystery or sacrament the nations were to be baptized." It would be easy to multiply quotations upon this subject; but these are amply sufficient to show the opinions of the early fathers, and to refute the assertion that the doctrine of the Trinity was an invention of the fourth century. To these positive testimonies may be subjoined a negative argument: those who acknowledged the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost, are never called heretics by any writer of the first three centuries; and this circumstance is surely a strong proof that the doctrine of the Trinity was the doctrine of the primitive church; more especially, since the names of those who first denied the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost, are transmitted to us as of persons who dissented from the common faith of Christians.

But while we contend that the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity is founded in Scripture, and supported by the authority of the early Christians, we must

acknowledge that it is not given to man to understand in what manner the three persons are united, or how, separately and jointly, they are God. It would, perhaps, have been well, if divines, in treating this awful and mysterious subject, had confined themselves to the expressions of Scripture; for the moment we begin to explain it beyond the written word of God, we plunge ourselves into inextricable difficulties. And how can it be otherwise? Is it to be expected that our finite understandings should be competent to the full comprehension of the nature and properties of an infinite Being? "Can we find out the Almighty to perfection," Job xi, 7; or penetrate into the essence of the Most High? "God is a Spirit," John iv, 24, and our gross conceptions are but ill-adapted to the contemplation of a pure and spiritual Being. We know not the essence of our own mind, nor the precise distinction of its several faculties; and why then should we hope to comprehend the personal characters which exist in the Godhead? "If I tell you earthly things, and you understand them not, how shall ye understand if I tell you heavenly things?" When we attempt to investigate the nature of the Deity, whose existence is commensurate with eternity, by whose power the universe was created, and by whose wisdom it is governed; whose presence fills all space, and whose knowledge extends to the thoughts of every man in every age, and to the events of all places, past, present, and to come, the mind is quickly lost in the vastness of these ideas, and, unable to find any sure guide to direct its progress, it becomes, at every step, more bewildered and entangled in the endless mazes of metaphysical abstraction. "God is a God that hideth himself." "We cannot by searching find out God." "Behold, God is great, and we know him not," Job xxiii, 9; xi, 7; xxxvi, 26. "Such knowledge is too wonderful and excellent for us; it is high; we cannot attain unto it," Psalm cxxxix, 6. It is for us, simply and in that docile spirit which becomes us, to receive the testimony of God as to himself, and to fix ourselves upon that firmest of all foundations, and most rational of all evidence, "Thus saith the Lord."

**TRIUMPHS, Military.** The Hebrews, under the direction of inspired prophets, celebrated their victories by triumphal processions, the women and children dancing, and playing upon musical instruments, and singing hymns and songs of triumph to the living and true God. The song of Moses at the Red Sea, which was sung by Miriam and the women of Israel to the dulcet beat of the timbrel, is a majestic example of the triumphal hymns of the ancient Hebrews. The song of Deborah and Barak, after the decisive battle in which Sisera lost his life, and Jabin his dominion over the tribes of Israel, is a production of the same sort, in which the spirit of genuine heroism and of true religion are admirably combined. But the song which the women of Israel chanted when they went out to meet Saul and his victorious army, after the death of Goliath, and the discomfiture of the Philistines, possesses somewhat of a different character, turning chiefly on



the valorous exploits of Saul and the youthful champion of Israel: "And it came to pass, as they came, when David was returned from the slaughter of the Philistine, that the women came out of all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet King Saul with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music: and the women answered one another as they played, and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands," 1 Sam. xviii, 6, 7. But the most remarkable festivity, perhaps, on the records of history, was celebrated by Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, in a succeeding age. When that religious prince led forth his army to battle against a powerful confederacy of his neighbours, he appointed a band of sacred music to march in front, praising the beauty of holiness as they went before the army, "and to say, Praise the Lord, for his mercy endureth for ever." After the discomfiture of their enemies, he assembled his army in the valley of Beracha, near the scene of victory, where they resumed the anthem of religious praise: "Then they returned, every man of Judah and Jerusalem, and Jehoshaphat in the fore front of them, to go again to Jerusalem with joy; for the Lord had made them to rejoice over their enemies. And they came to Jerusalem with psalteries, and harps, and trumpets, unto the house of the Lord," 2 Chron. xx, 21, 27. Instead of celebrating his own heroism, or the valour of his troops, on this memorable occasion, that excellent prince sung with his whole army the praises of the Lord of hosts, who disposes of the victory according to his pleasure. This conduct was becoming the descendant and successor of David, the man according to God's own heart, and a religious people, the peculiar inheritance of Jehovah.

The Roman conquerors used to carry branches of palm in their hands when they went in triumph to the capitol; and sometimes wore the toga palmata, a garment with the figures of palm trees upon it, which were interwoven in the fabric. In the same triumphant attitude, the Apostle John beheld in vision those who had overcome by the blood of the lamb, standing "before the throne, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands," Rev. vii, 9. The highest military honour which could be obtained in the Roman state, was a triumph, or solemn procession, in which a victorious general and his army advanced through the city to the capitol. He set out from the Campus Martius, and proceeded along the Via Triumphalis, and from thence through the most public places of the city. The streets were strewed with flowers, and the altars smoked with incense. First went a numerous band of music, singing and playing triumphal songs; next were led the oxen to be sacrificed, having their horns gilt, and their heads adorned with fillets and garlands; then, in carriages, were brought the spoils taken from the enemy; also golden crowns sent by the allied and tributary states. The titles of the vanquished nations were inscribed on wooden frames; and images or representations of the conquered countries and cities were exhibited.

The captive leaders followed in chains, with their children and attendants; after the captives came the lictors, having their faces wreathed with laurel, followed by a great company of musicians and dancers, dressed like satyrs, and wearing crowns of gold; in the midst of whom was a pantomime, clothed in a female garb, whose business it was, with his looks and gestures, to insult the vanquished; a long train of persons followed, carrying perfumes; after them came the general, dressed in purple, embroidered with gold, with a crown of laurel on his head, a branch of laurel in his right hand, and in his left an ivory sceptre, with an eagle on the top, his face painted with vermilion, and a golden ball hanging from his neck on his breast; he stood upright in a gilded chariot, adorned with ivory, and drawn by four white horses, attended by his relations, and a great crowd of citizens, all in white. His children rode in the chariot along with him; his lieutenants and military tribunes, commonly by his side. After the general followed the consuls and senators, on foot; and the whole procession was closed by the victorious army drawn up in order, crowned with laurel, and decorated with the gifts which they had received for their valour, singing their own and their general's praises. The triumphal procession was not confined to the Romans; the Greeks had a similar custom; for the conquerors used to make a procession through the middle of their city, crowned with garlands, repeating hymns and songs, and brandishing their spears; the captives followed in chains, and all their spoils were exposed to public view.

The great Apostle of the Gentiles alludes to these splendid triumphal scenes in his Epistle to the Ephesians, where he mentions the glorious ascension of his Redeemer into heaven: "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men," Eph. iv, 8. These words are a quotation from the sixty-eighth Psalm, where David in spirit describes the ascension of Messiah in very glowing colours: "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive," or an immense number of captives; "thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also; that the Lord God might dwell among them. Blessed be the Lord, who daily loadeth us with his benefits, even the God of our salvation. Selah," Psalm lxxviii, 17-19. Knowing the deep impression which such an allusion is calculated to make on the mind of a people familiarly acquainted with triumphal scenes, the Apostle returns to it in his Epistle to the Colossians, which was written about the same time: "Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it," Col. ii, 15. After obtaining a complete victory over all his enemies, he ascended in splendour and triumph into his Father's presence on the clouds of heaven, the chariots of the Most High, thousands of holy angels attending in his train; he led the

devil and all his angels, together with sin, the world, and death, as his spoils of war, and captives in chains, and exposed them to open contempt and shame, in the view of all his angelic attendants, triumphing like a glorious conqueror over them, in virtue of his cross, upon which he made complete satisfaction for sin, and by his own strength, without the assistance of any creature, destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. And as mighty princes were accustomed to scatter largesses among the people, and reward their companions in arms with a liberal hand, when, laden with the spoils of vanquished nations, they returned in triumph to their capital; so the Conqueror of death and hell, when he ascended far above all heavens, and sat down in the midst of the throne, shed forth blessings of his grace and Holy Spirit, upon people of every tongue and of every nation.

The officers and soldiers, also, were rewarded according to their merit. Among the Romans, the noblest reward which a soldier could receive, was the crown, made of leaves. Alluding to this high distinction, the Apostle says to his son Timothy, "I have fought a good fight; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing;" 2 Tim. iv, 7, 8. And lest any one should imagine that the Christian's crown is perishable in its nature, and soon fades away, like a crown of oak leaves, the Apostle Peter assures the faithful soldier of Christ that his crown is infinitely more valuable and lasting: "Ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away," 1 Peter v, 4. And this account is confirmed by St. James: "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him," James i, 12. The military crowns were conferred by the general in presence of his army; and such as received them, after a public eulogium on their valour, were placed next his person. The Christian also receives his unmerited reward from the hand of the Captain of his salvation: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life," Rev. ii, 10. And, like the brave veteran of ancient times, he is promoted to a place near his Lord: "To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne," Rev. iii, 21.

TROAS, a city of Phrygia, or of Mysia, upon the Hellespont, having the old city of Troy to the north, and that of Assos to the south. Sometimes the name of Troas is put for the province, wherein the city of Troy stood. St. Paul was at Troas, when he had the vision of the Macedonian inviting him to come and preach in that kingdom, Acts xvi, 8. Beside this, the Apostle was several times at Troas; but we know nothing particular of his transactions there, Acts xx, 5, 6; 2 Cor. ii, 14; 2 Tim. iv, 13.

TROPHIMUS, a disciple of St. Paul, and an Ephesian by birth. He came from Ephesus to Corinth with the Apostle, and kept him company in his whole journey from Corinth to Jerusalem, A. D. 58, Acts xx, 4. When St. Paul was in the temple there, the Jews laid hold of him, crying out, "Men of Israel, help; this is the man that teacheth all men every where against the people, and the law, and this place; and farther, brought Greeks also into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place," Acts xxi, 28, 29. And this they said, because certain Jews of Ephesus having seen Trophimus with St. Paul in the city, whom they looked upon as a Gentile, imagined that St. Paul had introduced him into the temple. The whole city was immediately in an uproar, and St. Paul was secured. Trophimus afterward accompanied St. Paul; for that Apostle writes to Timothy, that he had left Trophimus sick at Miletus, 2 Tim. iv, 20.

TRUMPET. The Lord commanded Moses to make two trumpets of beaten silver, to be employed in calling the people together when they were to decamp, Num. x, 2, 3, &c. They also chiefly made use of these trumpets, to proclaim the beginning of the civil year, the beginning of the Sabbatical year, and the beginning of the jubilee, Lev. xxv, 9, 10. Josephus says, that these trumpets were near a cubit long; and had a tube, or pipe, of the thickness of a common flute. Their mouths were only wide enough to be blown into, and their ends were like those of a modern trumpet. At first there were but two in the camp, but afterward a greater number were made. Even in the time of Joshua there were seven of them, Joshua vi, 4. At the dedication of the temple of Solomon six-score priests sounded as many trumpets, 2 Chron. v, 12. Beside the sacred trumpets of the temple, the use of which was restrained to the priests only, in war there were others, which the generals sometimes employed for gathering their troops together. For example, Ehud sounded the trumpet, to assemble the Israelites against the Moabites, who oppressed them, and whose king Eglon he had lately slain, Judg. vi, 27. Gideon took a trumpet in his hand, and gave every one of his people one, when he assaulted the Midianites, Judges vii, 2, 16. Joab sounded the trumpet, to give the signal of retreat to his soldiers, in the battle against those of Abner's party, and in that against Absalom; and lastly, in the pursuit of Sheba the son of Bichri, 2 Sam. ii, 28; xviii, 16; xx, 22. The feast of trumpets was kept on the first day of the seventh month of the sacred year, the first of the civil year. See Music.

929TRUTH is used, 1. In opposition to falsehood, lies, or deceit, Prov. xii, 17, &c. 2. It signifies fidelity, sincerity, and punctuality in keeping promises; and to truth taken in this sense is generally joined mercy or kindness, as in Gen. xxiv, 27, and other places of Scripture. 3. Truth is put for the true doctrine of the Gospel, Galatians iii, 1. 4. Truth is put for the substance of the types and ceremonies of the law, John i, 17.

TUBAL, the fifth son of Japheth. The Scripture commonly joins together Tubal and Meshech, which makes it thought that they peopled countries bordering upon each other. The Chaldee interpreters, by Tubal and Meshech understand Italy and Asia, or rather Ausonia. Josephus accounts them to be Iberia and Cappadocia. St. Jerom affirms that Tubal represents the Spaniards, heretofore called Iberians. Bochart is very copious in proving, that by Meshech and Tubal are intended the Muscovites and the Tibarenians.

TUBAL-CAIN, or THUBAL-CAIN, son of Lamech the bigamous, and of Zillah, Gen. ix, 29. The Scriptures tell us, that he was the father and inventor, or master, of the art of forging and managing iron, and of making all kinds of iron-work. There is great reason to believe that this was the Vulcan of the Heathens.

TURTLE, ἰστ, τρυγὼν, Gen. xv, 9; Lev. i, 14; v, 7, 11; xii, 6, 8; xiv, 22, 30; xv, 14, 29; Num. vi, 10; Psalm lxxiv, 19; Cant. ii, 12; Jer. viii, 7; τρυγὼν, Luke ii, 24. We have the authority of the Septuagint, the Targum, and of all the ancient interpreters, for understanding this of the turtle. Indeed, it is one of those evident instances in which the name of the bird is by onomatopœia formed from its note or cry. The turtle is mentioned among migratory birds by Jeremiah viii, 7, and in this sense differs from the rest of its family, which are all stationary. The fact to which the prophet alludes is attested by Aristotle in these words: "The pigeon and the dove are always present, but the turtle only in summer: that bird is not seen in winter." And in another part of his work, he asserts that the dove remains, while the turtle migrates. Varro, and other ancient writers, make the like statement. Thus Solomon, Cant. ii, 12, mentions the return of this bird as one of the indications of spring: "The voice of the turtle is heard in the land." See Dove.

TYCHICUS, a disciple of St. Paul, whom the Apostle often employed to carry his letters to the several churches. He was of the province of Asia, and accompanied St. Paul, when, in A. D. 58, he made his journey from Corinth to Jerusalem, Acts xx, 4. It was he that carried the epistle to the Colossians, that to the Ephesians, and the first to Timothy. St. Paul did not send him merely to carry his letters, but also to learn the state of the churches, and to bring him an account of them. Wherefore he calls him his dear brother, a faithful minister of the Lord, and his companion in the service of God, Eph. vi, 21, 22; Col. iv, 7, 8. He had thoughts also of sending him into Crete, to preside over that church in the absence of Titus, iii, 12.

TYPE. This word is not frequently used in Scripture; but what it signifies is supposed to be very frequently implied. We usually consider a type as an example, pattern, or general similitude to a person, event, or thing which is to come: and in this it differs from a representation, memorial, or commemoration of an event, &c, which is past. The Spirit of God has adopted a variety of means to indicate his perfect foreknowledge of all events, and his power to control them. This is sometimes declared by express verbal prophecy; sometimes by specific actions performed by divine command; and sometimes by those peculiar events, in the lives of individuals, and the history or religious observances of the Israelites, which were caused to bear a designed reference to some parts of the Gospel history. The main point, says Chevallier, in an inquiry into these historical types, is to establish the fact of a preconcerted connection between the two series of events. No similarity, in itself, is sufficient to prove such a correspondence. Even those recorded in Scripture are recorded under very different circumstances. If the first event be declared to be typical, at the time when it occurs, and the second correspond with the prediction so delivered, there can be no doubt that the correspondence was designed. If, before the occurrence of the second event, there be delivered a distinct prophecy, that it will happen, and will correspond with some previous event; the fulfilment of the prophecy furnishes an intrinsic proof, that the person who gave it spake by divine inspiration. It may not, from this fact, follow, that the two events were connected by a design formed before either of them occurred: but it certainly does follow, that the second event, in some measure, had respect to the first; and that whatever degree of connection was, by such a prophet, assumed to exist, did really exist. If, again, no specific declaration be made, respecting the typical character of any event or person, until after the second event has occurred, which is then declared to have been prefigured; the fact of preconcerted connection will rest solely upon the authority of the person who advances the assertion. But, if we know, from other sources, that his words are the words of truth, our only inquiry will be, if he either distinctly asserts, or plainly infers, the existence of a designed correspondence. The fact, then, of a preconcerted connection between two series of events, is capable of being established in three ways: and the historical types may be accordingly arranged in three principal divisions. Some of them afford intrinsic evidence, that the Scriptures, which record them, are given by inspiration of God; the others can be proved to exist only by assuming that fact: but all, when once established, display the astonishing power and wisdom of God; and the importance of that scheme of redemption, which was ushered into the world with such magnificent preparations. In contemplating this wonderful system, we discern one great intention interwoven, not only into the verbal prophecies and extraordinary events of the history of the Israelites, but into the ordinary transactions of the lives of selected individuals, even

from the creation of the world. Adam was “the figure of him that was to come,” Romans v, 14. Melchisedec was “made like unto the Son of God,” Heb. vii, 3. Abraham, in the course of events in which he was engaged by the especial command of Heaven, was enabled to see Christ’s day, John viii, 56; and Isaac was received from the dead “in a figure,” Heb. xi, 19. At a later period, the paschal lamb was ordained to be sacrificed, not only as a memorial of the immediate deliverance, which it was instituted to procure and to commemorate, but also as a continued memorial of that which was to be “fulfilled in the kingdom of God,” Luke xxii, 16. Moses was raised up to deliver the people of Israel; to be to them a lawgiver, a prophet, a priest; and to possess the regal authority, if not the title of king. But, during the early period of his life, he was himself taught, that one great prophet should be raised up like unto him: before his death he delivered the same prophecy to the people: and, after that event, the Israelites continually looked for that faithful prophet, who should return answer to their inquiries, 1 Macc. iv, 46; xiv, 41. Their prophets all pointed to some greater lawgiver, who should introduce a new law into their hearts, and inscribe them upon their minds, Jer. xxxi, 33. The whole people of Israel were also made, in some instances, designedly representative of Christ: and the events, which occurred in their national history, distinctly referred to him. During their wanderings in the wilderness, God left not himself without witness, which should bear reference to the great scheme of the Gospel. They ate spiritual meat. It was an emblem of the true bread of life, which came down from heaven, John vi, 32. “They drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ,” 1 Cor. x, 4. They were destroyed of serpents; and a brazen serpent was lifted up on a pole, that whosoever looked might live. It was a sensible figure of the Son of man, who was, in like manner to be lifted up; “that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life,” John iii, 15. Beside, their religious ordinances were only “a figure for the time then present,” Heb. ix, 9. Their tabernacle was made after the pattern of heavenly things, Heb. viii, 5; Exod. xxv, 9, 40; and was intended to prefigure the “greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands,” Heb. ix, 11. The high priest was a living representative of the great “High Priest of our profession,” Heb. iii, 1: and the Levitical sacrifices plainly had respect to the one great sacrifice for sins. Joshua the son of Nun represented Jesus in name: and by his earthly conquests in some measure prefigured the heavenly triumphs of his Lord. In a subsequent period, David was no indistinct type of “the Messiah the Prince,” Dan. ix, 25, for a long time humbled, and at length triumphant over his enemies. And the peaceable dominion of Solomon prefigured that eternal rest and peace, which remaineth to the people of God. In a still later age, the miraculous preservation of the Prophet Jonah displayed a sign, which was fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ. And when the temple was rebuilt, Joshua, the son of Josedech, the high priest,

and his fellows, were set forth as “men of sign,” representatives of the Branch, which should, in the fulness of time, be raised up to the stem of Jesse, Zech. iii, 8; Isa. xi, 1. The illustration, then, to be derived from the historical types of the Old Testament, is found diffused over the whole period, which extends from the creation of the world, to the time when vision and prophecy were sealed. And all the light, which emanates from so many various points, is concentrated in the person of Christ.

TYRANNUS. It is said in Acts xix, 9, that St. Paul being at Ephesus, and seeing that the Jews to whom he preached, instead of being converted, were rather more hardened and obstinate, he withdrew from their society, nor went to preach in their synagogue, but taught every day in the school of one Tyrannus. It is inquired, Who was this Tyrannus? Some think him to have been a prince or great lord, who accommodated the Apostle with his house, in which to receive and instruct his disciples. But the generality conclude, that Tyrannus was a converted Gentile, a friend of St. Paul, to whom he withdrew.

TYRE, or Tyrus, was a famous city of Phenicia. Its Hebrew name is צור or צר, which signifies a rock. The city of Tyre was allotted to the tribe of Asher, Joshua xix, 29, with the other maritime cities of the same coast; but it does not appear that the Asherites ever drove out the Canaanites. Isaiah, xxiii, 12, calls Tyre the daughter of Sidon, that is, a colony from it. Homer never speaks of Tyre, but only of Sidon. Josephus says, that Tyre was built not above two hundred and forty years before the temple of Solomon; which would be in A. M. 2760, two hundred years after Joshua. Tyre was twofold, insular and continental. Insular Tyre was certainly the most ancient; for this it was which was noticed by Joshua: the continental city, however, as being more commodiously situated, first grew into consideration, and assumed the name of Palætyrus, or Old Tyre. Want of sufficient attention to this distinction, has embarrassed both the Tyrian chronology and geography. Insular Tyre was confined to a small rocky island, eight hundred paces long, and four hundred broad, and could never exceed two miles in circumference. But Tyre, on the opposite coast, about half a mile from the sea, was a city of vast extent, since many centuries after its demolition by Nebuchadnezzar, the scattered rains measured nineteen miles round, as we learn from Pliny and Strabo. Of these, the most curious and surprising are, the cisterns of Roselayne, designed to supply the city with water; of which there are three still entire; about one or two furlongs from the sea, so well described by Maundrell, for their 931 curious construction and solid masonry. Old Tyre withstood the mighty Assyrian power, having been besieged in vain, by Shalmaneser, for five years; although he cut off their supplies of water from the cisterns; which they remedied by digging wells within the city. It afterward held out thirteen



years against Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and was at length taken; but not until the Tyrians had removed their effects to the insular town, and left nothing but the bare walls to the victor, which he demolished. What completed the destruction of the city was, that Alexander afterward made use of these materials to build a prodigious causeway, or isthmus, above half a mile long, to the insular city, which revived, as the phoenix, from the ashes of the old, and grew to great power and opulence, as a maritime state; and which he stormed after a most obstinate siege of five months. Pococke observes, that "there are no signs of the ancient city; and as it is a sandy shore, the face of every thing is altered, and the great aqueduct is in many parts almost buried in the sand." Thus has been fulfilled the prophecy of Ezekiel: "Thou shalt be built no more: though thou be sought for, yet shalt thou never be found again," Ezek. xxvi, 21. The fate of insular Tyre has been no less remarkable. When Alexander stormed the city, he set fire to it. This circumstance was foretold. "Tyre did build herself a strong hold, and heaped up silver as the dust, and fine gold as the mire of the streets. Behold, the Lord will cast her out, and he will smite her power in the sea, and she shall be devoured with fire," Zech. ix, 3, 4. After this terrible calamity, Tyre again retrieved her losses. Only eighteen years after, she had recovered such a share of her ancient commerce and opulence, as enabled her to stand a siege of fourteen months against Antigonus, before he could reduce the city; but after this, Tyre fell alternately under the dominion of the kings of Syria and Egypt, and then of the Romans, until it was taken by the Saracens, about A. D. 639, retaken by the Crusaders, A. D. 1124; and at length sacked and razed by the Mamelukes of Egypt, with Sidon, and other strong towns, that they might no longer harbour the Christians, A. D. 1289.

The final desolation of Tyre was thus foretold: "I will scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock: it shall be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea: for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God." "I will make thee like the top of a rock: thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon: thou shalt be built no more; for I the Lord have spoken it, saith the Lord God." Nothing can be more literally and astonishingly executed than this sentence. Huetius relates of one Hadrianus Parvillierius, that "when he approached the ruins of Tyre, and beheld the rocks stretched forth to the sea, and the great stones scattered up and down on the shore, made clean and smooth by the sun and waves and wind, and useful only for the drying of fishermen's nets, many of which happened at that time to be spread thereon, it brought to his memory the prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Tyre, that such should be its fate." Maundrell, who visited the Holy Land, A. D. 1697, describes it thus: "This city, standing in the sea upon a peninsula, promises at a distance, something very magnificent; but when you come to it, you find no similitude of that glory for which it was so renowned in

ancient times, and which the Prophet Ezekiel describes, xxvi, xxvii, xxviii. On the north side it has an old Turkish ungarrisoned castle; beside which, you see nothing here but a mere Babel of broken walls, pillars, vaults, &c; there being not so much as one entire house left! Its present inhabitants are only a few poor wretches harbouring themselves in the vaults, and subsisting chiefly by fishing: who seem to be preserved in this place by Divine Providence, as a visible argument how God has fulfilled his word concerning Tyre, namely, that it should be as the top of a rock; a place for fishers to dry their nets upon, Ezek. xxvi, 14." Hasselquist, who saw it since, in A. D. 1751, observes as follows: "None of those cities which were formerly famous are so totally ruined as Tyre, now called Zur; except Troy. Zur now scarcely can be called a miserable village, though it was formerly Tyre, the queen of the sea. Here are about ten inhabitants, Turks and Christians, who live by fishing." Bruce, who visited this country about eighty years after Maundrell, says, that "passing by Tyre from curiosity, I came to be a mournful witness of the truth of that prophecy, that Tyre, the queen of nations, should be a rock for fishers to dry their nets on." Mr. Buckingham, who visited it in 1816, represents it as containing about eight hundred substantial stone-built houses, and from five to eight thousand inhabitants. But Mr. Jowett, on the authority of the Greek archbishop, reduces this number to less than four thousand; namely, one thousand two hundred Greek Catholics, one hundred Maronites, one hundred Greeks, one thousand Montonalis, and one hundred Turks. Mr. Jowett observed numerous and beautiful columns stretched along the beach, or standing in fragments half buried in the sand, that has been accumulating for ages: "the broken aqueduct, and the ruins which appear in its neighbourhood, exist as an affecting monument of the fragile and transitory nature of earthly grandeur." Mr. Joliffe states, that there now exist scarcely any traces of this once powerful city. "Some miserable cabins, ranged in irregular lines, dignified with the name of streets, and a few buildings of a rather better description, occupied by the officers of government, compose nearly the whole of the town. It still makes, indeed, some languishing efforts at commerce, and contrives to export annually to Alexandria cargoes of silk and tobacco; but the amount merits no consideration. The noble dust of Alexander, traced by the imagination till found stopping a beer barrel, would scarcely afford a stronger contrast of grandeur and debasement, than Tyre, at the period of being besieged by that conqueror, and the modern town of Tsour erected on its ashes."

932As commercial cities, says Mansford, ancient Alexandria and London may be considered as approaching the nearest to Tyre. But Alexandria, during the whole of her prosperous days, was subject to foreign rule; and London, great as are her commerce and her wealth, and possessing as she does almost a monopoly of what has in all ages been the most enviable and

most lucrative branch of trade, that with the east, does not centre in herself, as Tyre did, without a rival and without competition, the trade of all nations, and hold an absolute monopoly, not of one, but of every branch of commerce. For the long period of a thousand years, not a single production of the east passed to the west, or of the west to the east, but by the merchants of Tyre. Nor for many ages were any ships found but those of Tyre daring enough to pass the straits of the Red Sea on one side, or of the Mediterranean on the other. While the vessels of other countries were groping along their coasts, clinging to their landmarks, and frightened at a breeze, the ships of Tyre were found from Spain, if not from Britain, on the west, to the coast of Malabar and Sofala on the east and south. No wonder that her merchants were princes, and that they lived in a style of magnificence unknown in any other country in the same age; or that she should be considered a desirable prey by the conquerors of the times. But enterprise and wealth did not alone complete the character of the Tyrians; they had an undoubted claim to valour of no common order. Their city, which possessed scarcely any territory beyond their own walls, maintained a siege of thirteen years (the longest in history except that of Ashdod) against the whole power of Babylon; and another of seven months against Alexander, whose successes had afforded no instance of similar delay. And in neither case had the captors much to boast of, as the Tyrians had shipped off their most valuable property to Carthage; and in the former particularly, as has been already related, they so effectually secured or sacrificed the whole, that the soldiers of Nebuchadnezzar found nothing to reward them for their length of labour, during which, by excessive toil and heat, "their heads were made bald, and their very shoulders peeled," but vacant streets, and houses already sacked. Carthage, Utica, and Cadiz, are celebrated monuments of the power of Tyre on the Mediterranean, and in the west. She extended her navigation even into the ocean, and carried her commerce beyond England to the north, and the Canaries to the south. Her connections with the east, though less known, were not less considerable; the islands of Tyrus and Aradus, (the modern Barhain,) in the Persian Gulf. The cities of Faran and Phœnicum Oppidum, on the Red Sea, in ruins even in the time of the Greeks, prove that the Tyrians had long frequented the coast of Arabia and the Indian Sea. But, through the vicissitudes of time, Tyre, reduced to a miserable village, has no other trade than the exportation of a few sacks of corn and raw cotton, nor any merchant, says Volney, but a single Greek factor in the service of the French Saide, (Sidon,) who scarcely makes sufficient profit to maintain his family. In allusion to Tyre in her better days, Forbes observes, when speaking of Surat, "The bazars, filled with costly merchandise; picturesque and interesting groups of natives on elephants, camels, horses, and mules; strangers from all parts of the globe, in their respective costume; vessels building on the stocks, others navigating the river; together with Turks, Persians, and Armenians, on

Arabian chargers; European ladies in splendid carriages, the Asiatic females in hackeries drawn by oxen; and the motley appearance of the English and nabob's troops on the fortifications, remind us of the following description of Tyre, "O thou that art situate at the entry of the sea, which art a merchant of the people for many isles," &c, Ezek. xxvii, 3. This is a true picture of oriental commerce in ancient times; and a very exact description of the port and the bazars of Surat, at the present day."

Dr. Vincent has given the following able illustration of the trade of Tyre as described in Ezek. xxvii, which must be considered as one of the most ample and early accounts extant. The learned author has rendered the Hebrew names into others better known in the geography of more recent times:--Tyre produced from Hermon, and the mountains near it, fir for planking; and from Libanus, cedars for masts. From Bashan, east of the sea of Galilee, oaks for oars. From Greece, or the Grecian isles, ivory to adorn the benches or the waists of the galleys. From Egypt, linen, ornamented with different colours, for sails, or flags, or ensigns. From Peloponnesus, blue and purple cloths for awnings. From Sidon and Aradus, mariners; but Tyre itself furnished pilots and commanders. From Gebal, or Biblos, on the coast between Tripolis and Berytus, caulkers. From Persia and Africa, mercenary troops. From Aradus, the troops that garrisoned Tyre with the Gamadim. From Tarshish, or by distant voyages toward the west, and toward the east, great wealth, iron, tin, lead, and silver. Tin implies Britain or Spain, or at least a voyage beyond the Straits of Hercules. From Greece, and the countries bordering on Pontus, slaves, and brass ware. From Armenia, horses, horsemen, and mules. From the Gulf of Persia, and the isles within that gulf, horns (tusks) of ivory, and ebony. The export to these isles was the manufacture of Tyre. From Syria, emeralds, purple, broided work, fine linen, coral, and agate. The exports to Syria were the manufactures of Tyre in great quantities. From Judah and Israel, the finest wheat, honey, oil, and balsam. From Damascus, wine of Chalybon, (the country bordering on the modern Aleppo,) and wool in the fleece. The exports to Damascus were costly and various manufactures. From the tribe of Dan, situated nearest to the Philistines, the produce of Arabia, bright or wrought iron, cassia or cinnamon, and the calamus aramaticus. In conducting the 933transport of these articles, Dan went to and fro, that is, formed or conducted the caravans. By one interpretation, they are said to come from Uzal; and Uzal is said to be Sana, the capital of Yemen, or Arabia Felix. From the Gulf of Persia, rich cloth for the decoration of chariots or horsemen. From Arabia Petraea and Hedjaz, lambs, and rams, and goats. From Sabea and Oman, the best of spices. From India, gold, and precious stones. From Mesopotamia, from Carrhae, and Babylonia, the Assyrians brought all sorts of exquisite things; that is, fine manufacture, blue cloth, and broided work, or fabric of various colours, in chests of

cedar bound with cords, containing rich apparel. If these articles were obtained farther from the east, may they not be the fabrics of India, first brought to Assyria by the Gulf of Persia, or by caravans from Karmania and the Indus, and then conveyed by the Assyrians, in other caravans, to Tyre and Syria? In this view, the care of package, the chests of cedar, and the cording of the chests, are all correspondent to the nature of such a transport. From Tarshish the ships came that rejoiced in the markets of Tyre: they replenished the city, and made it glorious in the midst of the sea, Ezek. xxvii, 5–25. Dr. Vincent observes, that from the Tarshish last mentioned the ships returned to the ports in the Red Sea; as from the nineteenth to the twenty-fourth verse every particular relates to the east, while that referred to in the twelfth implies the west--Spain, or beyond. We have here some light thrown on the obscurity which surrounds the situation of this distant and unknown place. There is, indeed, a clear reference to two distinct places, or parts of the world, denominated Tarshish; perhaps from those very circumstances, their distance, and the little that was known respecting them. That one was situated westward, and reached by a passage across the Mediterranean, is certain from other parts of Scripture; that the other was eastward, or southward, on the coast of Arabia, India, or Africa, is equally certain. See Tarshish, and Ophir.

UNBELIEF or INFIDELITY is a want of credence in the word of God; or it may be defined, a calling in question the divine veracity, in what God hath either testified, promised, or threatened; and thus it is the opposite of faith, which consists in crediting what God hath said, John iii, 18, 33. It is said that the Jews could not enter into the promised land, “because of their unbelief,” Heb. iii, 18, 19. And the Apostle, teaching the believing Hebrews what instruction they should deduce from that portion of the history of their forefathers, says, as the words literally translated would run, “We are evangelized as well as they were; but the word which they heard did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it,” Heb. iv, 2. The meaning is, We Christians are favoured with the good news of the heavenly rest, as well as Israel in the wilderness were with the good news of the earthly rest in Canaan; but the word which they heard concerning that rest did not profit them, because they did not believe it. Hence it appears that faith and unbelief are not confined to the spiritual truths and promises of the Gospel of Christ, but respect any truth which God may reveal, or any promise which he may make even concerning temporal things. It is a crediting or discrediting God in what he says, whatever be the subject. Christ could not do many mighty works in his own country, because of their unbelief, Matt. vi, 5, 6; their mean opinion of him, and contempt of his miracles, rendered them unfit objects to have miracles wrought upon or among them. The Apostles’ distrust of Christ’s promises, of enabling them to cast out devils, rendered them incapable of casting one

out, Mark xvii, 16; and St. Peter's distrust of his Master's power occasioned his sinking in the water, Matt. xiv, 30, 31. The unbelief for which the Jews were broken off from their being a church was their denial of Christ's Messiahship, their contempt and refusal of him, and their violent persecution of his cause and members, Rom. xi, 20.

Adverting to the infidelity which prevailed among the educated class of Heathens when Christianity first appeared in the world, Dr. Neander observes:--It was Christianity which first presented religion under the form of objective truth, as a system of doctrines perfectly independent of all individual conceptions of man's imagination, and calculated to meet the moral and religious wants of man's nature, and in that nature every where to find some point on which it might attach itself. The religions of antiquity, on the contrary, consist of many elements of various kinds, which, either by the skill of the first promulgator, or, in the length of years, by the impress of national peculiarities, were moulded together into one whole. By the transmission of tales, half mythical, and half historical, by forms and statutes bearing the impress of religious feelings or ideas, mingled with multifarious poems, which showed a powerful imaginative spirit, rugged indeed, or, if animated by the spirit of beauty, at least devoid of that of holiness,--all these varied materials were interwoven so completely into all the characters, customs, and relations of social life, that the religious matter could no longer be separated from the mixed mass, nor be disentangled from the individual nature of the life and political character of each people with which it was interwoven. There was no religion generally adapted to human nature, only religions fitted to each people. The Divinity appeared here, not as free and elevated above nature; not as that which, overruling nature, might form and illuminate the nature of man; but was lowered to the level of nature, and made subservient to it. Through this principle of deifying the powers of nature, by which every exertion of bare power, even though immoral, might be received among the objects of religious veneration, the idea of holiness which beams forth from man's conscience must continually have been thrown into the back ground and overshadowed. The old lawgivers were well aware how closely the maintenance of an individual state religion depends on the maintenance of the individual character of the people, and their civil and domestic virtues. They were well aware that when once this union is dissolved no power can restore it again. Therefore we find, especially in Rome, where politics were the ruling passion, a watchfulness after the most punctilious observance of traditional religious ceremonies, and a jealous aversion to any innovations in religion. The belief of a divine origin of all existence is a first principle in man's nature, and he is irresistibly impelled to ascend from many to One. This very feeling showed itself even in the polytheism of national religions, under the idea of a highest God, or a father of the

gods. Among those who gave themselves up to the consideration of divine things, and to reflection upon them, this idea of an original unity must have been more clearly recognized, and must have formed the centre point of all their inward religious life and thought. The imagination of the people was to be engaged with the numerous powers and energies flowing forth from that one highest Being, while to the contemplation of that unity, only a small number of exalted spirits, the initiated leaders of the multitude, could elevate themselves. The one God was the God of philosophers alone. The ruling opinion of all the thinking men of antiquity, from which all religious legislation proceeded, was, that pure religious truth could not be proposed to the multitude, but only such a mixture of fiction, poetry, and truth, as would serve to represent religious notions in such a manner that they might make an impression on men, whose only guide was their senses. The principle of a so called *fraus pia* [pious fraud] was prevalent in all the legislation of antiquity. But how miserable would be the case of mankind, if the higher bond, connecting human affairs with heaven, could only be united by means of lies; if lies were necessary in order to restrain the greater portion of mankind from evil! And what could their religion in such a case effect? It could not impart holy dispositions to the inward heart of man; it could only restrain the open outbreaking of evil that existed in the heart, by the power of fear. Falsehood, which cannot be arbitrarily imposed on human nature, would never have been able to obtain this influence, had not a truth, which is sure to make itself felt by human nature, been working through it,--had not the belief in an unseen God, on whom man universally feels himself dependent, and to whom he feels himself attracted,--had not the impulse toward an invisible world, which is implanted in the human heart,--been able to work also through this covering of superstition. The geographer Strabo thinks that, in the same manner that mythical tales and fables are needful for children, so also they are necessary for the uneducated and uninformed, who are in some sort children, and also for those who are half educated; for even with them reason is not sufficiently powerful, and they are not able to free themselves from the habits they have acquired as children. This is, indeed, a sad condition of humanity, when the seed of holiness, which can develop itself only in the whole course of a life, cannot be strewn in the heart of the child, and when mature reason must destroy that which was planted in the early years of infancy! when holy truth cannot form the foundation of the future development of life from the earliest dawn of childish consciousness! The thinking Roman statesmen also of the time at which Christianity appeared, as Varro, for instance, distinguish between the *theologia philosophica* [philosophical theology] and the *theologia civilis*, [civil theology,] which contradicts the principles of the former, as Cotta in Cicero distinguished between the belief of Cotta, and the belief of the Pontifex. The philosopher required in religion a persuasion grounded on reasoning; the citizen, the statesman, followed

the tradition of his ancestors without inquiry. Suppose now this *theologia civilis*, and this *theologia philosophica* to proceed together, without a man's wishing to set the opposition between the two in a very clear light to himself; that the citizen and the statesman, the philosopher and the man, could be united in the same individual with contradictory sentiments, (a division which in the same man is very unnatural,) and then he would perhaps say, "Philosophical reason conducts to a different result from that which is established by the state religion; but the latter has in its favour the good fortune which the state has enjoyed in the exercise of religion handed down from our ancestors. Let us follow experience even where we do not thoroughly understand." Thus speaks Cotta, and thus also many Romans of education in his time, either more or less explicitly. Or perhaps we may suppose, that men openly expressed this contradiction, and did not scruple to assign the pure truth to the *theologia philosophica*, and to declare the *theologia civilis* only a matter of politics. In the east, which is less subject to commotions, where tranquil habits of life were more common, and where a mystical spirit of contemplation, accompanying and spiritualizing the symbolical religion of the people, was more prevalent than an intellectual cultivation opposed to it, and developing itself independently, it was possible that this kind of esoteric and exoteric religion should proceed hand in hand without change for many centuries. But it was otherwise with the more stirring spirits and habits of the west. Here this independently proceeding development of the intellect must have been at open war with the religion of the people; and as intellectual culture spread itself more widely, so also must a disbelief of the popular religion have been more extensively diffused; and, in consequence of the intercourse between the people and the educated classes, this disbelief must also have found its way at last among the people themselves; more especially since, as this perception of the nothingness of the popular religion spread itself more widely, there would naturally be many who would not, with the precaution of the men of old, hide their new illumination from the multitude, but would think themselves bound to procure for it new adherents, without any regard to the injury of which they might be laying the foundations, without inquiring of themselves, whether they had any thing to offer to the people in the room of that of which they robbed them; in the room of their then source of tranquillity under the storms of life; instead of that which taught them moderation under affliction; and, lastly, in the place of their then counterpoise against the power of wild desires and passions. Men saw, in the religious systems of different nations which then came into contact with each other in the enormous empire of Rome, nothing but utter contradiction and opposition. The philosophical systems also exhibited nothing but opposition of sentiments, and left those who could see in the moral consciousness no criterion of truth to doubt whether there were any such thing or not. In this sense, as representing the opinions



of many eminent and cultivated Romans, with a sneer at all desire for truth, Pilate made the sarcastic inquiry, "What is truth?" Many contented themselves with a shallow lifeless deism, which usually takes its rise where the thirst after a living union with heaven is wanting; a system which, although it denies not the existence of a God, yet drives it as far into the back ground as possible; a listless God! who suffers every thing to take its own course, so that all belief in any inward connection between this Divinity and man, any communication of this Divinity to man, would seem to this system fancy and enthusiasm! The world and human nature remain at least free from God. This belief in God, if we can call it a belief, remains dead and fruitless, exercising no influence over the life of man. The belief in God here produced neither the desire after that ideal perfection of holiness, the contemplation of which shows at the same time to man the corruption of his own nature, so opposite to that holiness; nor that consciousness of guilt by which man, contemplating the holiness of God within him, feels himself estranged from God; nor does this belief impart any lively power of sanctification. Man is not struck by the inquiry, "How shall I, unclean as I am, approach the holy God, and stand before him, when he judges me according to the holy law which he has himself engraven on my conscience? What shall I do to become free from the guilt which oppresses me, and again to attain to communion with him?" To make inquiries such as these, this spirit of deism considers as fanaticism; and it casts away from itself all notions of God's anger, judgments, or punishments, as representations arising only from the limited nature of the human understanding. More lively and penetrating spirits, who felt in the world an infinite Spirit which animated all things, fell into an error of quite an opposite nature to this deism, which removed God too far from the world; namely into a pantheism, which confused God and the world, which was just as little calculated to bestow tranquillity and consolation. They conceived God only as the infinite Being elevated above frail man, and not as being connected with him, attracting him to himself, and lowering himself down to him. It was only the greatness, not the holiness nor the love, of God which filled their souls. Yet the history of all ages proves that man cannot for any length of time disown the desire for religion implanted in his nature. Whenever man, entirely devoted to the world, has for a long time wholly overwhelmed the perception of the Divinity which exists in his nature, and has long entirely estranged himself from divine things, these at last prevail over humanity with greater force. Man feels that something is wanting to his heart, which can be replaced to him by nothing else; he feels a hollowness within him which can never be satisfied by earthly things, and can find satisfaction and blessing suited to his condition in the Divinity alone, and an irresistible desire impels him to seek again his lost connection with Heaven. The times of the dominion of superstition also, as history teaches us, are always times of earthly calamity; for the moral

corruption which accompanies superstition necessarily, also, destroys all the foundations of earthly prosperity. Thus the times in which superstition extended itself among the Romans were those of the downfall of civil freedom, and of public suffering under cruel despots. But, however, the consequences of these evils conducted man, also to their remedy; for by distress from without man is brought to the consciousness of his own weakness, and his dependence on a higher than earthly power; and when he is forsaken by human help, he is compelled to seek it here. Man becomes induced to look upon his misfortunes as the punishments of a higher Being, and to seek for means by which he may secure again for himself the favour of that Being. The need of a connection with Heaven, from which man felt himself estranged, and dissatisfaction with the cold and joyless present, obtained a more ready belief for the picture which mythology presented, of a golden age, when gods and men lived together in intimate union; and warm imaginations looked back on such a state with longing and desire. This belief and this desire, it must be owned, were founded on a great truth which man could rightly apprehend only through Christianity; and this desire was a kind of intimation which pointed to Christianity. From the nature of the case, however, it is clear that a fanatical zeal, where the heat of passion concealed from man the hollowness and falsehood of his faith, might be created for a religion, to which man only betook himself as a refuge in his misery, and in his dread of the abyss of unbelief; a religion which no longer served for the developement of man's nature, and into which, nevertheless, he felt himself driven back from the want of any other; and that men must use every kind of power and art to uphold that which was in danger of falling from its own internal weakness, and to defend that which was unable to defend itself by its own power. Fanaticism was therefore obliged to avail itself of every kind of power in the struggle with Christianity, 936 in order to uphold Heathenism, which was fast sinking by its own weakness. Although the Romans had from the oldest times been noted for their repugnance to all foreign sorts of religious worship, yet this trait of the old Roman character had with many altogether disappeared. Because the old national temples of the Romans had lost their respect, in many dispositions man was inclined to bring in to their assistance foreign modes of worship. Those which obtained the readiest admission were such as consisted of mysterious, symbolical customs, and striking, sounding forms. As is always the case, men looked for some special and higher power in what is dark and mysterious. The very simplicity of Christianity became therefore a ground of hatred to it.

UNICORN, ראם, Num. xxiii, 22; xxiv, 8; Deut. xxxiii, 17; Job xxxix, 9, 10; Psalm xxii, 21; xxix, 6; xcii, 10; Isa. xxxiv, 7. In each of these places it is rendered in the Septuagint μονόκερως, except in Isaiah, where it is ἄδρῶι, the great or mighty ones. Barrow, in his "Travels in Southern Africa," has

given a drawing of the head of the unicorn, "a beast with a single horn projecting from the forehead;" accompanied with such details as, he thinks, offer strong arguments for the existence of such animals in the country of the Bosjesmans. He observes that this creature is represented as a "solid-ungulous animal resembling a horse, with an elegantly shaped body, marked from the shoulders to the flanks with longitudinal stripes or bands." Still he acknowledges that the animal to which the writer of the book of Job, who was no mean natural historian, makes a poetical allusion, has been supposed, with great plausibility, to be the one-horned rhinoceros; and that Moses also very probably meant the rhinoceros, when he mentions the unicorn as having the strength of God.

"There are two animals," says Bruce, "named frequently in Scripture, without naturalists being agreed what they are. The one is the behemoth, the other the reem; both mentioned as types of strength, courage, and independence on man; and, as such, exempted from the ordinary lot of beasts, to be subdued by him, or reduced under his dominion. The behemoth, then, I take to be the elephant; his history is well known, and my only business is with the reem, which I suppose to be the rhinoceros. The derivation of this word, both in the Hebrew and Ethiopic, seems to be from erectness, or standing straight. This is certainly no particular quality in the animal itself, which is not more, nor even so much erect as many other quadrupeds, for its knees are rather crooked; but it is from the circumstance and manner in which his horn is placed. The horns of all other animals are inclined to some degree of parallelism with the nose, or os frontis, [front bone.] The horn of the rhinoceros alone is erect and perpendicular to this bone, on which it stands at right angles; thereby possessing a greater purchase or power, as a lever, than any horn could possibly have in any other position. This situation of the horn is very happily alluded to in the sacred writings: 'My horn shalt thou exalt like the horn of a reem,' Psalm xcii, 10. And the horn here alluded to is not wholly figurative, but was really an ornament worn by great men in the days of victory, preferment, or rejoicing, when they were anointed with new, sweet, or fresh oil; a circumstance which David joins with that of erecting the horn. Balaam, a priest of Midian, and so in the neighbourhood of the haunts of the rhinoceros, and intimately connected with Ethiopia, for they themselves were shepherds of that country, in a transport, from contemplating the strength of Israel, whom he was brought to curse, says, that they had as it were the strength of the reem, Num. xxiii, 22. Job, xxxix, 9, 10, makes frequent allusion to his great strength, ferocity, and indocility. Isaiah, xxxiv, 7, who of all the prophets seems to have known Egypt and Ethiopia the best, when prophesying about the destruction of Idumea, says, that the reem shall come down with the fat cattle: a proof that he knew his habitation was in the neighbourhood. In the same manner as when

foretelling the desolation of Egypt, he mentions, as one manner of effecting it, the bringing down the fly from Ethiopia, Isa. vii, 18, 19, to meet the cattle in the desert and among the bushes, and destroy them there, where that insect did not ordinarily come but on command, Exodus viii, 22, and where the cattle fled every year, to save themselves from that insect.

“The rhinoceros in Geez is called arwé harish, and in the Amharic auraris, both which names signify the large wild beast with the horn. This would seem as if applied to the species that had but one horn. The Ethiopic text renders the word reem, arwe harish, and this the Septuagint translates μονόκερωσ, or unicorn. If the Abyssinian rhinoceros had invariably two horns, it seems to me improbable the Septuagint would call him μονόκερωσ, especially as they must have seen an animal of this kind exposed at Alexandria in their time, when first mentioned in history, at an exhibition given to Ptolemy Philadelphus, at his accession to the crown, before the death of his father. The principal reason for translating the word reem unicorn, and not rhinoceros, is from a prejudice that he must have but one horn. But this is by no means so well founded, as to be admitted as the only argument for establishing the existence of an animal, which never has appeared after the search of so many ages. Scripture speaks of the horns of the unicorn, Deut. xxxiii, 17; Psalm xxii, 21; so that even from this circumstance the reem may be the rhinoceros as the rhinoceros may be the unicorn.”

In the book of Job, xxxix, 9, 10, the reem is represented as an unmanageable animal, which, although possessed of sufficient strength to labour, sternly and pertinaciously refused to bend his neck to the yoke.

Will the reem submit to serve thee?  
Will he, indeed, abide at thy crib?  
Canst thou make his harness bind the reem to the furrow?  
Will he, forsooth, plough up the valleys for thee?  
Wilt thou rely on him for his great strength,  
937And commit thy labour unto him?  
Wilt thou trust him that he may bring home thy grain,  
And gather in thy harvest?

The rhinoceros, in size, is only exceeded by the elephant; and in strength and power is inferior to no other creature. He is at least twelve feet in length, from the extremity of the snout to the insertion of the tail; six or seven feet in height, and the circumference of the body is nearly equal to its length. He is particularly distinguished from the elephant and all other animals by the remarkable and offensive weapon he carries upon his nose. This is a very hard horn, solid throughout, directed forward, and has been seen four feet in length. Mr. Browne, in his Travels, says, that the Arabians

call the rhinoceros abu-kurn, "father of the one horn." The rhinoceros is very hurtful, by the prodigious devastation which he makes in the fields. This circumstance peculiarly illustrates the passage from Job. Instead of trusting him to bring home the grain, the husbandman will endeavour to prevent his entry into the fields, and hinder his destructive ravages. In a note upon this passage, Mr. Good says, "The original reem, by all the older translators rendered rhinoceros, or unicorn, is by some modern writers supposed to be the bubalus, bison, or wild ox. There can be no doubt that rhinoceros is the proper term; for this animal is universally known in Arabia, by the name of reem, to the present day." The rhinoceros, though next in size, yet in docility and ingenuity greatly inferior, to the elephant, has never yet been tamed, so as to assist the labours of mankind, or to appear in the ranks of war. The rhinoceros is perfectly indocile and untractable, though neither ferocious nor carnivorous. He is among large animals what the hog is among smaller ones, brutal and insensible; fond of wallowing in the mire, and delighting in moist and marshy situations near the banks of rivers. He is, however, of a pacific disposition; and, as he feeds on vegetables, has few occasions for conflict. He neither disturbs the less, nor fears the greater, beasts of the forest, but lives amicably with all. He subsists principally on large succulent plants, prickly shrubs, and the branches of trees; and lives to the age of seventy or eighty years.

UNITARIANS, a comprehensive term, including all who believe the Deity to subsist in one person only. The chief article in the religious system of the Unitarians is, that Christ was a mere man. But they consider him as the great instrument in the hands of God of reversing all the effects of the fall; as the object of all the prophecies from Moses to his own time; as the great bond of union to virtuous and good men, who, as Christians, make one body in a peculiar sense. The Socinian creed was reduced to what Dr. Priestley calls Humanitarianism, by denying the miraculous conception, the infallibility, and the impeccability of the Saviour; and, consequently, his right to any divine honours or religious worship. As to those texts which declare that Jesus Christ "knew no sin," &c, his followers explain them in the sense in which it is said of believers, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin," 1 John iii, 9. Or, if this be not satisfactory, Dr. Priestley refers us to the "Theological Repository," "in which," he says, "I think I have shown that the Apostle Paul often reasons inconclusively; and, therefore, that he wrote as any other person of his turn of mind or thinking, and in his situation, would have written, without any particular inspiration. Facts, such as I think I have there alleged, are stubborn things, and all hypotheses must be accommodated to them." Nor is this sentiment peculiar to Dr. Priestley. Mr. Belsham says, "The Unitarian doctrine is, that Jesus of Nazareth was a man constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices, and frailties;

descended from the family of David, the son of Joseph and Mary, though some indeed still adhere to the popular opinion of the miraculous conception; that he was born in low circumstances, having no peculiar advantages of education or learning, but that he was a man of exemplary character; and that, in conformity to ancient prophecy, he was chosen and appointed by God to introduce a new moral dispensation into the world, the design of which was to abolish the Jewish economy, and to place believing Gentiles upon an equal ground of privilege and favour with the posterity of Abraham; in other words, he was authorized to reveal to all mankind, without distinction, the great doctrine of a future life, in which men shall be rewarded according to their works." Mr. Belsham goes on to state the Unitarian opinion to be, that Jesus was not conscious of his high character till after his baptism; that he afterward spent some time in the wilderness, where he was invested with miraculous powers, and favoured with heavenly visions, like St. Paul, 2 Cor. xii, in which he supposed himself taken up into heaven, and in consequence of which he speaks of his descent from heaven; that he exercised his ministry on earth for the space of a year or more, and then suffered death upon the cross, not to exhibit the evil of sin, or in any sense to make atonement for it, but as a martyr to the truth, and as a necessary preliminary to his resurrection, which they consider as a pledge of the resurrection of mankind. Many also believe that Jesus maintained some personal and sensible connection with the church during the apostolic age, and the continuance of miraculous powers in the church. They farther believe that he is appointed to revisit the earth, and to judge the world,--a difficult task one would suppose, if "he be constituted," as said above, "in all respects like other men, subject to the same ignorance, prejudices frailties," &c! So this blasphemous system contains, in this respect, and in almost every other, its own refutation. See Socinians.

The creed which the celebrated council of Nice established, says Grier, in his "Epitome of General Councils," is that which Christians now profess; the errors and impieties which it condemned are those which, according to the refinements of Socinus, his followers of the present day have moulded into their antichristian system. Arius, a presbyter in the church of Alexandria, a man of consummate talent and address, but of a cold and speculative mind, impiously maintained that there had been a time when the Son of God was not; that he was capable of virtue and vice; and that he was a creature, and mutable as creatures are! It is true that Arius held a qualified preëxistence, when he said that God created the Son from nothing before he created the world; in other words, that the Son was the first of created beings; but such preëxistence does not imply coëxistence or coëternity with the Father. After this manner did he deny the divinity of the Son, and his coëternity with the Father. Seduced by the pride of reasoning,

no less than by his fondness for novelty, did he likewise reject the ὁμοούσιον, as it is called, or the tenet of the Son being of the same substance with the Father. The blasphemies of Arius consisted in the denial of Christ's being either co-eternal or consubstantial with God. After a lapse of twelve centuries, Socinus lowered him another step by declaring his inferiority to the Father; for that he, as well as all other things, was subject to the supreme Creator of the universe; and although he held his mere humanity, yet, inconsistently enough, he would offer him divine worship! Inconsistently it may be said, because the Socinian, on his own principles, thereby incurs the guilt of idolatry as much as the Roman Catholic who worships the Virgin Mary, a mere created being. The Unitarian, or Humanitarian, sinks the character of the Saviour still lower, by withholding all worship from him; and while he considers him as a mere man, and therefore as not possessing the attributes of the Deity, with an inconsistency as singular as that of Socinus, he acknowledges his divinity so as to call him God; as if the terms Deity and Divinity bore different significations, or as if the principle which constituted the essence of the Godhead were separable from the Godhead itself! It should be observed, that the lowest denomination of unbelievers in the descending scale, namely, the modern Unitarian, combines with his own peculiar errors and impieties all the errors and impieties of both Arius and Socinus, together with an absolute denial of the Holy Ghost being a divine Person. Having touched on the shades of difference which exist between the followers of Arius and Socinus, a more minute detail of the division and subdivision of the classes into which they may be ranged may not be unacceptable to the reader: Arians and Semi-Arians constituted the original distinction; that of a subsequent day was high and low Arians. The high Arians entertain the highest views of the mediatorial influence of Christ, and believe in the entire Scriptures; the low Arians run into the opposite extreme, yet neither high nor low Arians consider Christ to be truly God. The old Socinians admitted the miraculous conception, and the worship of the Son; the modern Socinians do not; a circumstance that identifies the modern Socinian with the Unitarian. Some high Arians, such as Dr. Samuel Clarke, &c, thought that Christ might be worshipped; others of them affect to have no distinct notion of what the Holy Ghost meant, and to believe that worship is not to be addressed to Christ, but through Christ! These variations in the Unitarian creed have been deduced from the evidence of Unitarians themselves, given before the Commissioners of Education Inquiry in Ireland in 1826, as detailed in their Report to Parliament; a circumstance that renders them the more valuable, as it imparts to them a living, speaking authority. It must, however, be observed, that motley as they are, they all terminate in one point, the rejection of Christ's divinity; and that, diversified as the distinctions appear to be, they all will be ultimately found to be without a shadow of difference. In short, Arians,

Socinians, Unitarians, &c, not only agree with each other in their antichristian scheme; but can scarcely be said to differ from the infidel Musselmans, who are taught by their Koran to regard Christ as a great prophet, and the forerunner of their own. With Deism doubtless Unitarianism has an intimate alliance. For Deists reject all the doctrines of the Christian revelation, while Unitarians reject all its peculiar doctrines: 1. The Trinity of Persons in the Godhead. 2. The divinity of Christ. 3. The personality of the Holy Spirit. 4. The miraculous birth of Christ. 5. The atonement of Christ. 6. The sanctification of the Spirit. 7. The existence of angels and spirits; 8. And, therefore, of the devil and his angels. "In what, then," says the learned Dr. Burgess, bishop of Salisbury, after this enumeration of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, "does Unitarianism differ from Deism? Deists deny the essential doctrines of Christianity by rejecting the whole of the Christian revelation; Unitarians reject the Christian revelation by denying all its peculiar and essential doctrines."

UNIVERSALISTS. Those who believe that Christ so died for all, that, before he shall have delivered up his mediatorial kingdom, all fallen creatures shall be brought to a participation of the benefits of his death, in their restoration to holiness and happiness. They are called also Universal Restorationists, and their doctrine, the doctrine of universal restoration. Some of its friends have maintained it, also, under the name of universal salvation; but perhaps the former name is that by which it should be distinguished; for the Universalists do not hold any universal exemption from future punishment, but merely the recovery of all those that shall have been exposed to it.[A] They have likewise a just claim to this title on other grounds; for their doctrine, which includes the restoration, or "restitution of all the intelligent offspring of God," or of all

[Footnote A: This may be true in respect to the Universalists in Europe; but in America there are those who deny any future punishment whatever. In this country also they have formed themselves into separate and distinct societies. Am. Ed.] 939 "lapsed intelligences," seems to embrace even the fallen angels. They admit the reality and equity of future punishment; but they contend that it will be corrective in its nature, and limited in its duration. They teach the doctrine of election, but not in the exclusive Calvinistic sense of it. They suppose that God has chosen some for the good of all; and that his final purpose toward all is intimated by his calling his elect the first-born and the first-fruits of his creatures, which, say they, implies other branches of his family, and a future ingathering of the harvest of mankind. They teach, also, that the righteous shall have part in the first resurrection, shall be blessed and happy, and be made priests and kings to God and to Christ in the millennial kingdom, and that over them the second death shall have no power; that the wicked will receive a punishment



apportioned to their crimes; that punishment itself is a mediatorial work, and founded upon mercy, and, consequently, that it is a means of humbling, subduing, and finally reconciling the sinner to God. They add, that the words rendered "eternal," "everlasting," "for ever," and "for ever and ever," in the Scriptures, are frequently used to express the duration of things that have ended or must end; and if it is contended that these words are sometimes used to express proper eternity, they answer, that then the subject with which the words are connected must determine the sense of them; and as there is nothing in the nature of future punishment which can be offered as a reason why it should be endless, they infer that the above words ought always to be taken in a limited sense when connected with the infliction of misery.

Those who deny the eternity of future punishments have not formed themselves into any separate body or distinct society; but are to be found in most Christian countries, and among several denominations. Their doctrines form part of the creed of some Arians, as of Mr. Whiston; of many Deists, as of Mr. Hobbes, Mr. Tindal, &c; and of most Socinians. Nor need we be surprised that libertines and atheists hold it, and that they strive to bring others over to their opinion. "The tyranny of priests," said Dupont the atheist, in the national convention, December, 1792, "extends their opinion to another life, of which they have no other idea than that of eternal punishment; a doctrine which some men have hitherto had the good nature to believe. But these prejudices must now fall: we must destroy them, or they will destroy us." The Mennonites in Holland have long held the doctrine of the Universalists; the people called Dunkers, or Tunkers, in America, descended from the German Baptists, hold it; and also the Shakers. Excellent refutations of this specious system have been published by the Rev. S. Jerram, and the Rev. Daniel Isaac.

The Arminians are sometimes called "Universalists," on account of their holding the tenet of general redemption; in opposition to the Calvinists, who, from their specifically restricting the saving grace of God to certain fore ordained individuals, receive the denomination of "Particularists." By the epithet "Hypothetical Universalists," are designated on the continent those who have adopted the theological system of Amyraut and Cameron, but who are better KNOWN in this country as "Baxterians." See Amyraut, Baxterianism, and Cameron.

UPPER ROOM. The principal rooms anciently in Judea were those above, as they are to this day at Aleppo; the ground floor being chiefly made use of for their horses and servants. "The house in which I am at present living," says, Jowett, "gives what seems to be a correct idea of the scene of Eutychus' falling from the upper loft while St. Paul was preaching, Acts

xx, 6–12. According to our idea of houses, the scene is very far from intelligible; and, beside this, the circumstance of preaching generally leaves on the mind of cursory readers the notion of a church. To describe this house, which is not many miles distant from the Troad, and perhaps, from the unchanging character of oriental customs, nearly resembles the houses then built, will fully illustrate the narrative. On entering my host's door, we find the first floor entirely used as a store: it is filled with large barrels of oil, the produce of the rich country for many miles round: this space, so far from being habitable, is sometimes so dirty with the dripping of the oil, that it is difficult to pick out a clean footing from the door to the first step of the staircase. On ascending, we find the first floor, consisting of an humble suit of rooms, not very high; these are occupied by the family for their daily use. It is on the next story that all their expense is lavished: here my courteous host has appointed my lodging: beautiful curtains and mats, and cushions to the divan, display the respect with which they mean to receive their guest. Here, likewise, their splendour, being at the top of the house, is enjoyed by the poor Greeks with more retirement, and less chance of molestation from the intrusion of Turks: here, when the professors of the college waited upon me to pay their respects, they were received in ceremony, and sat at the window. The room is both higher and also larger than those below; it has two projecting windows; and the whole floor is so much extended in front beyond the lower part of the building, that the projecting windows considerably overhang the street. In such an upper room, secluded, spacious, and commodious, St. Paul was invited to preach his parting discourse. The divan, or raised seat, with mats or cushions, encircles the interior of each projecting window; and I have remarked that when the company is numerous, they sometimes place large cushions behind the company seated on the divan; so that a second tier of company, with their feet upon the seat of the divan, are sitting behind, higher than the front row. Eutychus, thus sitting, would be on a level with the open window; and, being overcome with sleep, he would easily fall out from the third loft of the house into the street, and be almost certain, from such a height, to lose his life. Thither St. Paul went down, and comforted the alarmed company by bringing up Eutychus alive. It is noted that 'there were many lights in the upper chamber.' The very great plenty of oil in this neighbourhood would enable them to afford many lamps; the heat of these and so much company would cause the drowsiness of Eutychus, at that late hour, and be the occasion, likewise, of the windows being open."

URIM AND THUMMIM. The high priests of the Jews, we are told, consulted God in the most important affairs of their commonwealth, and received answers by the Urim and Thummim. What these were, is disputed among the critics. Josephus, and some others, imagine the answer was

returned by the stones of the breastplate appearing with an unusual lustre when it was favourable, or in the contrary case dim. Others suppose, that the Urim and Thummim were something enclosed between the folding of the breastplate; this some will have to be the tetragrammaton, or the word יהוה Jehovah. Christophorus de Castro, and after him Dr. Spencer, maintain them to be two little images shut up in the doubling of the breastplate, which gave the oracular answer from thence by an articulate voice. Accordingly, they derive them from the Egyptians, who consulted their lares, and had an oracle, or teraphim, which they called Truth. This opinion, however, has been sufficiently confuted by the learned Dr. Pococke and by Witsius. The more common opinion among Christians concerning the oracle by Urim and Thummim, and which Dr. Prideaux espouses, is, that when the high priest appeared before the veil, clothed with his ephod and breastplate, to ask counsel of God, the answer was given with an audible voice from the mercy seat, within the veil; but, it has been observed, that this account will by no means agree with the history of David's consulting the oracle by Abiathar, 1 Sam. xxiii, 9, 11; xxx, 7, 8; because the ark, on which was the mercy seat, was then at Kirjathjearim; whereas David was in the one case at Ziklag, and in the other in the forest of Hareth. Braunius and Hottinger have adopted another opinion: they suppose, that, when Moses is commanded to put in the breastplate the Urim and Thummim, signifying lights and perfections in the plural number, it was meant that he should make choice of the most perfect set of stones, and have them so polished as to give the brightest lustre; and, on this hypothesis, the use of the Urim and Thummim, or of these exquisitely polished jewels, was only to be a symbol of the divine presence, and of the light and perfection of the prophetic inspiration; and, as such, constantly to be worn by the high priest in the exercise of his sacred function, especially in consulting the oracle.

Michaëlis observes: That in making distributions of property, and in cases of disputes relative to meum [mine] and tuum, [thine,] recourse was had to the lot, in default of any other means of decision, will naturally be supposed. The whole land was partitioned by lot; and that, in after times, the lot continued to be used, even in courts of justice, we see from Prov. xvi, 33; xviii, 18; where we are expressly taught to remember, that it is Providence which maketh the choice, and that therefore we ought to be satisfied with the decision of the lot, as the will of God. It was for judicial purposes, in a particular manner, that the sacred lot called Urim and Thummim was employed; and on this account the costly embroidered pouch, in which the priest carried this sacred lot on his breast, was called the judicial ornament. "But was this sacred lot used likewise in criminal trials?" Yes, says Michaëlis, only to discover the guilty, to convict them; for in the only two instances of its use in such cases which occur in the whole Bible, namely, in Joshua vii, 14–18, 1 Sam. xiv, 37–45, we find the

confessions of the two delinquents, Achan and Jonathan, annexed. It appears also to have been used only in the case of an oath being transgressed which the whole people had taken, or the leader of the host in their name, but not in the case of other crimes; for an unknown murder, for example, was not to be discovered by recourse to the sacred lot.

The inner sanctuary, within the veil of the tabernacle, observes Dr. Hales, or most holy place, was called the oracle, 1 Kings vi, 16, because there the Lord communed with Moses, face to face, and gave him instructions in cases of legal difficulty or sudden emergency, Exod. xxv, 22; Num. vii, 89; ix, 8; Exod. xxxiii, 11; a high privilege granted to none of his successors. After the death of Moses a different mode was appointed for consulting the oracle by the high priest, who put on "the breastplate of judgment," a principal part of the pontifical dress, on which were inscribed the words Urim and Thummim, emblematical of divine illumination; as the inscription on his mitre, "Holiness to the Lord," was of sanctification, Exod. xxviii, 30–37; Lev. viii, 8. Thus prepared, he presented himself before the Lord to ask counsel on public matters, not in the inner sanctuary, which he presumed not to enter, except on the great day of national atonement, but without the veil, with his face toward the ark of the covenant, inside; and behind him, at some distance, without the sanctuary, stood Joshua, the judge, or person who wanted the response, which seems to have been given with an audible voice from within the veil, Num. xxvii, 21, as in the case of Joshua, vi, 6–15; of the Israelites during the civil war with Benjamin, Judges xx, 27, 28; on the appointment of Saul to be king, when he hid himself, 1 Sam. x, 22–24; of David, 1 Sam. xxii, 10; xxiii, 2–12; xxx, 8; 2 Sam. v, 23, 24; of Saul, 1 Sam. xxviii, 6. This mode of consultation subsisted under the tabernacle erected by Moses in the wilderness, and until the building of Solomon's temple; after which we find no instances of it. The oracles of the Lord were thenceforth delivered by the prophets; as by Ahijah to Jeroboam, 1 Kings xi, 29; by Shemaiah to Rehoboam, 1 Kings xii, 22; by Elijah to Ahab, 1 Kings xvii, 1; xxi, 17–29; by Michaiah to Ahab and Jehoshaphat, 1 Kings xxii, 7; by Elisha to Jehoshaphat and Jehoram, 1 Kings iii, 11–14; by Isaiah to Hezekiah, 2 Kings xix, 6–34; xx, 1–11; by Huldah to Josiah, 2 Kings xxii, 13–20; by Jeremiah to Zedekiah, Jer. xxxii, 3–5, &c. After the Babylonish captivity, and the last of the prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, the oracle ceased; but its revival was foretold by Ezra, ii, 63, and accomplished by Christ, who was himself the oracle, under the old and new covenants, Gen. xv, 1; John i, 1. See Breastplate.

USURY, profit or gain from lending money or goods. Moses enacted a law to the effect that interest should not be taken from a poor person, neither for borrowed money, nor for articles of consumption, for instance, grain,

which was borrowed with the expectation of being returned, *Exod.* xxii, 25; *Lev.* xxv, 35–37. A difficulty arose in determining who was to be considered a poor person in a case of this kind; and the law was accordingly altered in *Deut.* xxiii, 20, 21, and extended in its operation to all the Hebrews, whether they had more or less property; so that interest could be lawfully taken only of foreigners. As the system of the Jews went to secure every man's paternal inheritance to his own family, they could not exact it from their brethren, but only from strangers. As the law of nature does not forbid the receipt of moderate interest in the shape of rent, for the use of lands or houses, neither does it prohibit it for the loan of money or goods. When one man trades with the capital of another, and obtains a profit from it, he is bound in justice to return a part of it to his benefactor, who, in the hands of God, has been a second cause of "giving him power to get wealth." But should Divine Providence not favour the endeavours of some who have borrowed money, the duty of the lenders is to deal gently with them, and to be content with sharing in their losses, as they have been sharers in their gains. The Hebrews were therefore exhorted to lend money, &c, as a deed of mercy and brotherly kindness, *Deut.* xv, 7–11; xxiv, 13. And hence it happens that we find encomiums every where bestowed upon those who were willing to lend without insisting upon interest for the use of the thing lent, *Psalms* xv, 15; xxxvii, 21, 26; cxii, 5; *Prov.* xix, 17; *Ezek.* xviii, 8. This regulation in regard to taking interest was very well suited to the condition of a state that had been recently founded, and which had but very little mercantile dealings; and its principle, though not capable of being generally introduced into communities that are much engaged in commerce, may still be exercised toward those who stand toward us in the relation of brethren.

UZ, Land of, the country of Job. As there were three persons of this name, namely, the son of Aram, the son of Nahor, and the grandson of Seir the Horite, commentators are divided in their opinion as to the situation of the country meant by the land of Uz. Bochart, Spanheim, Calmet, Wells, and others, place it in Arabia Deserta. Michaëlis places it in the valley of Damascus; which city was, in fact, built by Uz, the grandson of Shem. Archbishop Magee, Bishop Lowth, Dr. Hales, Dr. Good, and others, with more reason, fix the scene of the history of Job in Idumea. This is also the opinion of Mr. Horne, who refers for a confirmation of it to *Lam.* iv, 21, where Uz is expressly said to be in Edom; and to *Jer.* xlix, 7, 8, 20; *Ezek.* xxv, 13; *Amos* i, 11, 12; *Obad.* 8, 9, where both Teman and Dedan are described as inhabitants of Edom. In effect, says Mr. Horne, nothing is clearer than that the history of an inhabitant of Idumea is the subject of the poem which bears the name of Job, and that all the persons introduced into it were Idumeans, dwelling in Idumea; in other words, Edomite Arabs.

VEIL. Women were wont to cover their faces with veils in token of modesty, of reverence, and subjection to their husbands, Gen. xxiv, 65; 1 Cor. xi, 3, &c. In modern times, the women of Syria never appear in the streets without their veils. These are of two kinds, the *furragi* and the common Aleppo veil; the former being worn by some of the Turkish women only, the latter indiscriminately by all. The first is in the form of a large cloak, with long straight sleeves, and a square hood hanging flat on the back; it is sometimes made of linen, sometimes of a shawl or cloth. This veil, reaching to the heels, conceals the whole of the dress, from the neck downward; while the head and face are covered by a large white handkerchief over the head dress and forehead, and a smaller one tied transversely over the lower part of the face, hanging down on the neck. Many of the Turkish women, instead of the smaller handkerchief, use a long piece of black crape stiffened, which, sloping a little from the forehead, leaves room to breathe more freely. In this last way, the ladies are completely disguised; in the former, the eyes and nose remaining visible, they are easily known by their acquaintances. The *radid* is a species of veil, which Calmet supposes is worn by married women, as a token of their submission and dependence, and descends low down on the person. To lift up the veil of a virgin is reckoned a gross insult; but to take away the veil of a married woman is one of the greatest indignities that she can receive, because it deprives her of the badge which distinguishes and dignifies her in that character, and betokens her alliance to her husband, and her interest in his affections. This is the reason why the spouse so feelingly complains: "They took away my veil, 777, from me," Cant. v, 7. When it is forcibly taken away by the husband, it is equivalent to divorce, and justly reckoned a most severe calamity; therefore, God threatened to take away the ornamental dresses of the daughters of Zion, including the *radidim*, the low descending veils: "In that day the Lord will take away the changeable suits of apparel, and the mantles, and the fine linen, and the hoods, and the veils," Isaiah iii, 18, &c.

The ordinary Aleppo veil is a linen sheet, large enough to cover the whole habit from head to foot, and is brought over the face in a manner to conceal all but one eye. This is perhaps alluded to by the bridegroom in these words: "Thou hast ravished my heart with one of thine eyes," Cant. iv, 9. In Barbary, when the ladies appear in public, they always fold themselves up so closely in their *hykes*, that, even without their veils, one can discover very little of their faces. But, in the summer months, when they retire to their country seats, they walk abroad with less caution; though, even then, on the approach of a stranger, they always drop their veils, as Rebekah did on the approach of Isaac. But, although they are so closely wrapped up, that those who look at them cannot see even their hands, still less their face, yet it is reckoned indecent in a man to fix his eyes upon them; he must let

them pass without seeming at all to observe them. When a lady of distinction, says Hanway, travels on horseback, she is not only veiled, but has generally a servant, who runs or rides before her to clear the way; and on such occasions the men, even in the market places, always turn their backs till the women are past, it being thought the highest ill manners to look at them. A lady in the east considers herself degraded when she is exposed to the gaze of the other sex, which accounts for the conduct of Vashti in refusing to obey the command of the king. Their ideas of decency, on the other hand, forbid a virtuous woman to lay aside or even to lift up her veil in the presence of the other sex. She who ventures to disregard this prohibition inevitably ruins her character. From that moment she is noted as a woman of easy virtue, and her act is regarded as a signal for intrigue. Pitts informs us that in Barbary the courtesan appears in public without her veil; and, in Prov. vii, 13, 14, the harlot exposes herself in the same indecent manner: "So she caught him, and kissed him, and with an impudent face," a face uncovered and shameless, "said unto him, I have peace-offerings with me, this day have I paid my vows." But it must nevertheless be remarked, that, at different times, and in different parts of the east, the use, or partial use of the veil has greatly varied.

VINE, *ἴβλ*, Gen. xl, 9; *ἄμπελος*, Matt. xxvi, 29; Mark xiv, 25; Luke xxii, 18; John xv, 4, 5; James iii, 12; Rev. xiv, 19; a noble plant of the creeping kind, famous for its fruit, or grapes, and the liquor they afford. The vine is a common name or genus, including several species under it; and Moses, to distinguish the true vine, or that from which wine is made, from the rest, calls it, the wine vine, Num. vi, 4. Some of the other sorts were of a poisonous quality, as appears from the story related among the miraculous acts of Elisha, 2 Kings iv, 39, 41. (See Grapes.) The expression of "sitting every man under his own vine," probably alludes to the delightful eastern arbours, which were partly composed of vines. Capt. Norden, in like manner, speaks of vine arbours as common in the Egyptian gardens; and the Prænestine pavement in Dr. Shaw gives us the figure of an ancient one. Plantations of trees about houses are found very useful in hot countries, to give them an agreeable coolness. The ancient Israelites seem to have made use of the same means, and probably planted fruit trees, rather than other kinds, to produce that effect. "It is their manner in many places," says Sir Thomas Rowe's chaplain, speaking of the country of the Great Mogul, "to plant about and among their buildings, trees which grow high and broad, the shadow whereof keeps their houses by far more cool: this I observed in a special manner, when we were ready to enter Amadavar; for it appeared to us as if we had been entering a wood rather than a city." "Immediately on entering," says Turner, "I was ushered into the court yard of the aga, whom I found smoking under a vine, surrounded by horses, servants, and dogs, among which I distinguished an English pointer." There were in

Palestine many excellent vineyards. Scripture celebrates the vines of Sorek, of Sebamah, of Jazer, of Abel. Profane authors mention the excellent wines of Gaza, Sarepta, Libanus, Saron, Ascalon, and Tyre. Jacob, in the blessing which he gave Judah, "Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine, he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes," Gen. xlix, 11; he showed the abundance of vines that should fall to his lot. "Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well, whose branches hang over the wall," Gen. xlix, 22. "To the northward and westward," says Morier, "are several villages, interspersed with extensive orchards and vineyards, the latter of which are generally enclosed by high walls. The Persian vine dressers do all in their power to make the vine run up the wall, and curl over on the other side, which they do by tying stones to the extremity of the tendril. The vine, particularly in Turkey and Greece, is frequently made to entwine on trellises around a well, where, in the heat of the day, whole families collect themselves, and sit under the shade."

Noah planted the vine after the deluge, and is supposed to have been the first who cultivated it, Gen. ix, 20. Many are of opinion that wine was not unknown before the deluge; and that this patriarch only continued to cultivate the vine after that event, as he had done before it: but the fathers think that he knew not the force of wine, having never used it before, nor having ever seen any one use it. He was the first that gathered the juice of the grape, and preserved it till by fermentation it became a potable liquor. Before him men only ate the grapes like other fruit. The law of Moses did not allow the planters of vineyards to eat the fruit before the fifth year, Lev. xix, 24, 25. The Israelites were also required to indulge the poor, the orphan, and the stranger, with the use of the grapes on the seventh year. A traveller was allowed to gather and eat the grapes in a vineyard as he passed along, but he was not permitted to carry any away, Deut. xxiii, 24. The scarcity of fuel, especially wood, in most parts of the east, is so great, that they supply it with every thing capable of burning; cow dung dried, roots, parings of fruits, withered stalks of herbs and flowers, Matthew vi, 30. Vine twigs are particularly mentioned as used for fuel in dressing their food, by D'Arvieux, La Roque, and others: Ezekiel says, in his parable of the vine, used figuratively for the people of God, "Shall wood be taken thereof to do any work? Or will men take a pin of it to hang any vessel thereon? Behold, it is cast into the fire for fuel," Ezekiel xv, 3, 4. "If a man abide not in me," saith our Lord, "he is cast forth as a branch" of the vine, "and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned," John xv, 6.

VINEGAR, *γρη*, Num. vi, 3; Ruth ii, 14; Psalm lxix, 21; Prov. x, 26; xxv, 20; *ὄξος*, Matt. xxvii, 48; Mark xv, 36; John xix, 29, 30; an acid produced



by a second fermentation of vinous liquors. The law of the Nazarite was that he should "separate himself from wine and strong drink, and should drink no vinegar of wine, nor vinegar of strong drink, nor any liquor of grapes." This is exactly the same prohibition that was given in the case of John the Baptist, Luke i, 15, οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ πίνῃ, wine and sikera he shall not drink. Any inebriating liquor, says Jerom, is called sicera, whether made of corn, apples, honey, dates, or other fruits. One of the four prohibited drinks among the Mohammedans in India is called sakar, which signifies inebriating drink in general, but especially date wine. From the original word, probably, we have our term cider or sider, which among us, exclusively means the fermented juice of apples. Vinegar was used by harvesters for their refreshment. Boaz told Ruth that she might come and dip her bread in vinegar with his people. Pliny says, "Aceto summa vis in refrigerando." [There is the greatest power in vinegar, in cooling.] It made a very cooling beverage. It was generally diluted with water. When very strong, it affected the teeth disagreeably, Prov. x, 26. In Proverbs xxv, 20, the singing of songs to a heavy heart is finely compared to the contrariety or colluctation between vinegar and nitre; untimely mirth to one in anxiety serves only to exasperate, and as it were put into a ferment by the intrusion.

The Emperor Pescennius Niger gave orders that his soldiers should drink nothing but vinegar on their marches. That which the Roman soldiers offered to our Saviour at his crucifixion, was, probably, the vinegar they made use of for their own drinking. Constantine the Great allowed them wine and vinegar alternately, every day. This vinegar was not of that sort which we use for salads and sauces; but it was a tart wine called pesca, or sera. They make great use of it in Spain and Italy, in harvest time. They use it also in Holland, and on shipboard, to correct the ill taste of the water.

VIPER, אַפְסָה, Job xx, 16; Isaiah xxx, 6; lix, 5; ἔχιδνα, Matt. iii, 7; xii, 34; xxiii, 33; Luke iii, 7; Acts xxviii, 3; a serpent famed for the venomousness of its bite, which is one of the most dangerous poisons in the animal kingdom. So remarkable, says Dr. Mead, has the viper been for its venom, that the remotest antiquity made it an emblem of what is hurtful and destructive. Nay, so terrible was the nature of these creatures, that they were very commonly thought to be sent as executioners of divine vengeance upon mankind, for enormous crimes which had escaped the course of justice. An instance of such an opinion as this we have in the history of St. Paul, Acts xxviii, whom the people of Melita, when they saw the viper leap upon his hand, presently concluded to be a murderer; and as readily made a god of him when, instead of having his hand inflamed, or falling down dead, one or other of which is usually the effect of these bites, he without any harm shook the reptile into the fire: it being obvious enough to imagine that he must stand in a near relation at least to the gods

themselves, who could thus command the messengers of their vengeance, and counterwork the effects of such powerful agents.

VISION, the act of seeing; but, in Scripture, it generally signifies a supernatural appearance, either by dream or in reality, by which God made known his will and pleasure to those to whom it was vouchsafed, Acts ix, 10, 12; xvi, 9, xxvi, 13; 2 Cor. xii, 1. Thus, in the earliest times, to patriarchs, prophets, and holy men God sent angels, he appeared to them himself by night in dreams, he illuminated their minds, he made his voice to be heard by them, he sent them ecstasies, and transported them beyond themselves, and made them hear things that eye had not seen, ear had not heard, and which had not entered into the heart of man. The Lord showed himself to Moses, and spoke to him when he was at the mouth of the cave. Jesus Christ manifested himself to his Apostles, in his transfiguration upon the mount, and on several other occasions after his resurrection. God appeared to Abraham under the form of three travellers; he showed himself to Isaiah and Ezekiel, in the splendour of his glory. Vision is also used for the prophecies written by the prophets. The beatific vision denotes the act of angels and glorified spirits beholding in heaven the unveiled splendours of the Lord Jehovah, and privileged to contemplate his perfections and plans in and by himself.

VOCATION, or CALLING, is a gracious act of God in Christ, by which, through his word and Spirit, he calls forth sinful men, who are liable to condemnation and placed under the dominion of sin, from the condition of the animal life, and from the pollutions and corruptions of this world, 2 Tim. i, 9; Matt. xi, 28; 1 Peter ii, 9, 10; Gal. i, 4; 2 Peter ii, 20; Romans x, 13–15; 1 Peter iii, 19; Gen. vi, 3, unto “the fellowship of Jesus Christ,” and of his kingdom and its benefits; that, being united unto him as their head, they may derive from him life, sensation, motion, and a plenitude of every spiritual blessing, to the glory of God and their own salvation, 1 Cor. i, 9; Gal. ii, 20; Eph. i, 3, 6; 2 Thess. ii, 13, 14. The end intended is, that they who have been called answer by faith to God and to Christ who give the call, and that they thus become the covenanted people of God through Christ the Mediator of the new covenant; and, after having become believers and parties to the covenant, 944that they love, fear, honour, and worship God and Christ, render in all things obedience to the divine precepts “in righteousness and true holiness,” and that by this means they “make their calling and election sure,” Prov. i, 24; Heb. iii, 7; Rev. iii, 20; Eph. ii, 11–16; Titus iii, 8; Deut. vi, 4, 5; Jer. xxxii, 38, 39; Luke i, 74, 75; 2 Peter i, 1, 10. The glory of God, who is supremely wise, good, merciful, just, and powerful, is so luminously displayed in this communication both of his grace and glory, as deservedly to raise into rapturous admiration the

minds of angels and of men, and to employ their loosened tongues in celebrating the praises of Jehovah, Rev. iv, 8–11; v, 8–10. See Calling.

VOW, a promise made to God, of doing some good thing hereafter. The use of vows is observable throughout Scripture. When Jacob went into Mesopotamia, he vowed to God the tenth of his estate, and promised to offer it at Bethel, to the honour of God, Gen. xxviii, 22. Moses enacts several laws for the regulation and execution of vows. A man might devote himself, or his children, to the Lord. Jephthah devoted his daughter, Judges xi, 30, 31. Samuel was vowed or consecrated to the service of the Lord before his birth, by his pious mother Hannah; and was really offered to him, to serve in the tabernacle, 1 Sam. i, 21, &c. If a man and woman vowed themselves to the Lord, they were obliged to adhere strictly to his service, according to the conditions of the vow; but in some cases they might be redeemed. A man from twenty years of age till sixty, gave fifty shekels of silver; and a woman thirty, Lev. xxvii, 3. From the age of five years to twenty, a man gave twenty shekels, and a woman ten; from a month old to five years, they gave for a boy five shekels, and for a girl three. A man of sixty years old, or upward, gave fifteen shekels, and a woman of the same age gave ten. If the person was poor, and could not procure this sum, the priest imposed a ransom upon him, according to his abilities. If any one had vowed an animal that was clean, he had not the liberty of redeeming it, or of exchanging it, but was obliged to sacrifice it to the Lord. If it was an unclean animal, and such as was not allowed to be sacrificed, the priest made a valuation of it; and if the proprietor would redeem it, he added a fifth part to the value, by way of forfeit. They did the same in proportion, when the thing vowed was a house or a field. They could not devote the first born, because in their own nature they belonged to the Lord, Lev. xxvii, 28, 29. Whatever was devoted by way of anathema, could not be redeemed, of whatever nature or quality it was. An animal was put to death, and other things were devoted for ever to the Lord. The consecration of Nazarites was a particular kind of vow. The vows and promises of children were void, of course, except they were ratified either by the express or tacit consent of their parents. It was the same with the vows of a married woman; they were of no validity, except confirmed by the express or tacit consent of her husband, Num. xxx. But widows, or liberated wives, were bound by their vows, whatever they were.

Whosoever invokes the awful name of God to witness any untruth, knowing it to be such, is guilty of taking it in vain. Our Lord did not mean to preclude solemn appeals to heaven, whether oaths or vows, in courts of justice, or in important compacts. For an oath, or appeal to the greatest of all beings, as the Searcher of hearts, to witness a transaction, and to punish falsehood or perjury, is necessary, for putting an end to all strife or

controversy among men, to promote confirmation or security of property, Heb. vi, 16. And it was sanctioned by the example of God, swearing by himself, Genesis xxii, 15; Heb. vi, 17, 18; and by the example of the patriarchs and saints of old; thus Abraham swore by the most high God, Creator of heaven and earth, Gen. xiv, 22; the transjordanite tribes, by the God of gods, the Lord, Joshua xxii, 22. And the law prescribed, "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name," Deut. vi, 13. And afterward, "All Judah rejoiced at the oath, for they had sworn unto the Lord with a loud voice, with all their heart, and sought him with their whole desire: and he was found of them; and the Lord gave them rest round about," 2 Chron. xv, 14, 15. And a highly gifted Apostle uses the following most solemn asseveration, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not," 2 Cor. xi, 31. See the vows of the priests and Levites, to put away strange wives, Ezra x, 5; and to take no usury from their brethren, Neh. x, 29. St. Paul also vowed a vow, which he performed, Acts xviii, 18; xxi, 23. Our Lord, therefore, reënacted the law, while he guarded against the abuse of it, by prohibiting all oaths in common conversation, as a profanation either of God's name, where that was irreverently used, or where any of his works was substituted instead of the awful and terrible name of the Lord, which the Jews, through superstitious dread, at length ceased to use, from misinterpretation of Deut. xxviii, 58: "But I say unto you, Swear not at all," in common conversation, by any of your usual oaths, "neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is his footstool," &c. For, by the detestable casuistry of the scribes and Pharisees, some oaths were reckoned binding, others not, as we learn from the sequel; thus, to swear by the temple, the altar, heaven, &c, they considered as not binding: but to swear by the gold of the temple, by the gift on the altar, &c, they considered as binding; the absurdity and impiety of which practice is well exposed by our Lord in Matt. xxiii, 16–22.

VULGATE, a very ancient Latin translation of the Bible; and the only one the church of Rome acknowledges to be authentic. The ancient Vulgate of the Old Testament was translated almost word for word, from the Greek of the Septuagint. The author of the version is not known. It was a long time known by the name of the Italic, or old version; 945as being of very great antiquity in the Latin church. It was the common, or vulgar version, before St. Jerom made a new one from the Hebrew original, with occasional references to the Septuagint; whence it has its name Vulgate. Nobilius, in 1558, and F. Morin, in 1628, gave new editions of it; pretending to have restored and re-collated it from the ancients who had cited it. It has since been retouched from the correction of St. Jerom; and it is this mixture of the ancient Italic version, and some corrections of St. Jerom, that is now called the Vulgate, and which the council of Trent has declared to be

authentic. It is this Vulgate alone that is used in the Romish church, excepting some passages of the ancient Vulgate, which were left in the Missal and the Psalms, and which are still sung according to the old Italic version. St. Jerom declares that, in his revisal of the Italic version, he used great care and circumspection, never varying from that version but when he thought it misrepresented the sense. But as the Greek copies to which he had access were not so ancient as those from which the Italic version had been made, some learned authors have been of opinion that it would have been much better if he had collected all the copies, and, by comparing them, have restored that translation to its original purity. It is plain that he never completed this work, and that he even left some faults in it, for fear of varying too much from the ancient version, since he renders in his commentaries some words otherwise than he has done in his translation. This version was not introduced into the church but by degrees, for fear of offending weak persons. Rufinus, notwithstanding his enmity to St. Jerom, and his having exclaimed much against this performance, was one of the first to prefer it to the vulgar or Italian. This translation gained at last so great an authority, by the approbation of Pope Gregory I., and his declared preference of it to every other, that it was subsequently brought into public use through all the western churches. Although it was not regarded as authentic, except by the council of Trent, it is certainly of some use, as serving to illustrate several passages both of the Old and New Testament.

The two principal popish editions of the Vulgate are those of pope Sixtus V. and Clement VIII.: the former was printed in 1590, after Pope Sixtus had collected the most ancient MSS. and best printed copies, summoned the most learned men out of all the nations of the Christian world, assembled a congregation of cardinals for their assistance and counsel, and presided over the whole himself. This edition was declared to be corrected in the very best manner possible, and published with a tremendous excommunication against every person who should presume ever afterward to alter the least particle of the edition thus authentically promulgated by his holiness, sitting in that chair, in *quâ Petri vivit potestas, et excellit auctoritas*, [in which the power of Peter lived, and his authority excelled.] The other edition was published in 1592, by Pope Clement VIII.; which was so different from that of Sixtus, as to contain two thousand variations, some of whole verses, and many others clearly and designedly contradictory in sense; and yet this edition is also, *ex cathedrâ*, [from the chair,] pronounced as the only authentic one, and enforced by the same sentence of excommunication with the former. Clement suppressed the edition of his predecessor; so that copies of the Sixtine Vulgate are now very scarce, and have long been reckoned among literary rarities. Our learned countryman, Dr. James, the celebrated correspondent and able coadjutor of Archbishop Usher, relates, with all the ardour of a hard

student, the delight which he experienced on unexpectedly obtaining a Sixtine copy; and he used it to good and effective purpose in his very clever book, entitled "Bellum Papale," in which he has pointed out numerous additions, omissions, contradictions, and glaring differences between the Sixtine and Clementine editions. All the popish champions are exceedingly shy about recognizing this irreconcilable conflict between the productions of two such infallible personages; and the boldest of them wish to represent it as a thing of nought. But it is no light matter thus to tamper with the word of God.

The Romanists generally hold the Vulgate of the New Testament preferable to the common Greek text; because it is this alone, and not the Greek text, that the council of Trent has declared authentic: accordingly that church has, as it were, adopted this edition, and the priests read no other at the altar, the preachers quote no other in the pulpit, nor the divines in the schools. Yet some of their best authors, F. Bouhours for instance, own, that among the differences that are found between the common Greek and the Vulgate, there are some in which the Greek reading appears more clear and natural than that of the Latin; so that the second might be corrected from the first, if the holy see should think fit. But those differences, taken in general, only consist in a few syllables or words; they rarely concern the sense. Beside, in some of the most considerable, the Vulgate is authorized by several ancient manuscripts. Bouhours spent the last years of his life in giving a French translation of the New Testament according to the Vulgate. It is probable that at the time the ancient Italic or Vulgate version of the New Testament was made, and at the time it was afterward compared with the Greek manuscripts by St. Jerom, as they were then nearer the times of the Apostles, they had more accurate Greek copies, and those better kept, than any of those used when printing was invented.

"Highly as the Latin Vulgate is extolled by the church of Rome," says Michaëlis, "it was depreciated beyond measure at the beginning of the sixteenth century by several learned Protestants, whose example has been followed by men of inferior abilities. At the restoration of learning, when the faculty of writing elegant Latin was the highest accomplishment of a scholar, the Vulgate was regarded with contempt, as not written with classical purity. But after the Greek manuscripts were discovered, their readings were preferred to those of the Latin, because the New Testament was written in Greek, and the Latin was only a version; but it was not considered that these Greek manuscripts were modern in comparison of those originals from which the Latin was taken; nor was it known at that time, that the more ancient the Greek manuscripts and the other versions were, the closer was their agreement with the Vulgate. Our ablest writers, such as Mill and Bengel, have been induced by F. Simon's treatise to

abandon the opinion of their predecessors, and have ascribed to the Latin Vulgate a value perhaps greater than it deserves.”

VULTURE, הָאֵרָב, and רָאָה, Lev. xi, 14; Isa. xxxiv, 15; a large bird of prey, somewhat resembling the eagle. There are several birds of the vulturine kind, which, though they differ much in respect to colour and dimensions, yet are all easily distinguished by their naked heads, and beaks partly straight and partly crooked. They are frequent in Arabia, Egypt, and many parts of Africa and Asia. They have a most indelicate voracity, preying more upon carrion than live animals. They were declared unclean in the Levitical constitution.

WALDENSES, WALLENCES, or ALBIGENSES, the Vaudois, or inhabitants of the beautiful valleys of the Alps, between Italy and Provence. Many have supposed that they derived their name from Peter Waldo, or Valdo, a merchant of Lyons, in the twelfth century, and one of their leaders and patrons; but their history has been traced considerably farther back, which has led others to suppose that, on the contrary, he derived his name from them, as Peter the Waldensian, or Peter of the Valleys. The learned Dr. Allix, in his “History of the Churches of Piedmont,” gives this account: For three hundred years or more, the bishop of Rome attempted to subjugate the church of Milan under his jurisdiction; and at last the interest of Rome grew too potent for the church of Milan, planted by one of the disciples; insomuch that the bishop and the people, rather than own their jurisdiction, retired to the valleys of Lucerne and Angrogne, and thence were called Vallenses, Wallenses, or, The People in the Valleys. From a confession of their faith, of the early date, A. D. 1120, we extract the following particulars: 1. That the Scriptures teach that there is one God, almighty, all-wise, and all-good, who made all things by his goodness; for he formed Adam in his own image and likeness; but that by the envy of the devil sin entered into the world, and that we are sinners in and by Adam. 2. That Christ was promised to our fathers, who received the law; that so knowing by the law their unrighteousness and insufficiency, they might desire the coming of Christ, to satisfy for their sins, and accomplish the law by himself. 3. That Christ was born in the time appointed by God the Father; that is to say, in the time when all iniquity abounded, that he might show us grace and mercy, as being faithful. 4. That Christ is our life, truth, peace, and righteousness; as also our pastor, advocate, and priest, who died for the salvation of all who believe, and is risen for our justification. 5. That there is no mediator and advocate with God the Father, save Jesus Christ. 6. That after this life there are only two places, the one for the saved, and the other for the damned. 7. That the feasts, the vigils of saints, the water which they call holy, as also to abstain from flesh on certain days, and the like, but especially the masses, are the inventions of men, and ought to be

rejected. 8. That the sacraments are signs of the holy thing, visible forms of the invisible grace; and that it is good for the faithful to use those signs or visible forms; but that they are not essential to salvation. 9. That there are no other sacraments but baptism and the Lord's Supper. 10. That we ought to honour the secular powers by subjection, ready obedience, and paying of tribute. On the subject of infant baptism, they held different opinions, as Christians do in the present day.

For bearing this noble testimony against the church of Rome, these pious people were for many centuries the subjects of a most cruel persecution; and in the thirteenth century the pope instituted a crusade against them, and they were pursued with a fury perfectly diabolical. Their principles, however, continued unsubdued, and at the Reformation their descendants were reckoned among the Protestants, with whom they were in doctrine so congenial; but in the seventeenth century the flames of persecution were again rekindled against them by the cruelty of Louis XIV. At the revocation of the edict of Nantz, about fifteen thousand perished in the prisons of Pignerol, beside great numbers who perished among the mountains. They received, however, the powerful protection and support of England under William III. But still the house of Saxony continued to treat them as heretics, and they were oppressed by a variety of cruel edicts.

When Piedmont was subjected to France in 1800, the French government, Buonaparte being first consul, placed them on the same plan of toleration with the rest of France; but on the return of the king of Sardinia to Genoa, notwithstanding the intercession of Lord William Bentinck, the old persecuting edicts were revived in the end of 1814; and though they have not been subjected to fire and faggot as aforetime, their worship has been restrained, and they were not only stripped of all employments, but, by a most providential circumstance only, saved from a general massacre. Since then they have been visited by some pious and benevolent Englishmen; and the number of Waldenses, or Vaudois, has been taken at nineteen thousand seven hundred and ten, beside about fifty families residing at Turin.

Mr. Milner very properly connects this people with the Cathari, or Paulicians, of the seventh century, who resided chiefly in the valleys of Piedmont, and who, in the twelfth century, according to this valuable historian, received a great accession of members from the learned labours and godly zeal of Peter Waldo, a pious man of unusual learning for a layman at that period. His thoughts being turned to divine things by the sudden death of a friend, he applied himself to the study of the Scriptures, and was, according to Mr. Milner, the first who, in the west of Europe, translated the Bible into a modern language. Waldo was rich, and



distributed his wealth among the poor, and with it the bread of life, which endeared him to the lower classes; and it was probably the great increase of these pious people, in consequence of his exertions, which brought upon them the horrible crusade in the next century. This was, however, wholly on account of their pretended heresies,—their bitterest enemies bearing testimony to the purity of their life and manners. Thus a pontifical inquisitor, quoted by Usher, says, “These heretics are known by their manners and conversation; for they are orderly and modest in their behaviour and deportment; they avoid all appearance of pride in their dress; they are chaste, temperate, and sober; they seek not to amass riches; they abstain from anger; and, even while at work, are either learning or teaching.” Seysillius, another popish writer, says of them, “Their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than other Christians.” Liclenstenius, a Dominican, says, “In morals and life they are good; true in words; unanimous in brotherly love; but their faith is incorrigible and vile, as I have shown you in my treatise.” But most remarkable is the testimony of Reinerus, an inquisitor of the thirteenth century: “Of all the sects which have been, or now exist, none is more injurious to the church, (that is, of Rome,) for three reasons: 1. Because it is more ancient. Some say it has continued from the time of Silvester; others from the time of the Apostles. 2. Because it is more general. There is scarcely any country into which this sect has not crept. 3. Because all other heretics excite horror by the greatness of their blasphemies against God; but these have a great appearance of piety, as they live justly before men, and believe rightly all things concerning God, and all the articles which are contained in the creed.”

WAR, or WARFARE, the attempt to decide a contest or difference between princes, states, or large bodies of people, by resorting to extensive acts of violence, or, as the phrase is, by an appeal to arms. The Hebrews were formerly a very warlike nation. The books that inform us of their wars display neither ignorance nor flattery; but are writings inspired by the Spirit of truth and wisdom. Their warriors were none of those fabulous heroes or professed conquerors, whose business it was to ravage cities and provinces, and to reduce foreign nations under their dominion, merely for the sake of governing, or purchasing a name for themselves. They were commonly wise and valiant generals, raised up by God “to fight the battles of the Lord,” and to exterminate his enemies. Such were Joshua, Caleb, Gideon, Jephthah, Samson, David, Josiah, and the Maccabees, whose names alone are their own sufficient encomiums. Their wars were not undertaken upon slight occasions, or performed with a handful of people. Under Joshua the affair was of no less importance than to make himself master of a vast country which God had given up to him; and to root out several powerful nations that God had devoted to an anathema; and to vindicate an offended

Deity, and human nature which had been debased by a wicked and corrupt people, who had filled up the measure of their iniquities. Under the Judges, the matter was to assert their liberty, by shaking off the yoke of powerful tyrants, who kept them in subjection. Under Saul and David the same motives prevailed to undertake war; and to these were added a farther motive, of making a conquest of such provinces as God had promised to his people. Far was it from their intention merely to reduce the power of the Philistines, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Idumeans, the Arabians, the Syrians, and the several princes that were in possession of those countries. In the later times of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, we observe their kings bearing the shock of the greatest powers of Asia, of the kings of Assyria and Chaldea, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Nebuchadnezzar, who made the whole east tremble. Under the Maccabees a handful of men opposed the whole power of the kings of Syria, and against them maintained the religion of their fathers, and shook off the yoke of their oppressors, who had a design both against their religion and liberty. In still later times, with what courage, intrepidity, and constancy, did they sustain the war against the Romans, who were then masters of the world!

We may distinguish two kinds of wars among the Hebrews: some were of obligation, as being expressly commanded by the Lord; but others were free and voluntary. The first were such as God appointed them to undertake: for example, against the Amalekites and the Canaanites, which were nations devoted to an anathema. The others were undertaken by the captains of the people, to revenge some injuries offered to the nation, to punish some insults or offences, or to defend their allies. Such was that which the Hebrews made against the city of Gibeah, and against the tribe of Benjamin, which would support them in their fault; that which David made against the Ammonites, whose king had affronted his ambassadors; and that of Joshua against the kings of the Canaanites, to protect the Gibeonites. Whatever reasons authorize a nation or a prince to make war against another, obtained, likewise, among the Hebrews; for all the laws of Moses suppose that the Israelites might make war, and might defend themselves, against their enemies. When a war was resolved upon, all the people that were capable of bearing arms were collected together, or only part of them, according as the exigence of the existing case and the necessity and importance of the enterprise required. For it does not appear that, before the reign of King David, there were any regular troops or magazines in Israel. A general rendezvous was appointed, a review was made of the people by tribes and by families, and then they marched against the enemy. When Saul, at the beginning of his reign, was informed of the cruel proposal that the Ammonites had made to the men of the city of Jabesh-Gilead, he cut in pieces the oxen belonging to his plough, and sent

them through the country, saying, "Whosoever cometh not forth after Saul and Samuel, to the relief of Jabesh-Gilead, so shall it be done unto his oxen," 1 Sam. xi, 7. In ancient times, those that went to war generally carried their own provisions along with them, or they took them from the enemy. Hence these wars were generally of short continuance; because it was hardly possible to subsist a large body of troops for a long time with such provisions as every one carried along with him. When David, Jesse's younger son, stayed behind to look after his father's flocks while his elder brothers went to the wars along with Saul, Jesse sent David to carry provisions to his brothers, 1 Sam. xvii, 13. We suppose that this way of making war prevailed also under Joshua, the Judges, Saul, David at the beginning of his reign, the kings of Judah and Israel who were successors to Rehoboam and Jeroboam, and under the Maccabees, till the time of Simon Maccabæus, prince and high priest of the Jews, who had mercenary troops, that is, soldiers who received pay, 1 Mac. xiv, 32. Every one also provided his own arms for the war. The kings of the Hebrews went to the wars in person, and, in earlier times, fought on foot, as well as the meanest of their soldiers; no horses being used in the armies of Israel before David. The officers of war among the Hebrews were the general of the army, and the princes of the tribes or of the families of Israel, beside other princes or captains, some of a thousand, some of a hundred, some of fifty, and some of ten, men. They had also their scribes, who were a kind of commissaries that kept the muster roll of the troops; and these had others under them who acted by their direction.

Military fortifications were at first nothing more than a trench or ditch, dug round a few cottages on a hill or mountain, together with the mound, which was formed by the sand dug out of it; except, perhaps, there might have sometimes been an elevated scaffolding for the purpose of throwing stones with the greater effect against the enemy. In the age of Moses and Joshua, the walls which surrounded cities were elevated to no inconsiderable height, and were furnished with towers. The art of fortification was encouraged and patronized by the Hebrew kings, and Jerusalem was always well defended, especially Mount Zion. In later times the temple itself was used as a castle. The principal parts of a fortification were, 1. The wall, which, in some instances, was triple and double, 2 Chron. xxxii, 5. Walls were commonly made lofty and broad, so as to be neither readily passed over nor broken through, Jer. li, 58. The main wall terminated at the top in a parapet for the accommodation of the soldiers, which opened at intervals in a sort of embrasures, so as to give them an opportunity of fighting with missile weapons. 2. Towers, which were erected at certain distances from each other on the top of walls, and ascended to a great height, terminated at the top in a flat roof, and were surrounded with a parapet, which exhibited openings similar to those in the parapet of the

walls. Towers of this kind were erected, likewise, over the gates of cities. In these towers guards were kept constantly stationed; at least, this was the case in the time of the kings. It was their business to make known any thing that they discovered at a distance; and whenever they noticed an irruption from an enemy, they blew the trumpet, to arouse the citizens, 2 Sam. xiii, 34; xviii, 26, 27; 2 Kings ix, 17–19; Nahum ii, 1; 2 Chron. xvii, 2. Towers, likewise, which were somewhat larger in size, were erected in different parts of the country, particularly on places which were elevated; and these were guarded by a military force, Judges viii, 9, 17; ix, 46, 49, 51; Isaiah xxi, 6; Hab. ii, 1; Hosea v, 8; Jer. xxxi, 6. We find, even to this day, that the circular edifices of this sort, which are still erected in the solitudes of Arabia Felix, bear their ancient name of castles or towers. 3. The walls were erected in such a way as to curve inward; the extremities of them, consequently, projected outward, and formed a kind of bastions. The object of forming the walls so as to present such projections, was to enable the inhabitants of the besieged city to attack the assailants in flank. We learn from the history of Tacitus, that the walls of Jerusalem, at the time of its being attacked by the Romans, were built in this manner. These projections were introduced by King Uzziah, B.C. 810, and are subsequently mentioned in Zeph. i, 16. 4. The digging of a fosse put it in the power of the inhabitants of a city to increase the elevation of the walls, and of itself threw a serious difficulty in the way of an enemy's approach, 2 Sam. xx, 15; Isaiah xxvi, 1; Neh. iii, 8; Psalm xlvi, 13. The fosse, if the situation of the place admitted it, was filled with water. This was the case at Babylon. 5. The gates were at first made of wood, and were small in size. They were constructed in the manner of valve doors, and were secured by means of wooden bars. Subsequently, they were made larger and stronger; and, in order to prevent their being burned, were covered with plates of brass or iron. The bars were covered in the same manner, in order to prevent their being cut asunder; but it was sometimes the case that they were made wholly of iron. The bars were secured by a sort of lock, Psalm cvii, 16; Isaiah xlv, 2.

Previously to commencing war, the Heathen nations consulted oracles, soothsayers, necromancers, and also the lot, which was ascertained by shooting arrows of different colours, 1 Sam. xxviii, 1–10; Isaiah xli, 21–24; Ezek. xxv, 11. The Hebrews, to whom things of this kind were interdicted, were in the habit, 949 in the early part of their history, of inquiring of God by means of Urim and Thummim, Judges i, 1; xx, 27, 28; 1 Sam. xxiii, 2; xxviii, 6; xxx, 8. After the time of David, the kings who reigned in Palestine consulted, according to the different characters which they sustained, and the feelings which they exercised, sometimes true prophets, and sometimes false, in respect to the issue of war, 1 Kings xxii, 6–13; 2 Kings xix, 2, &c. Sacrifices were also offered, in reference to

which the soldiers were said to consecrate themselves to the war, Isaiah xiii, 3; Jer. vi, 4; li, 27; Joel iii, 9; Obad. 1. There are instances of formal declarations of war, and sometimes of previous negotiations, 2 Kings xiv, 8; 2 Chron. xxv, 27; Judges xi, 12–28; but ceremonies of this kind were not always observed, 2 Sam. x, 1–12. When the enemy made a sudden incursion, or when the war was unexpectedly commenced, the alarm was given to the people by messengers rapidly sent forth, by the sound of warlike trumpets, by standards floating on the loftiest places, by the clamour of many voices on the mountains, that echoed from summit to summit, Judges iii, 27; vi, 34; vii, 22; xix, 29, 30; 1 Sam. xi, 7, 8; Isaiah v, 26; xiii, 2; xviii, 3; xxx, 17; xlix, 2; lxii, 10. Military expeditions commonly commenced in the spring, 2 Sam. xi, 1, and were continued in the summer, but in the winter the soldiers went into quarters. The firm persuasion that God fights for the good against the wicked, discovers itself in the Old Testament, and accounts for the fact, that, not only in the Hebrew, but also in the Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldaic languages, words, which originally signify justice, innocence, or uprightness, signify likewise victory; and that words, whose usual meaning is injustice or wickedness, also mean defeat or overthrow. The same may be said in respect to words which signify help or aid, inasmuch as the nation which conquered received aid from God, and God was its helper, Psalm vii, 9; ix, 9; xx, 6; xxvi, 1; xxxv, 24; xliii, 1; xliv, 5; lxxv, 3; lxxvi, 13; lxxviii, 9; lxxxii, 8; 1 Sam. xiv, 45; 2 Kings v, 1; Isa. lix, 17; Hab. iii, 8.

The attack of the orientals in battle has always been, and is to this day, characterized by vehemence and impetuosity. In case the enemy sustain an unaltered front, they retreat, but it is not long before they return again with renewed ardour. It was the practice of the Roman armies to stand still in the order of battle, and to receive the shock of their opposers. To this practice there are allusions in the following passages: 1 Cor. xvi, 13; Gal. v, 1; Eph. vi, 14; Phil. i, 27; 1 Thess. iii, 8; 2 Thess. ii, 15. The Greeks, while they were yet three or four furlongs distant from the enemy, commenced the song of war; something resembling which occurs in 2 Chron. xx, 21. They then raised a shout, which was also done among the Hebrews, 1 Sam. xvii, 52; Joshua vi, 6; Isa. v, 29, 30; xvii, 12; Jer. iv, 19; xxv, 30. The war shout in Judges vii, 20, was as follows, “The sword of the Lord and of Gideon.” In some instances it seems to have been a mere yell or inarticulate cry. The mere march of armies with their weapons, chariots, and trampling coursers, occasioned a great and confused noise, which is compared by the prophets to the roaring of the ocean, and the dashing of the mountain torrents, Isa. xvii, 12, 13; xxvii, 2. The descriptions of battles in the Bible are very brief; but although there is nothing especially said, in respect to the order in which the battle commenced and was conducted, there is hardly a doubt that the light-armed troops, as was the case in other

nations, were the first in the engagement. The main body followed them, and, with their spears extended, made a rapid and impetuous movement upon the enemy. Hence swiftness of foot in a soldier is mentioned as a ground of great commendation, not only in Homer, but in the Bible, 2 Sam. ii, 19–24; 1 Chron. xii, 8; Psalm xviii, 33. Those who obtained the victory were intoxicated with joy; the shout of triumph resounded from mountain to mountain, Isa. xlii, 11; lii, 7, 8; Jer. 1, 2; Ezek. vii, 7; Nahum i, 15. The whole of the people, not excepting the women, went out to meet the returning conquerors with singing and with dancing, Judges xi, 34–37; 1 Sam. xviii, 6, 7. Triumphal songs were uttered for the living, and elegies for the dead, 2 Sam. i, 17, 18; 2 Chron. xxxv, 25; Judges v, 1–31; Exod. xv, 1–21. Monuments in honour of the victory were erected, 2 Sam. viii, 13; Psalm lx, 1; and the arms of the enemy were hung up as trophies in the tabernacle, 1 Sam. xxxi, 10; 2 Kings xi, 10. The soldiers who conducted themselves meritoriously were honoured with presents, and had the opportunity of entering into honourable matrimonial connections, Joshua xiv; 1 Sam. xvii, 25; xxviii, 17; 2 Sam. xviii, 11. See Armies, and Arms.

**WATER.** In the sacred Scriptures, bread and water are commonly mentioned as the chief supports of human life; and to provide a sufficient quantity of water, to prepare it for use, and to deal it out to the thirsty, are among the principal cares of an oriental householder. The Moabites and Ammonites are reproached for not meeting the Israelites with bread and water; that is, with proper refreshments, Deut. xxxiii, 4. Nabal says in an insulting manner to David's messengers, "Shall I then take my bread and my water, and my flesh that I have killed for my shearers, and give it unto men whom I know not whence they be?" 1 Sam. xxv, 11. To furnish travellers with water is, even in present times, reckoned of so great importance, that many of the eastern philanthropists have been at considerable expense to procure them that enjoyment. The nature of the climate, and the general aspect of the oriental regions, require numerous fountains to excite and sustain the languid powers of vegetation; and the sun, burning with intense heat in a cloudless sky, demands for the fainting inhabitants the verdure, shade, and coolness which vegetation produces. Hence fountains of living water are met with in the towns and villages, in the fields and gardens, and by the sides of the roads and of the beaten tracks on the mountains; and a cup of cold water from these wells is no contemptible present. "Fatigued with heat and thirst," says Carne, "we came to a few cottages in a palm wood, and stopped to drink of a fountain of delicious water. In this northern climate no idea can be formed of the luxury of drinking in Egypt: little appetite for food is felt; but when, after crossing the burning sands, you reach the rich line of woods on the brink of the Nile, and pluck the fresh limes, and, mixing their juice with Egyptian sugar and the soft river water, drink repeated bowls of lemonade, you feel

that every other pleasure of the senses must yield to this. One then perceives the beauty and force of those similes in Scripture, where the sweetest emotions of the heart are compared to the assuaging of thirst in a thirsty land." In Arabia, equal attention is paid, by the wealthy and benevolent, to the refreshment of the traveller. On one of the mountains of Arabia, Niebuhr found three little reservoirs, which are always kept full of fine water for the use of passengers. These reservoirs, which are about two feet and a half square, and from five to seven feet high, are round, or pointed at the top, of mason's work, having only a small opening in one of the sides, by which they pour water into them. Sometimes he found, near these places of Arab refreshment, a piece of a ground shell, or a little scoop of wood, for lifting the water. The same attention to the comfort of travellers is manifested in Egypt, where public buildings are set apart in some of their cities, the business of whose inhabitants is to supply the passengers with water free of expense. Some of these houses make a very handsome appearance; and the persons appointed to wait on the passengers are required to have some vessels of copper, curiously tinned and filled with water, always ready on the window next the street. Some of the Mohammedan villages in Palestine, not far from Nazareth, brought Mr. Buckingham and his party bread and water, while on horseback, without even being solicited to do so; and when they halted to accept it, both compliments and blessings were mutually interchanged. "Here, as in every other part of Nubia," says Burckhardt, "the thirsty traveller finds, at short distances, water jars placed by the road side under a low roof. Every village pays a small monthly stipend to some person to fill these jars in the morning, and again toward evening. The same custom prevails in Upper Egypt, but on a larger scale: and there are caravanserais often found near the wells which supply travellers with water." In India the Hindoos go sometimes a great way to fetch water, and then boil it, that it may not be hurtful to travellers that are hot; and after this stand from morning till night in some great road, where there is neither pit nor rivulet, and offer it in honour of their gods, to be drunk by the passengers. This necessary work of charity in these hot countries seems to have been practised among the more pious and humane Jews; and our Lord assures them, that if they do this in his name, they shall not lose their reward. Hence a cup of water is a present in the east of great value, though there are some other refreshments of a superior quality. It is still the proper business of the females to supply the family with water. From this drudgery, however, the married women are exempted, unless when single women are wanting. The proper time for drawing water in those burning climates is in the morning, or when the sun is going down; then they go forth to perform that humble office adorned with their trinkets, some of which are often of great value. Agreeably to this custom Rebecca went instead of her mother to fetch water from the well, and the servant of Abraham expected to meet an unmarried female

there who might prove a suitable match for his master's son. In the East Indies, the women also draw water at the public wells, as Rebecca did, on that occasion, for travellers, their servants and their cattle; and women of no mean rank literally illustrate the conduct of an unfortunate princess in the Jewish history, by performing the services of a menial, 2 Sam. xiii, 8. The young women of Guzerat daily draw water from the wells, and carry the jars upon the head; but those of high rank carry them upon the shoulder. In the same way Rebecca carried her pitcher; and probably for the same reason, because she was the daughter of an eastern prince, Gen. xxiv, 45.

Water sometimes signifies the element of water, Gen. i, 10; and metaphorically, trouble and afflictions, Psalm lxix, 1. In the language of the prophets, waters often denote a great multitude of people, Isa. viii, 7; Rev. xvii, 15. Water is put for children or posterity, Num. xxiv, 7; Isa. xlvi, 1; for the clouds, Psalm civ, 3. Waters sometimes stand for tears, Jer. ix, 1, 7; for the ordinances of the Gospel, Isa. xii, 3; xxxv, 6, 7; lv, 1; John vii, 37, 38. "Stolen waters" denote unlawful pleasures with strange women, Prov. ix, 17. The Israelites are reproached with having forsaken the fountain of living water, to quench their thirst at broken cisterns, Jer. ii, 13; that is, with having quitted the worship of God for the worship of false and ridiculous deities. Waters of Meribah, or the waters of strife, were so called because of the quarrelling or contention and murmuring of the Israelites against Moses and against God. When they came to Kadesh, and there happened to be in want of water, they made a sedition against him and his brother Aaron, Numbers xx, 1, &c. Upon this occasion Moses committed that great sin with which God was so much displeased, that he deprived him of the honour of introducing his people into the land of promise.

WAX, וָגַח, Psalm xxii, 14; lxviii, 2; xcvi, 5; Micah i, 4. Thus the LXX. throughout, κηρός, and vulgate cera; so there is no room to doubt but this is the true meaning of the word: and the idea of the root appears to be soft, melting, yielding, or the like, which properties are not only well known to belong to wax, but are also intimated in all the passages of Scripture in which this word occurs.

WAYFARING MEN. In the primitive ages of the world there were no public inns or taverns. In those days the voluntary exhibition of hospitality to one who stood in need of it was highly honourable. The glory of an open-hearted and generous hospitality continued even after public inns or caravanserais were erected, and continues to this day in the east, Job xxii, 7; xxxi, 17; Gen. xviii, 3–9; xix, 2–10; Exodus ii, 20; Judges xix, 2–10; Acts xvi, 15; xvii, 7; xxviii, 7; Matt. xxv, 35; Mark ix, 41; Rom. xii, 13; 1 Tim. iii, 2; v, 10; Heb. xiii, 2. Buckingham in his "Travels among the Arab Tribes," says, "A foot passenger could make his way at little or no



expense, as travellers and wayfarers of every description halt at the sheikh's dwelling, where, whatever may be the rank or condition of the stranger, before any questions are asked him as to where he comes from, or whither he is going, coffee is served to him from a large pot always on the fire; and a meal of bread, milk, oil, honey, or butter, is set before him, for which no payment is ever demanded or even expected by the host, who, in this manner, feeds at least twenty persons on an average every day in the year from his own purse; at least, I could not learn that he was remunerated in any manner for this expenditure, though it is considered as a necessary consequence of his situation, as chief of the community, that he should maintain this ancient practice of hospitality to strangers.--We had been directed to the house of Eesa, or Jesus. Our horses were taken into the court yard of the house, and unburdened of their saddles, without a single question being asked on either side; and it was not until we had seated ourselves that our intention to remain here for the night was communicated to the master of the house: so much is it regarded a matter of course, that those who have a house to shelter themselves in, and food to partake of, should share those comforts with wayfarers." The passage in Isa. xxxv, 8, "The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein," receives elucidation from some of the accounts of modern travellers. Irwin, speaking of his passing through the deserts on the eastern side of the Nile, in his going from Upper Egypt to Cairo, tells us, that, after leaving a certain valley, which he mentions, their road lay over level ground. "As it would be next to an impossibility to find the way over these stony flats, where the heavy foot of a camel leaves no impression, the different bands of robbers," wild Arabs, he means, who frequent that desert, "have heaped up stones at unequal distances for their direction through this desert. We have derived great assistance from the robbers in this respect, who are our guides when the marks either fail, or are unintelligible to us." "It was on the 24th of March," says Hoste, "that I departed from Alexandria for Rosetta: it was a good day's journey thither, over a level country, but a perfect desert, so that the wind plays with the sand, and there is no trace of a road. We travel first six leagues along the sea coast; but when we leave this, it is about six leagues more to Rosetta, and from thence to the town there are high stone or bark pillars, in a line, according to which travellers direct their journey."

WAYS, in Scripture, means conduct: for example: "Make your paths straight." The paths of the wicked are crooked. To forsake the ways of the Lord, is to forsake his laws. Ways also signifies custom, manners, and way of life: "All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth," Gen. vi, 12; xix, 31; Jer. xxxii, 19. The way of the Lord expresses his conduct to us: "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord," Isa. lv, 8. We find through the whole of Scripture this kind of expressions: The way of peace, of justice, of iniquity, of truth, of darkness.

To go the way of all the earth, Joshua xxiii, 14, signifies dying and the grave. A hard way represents the way of sinners, a way of impiety, Judges ii, 19. Jesus Christ is called the Way, John xiv, 6, because it is by him alone that believers obtain eternal life, and an entrance into heaven. The psalmist says, "Thou wilt show me the path of life," Psalm xvi, 11; that is, Thou wilt raise my body from death to life, and conduct me to the place and state of everlasting happiness. When a great prince in the east sets out on a journey, it is usual to send a party of men before him, to clear the way. The state of those countries in every age, where roads are almost unknown, and, from the want of cultivation, in many parts overgrown with brambles, and other thorny plants, which renders travelling, especially with a large retinue, very incommodious, requires this precaution. The emperor of Hindostan, in his progress through his dominions, as described in the narrative of Sir Thomas Roe's embassy to the court of Delhi, was preceded by a very great company, sent before him to cut up the trees and bushes, to level and smooth the road, and prepare their place of encampment. Balin, who swayed the imperial sceptre of India, had five hundred chosen men, in rich livery, with their drawn sabres, who ran before him, proclaiming his approach, and clearing the way. Nor was this honour reserved exclusively for the reigning emperor; it was often shown to persons of royal birth. When an Indian princess made a visit to her father, the roads were directed to be repaired, and made clear for her journey; fruit trees were planted, water vessels placed in the road side, and great illuminations prepared for the occasion. Mr. Bruce gives nearly the same account of a journey, which the king of Abyssinia made through a part of his dominions. The chief magistrate of every district through which he had to pass was, by his office, obliged to have the roads cleared, levelled, and smoothed; and he mentions, that a magistrate of one of the districts, having failed in this part of his duty, was, together with his son, immediately put to death on the spot, where a thorn happened to catch the garment, and interrupt for a moment the progress of his majesty. This custom is easily recognized in that beautiful prediction: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it," Isa. xl, 3-5. We shall be able, perhaps, to form a more clear and precise idea, from the account which Diodorus gives of the marches of Semiramis, the celebrated queen of Babylon, into Media and Persia. In her march to Ecbatane, says the historian, she came to the Zarcean mountain, which, extending many furlongs, and being full of craggy precipices and deep hollows, could not be passed without taking a great compass. Being therefore desirous of leaving an everlasting memorial of herself, as well as of shortening the

way, she ordered the precipices to be digged down, and the hollows to be filled up; and at great expense she made a shorter and more expeditious road; which to this day is called, from her, the road of Semiramis. Afterward she went into Persia, and all the other countries of Asia subject to her dominion; and wherever she went, she ordered the mountains and the precipices to be levelled, and raised causeways in the plain country, and at a great expense made the ways passable. Whatever may be in this story, the following statement is entitled to the fullest credit: "All eastern potentates have their precursors and a number of pioneers to clear the road, by removing obstacles, and filling up the ravines and the hollow ways in their route. In the days of Mogul splendour, the emperor caused the hills and mountains to be levelled, and the valleys to be filled up for his convenience. This beautifully illustrates the figurative language in the approach of the Prince of Peace, when every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain."

WEAVING. The combined arts of spinning and weaving are among the first essentials of civilized society, and we find both to be of very ancient origin. The fabulous story of Penelope's web, and, still more, the frequent allusions to this art in the sacred writings, tend to show that the fabrication of cloth from threads, hair, &c, is a very ancient invention. It has, however, like other useful arts, undergone a vast succession of improvements, both as to the preparation of the materials of which cloth is made, and the apparatus necessary in its construction, as well as in the particular modes of operation by the artist. Weaving, when reduced to its original principle, is nothing more than the interlacing of the weft or cross threads into the parallel threads of the warp, so as to tie them together, and form a web or piece of cloth. This art is doubtless more ancient than that of spinning; and the first cloth was what we now call matting, that is, made by weaving together the shreds of the bark, or fibrous parts of plants, or the stalks, such as rushes and straws. This is still the substitute for cloth among most rude and savage nations. When they have advanced a step farther in civilization than the state of hunters, the skins of animals become scarce, and they require some more artificial substance for clothing, and which they can procure in greater quantities. When it was discovered that the delicate and short fibres which animals and vegetables afford could be so firmly united together by twisting, as to form threads of any required length and strength, the weaving art was placed on a very permanent foundation. By the process of spinning, which was very simple in the origin, the weaver is furnished with threads far superior to any natural vegetable fibres in lightness, strength, and flexibility; and he has only to combine them together in the most advantageous manner. In the beautiful description which is given, in the last chapter of Solomon's Proverbs, of the domestic economy of the

virtuous woman, it is said, "She seeketh wool and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands: she layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff. She maketh herself coverings of tapestry," &c. Such is the occupation of females in the east in the present day. Not only do they employ themselves in working rich embroideries, but in making carpets filled with flowers and other pleasing figures. Dr. Shaw gives us an account of the last: "Carpets, which are much coarser than those from Turkey, are made here in great numbers, and of all sizes. But the chief branch of their manufactories is the making of hykes, or blankets, as we should call them. The women alone are employed in this work, (as Andromache and Penelope were of old,) who do not use the shuttle, but conduct every thread of the woof with their fingers." Hezekiah says, "I have cut off like a weaver my life," Isa. xxxviii, 12. Mr. Harmer suggests whether the simile here used may not refer to the weaving of a carpet filled with flowers and other ingenious devices; and that the meaning may be, that, just as a weaver, after having wrought many decorations into a piece of carpeting, suddenly cuts it off, while the figures were rising into view fresh and beautiful, and the spectator expecting he would proceed in his work; so, after a variety of pleasing transactions in the course of life, it suddenly and unexpectedly comes to its end.

WEEKS. A period of seven days, under the usual name of a week, שבועה, is mentioned as far back as the time of the deluge, Gen. vii, 4, 10; viii, 10, 12; xxix, 27, 28. It must, therefore, be considered a very ancient division of time, especially as the various nations among whom it has been noticed, for instance, the Nigri in Africa, appear to have received it from the sons of Noah. The enumeration of the days of the week commenced at Sunday. Saturday was the last or seventh, and was the Hebrew Sabbath, or day of rest. The Egyptians gave to the days of the week the same names that they assigned to the planets. From the circumstance that the Sabbath was the principal day of the week, the whole period of seven days was likewise called שפּת, in Syriac שבּתא, in the New Testament σάββατον and 953σάββατα. The Jews, accordingly, in designating the successive days of the week, were accustomed to say, the first day of the Sabbath, that is, of the week; the second day of the Sabbath, that is, Sunday, Monday, &c, Mark xvi, 2, 9; Luke xxiv, 1; John xx, i, 19. In addition to the week of days, the Jews had three other seasons, denominated weeks, Lev. xxv, 1-17; Deut. xvi, 9-10: 1. The week of weeks. It was a period of seven weeks or forty-nine days, which was succeeded on the fiftieth day by the feast of pentecost, πεντηκοστή, "fifty," Deut. xvi, 9, 10. 2. The week of years. This was a period of seven years, during the last of which the land remained untilled, and the people enjoyed a Sabbath or season of rest. 3. The week of seven sabbatical years. It was a period of forty-nine years, and was succeeded by the year of jubilee, Lev. xxv, 1-22; xxvi, 34. See Year.

WEIGHTS. See "Table of Weights and Measures" at the end of the volume.

WELLS. When the pool, the fountain, and the river fail, the oriental shepherd is reduced to the necessity of digging wells; and, in the patriarchal age, the discovery of water was reckoned of sufficient importance to be the subject of a formal report to the master of the flock, who commonly distinguished the spot by an appropriate name. A remarkable instance of this kind is recorded by Moses in these terms: "And Isaac departed thence, and pitched his tent in the valley of Gerar, and dwelt there. And Isaac digged again the wells of water which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father; for the Philistines had stopped them after the death of Abraham; and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them. And Isaac's servants digged in the valley, and found there a well of springing water. And the herdmen of Gerar did strive with Isaac's herdmen, saying, The water is ours; and he called the name of the well Ezek, because they strove with him. And they digged another well; and they strove for that also, and he called the name of it Sitnah, (opposition;) and he removed from thence and digged another well: and for that they strove not; and he called the name of it Rehoboth, (room;) and he said, For now the Lord hath made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land," Gen. xxvi, 17, &c. "Strife," says Dr. Richardson, "between the different villagers and the different herdsmen here, exists still, as it did in the days of Abraham and Lot: the country has often changed masters; but the habits of the natives, both in this and other respects, have been nearly stationary." So important was the successful operation of sinking a well in Canaan, that the sacred historian remarks in another passage: "And it came to pass the same day, (that Isaac and Abimelech had concluded their treaty,) that Isaac's servants came and told him concerning the well which they had digged, and said unto him, We have found water; and he called it Shebah, (the oath,) therefore the name of the city is Beershebah unto this day," Gen. xxvi, 33. To prevent the sand, which is raised from the parched surface of the ground by the winds, from filling up their wells, they were obliged to cover them with a stone. In this manner the well was covered, from which the flocks of Laban were commonly watered: and the shepherds, careful not to leave them open at any time, patiently waited till all the flocks were gathered together, before they removed the covering, and then, having drawn a sufficient quantity of water, they replaced the stone immediately. The extreme scarcity of water in these arid regions, entirely justifies such vigilant and parsimonious care in the management of this precious fluid; and accounts for the fierce contentions about the possession of a well, which so frequently happened between the shepherds of different masters. But after the question of right, or of possession, was decided, it would seem the shepherds were often detected in fraudulently watering their flocks and

herds from their neighbour's well. To prevent this, they secured the cover with a lock, which continued in use so late as the days of Chardin, who frequently saw such precautions used in different parts of Asia, on account of the real scarcity of water there. According to that intelligent traveller, when the wells and cisterns were not locked up, some person was so far the proprietor that no one dared to open a well or cistern but in his presence. This was probably the reason that the shepherds of Padanaram declined the invitation of Jacob to water the flocks, before they were all assembled; either they had not the key of the lock which secured the stone, or, if they had, they durst not open it but in the presence of Rachel, to whose father the well belonged. It is ridiculous to suppose the stone was so heavy that the united strength of several Mesopotamian shepherds could not roll it from the mouth of the well, when Jacob had strength or address to remove it alone; or that, though a stranger, he ventured to break a standing rule for watering the flocks, which the natives did not dare to do, and that without opposition. The oriental shepherds were not on other occasions so passive, as the violent conduct of the men of Gerar sufficiently proves.

Twice in the day they led their flocks to the wells; at noon, and when the sun was going down. To water the flocks was an operation of much labour, and occupied a considerable space of time. It was, therefore, an office of great kindness with which Jacob introduced himself to the notice of his relations, to roll back the stone which lay upon the mouth of the well, and draw water for the flocks which Rachel tended. Some of these wells are furnished with troughs and flights of steps down to the water, and other contrivances to facilitate the labour of watering the cattle. It is evident the well to which Rebekah went to draw water, near the city of Nahor, had some convenience of this kind; for it is written, "Rebekah hastened and emptied her pitcher into the trough, and ran again unto the well to draw water, and drew for all his camels," Gen. xxiv, 20. A trough was also placed by the 954well, from which the daughters of Jethro watered his flocks, Exod. ii, 16; and, if we may judge from circumstances, was a usual contrivance in every part of the east. In modern times, Mr. Park found a trough near the well, from which the Moors watered their cattle, in the sandy deserts of Sahara. Dr. Shaw, speaking of the occupation of the Moorish women in Barbary, says, "To finish the day, at the time of the evening, even at the time that the women go out to draw water, they are still to fit themselves with a pitcher or goat skin, and tying their sucking children behind them, trudge it in this manner two or three miles to fetch water." "The women in Persia," says Morier, "go in troops to draw water for the place. I have seen the elder ones sitting and chatting at the well, and spinning the coarse cotton of the country, while the young girls filled the skins which contain the water, and which they all carry on their backs into the town." "A public well," says Forbes, "without the gate of Diamonds, in

the city Dhuboy, was a place of great resort: there, most travellers halted for shade and refreshment: the women frequented the fountains and reservoirs morning and evening, to draw water. Many of the Gwzerat wells have steps leading down to the surface of the water; others have not, nor do I recollect any furnished with buckets and ropes for the convenience of a stranger; most travellers are therefore provided with them, and halcarras and religious pilgrims frequently carry a small brass pot affixed to a long string for this purpose.”

WHALE, תן and תניין, Gen. i, 21; Job vii, 12; Ezek. xxxii, 2; κῆτος, Matt. xii, 40; the largest of all the inhabitants of the water. A late author, in a dissertation expressly for the purpose, has proved that the crocodile, and not the whale, is spoken of in Gen. i, 21. The word in Job vii, 12, must also be taken for the crocodile. It must mean some terrible animal, which, but for the watchful care of Divine Providence, would be very destructive. Our translators render it by dragon in Isaiah xxvii, 1, where the prophet gives this name to the king of Egypt: “He shall slay the dragon that is in the sea.” The sea there is the river Nile, and the dragon the crocodile, Ezek. xxxii, 2. On this passage Bochart remarks, “The תניין is not a whale, as people imagine; for a whale has neither feet nor scales, neither is it to be found in the rivers of Egypt; neither does it ascend therefrom upon the land; neither is it taken in the meshes of a net; all of which properties are ascribed by Ezekiel to the תניין of Egypt. Whence it is plain that it is not a whale that is here spoken of, but the crocodile. Merrick supposes David, in Psalm lxxiv, 13, to speak of the tunnie, a kind of whale, with which he was probably acquainted; and Bochart thinks it has its Greek name thunnos from the Hebrew thanot. The last-mentioned fish is undoubtedly that spoken of in Psalm civ, 26. We are told, that, in order to preserve the Prophet Jonah when he was thrown overboard by the mariners, “the Lord prepared a great fish to swallow him up.” What kind of fish it was, is not specified; but the Greek translators take the liberty to give us the word κῆτος, whale; and though St. Matthew, xii, 40, makes use of the same word, we may probably conclude that he did so in a general sense; and that we are not to understand it as an appropriated term, to point out the particular species of fish. It is notorious that sharks are common in the Mediterranean.

WHEAT, חטה, Gen. xxx, 14; Deut. viii, 8; σῖτος, Matt. xiii, 25; Luke xvi, 7; 1 Cor. xv, 37; the principal and the most valuable kind of grain for the service of man. (See Barley, and Fitches.) In Lev. ii, directions are given for oblations, which in our translation are called meat-offerings; but as meat means flesh, and all kinds of offerings there specified, were made of wheat, it had been better to render it “wheaten offerings.” Calmet has observed, that there were five kinds of these, simple flour, oven cakes, cakes of the fire plate, cakes of the frying pan, and green ears of corn. The

word בר, translated corn, Gen. xli, 35, and wheat in Jer. xxiii, 28; Joel ii, 24; Amos v, 11, &c, is undoubtedly the burr, or wild corn of the Arabs, mentioned by Forskal.

WHIRLWIND, a wind which rises suddenly from almost every point, is exceedingly impetuous and rapid, and imparts a whirling motion to dust, sand, water, and occasionally to bodies of great weight and bulk, carrying them either upward or downward, and scattering them about in different directions. Whirlwinds and water spouts are supposed to proceed from the same cause; their only difference being, that the latter pass over the water, and the former over the land. Both of them have a progressive as well as a circular motion, generally rise after calms and great heats, and occur most frequently in warm latitudes. The wind blows in every direction from a large surrounding space, both toward the water spout and the whirlwind; and a water spout has been known to pass, in its progressive motion, from sea to land, and, when it has reached the latter, to produce all the phenomena and effects of a whirlwind. There is no doubt, therefore, of their arising from a similar cause, as they are both explicable on the same general principles. In the imagery employed by the sacred writers, these frightful hurricanes are introduced as the immediate instruments of the divine indignation: "He shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living and in his wrath," Psalm lviii, 9. "God shall rebuke them, and they shall flee far off, and shall be chased as the chaff of the mountains before the wind, and like a rolling thing before the whirlwind," Isaiah xvii, 13. "The Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet," Nahum i, 3. All these are familiar images to the inhabitants of eastern countries, and receive some elucidation from the subjoined descriptions of English travellers. "On the 25th," says Bruce, "at four o'clock in the afternoon, we set out from the villages of the Nuba, intending to arrive at Basbock, where is the ferry over the Nile; 955but we had scarcely advanced two miles into the plain, when we were enclosed in a violent whirlwind, or what is called at sea the water spout. The plain was red earth, which had been plentifully moistened by a shower in the night time. The unfortunate camel that had been taken by Cohala seemed to be nearly in the centre of its vortex; it was lifted and thrown down at a considerable distance, and several of its ribs broken; although, as far as I could guess, I was not near the centre, it whirled me off my feet, and threw me down upon my face, so as to make my nose gush out with blood: two of the servants, likewise, had the same fate. It plastered us all over with mud, almost as smoothly as could have been done with a trowel. It took away my sense and breathing for an instant; and my mouth and nose were full of mud when I recovered. I guess the sphere of its action to be about two hundred feet. It demolished one half of a small hut, as if it had been cut through with a knife, and dispersed the materials all over the plain,



leaving the other half standing.” “When there was a perfect calm,” observes Morier, “partial and strong currents of air would arise, and form whirlwinds, which produced high columns of sand all over the plain. Those that we saw at Shiraz were formed and dissipated in a few minutes: nor is it the nature of this phenomenon to travel far; it being a current of air that takes its way in a capricious and sudden manner, and is dissolved by the very nature of its formation. Whenever one of them took our tents, it generally disturbed them very materially, and frequently threw them down. Their appearance was that of water spouts at sea, and perhaps they are produced in the same manner.” And Burchell remarks: “The hottest days are often the most calm; and at such times the stillness of the atmosphere was sometimes suddenly disturbed in an extraordinary manner. Whirlwinds, raising up columns of dust to a great height in the air, and sweeping over the plains with momentary fury, were no unusual occurrence. As they were always harmless, it was an amusing sight to watch these tall pillars of dust as they rapidly passed by, carrying up every light substance to the height of from one to even three or four hundred feet. The rate at which they travelled varied from five to ten miles in the hour: their form was seldom straight, nor were they quite perpendicular, but uncertain and changing. Whenever they happened to pass over our fire, all the ashes were scattered in an instant, and nothing remained but the heavier sticks and logs. Sometimes they were observed to disappear, and in a minute or two afterward to make their re-appearance at a distance farther on. This occurred whenever they passed over rocky ground, or a surface on which there was no dust, nor other substances sufficiently light to be carried up in the vortex. Sometimes they changed their colour, according to that of the soil or dust which lay in their march; and when they crossed a tract of country where the grass had lately been burned, they assumed a corresponding blackness. But to-day the calm and heat of the air was only the prelude to a violent wind, which commenced as soon as the sun had sunk, and continued during the greater part of the night. The great heat and long-protracted drought of the season had evaporated all moisture from the earth, and rendered the sandy soil excessively light and dusty. Astonishing quantities of the finer particles of this sand were carried up by the wind, and filled the whole atmosphere, where, at a great height, they were borne along by the tempest, and seemed to be real clouds, although of a reddish hue; while the heavier particles, descending again, presented, at a distance, the appearance of mist or driving rains.”

WHITE, a favourite and emblematical colour in Palestine. See Habits.

WIDOW. Among the Hebrews, even before the law, a widow who had no children by her husband was to marry the brother of her deceased spouse, in order to raise up children who might inherit his goods and perpetuate his

name and family. We find the practice of this custom before the law in the person of Tamar, who married successively Er and Onan, the sons of Judah, and who was likewise to have married Selah, the third son of this patriarch, after the two former were dead without issue, Gen. xxxviii, 6–11. The law that appoints these marriages is Deut. xxv, 5, &c. Two motives prevailed to the enacting of this law. The first was, the continuation of estates in the same family; and the other was to perpetuate a man's name in Israel. It was looked upon as a great misfortune for a man to die without an heir, or to see his inheritance pass into another family. This law was not confined to brothers-in-law only, but was extended to more distant relations of the same kind; as we see in the example of Ruth, who married Boaz after she had been refused by a nearer kinsman. See Sandals.

WILL. "In his primitive condition as he came out of the hands of his Creator, man was endowed with such a portion of knowledge, holiness, and power, as enabled him to understand, esteem, consider, will, and to perform the true good, according to the commandment delivered to him: yet none of these acts could he do, except through the assistance of divine grace. But in his lapsed and sinful state, man is not capable, of and by himself, either to think, to will, or to do that which is really good; but it is necessary for him to be regenerated and renewed in his intellect, affections or will, and in all his powers, by God in Christ through the Holy Spirit, that he may be qualified rightly to understand, esteem, consider, will, and perform whatever is truly good. When he is made a partaker of this regeneration, or renovation, since he is delivered from sin, he is capable of thinking, willing, and doing that which is good, but yet not without the continued aids of divine grace." Such were the sentiments of the often misrepresented Arminius on this subject; to which is only to be added, to complete the Scriptural view, that a degree of grace to consider his ways, and to return to God, is through the merit of Christ vouchsafed to every man. Every one must be conscious that he possesses free will, and that he is a free agent; that is, that he is capable of considering and reflecting upon the objects which are presented to his mind, and of acting, in such cases as are possible, according to the determination of his will. And, indeed, without this free agency, actions cannot be morally good or bad; nor can the agents be responsible for their conduct. But the corruption introduced into our nature by the fall of Adam has so weakened our mental powers, has given such force to our passions, and such perverseness to our wills, that a man "cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God." The most pious of those who lived under the Mosaic dispensation often acknowledged the necessity of extraordinary assistance from God: David prays to God to open his eyes, to guide and direct him; to create in him a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within him, Psalm li, 10; cxix, 18, 33, 35. Even we, whose minds are

enlightened by the pure precepts of the Gospel, and urged by the motives which it suggests, must still be convinced of our weakness and depravity, and confess, in the words of the tenth article, that “we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.” The necessity of divine grace to strengthen and regulate our wills, and to coöperate with our endeavours after righteousness, is clearly asserted in the New Testament: “They that are in the flesh cannot please God,” Rom. viii, 8. “Abide in me,” says our Saviour, “and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, and ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing,” John xv, 4, 5. “No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him.” “It is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure,” Phil. ii, 13. “Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God,” 2 Cor. iii, 5. “We know not what to pray for as we ought, but the Spirit helpeth our infirmities,” Rom. viii, 26. We are said to be “led by the Spirit,” and to “walk in the Spirit,” Rom. viii, 14; Gal. v, 16, 25. These texts sufficiently prove that we stand in need both of a prevenient and of a coöperating grace. This doctrine we find asserted in many of the ancient fathers, and particularly in Ambrose, who, in speaking of the effects of the fall, uses these words: “Thence was derived mortality, and no less a multitude of miseries than of crimes. Faith being lost, hope being abandoned, the understanding blinded, and the will made captive, no one found in himself the means of repairing these things. Without the worship of the true God, even that which seems to be virtue is sin; nor can any one please God without God. But whom does he please who does not please God, except himself and Satan? The nature therefore, which was good is made bad by habit: man would not return unless God turned him.” And Cyprian says, “We pray day and night that the sanctification and enlivening, which springs from the grace of God, may be preserved by his protection.” Dr. Nicholls, after quoting many authorities to show that the doctrine of divine grace always prevailed in the catholic church, adds, “I have spent, perhaps, more time in these testimonies than was absolutely necessary; but whatever I have done is to show that the doctrine of divine grace is so essential a doctrine of Christianity, that not only the Holy Scriptures and the primitive fathers assert it, but likewise that the Christians could not in any age maintain their religion without it,—it being necessary, not only for the discharge of Christian duties, but for the performance of our ordinary devotions.” And this seems to have been the opinion of the compilers of our excellent liturgy, in many parts of which both a prevenient and a coöperating grace is unequivocally acknowledged; particularly in the second collect for the

evening service; in the fourth collect at the end of the communion service; in the collect for Easter day; in the collect for the fifth Sunday after Easter; in the collects for the third, ninth, seventeenth, nineteenth, and twenty-fifth Sundays after Trinity. This assistance of divine grace is not inconsistent with the free agency of men: it does not place them under an irresistible restraint, or compel them to act contrary to their will. Our own exertions are necessary to enable us to work out our salvation; but our sufficiency for that purpose is from God. It is, however, impossible to ascertain the precise boundary between our natural efforts and the divine assistance, whether that assistance be considered as a coöperating or a prevenient grace. Without destroying our character as free and accountable beings, God may be mercifully pleased to counteract the depravity of our hearts by the suggestions of his Spirit; but still it remains with us to choose whether we will listen to those suggestions, or obey the lusts of the flesh. We may rest assured that he will, by the communication of his grace, varied often as to power and distinctness, help our infirmities, invigorate our resolutions, and supply our defects. The promises that if we draw nigh to God, God will draw nigh to us, and pour out his Spirit upon us, James iv, 8; Acts ii, 17, and that he will give his Holy Spirit to every one that asketh him, Luke xi, 13, imply that God is ever ready to work upon our hearts, and to aid our well-doing through the powerful, though invisible, operation of his Spirit: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit," John iii, 8. The joint agency of God and man, in the work of human salvation, is pointed out in the following passage: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure," Phil, ii, 12, 13; and therefore we may assure ourselves that free will and grace are not incompatible, though the mode and degree of their coöperation be utterly inexplicable, and though at different times one may appear for a season to overwhelm the other. This doctrine has, however, been the subject of much dispute among Christians: some sects contend for the irresistible impulses of grace, and others reject the idea of any influence of the divine Spirit upon the human mind. The former opinion seems irreconcilable with the free agency of man, if held as the constant unvarying mode in which he carries on his work in the soul of man, and the latter contradicts the authority of Scripture; "and therefore," says Vener, "let us neither ascribe nothing to free will, nor too much; let us not, with the defenders of irresistible grace, deny free will, or make it of no effect, not only before, but even under, grace; nor let us suffer the efficacy of saving grace, on the other hand, to be swallowed up in the strength and freedom of our wills; but, allowing the government or superiority to the grace of God, let the will of man be admitted to be its handmaid, but such a one as is free, and freely obeys; by which, when it is freely excited by the

admonitions of prevenient grace, when it is prepared as to its affections, strengthened and assisted as to its powers and faculties, a man freely and willingly coöperates with God, that the grace of God be not received in vain." "All men are also to be admonished," observes Cranmer, in his "Necessary Doctrine," "and chiefly preachers, that in this high matter they, looking on both sides, so temper and moderate themselves, that they neither so preach the grace of God that they take away thereby free will, nor on the other side so extol free will, that injury be done to the grace of God." And Jortin remarks: "Thus do the doctrine of divine grace and the doctrine of free will or human liberty unite and conspire, in a friendly manner, to our everlasting good. The first is adapted to excite in us gratitude, faith, and humility; the second, to awaken our caution and quicken our diligence."

Many, indeed, relying on mere abstract arguments, deny free will, in the strict meaning of the term, altogether, and define the mental faculties of man according to their various fancies. But the existence and nature of our moral and rational powers are and ought to be, in true philosophy, the subject of mental observation, not the sport of hypothesis. Those who love metaphysical abstractions may people the worlds of their imagination with beings of whatsoever character they prefer; but the nature and capabilities of man, as he really is, must be determined not by speculation but by experience. It is true that this experience is the object of consciousness, not of the senses; and, accordingly, each man is, in some respect, the judge in his own case, and may, if he chooses, deny his own freedom and his power of self control, or of using those means which God hath appointed to lead to this result. But this is seldom done in ordinary life, except by those abandoned individuals who seek, in such a statement, an excuse for capricious or unprincipled conduct,--an excuse which is never admitted by the majority of reasoning persons, much less by the truly pious. The latter, indeed, will always be found attributing any thing good they achieve to the coöperating efficacy of superior assistance. But they will, with equal sincerity, blame themselves for what they have done amiss; or, in other words, acknowledge that they should and might have willed and acted otherwise; and this is exactly the practical question, the very turning point, on which the whole controversy hinges. The only competent judges in such a question, says Dr. R. H. Graves, are those who have made it the subject of mental observation, exertion, and pursuit; or, in other words, those who have sought after righteousness, under whatever dispensation, Acts x, 35; Romans ii, 7, 10. And surely the confessions, the prayers, the repentance, and the sacrifices, of the humble and pious of all ages show that they felt, not only that they were themselves to blame for their actions, and therefore that they might have done otherwise, that is, they had a free will, but that, to make this will operative in spiritual matters, they required an aid beyond

the reach of mere human attainment. Some may fancy this statement inconsistent in itself; and I allow that it cannot satisfy the mere speculative supporters either of free will or its opponents. But to me it seems the testimony of conscience and experience, which, in natural religion, must, as I conceive, be preferred to abstract hypothesis. The inquiry is not how the mind may be, but how it is actually, constituted. This surely is a question of fact, not of conjecture, and must therefore be decided by an appeal to common sense and experience, not by random speculation. Again: even those who in theory contend for the doctrine of necessity, yet in all the affairs of life where their interests, comforts, or gratifications are concerned, both speak and act as if they disbelieved it, and as if they really imagined themselves capable of such self determination and self control, as to improve their talents, their opportunities, and their acquirements, and so to exercise a material influence on their worldly fortunes. But suppose the assertions of individuals, as to their consciousness in this particular, to disagree. It is then evident, that, the question being as to the nature of man in general, it must be determined by the voice of preponderating testimony. But how, it may be asked, are the suffrages to be collected? Since the judgment of each individual must in this scheme be considered as a separate fact, how is a sufficiently extensive induction to be made? In answer, it may be asserted, that in every civilized nation the induction has been already made, the suffrages have been taken, the case has been tried, and the decision is on record. And the verdict is the most impartial 958that can be looked for in such a case, because given without any reference to the controversy in dispute. All human laws, forbidding, condemning, and punishing vicious actions, are grounded on the acknowledged supposition that man is possessed of a self control, a self determining power, by which he could, both in will and in deed, have avoided the very actions for which he is condemned, and in the very circumstances in which he has committed them. Nor would it be easy to find a case where the criminal has deceived himself, or hoped to deceive his judges, by pleading that he laboured under a fatal necessity, which rendered his crimes unavoidable, and therefore excusable. The justice of all legislative enactments evidently and essentially depends on the principle, that the things prohibited can be avoided, or, in other words, might have been done otherwise than they were done; and this is the very turning point of the controversy. Accordingly, in whatever instances such freedom of will is not presupposed, (as in the cases of idiots and madmen,) the operation of such enactments is suspended. All nations, therefore, who consent to frame and abide by such laws, do thereby testify their deliberate and solemn assent to the truth of this principle, and, consequently, to the existence of free will in man; and do certify the sincerity of their conviction by staking upon it their properties, their liberties, and their lives. Numberless other instances might be adduced in which the practice of mankind implies their belief in this

principle. And so conscious of this are the opponents of free will, that they generally deprecate appeals to common sense and experience, and resort to metaphysical arguments to examine what is in truth a matter of truth, not of conjecture; or, in other words, to determine, not what man is, but what they imagine he must be. In their reasonings they differ, as might have been expected, as much from each other as they do from truth and reality. But the experience of common sense and conscience will always decide, that no man can conscientiously make this excuse for his crimes, that he could not have willed or acted otherwise than he did. The existence of the above faculties in the human mind once acknowledged leads, by necessary inference, to the admission, that there exists in the great First Cause a power to create them. Not, indeed, that these faculties themselves exist in him in the same manner as in us, but the power of originating and producing them in all possible variety. We can indeed conclude, that having created all these in us, his nature must be so perfect that we cannot attribute to him any line of conduct inconsistent with whatever is excellent in the exercise of these faculties in ourselves. And therefore we cannot ascribe to him, as his special act, any thing we should perceive to be unworthy of any just or merciful, any wise or upright, being. But this furnishes no clue whatever to a knowledge of the real constitution of his nature, or of the manner in which his divine attributes exist together. In truth, we no more comprehend how he wills than how he acts, and therefore we have no better right to assert that he wills evil than that he does evil. Again: we as little understand how he knows as how he sees, and therefore might as well argue that all things exist in consequence of his beholding them, as that all events arise in consequence of his foreknowing them. In short, all that can be inferred by reason concerning the intrinsic nature of the invisible, unsearchable Deity, must be admitted by the candid inquirer to be no better than conjecture. And he who should hope from such doubtful support as his fancied insight into the unknown operations of the divine mind to suspend a system of irrespective decrees, embracing the moral government of the world, would but too much resemble him who should imagine the material globe adequately sustained if upheld by a chain whose highest links were wrapped in clouds and darkness. Thus our affirmative knowledge of the Deity, as derived from this part of our inquiry, consists in the certainty, (though his nature is unknown to us,) that he is the creative source of all that is great, glorious, and good in heaven or in earth; while we may negatively conclude, that his moral government shall, on the whole, be conducted in a manner not inconsistent with whatever is excellent in the exercise of power and wisdom, justice and mercy, goodness and truth. Nor is it a little important, as connected with the present inquiry, to keep in mind this distinction between our affirmative and negative knowledge in this matter. For it shows us that as, on the one side, we cannot pretend to such an insight into the nature and character of the divine

knowledge as to deduce therefrom a system of eternal and irrespective decrees; so neither, on the other, can this system of moral government be ascribed to the Deity, because it would be manifestly unworthy, not merely of him who has created all moral excellence, but of any of those beings on whom he has conferred the most ordinary degrees of mercy and justice. The natural benefits or evils arising out of moral or immoral practices are, in fact, so many rewards or punishments, exhibiting the Being who has so constituted our nature as a moral governor. This part of his government may not be so clearly discernible in individual instances, because much of the happiness and unhappiness attending virtue and vice is mental and invisible. In the case of nations, however, considered merely as bodies politic, the internal sanction of an approving or reproaching conscience, of subdued or distracting passions, can have no existence; and therefore the external sanctions are more uniformly enforced. Hence, whoever carefully examines the dealings of Providence with the human race will admit, that national prosperity has ever kept pace with national wisdom and integrity; whereas, the greatest empires, when once corrupted, have soon become the prey of internal strife or foreign domination. Again: man is made for society, and cannot exist without it: consequently, all the regulations which are really conducive to the maintenance of civil policy and social order must be regarded as evident consequences of our nature, when enlightened to the rational pursuit of its own advantage; and therefore should be considered as intimations of a moral government, carried on through their intervention. In addition to which, it ought to be observed, that these laws may be regarded in another point of view,—as a most important class of moral phenomena; inasmuch as they virtually exhibit the most unexceptionable declarations of reason on this subject, because they are collected from the common consent of mankind, and therefore rendered, in a great measure, independent of the obliquities of individual intellect, the errors of private judgment, and the partial views of self interest, prejudice, or passion. But all the laws of civilized nations, both in their enactment and administration, not only presuppose certain notions concerning the freedom and accountableness of man, the merit and demerit of human actions, and the inseparable connection of virtue and vice with rewards and punishments, but greatly contribute to fix and perpetuate these notions. It is therefore evidently the intention of that part of the moral government with which we are acquainted, to impress these principles deeply on the human mind, and to induce the human race to regulate their conduct accordingly. The laws, then, of this moral government under which we find ourselves placed, and from which we cannot escape, correspond with and corroborate the conclusions deduced from the observation of mental phenomena. And from both we conclude that similar principles of government will be adopted, (so far, at least, as man is concerned,) in other worlds and in future ages; only more developed, and



therefore more evidently free from its present apparent imperfections. Upon this account we look, in another life, for some such general disclosure and consummation of the ways and wisdom of Providence as shall vindicate, even in the minor details, the grand principles upon which, generally speaking, the government of God is at present obviously conducted. How this may be done, with many questions connected therewith, reason without revelation could, as I conceive, do little more than form plausible conjectures. Though now that it has pleased God in Christ to bring “life and immortality to light through the Gospel,” it is possible for reason to estimate the beauty and the mercy and the wisdom of the dispensation by which it has been effected.

WIND. The Hebrews, like us, acknowledge four principal winds, Ezek. xiii, 16–18: the east wind, the north wind, the south wind, and the west wind, or that from the Mediterranean sea. See Whirlwind.

WINDOWS. The method of building both in Barbary and the Levant seems to have continued the same from the earliest ages. All the windows open into private courts, if we except sometimes a latticed window or balcony toward the street. It is only during the celebration of some *zeenah*, or public festival, that these houses and their latticed windows are left open; for this being a time of great liberty, revelling, and extravagance, each family is ambitious of adorning both the inside and outside of their houses with the richest part of their furniture; while crowds of both sexes, dressed out in their best apparel, and laying aside all ceremony and restraint, go in and out where they please. The account we have, 2 Kings ix, 30, of Jezebel’s painting her face, tiring her head, and looking out at a window upon Jehu’s public entry into Jezreel, gives us a lively idea of an eastern lady at one of those solemnities.

WINE, יַיִן, Gen. xix, 32, οἶνος, Matt. ix, 17, a liquor expressed from grapes. The art of refining wine upon the lees was known to the Jews. The particular process, as it is now practised in the island of Cyprus, is described in Mariti’s Travels. The wine is put immediately from the vat into large vases of potters’ ware, pointed at the bottom, till they are nearly full, when they are covered tight and buried. At the end of a year what is designed for sale is drawn into wooden casks. The dregs in the vases are put into wooden casks destined to receive wine, with as much of the liquor as is necessary to prevent them from becoming dry before use. Casks thus prepared are very valuable. When the wine a year old is put in, the dregs rise, and make it appear muddy, but afterward they subside and carry down all the other feculences. The dregs are so much valued that they are not sold with the wine in the vase, unless particularly mentioned.

The "new wine," or "must," is mentioned, Isa. xlix, 26; Joel i, 5; iii, 18; and Amos ix, 13, under the name עֲסִים. The "mixed wine," מְמֻסָּד, Prov. xxiii, 30, and in Isaiah lxv, 11 rendered "drink-offering," may mean wine made stronger and more inebriating by the addition of higher and more powerful ingredients, such as honey, spices, defrutum, or wine inspissated by boiling it down, myrrh, mandragora, and other strong drugs. Thus the drunkard is properly described as one that seeketh "mixed wine," Prov. xxiii, 30, and is mighty to "mingle strong drink," Isa. v, 22; and hence the psalmist took that highly poetical and sublime image of the cup of God's wrath, called by Isaiah, li, 17, "the cup of trembling," containing, as St. John expresses it, Rev. xiv, 10, pure wine made yet stronger by a mixture of powerful ingredients: "In the hand of Jehovah is a cup, and the wine is turbid; it is full of a mixed liquor, and he poureth out of it," or rather, "he poureth it out of one vessel into another," to mix it perfectly; "verily the dregs thereof," the thickest sediment of the strong ingredients mingled with it, "all the ungodly of the earth shall wring them out, and drink them." "Spiced wine," Cant. viii, 2, was wine rendered more palatable and fragrant with aromatics. This was considered as a great delicacy. Spiced wines were not peculiar to the Jews; Hafiz speaks of wines "richly bitter, richly sweet." The Romans lined their vessels, amphoræ, with odorous gums, to give the wine a warm bitter flavour: and the orientals now use the admixture of spices to give their wines a favourite relish. The "wine of Helbon," 960Ezek. xxvii, 18, was an excellent kind of wine, known to the ancients by the name of chalibonium vinum. It was made at Damascus; the Persians had planted vineyards there on purpose, says Posidosius, quoted by Athenæus. This author says that the kings of Persia used no other wine. Hosea, xiv, 7, mentions the wine of Lebanon. The wines from the vineyards on that mount are even to this day in repute; but some think that this may mean a sweet-scented wine, or wine flavoured with fragrant gums.

**WINE PRESS.** The vintage in Syria commences about the middle of September, and continues till the middle of November. But grapes in Palestine, we are informed, were ripe sometimes even in June or July, which arose perhaps from a triple pruning, in which case there was also a third vintage. The first vintage was in August, the second in September, and the third in October. The grapes when not gathered were sometimes found on the vines until November and December. The Hebrews were required to leave gleanings for the poor, Lev. xix, 10. The season of vintage was a most joyful one, Judges ix, 27; Isaiah xvi, 10; Jer. xxv, 30; xlviii, 33. With shoutings on all sides, the grapes were plucked off and carried to the wine press, פַּאֲרָה, פּוֹרָה, ληνός, which was in the vineyard, Isa. liii, 3; Zech. xiv, 10; Haggai ii, 16; Matt. xxi, 33; Rev. xiv, 19, 20. The presses consisted of two receptacles, which were either built of stones and covered with plaster, or hewn out of a large rock. The upper receptacle, called נַת, as it is

constructed at the present time in Persia, is nearly eight feet square and four feet high. Into this the grapes are thrown and trodden out by five men. The juice flows out into the lower receptacle, through a grated aperture, which is made in the side near the bottom of the upper one. The treading of the wine press was laborious, and not very favourable to cleanliness; the garments of the persons thus employed were stained with the red juice, and yet the employment was a joyful one. It was performed with singing, accompanied with musical instruments; and the treaders, as they jumped, exclaimed,  $\text{וְהִיָּה}$ , Isa. xvi, 9, 10; Jer. xxv, 30; xlviii, 32, 33. Figuratively, vintage, gleaning, and treading the wine press, signified battles and great slaughters, Isa. xvii, 6; lxiii, 1–3; Jer. xlix, 9; Lam. i, 15. The must, as is customary in the east at the present day, was preserved in large firkins, which were buried in the earth. The wine cellars were not subterranean, but built upon the earth. When deposited in these, the firkins, as is done at the present time in Persia, were sometimes buried in the ground, and sometimes left standing upon it. Formerly, also, new wine or must was preserved in leathern bottles; and, lest they should be broken by fermentation, the people were very careful that the bottles should be new, Job xxxii, 19; Matt. ix, 17; Mark ii, 22. Sometimes the must was boiled and made into syrup, which is comprehended under the term  $\text{שֶׁבֶבֶת}$ , although it is commonly rendered “honey,” Gen. xliii, 11; 2 Chron. xxxi, 5. Sometimes the grapes were dried in the sun and preserved in masses, which were called “bunches or clusters of raisins,” 1 Sam. xxv, 18; 2 Sam. xvi, 1; 1 Chron. xii, 40; Hosea iii, 1. From these dried grapes, when soaked in wine and pressed a second time, was manufactured sweet wine, which is also called new wine,  $\text{γλεῦκος}$ , Acts ii, 13.

WISDOM is put for that prudence and discretion which enables a man to perceive that which is fit to be done, according to the circumstances of time, place, persons, manners, and end of doing, Eccles. ii, 13, 14. It was this sort of wisdom that Solomon intreated of God with so much earnestness, and which God granted him with such divine liberality, 1 Kings iii, 9, 12, 28. It also signifies quickness of invention, and dexterity in the execution of several works, which require not so much strength of body, as industry, and labour of the mind. For example, God told Moses, Exod. xxxi, 3, that he had filled Bezaleel and Aholiab with wisdom, and understanding, and knowledge, to invent and perform several sorts of work for completing the tabernacle. It is used for craft, cunning, and stratagem, and that whether good or evil. Thus it is said by Moses, that Pharaoh dealt wisely with the Israelites, when he opposed them in Egypt, Exodus i, 10: it is observed of Jonadab, the friend of Ammon, and nephew of David, that he was very wise, that is, very subtle and crafty, 2 Sam. xiii, 3; and Job, v, 13, says, that God “taketh the wise in their own craftiness.” Wisdom means also doctrine, learning, and experience: “With the ancient is wisdom, and

in length of days understanding,” Job xii, 12. It is put for true piety, or the fear of God, which is spiritual wisdom: “So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom,” Psalm xc, 12; “The fear of the Lord that is wisdom,” Job xxvii, 28. Wisdom is put for the eternal Wisdom, the Word of God. It was by wisdom that God established the heavens, and founded the earth, Prov. iii, 19. How magnificently does Solomon describe the primeval birth of the eternal Son of God, under the character of Wisdom personified; to which so many references and allusions are to be found in the Old and New Testament! “The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth,” Prov. viii, 22–25. The apocryphal book of Wisdom introduces, by a reference to this passage, the following admirable invocation, Wisdom ix, 9, 10:--

“O send forth wisdom, out of thy holy heavens,  
 Even from the throne of thy glory;  
 That being present she may labour with me,  
 That I may know what is pleasing in thy sight!”  
 And our Lord assumes the title of Wisdom, Luke xi, 49; Matt. xxiii, 34; and declares that “wisdom shall be justified of all her children,” Matt. xi, 19; Luke vii, 35.

961 WISDOM, Book of, an apocryphal book of Scripture, so called on account of the wise maxims contained in it. This book has been commonly ascribed to Solomon, either because the author imitated that king’s manner of writing, or because he sometimes speaks in his name. But it is certain Solomon was not the author of it; for it was not written in Hebrew, nor was it inserted in the Jewish canon, nor is the style like that of Solomon; and therefore St. Jerom observes justly that it smells strong of the Grecian eloquence; that it is composed with art and method, after the manner of the Greek philosophers, very different from that noble simplicity so full of life and energy to be found in the Hebrew books. It has been ascribed by many of the ancients to Philo.

WOLF,  $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ , in Arabic, zeeb, Gen. xlix, 27; Isa. xi, 6; lxv, 25; Jer. v, 6; Ezek. xxii, 27; Zeph. iii, 3; Hab. i, 8;  $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ , Matt. vii, 15; x, 16; Luke x, 3; John x, 12; Acts xx, 29; Eccles. xiii, 17. M. Majus derives it from the Arabic word zaab or daaba, “to frighten;” and hence, perhaps, the German word dieb, “a thief.” The wolf is a fierce, strong, cunning, mischievous, and carnivorous quadruped; externally and internally so nearly resembling the dog, that they seem modelled alike, yet have a perfect antipathy to each other. The Scripture observes of the wolf, that it lives upon rapine; is

violent, bloody, cruel, voracious, and greedy; goes abroad by night to seek its prey, and is a great enemy to flocks of sheep. Indeed, this animal is fierce without cause, kills without remorse, and by its indiscriminate slaughter seems to satisfy its malignity rather than its hunger. The wolf is weaker than the lion or the bear, and less courageous than the leopard; but he scarcely yields to them in cruelty and rapaciousness. His ravenous temper prompts him to destructive and sanguinary depredations; and these are perpetrated principally in the night. This circumstance is expressly mentioned in several passages of Scripture. "The great men have altogether broken the yoke and burst the bonds; wherefore, a lion out of the forest shall slay them, and a wolf of the evenings shall spoil them," Jer. v, 6. The rapacious and cruel conduct of the princes of Israel is compared by Ezekiel, xxii, 27, to the mischievous inroads of the same animal: "Her princes in the midst thereof are like wolves ravening the prey, to shed blood, to destroy lives, to get dishonest gain;" and Zephaniah, iii, 3, says, "Her princes within her are roaring lions, her judges are evening wolves: they gnaw not the bones till the morrow." Instead of protecting the innocent and restraining the evil doer, or punishing him according to the demerit of his crimes, they delight in violence and oppression, in blood and rapine; and so insatiable is their cupidity, that, like the evening wolf, they destroy more than they are able to possess. The dispositions of the wolf to attack the weaker animals, especially those which are under the protection of man, is alluded to by our Saviour in the parable of the hireling shepherd: "The wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the flock," Matt. vii, 15. And the Apostle Paul, in his address to the elders of Ephesus, gives the name of this insidious and cruel animal to the false teachers who disturbed the peace and perverted the faith of their people: "I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock," Acts xx, 29.

WORD. Sometimes the Scripture ascribes to the word of God certain supernatural effects, and often represents it as animated and active: "He sent his word and healed them," Psalm cvii, 20. It also signifies what is written in the sacred books of the Old and New Testament, Luke xi, 28; James i, 22; the divine law which teaches and commands good things, and forbids evil, Psalm cxix, 101; and is used to express every promise of God, Psalm cxix, 25, &c, and prophecy or vision, Isaiah, ii, 1. This term is likewise consecrated and appropriated to signify the only Son of the Father, the uncreated Wisdom, the second Person of the most holy Trinity, equal to and consubstantial with the Father. St. John the evangelist, more expressly than any other, has opened to us the mystery of the Word of God, when he tells us, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that

was made,” John i, 1–3. The Chaldee paraphrasts, the most ancient Jewish writers extant, generally make use of the word memra, which signifies “the Word,” in those places where Moses puts the name Jehovah. They say, for example, that it was the Memra, or the Word, which created the world, which appeared to Moses on Mount Sinai, which gave him the law, which spoke to him face to face, which brought Israel out of Egypt, which marched before the people, and which wrought all those miracles that are recorded in Exodus. It was the same Word that appeared to Abraham in the plain of Mamre, that was seen of Jacob at Bethel, to whom Jacob made his vow, and acknowledged as God, saying, “If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, then shall the Lord be my God,” Gen. xxviii, 20, 21. The manner in which St. John commences his Gospel is strikingly different from the introductions to the histories of Christ by the other evangelists; and no less striking and peculiar is the title under which he announces him--“the Word.” It has therefore been a subject of much inquiry and discussion, from whence this evangelist drew the use of this appellation, and what reasons led him, as though intending to solicit particular attention, to place it at the very head of his Gospel. That it was for the purpose of establishing an express opinion, as to the personal character of him it is used to designate, is made more than probable from the predominant character of the whole Gospel, which is more copiously doctrinal, and contains a record more full of what Jesus “said” than the others. As to the source from which the term Logos was drawn 962 by the Apostle, some have held it to be taken from the Jewish Scriptures; others, from the Chaldee paraphrases; others, from Philo and the Hellenizing Jews. The most natural conclusion certainly appears to be, that, as St. John was a plain, “unlearned” man, chiefly conversant in the Holy Scriptures, he derived this term from the sacred books of his own nation, in which the Hebrew phrase, Dabar Jehovah, “the Word of Jehovah,” frequently occurs in passages which must be understood to speak of a personal Word, and which phrase is rendered Λόγος Κυρίου [the word of the Lord] by the Septuagint interpreters. Certainly, there is not the least evidence in his writings, or in his traditional history, that he ever acquainted himself with Philo or with Plato; and none, therefore, that he borrowed the term from them, or used it in any sense approaching to or suggested by these refinements:--in the writings of St. Paul there are allusions to poets and philosophers; in those of St. John, none, except to the rising sects afterward known under the appellation of Gnostics. The Hebrew Scriptures contain frequent intimations of a distinction of Persons in the Godhead; one of these Divine Persons is called Jehovah; and, though manifestly represented as existing distinct from the Father, is yet arrayed with attributes of divinity, and was acknowledged by the ancient Jews to be, in the highest sense, “their God,” the God with whom, through all their history, they chiefly “had to do.” This Divine Person is proved to have been spoken of

by the prophets as the future Christ; the evangelists and Apostles represent Jesus as that Divine Person of the prophets; and if, in the writings of the Old Testament, he is also called the Word, the application of this term to our Lord is naturally accounted for. It will then appear to be a theological, not a philosophic appellation, and one which, previously even to the time of the Apostle, had been stamped with the authority of inspiration.

Celebrated as this title of the Logos was in the Jewish theology, it is not, however, the appellation by which the Spirit of inspiration has chosen that our Saviour should be principally designated. It occurs but a very few times, and principally and emphatically in the introduction to St. John's Gospel. A cogent reason can be given why this Apostle adopts it; and we are not without a probable reason why, in the New Testament, the title "Son of God" should have been preferred, which is a frequent title of the Logos in the writings also of Philo. Originating from the spiritual principle of connection, between the first and the second Being in the Godhead; marking this, by a spiritual idea of connection; and considering it to be as close and as necessary as the Word is to the energetic mind of God, which cannot bury its intellectual energies in silence, but must put them forth in speech; it is too spiritual in itself, to be addressed to the faith of the multitude. If with so full a reference to our bodily ideas, and so positive a filiation of the second Being to the first, we have seen the attempts of Arian criticism endeavouring to resolve the doctrine into the mere dust of a figure; how much more ready would it have been to do so, if we had only such a spiritual denomination as this for the second! This would certainly have been considered by it as too unsubstantial for distinct personality, and therefore too evanescent for equal divinity. One of the first teachers of this system was Cerinthus. We have not any particular account of all the branches of his system; and it is possible that we may ascribe to him some of those tenets by which later sects of Gnostics were discriminated. But we have authority for saying, that the general principle of the Gnostic scheme was openly taught by Cerinthus before the publication of the Gospel of St. John. The authority is that of Irenæus, a bishop who lived in the second century, who in his youth had heard Polycarp, the disciple of the Apostle John, and who retained the discourses of Polycarp in his memory till his death. There are yet extant of the works of Irenæus, five books which he wrote against heresies, one of the most authentic and valuable monuments of theological erudition. In one place of that work he says, that Cerinthus taught in Asia that the world was not made by the Supreme God, but by a certain power very separate and far removed from the Sovereign of the universe, and ignorant of his nature. In another place, he says that John the Apostle wished, by his Gospel, to extirpate the error which had been spread among men by Cerinthus; and Jerom, who lived in the fourth century, says that St. John wrote his Gospel, at the desire of the bishops of Asia, against

Cerinthus and other heretics, and chiefly against the doctrines of the Ebionites, then springing up, who said that Christ did not exist before he was born of Mary.

“It appears,” says Dr. Hill, “to have been the tradition of the Christian church, that St. John, who lived to a great age, and who resided at Ephesus, in Proconsular Asia, was moved by the growth of the Gnostic heresies, and by the solicitations of the Christian teachers, to bear his testimony to the truth in writing, and particularly to recollect those discourses and actions of our Lord, which might furnish the clearest refutation of the persons who denied his preëxistence. This tradition is a key to a great part of his Gospel. Matthew, Mark, and Luke had given a detail of those actions of Jesus which are the evidences of his divine mission; of those events in his life upon earth which are most interesting to the human race; and of those moral discourses in which the wisdom, the grace, and the sanctity of the Teacher shine with united lustre. Their whole narration implies that Jesus was more than man. But as it is distinguished by a beautiful simplicity, which adds very much to their credit as historians, they have not, with the exception of a few incidental expressions, formally stated the conclusion that Jesus was more than man; but have left the Christian world to draw it for themselves from the facts narrated, or to receive it by the teaching and the writings of the Apostles. St. John, who was preserved by 963 God to see this conclusion, which had been drawn by the great body of Christians, and had been established in the epistles, denied by different heretics, brings forward, in the form of a history of Jesus, a view of his exalted character, and draws our attention particularly to the truth of that which had been denied. When you come to analyze the Gospel of St. John, you will find that the first eighteen verses contain the positions laid down by the Apostle, in order to meet the errors of Cerinthus; that these positions, which are merely affirmed in the introduction, are proved in the progress of the Gospel, by the testimony of John the Baptist, and by the words and the actions of our Lord; and that after the proof is concluded by the declaration of Thomas, who, upon being convinced that Jesus had risen, said to him, ‘My Lord, and my God,’ St. John sums up the amount of his Gospel in these few words: ‘These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God;’ that is, that Jesus and the Christ are not distinct persons, and that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. The Apostle does not condescend to mention the name of Cerinthus, because that would have preserved, as long as the world lasts, the memory of a name which might otherwise be forgotten. But, although there is dignity and propriety in omitting the mention of his name, it was necessary, in laying down the positions that were to meet his errors, to adopt some of his words, because the Christians of those days would not so readily have applied the doctrine of the Apostle to the refutation of those heresies which Cerinthus was



spreading among them, if they had not found in the exposition of that doctrine some of the terms in which the heresy was delivered; and as the chief of these terms, Logos, which Cerinthus applied to an inferior spirit, was equivalent to a phrase in common use among the Jews, 'the Word of Jehovah,' and was probably borrowed from thence, John by his use of Logos rescues it from the degraded use of Cerinthus, and restores it to a sense corresponding to the dignity of the Jewish phrase."

The Logos was no fanciful term, merely invented by St. John, *pro re natâ*, [according to circumstances,] or even suggested by the Holy Spirit, as a suitable title for a prophet by whom God chose to reveal himself or his Word. It was a term diversely understood in the world before St. John began his Gospel. Is it possible, therefore, that he should have used the term without some express allusion to these prevailing opinions? Had he contradicted them all, it would, of course, have been a plain proof, that they were all equally fabulous and fanciful; but by adopting the term, he certainly meant to show, that the error did not consist in believing that there was a Logos, or Word of God, but in thinking amiss of it. We might, indeed, have wondered much had he decidedly adopted the Platonic or Gnostic notions, in preference to the Jewish; but that he should harmonize with the latter, is by no means surprising; first, because he was a Jew himself; and, secondly, because Christianity was plainly to be shown to be connected with, and, as it were, regularly to have sprung out of, Judaism. It is certainly, then, in the highest degree consistent with all we could reasonably expect, to find St. John and others of the sacred writers expressing themselves in terms not only familiar to the Jews under the old covenant, but, in such as might tend, by a perfect revelation of the truth, to give instruction to all parties; correcting the errors of the Platonic and oriental systems, and confirming, in the clearest manner, the hopes and expectations of the Jews.

While the reasons for the use of this term by St. John are obvious, the argument from it is irresistible; for, first, the Logos of the evangelist is a person, not an attribute, as many Socinians have said, who have, therefore, sometimes chosen to render it wisdom. For if it be an attribute, it were a mere truism to say, that "it was in the beginning with God;" because God could never be without his attributes. The Apostle also declares, that the Logos was the Light; but that John Baptist was not the light. Here is a kind of parallel supposed, and it presumes, also, that it was possible that the same character might be erroneously ascribed to both. Between person and person this may, undoubtedly, be the case; but what species of parallel can exist between man and an attribute? Nor will the difficulty be obviated by suggesting, that wisdom here means not the attribute itself, but him whom that attribute inspired, the man Jesus Christ, because the name of our

Saviour has not yet been mentioned; because that rule of interpretation must be inadmissible, which at one time would explain the term Logos by an attribute, at another by a man, as best suits the convenience of hypothesis; and because, if it be, in this instance, conceived to indicate our Saviour, it must follow, that our Saviour created the world, (which the Unitarians will by no means admit,) for the Logos, who was that which John the Baptist was not, the true Light, is expressly declared to have made the world. Again: the Logos was made flesh, that is, became man; but in what possible sense could an attribute become man? The Logos is “the only begotten of the Father;” but it would be uncouth to say of any attribute, that it is begotten; and, if that were passed over, it would follow, from this notion, either that God has only one attribute, or that wisdom is not his only begotten attribute. Farther: St. John uses terms decisively personal, as that he is God, not divine as an attribute, but God personally; not that he was in God, which would properly have been said of an attribute, but with God, which he could only say of a person; that “all things were made by him;” that he was “in the world;” that “he came to his own;” that he was “in the bosom of the Father;” and that “he hath declared the Father.” The absurdity of representing the Logos of St. John as an attribute seems, at length, to have been perceived by the Socinians themselves, and their new version accordingly regards it as a personal term.

If the Logos be a person, then is he Divine; for, first, eternity is ascribed to him: “In the beginning was the Word.” The Unitarian comment is, “from the beginning of his ministry,” or “the commencement of the Gospel dispensation;” which makes St. John use another trifling truism, and solemnly tell his readers, that our Saviour, when he began his ministry, was in existence! “in the beginning of his ministry the Word was!” It is true, that ἀρχή, “the beginning,” is used for the beginning of Christ’s ministry, when he says that the Apostles had been with him from the beginning; and it may be used for the beginning of any thing whatever. It is a term which must be determined in its meaning by the context; and the question, therefore, is, how the connection here determines it. Almost immediately it is added, “All things were made by him;” which can only mean the creation of universal nature. He, then, who made all things was prior to all created things; he was when they began to be, and before they began to be; and, if he existed before all created things, he was not himself created, and was, therefore, eternal. Secondly, he is expressly called God; and, thirdly, he is as explicitly said to be the Creator of all things. The two last particulars have often been largely established, and nothing need be added, except, as another proof that the Scriptures can only be fairly explained by the doctrine of a distinction of divine Persons in the Godhead, the declaration of St. John may be adduced, that “the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” What hypothesis but this goes a single step to explain

this wonderful language? Arianism, which allows the preëxistence of Christ with God, accords with the first clause, but contradicts the second. Sabellianism, which reduces the personal to an official, and therefore a temporal, distinction, accords with the second clause, but contradicts the first; for Christ, according to this theory, was not with God in the beginning, that is in eternity. Socinianism contradicts both clauses; for on that scheme Christ was neither with God in the beginning, nor was he God. "The faith of God's elect" agrees with both clauses, and by both it is established: "The Word was with God, and the Word was God." See Unitarians.

WORM, the general name in Scripture for little creeping insects. Several kinds are spoken of: 1. Those that breed in putrefied bodies, רמה, Exod. xvi, 20, 24; Job vii, 5; xvii, 14; xxi, 26; xxiv, 20; xxv, 6; Isa. xiv, 11; σκόληξ, Eccus. vii, 17; x, 11; 1 Mac. ii, 62; 2 Mac. ix, 9; Judith xvi, 17; Mark ix, 44, 46, 48; Acts xii, 23. 2. That which eats woollen garments, סם, Isa. li, 8; σής, Matt. vi, 19, 20; Luke xii, 33. 3. That which, perforating the leaves and bark of trees, causes the little excrescences called kermes, whence is made a crimson dye, חולע, Deut. xxviii, 39; Job xxv, 6; Psalm xxii, 6; Isa. xiv, 11; xii, 14; lxvi, 24; Exod. xvi, 20; Jonah iv, 7. 4. The worm destructive of the vines, referred to in Deut. xxviii, 39; which was the *pyralis vitanae*, or *pyralis fasciana*, of Forskal, the vine weevil, a small insect extremely hurtful to the vines.

WORMWOOD, לענה, Deut. xxix, 18; Prov. v, 4; Jer. ix, 15; xxiii, 15; Lam. iii, 15, 19; Amos v, 7; vi, 12; ἄψιθον, Rev. viii, 11. In the Septuagint the original word is variously rendered, and generally by terms expressive of its figurative sense, for what is offensive, odious, or deleterious; but in the Syriac and Arabic versions, and in the Latin Vulgate, it is rendered "wormwood;" and this is adopted by Celsius, who names it the *absinthium santonicum Judaicum*, [bitter wormwood of Judea.] From the passages of Scripture, however, where this plant is mentioned, something more than the bitterness of its qualities seems to be intimated, and effects are attributed to it greater than can be produced by the wormwood of Europe. The Chaldee paraphrase gives it even the character of "the wormwood of death." It may therefore mean a plant allied, perhaps, to the *absinthium* in appearance and in taste, but possessing more nauseous, hurtful, and formidable properties.

WORSHIP. The Scriptural obligation of public worship is partly founded upon example, and partly upon precept; so that no person who admits that authority, can question this great duty without manifest and criminal inconsistency. The institution of public worship under the law, and the practice of synagogue worship among the Jews, from at least the time of

Ezra, cannot be questioned; both of which were sanctioned by the practice of our Lord and his Apostles. The preceptive authority for our regular attendance upon public worship, is either inferential or direct. The command to publish the Gospel includes the obligation of assembling to hear it; the name by which a Christian society is designated in Scripture is a church; which signifies an assembly for the transaction of business; and, in the case of a Christian assembly, that business must necessarily be spiritual, and include the sacred exercises of prayer, praise, and hearing the Scriptures. But we have more direct precepts, although the practice was obviously continued from Judaism, and was therefore consuetudinary. Some of the epistles of St. Paul are commanded to be read in the churches. The singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs is enjoined as an act of solemn worship to the Lord; and St. Paul cautions the Hebrews that they “forsake not the assembling of themselves together.” The practice of the primitive age is also manifest from the epistles of St. Paul. The Lord’s Supper was celebrated by the body of believers collectively; and this Apostle prescribes to the Corinthians regulations for the exercises of prayer and prophesyings, “when they came together in the church,”--the assembly. The statedness and order of these holy offices in the primitive church, appear also from the apostolical epistle of St. Clement: “We ought also, looking into the depths of the divine knowledge, to do all things in order, whatsoever the Lord hath commanded to be done. We ought to make our oblations, and perform our holy offices, at their appointed seasons; for these he hath commanded to be done, not irregularly or by chance, but at determinate times and hours; as he hath likewise ordained by his supreme will, where, and by what persons, they shall be performed; that so all things being done according to his pleasure, may be acceptable in his sight.” This passage is remarkable for urging a divine authority for the public services of the church, by which St. Clement, no doubt, means the authority of the inspired directions of the Apostles. The ends of the institution of public worship are of such obvious importance, that it must ever be considered as one of the most condescending and gracious dispensations of God to man. By this his church confesses his name before the world; by this the public teaching of his word is associated with acts calculated to affect the mind with that solemnity which is the best preparation for hearing it to edification. It is thus that the ignorant and the vicious are collected together, and instructed and warned; the invitations of mercy are published to the guilty, and the sorrowful and afflicted are comforted. In these assemblies God, by his Holy Spirit, diffuses his vital and sanctifying influence, and takes the devout into a fellowship with himself, from which they derive strength to do and to suffer his will in the various scenes of life, while he there affords them a foretaste of the deep and hallowed pleasures which are reserved for them at his right hand for evermore. Prayers and intercessions are offered for national and public

interests; and while the benefit of these exercises descends upon a country, all are kept sensible of the dependence of every public and personal interest upon God. Praise calls forth the grateful emotions, and gives cheerfulness to piety; and that instruction in righteousness which is so perpetually repeated, diffuses the principles of morality and religion throughout society; enlightens and gives activity to conscience; raises the standard of morals; attaches shame to vice, and praise to virtue; and thus exerts a powerfully purifying influence upon mankind. Laws thus receive a force, which, in other circumstances, they could not acquire, even were they enacted in as great perfection; and the administration of justice is aided by the strongest possible obligation and sanction being given to legal oaths. The domestic relations are rendered more strong and interesting by the very habit of the attendance of families upon the sacred services of the sanctuary of the Lord; and the rich and the poor meeting together, and standing on the same common ground as sinners before God, equally dependent upon him, and equally suing for his mercy, has a powerful, though often an insensible, influence in humbling the pride which is nourished by superior rank, and in raising the lower classes above abjectness of spirit, without injuring their humility. Piety, benevolence, and patriotism are equally dependent for their purity and vigour upon the regular and devout worship of God in the simplicity of the Christian dispensation.

The following is an abridgment of Dr. Neander's account of the mode of conducting public worship among the primitive Christians, which, though questionable on some points, is upon the whole just and interesting:--Since the religion of the New Testament did not admit of any peculiar outward priesthood, similar to that of the Old, the same outward kind of worship, dependent on certain places, times, and outward actions and demeanours, would also have no place in its composition. The kingdom of God, the temple of the Lord, were to be present, not in this or that place, but in every place where Christ himself is active in the Spirit, and where through him the worship of God in spirit and in truth is established. Every Christian in particular, and every church in general, were to represent a spiritual temple of the Lord; the true worship of God was to be only in the inward heart, and the whole life proceeding from such inward disposition, sanctified by faith, was to be a continued spiritual service; this is the great fundamental idea of the Gospel, which prevails throughout the New Testament, by which the whole outward appearance of religion was to assume a different form, and all that once was carnal was to be converted into spiritual, and ennobled. This notion came forward most strongly in the original inward life of the first Christians, particularly when contrasted with Judaism, and still more so when contrasted with Heathenism; a contrast which taught the Christians to avoid all pomp that caught the eye, and all multiplication of means of devotion addressed to the senses, while it made them hold fast

the simple, spiritual character of the Christian worship of God. It was this which always struck the Heathen so much in the Christian worship; namely, that nothing was found among them of the outward pomp of all other religions; no temples, no altars, no images. This reproach was made to the Christians by Celsus, and answered thus by Origen: "In the highest sense the temple and image of God are in the human nature of Christ; and hence, also, in all the faithful, who are animated by the Spirit of Christ,-- living images! with which no statue of Jove by Phidias is fit to be compared." Christianity impelled men frequently to seek for the stillness of the inward sanctuary, and here to pour forth their heart to God, who dwells in such temples; but then the flames of love were also lighted in their hearts, which sought communion in order to strengthen each other mutually, and to unite themselves into one holy flame which pointed toward heaven. The communion of prayer and devotion was thought a source of sanctification, inasmuch as men knew that the Lord was present by his Spirit among those who were gathered together in his name; but then they were far from ascribing any peculiar sacredness and sanctity to the place of assembly. Such an idea would appear to partake of Heathenism; and men were at first in less danger of being seduced into such an idea, because the first general places of assembly of the Christians were only common rooms in private houses, just according as it happened that any member of the church had sufficient accommodation for the purpose. Thus Gaius of Corinth, 966Rom. xvi, is called the host of the church, because the church was in the habit of assembling in a room of his house. Origen says, "The place where believers come together to pray has something agreeable and useful about it;" but then he only says this in respect to that spiritual communion. Man, we must avow, is very easily led to fall away from the worship of God in spirit and in truth, and to connect the religion of the Spirit with outward and earthly things; as the Apostle says, "Having begun in the Spirit, to wish to end in the flesh." Watchfulness on this point was constantly needed, lest the Jewish or the Heathen notions should here intrude themselves on those of the Gospel, which was likely enough to happen as soon as the Old and the New Testament notions of the priesthood had been confused. Even in the time of Clemens of Alexandria he found himself obliged to combat the notion, which allowed the essentials of a Christian life to be of one kind in, and of another out of, the church. "The disciples of Christ," he says, "must form the whole course of their life and conduct on the model which they assume in the churches, for the sake of propriety; they must be such, and not merely seem so; as mild, as pious, and as charitable. But now, I know not how it is, they change their habits and their manners with the change of place, as the polypus, they say, changes its colour, and becomes like the rock on which it hangs. They lay aside the spiritual habit which they had assumed in the church, as soon as they have left the church, and assimilate themselves to the multitude

among whom they live. I should rather say, that they convict themselves of hypocrisy, and show what they really are in their inward nature, by laying aside the mask of piety which they had assumed; and while they honour the word of God, they leave it behind them in the place where they heard it.”

The Christian places of assembly were, at first, in the rooms of private houses; it may perhaps be the case, that in large towns, where the number of Christians was soon considerable, and no member of the church had any room in his house sufficient to contain all his brethren, or in places where men did not fear any prejudicial consequences from large assemblies, the church divided itself into different sections, according to the habitations of its members, of which each section held its assemblies in one particular chamber of the house of some wealthy member of the church; or, perhaps, while it was usual to unite on Sundays in one general assembly, yet each individual part of the church met together daily in the rooms which lay the most convenient to it. Perhaps the passages in St. Paul’s epistles, which speak of churches in the houses of particular persons, are thus to be understood. The answer of Justin Martyr to the question of the prefect, “Where do you assemble?” exactly corresponds to the genuine Christian spirit on this point. This answer was, “Where each one can and will. You believe, no doubt, that we all meet together in one place; but it is not so, for the God of the Christians is not shut up in a room, but, being invisible, he fills both heaven and earth, and is honoured every where by the faithful.” Justin adds, that when he came to Rome, he was accustomed to dwell in one particular spot, and that those Christians who were instructed by him, and wished to hear his discourses, assembled at his house. He had not visited any other congregations of the church. The arrangements which the peculiarities of the Christian worship required, were gradually made in these places of assembly, such as an elevated seat for the purpose of reading the Scriptures and preaching, a table for the distribution of the sacrament, to which as early as the time of Tertullian the name of altar, ara or altare, was given, and perhaps not without some mixture of the unevangelical Old Testament notion of a sacrifice; or at least this idea might easily attach itself to this name. When the churches increased, and their circumstances improved, there were, during the course of the third century, already separate church buildings for the Christians, as the name *θησκεύσιμοι τοπόι*, [religious places,] of the Christians occurs in the edict of Gallienus. In the time of the external prosperity of the church, during the reign of Diocletian, many handsome churches arose in the great towns. The use of images was originally quite foreign to the Christian worship and churches, and it remained so during this whole period. The intermixture of art and religion, and the use of images for the latter, appeared to the first Christians a Heathenish practice. As in Heathenism the divine becomes desecrated

and tarnished by intermixture with the natural; and as men have often paid homage to the beauties of nature, with injury to the cause of holiness, the first warmth of Christian zeal, which opposed the idolatry of nature, so common to Heathenism, and sought to maintain the divine in all its purity and elevation, was inclined rather to set holiness in the strongest contrast with what is beautiful by nature, than to endeavour to grace it by lending it a beautiful form. Men were more inclined in general to carry into extremes the idea of the appearance of the Divinity in the form of a servant, which suited the oppressed condition of the church in these centuries than to throw it into the back ground, and overwhelm it under the predominance of their æsthetic dispositions, and their love of art. This is peculiarly shown by the general belief of the early church, that Christ had clothed his inward divine glory in a mean outward form, which was in direct contradiction to it; a conclusion which was drawn from interpreting the prophecy of the Messiah in Isa. liii, 2, too literally. Thus, Clemens of Alexandria warns the Christians, from the example of Christ, not to attribute too much value to outward beauty: “The Lord himself was mean in outward form; and who is better than the Lord? But he revealed himself not in the beauty of the body, perceptible to our senses, but in the true beauty of the soul as well as of the body; the beauty of the soul consisting in benevolence, and that of the body in immortality!” Fathers of entirely opposite habits of mind, the adherents of two different systems of conceiving divine things, were nevertheless united on this point by their common opposition to the mixture of the natural and the divine in Heathenism, and by the endeavour to maintain the devotion to God, in spirit and in truth, pure and undefiled. Clemens of Alexandria is as little favourable as Tertullian to the use of images. Heathens, who, like Alexander Severus, saw something divine in Christ’s personal form, and sects which mixed Heathenism and Christianity together, were the first who made use of images of Christ; as, for instance, the Gnostic sect of the followers of Carpocratian, who put his image beside those of Plato and Aristotle. The use of religious images among the Christians did not proceed from their ecclesiastical but from their domestic life. In the intercourse of daily life, the Christians saw themselves every where surrounded by objects of Heathen mythology, or by such as shocked their moral and Christian feelings. Similar objects adorned the walls of chambers, the drinking vessels, and the signet rings, (on which the Heathen had constantly idolatrous images,) to which, whenever they pleased, they could address their devotions; and the Christians naturally felt themselves obliged to replace these objects, which wounded their moral and religious feelings, with others more suited to those feelings. Therefore, they gladly put the likeness of a shepherd carrying a lamb upon his shoulders, on their cups, as a symbol of the Redeemer, who saves the sinners that return to him, according to the parable in the Gospel. And Clemens of Alexandria says, in reference to the



signet rings of the Christians, "Let our signet rings consist of a dove," the emblem of the Holy Ghost, "or a fish, or a ship sailing toward heaven," the emblem of the Christian church, or of individual Christian souls, "or a lyre," the emblem of Christian joy, "or an anchor," the emblem of Christian hope; "and he who is a fisherman, let him remember the Apostle, and the children who were dragged out from the water; for those men ought not to engrave idolatrous forms, to whom the use of them is forbidden; those can engrave no sword and no bow, who seek for peace; the friends of temperance cannot engrave drinking cups." And yet, perhaps, religious images made their way from domestic life into the churches as early as the end of the third century, and the walls of the churches were painted in the same way. The council of Elvira set itself against this innovation as an abuse, for it made the following order: "Objects of reverence and worship shall not be painted on the walls." It is probable that the visible representation of the cross found its way very early into domestic and ecclesiastical life. This token was remarkably common among them; it was used to consecrate their rising and their going to bed, their going out and their coming in, and all the actions of daily life; it was the sign which Christians made involuntarily whenever any thing of a fearful nature surprised them. This was a mode of expressing, by means perceptible to the senses, the purely Christian idea, that all the actions of Christians, as well as the whole course of their life, must be sanctified by faith in the crucified Jesus, and by dependence upon him; and that this faith is the most powerful means of conquering all evil, and preserving oneself against it. But here also, again, men were too apt to confuse the idea and the token which represented it; and they attributed the effects of faith in the crucified Redeemer to the outward sign, to which they ascribed a supernatural, sanctifying, and preservative power; an error of which we find traces as early as the third century.

We now pass from the consideration of the places of public worship, to that of the seasons of worship, and the festivals of the early Christians. It is here shown again, that the Gospel, as it remodelled the former conceptions of the priesthood, of worship in general, and of holy places, also entirely changed the then views of sacred seasons. And here again, also, the character of the theocracy of the New Testament revealed itself, a theocracy spiritualized, ennobled, and freed from its outward garb of sense, and from the limits which bounded its generalization. The Jewish laws relating to their festivals were not merely abrogated by the Gospel, in such a manner as to transfer these festivals to different seasons; but they were entirely abolished, as far as fixing religious worship to particular times is concerned. St. Paul expressly declares all sanctifying of certain seasons, as far as men deduced this from the divine command, to be Jewish and unevangelical, and to be like returning to the slavery of the law, and to

captivity to outward precepts. Such was the opinion of the early church. At first the churches assembled every day; as, for instance, the first church of Jerusalem, which assembled daily for prayer in common, and for the public consideration of the divine word, for the common celebration of the Lord's Supper and the agapæ, as well as to maintain the connection between the common head of the spiritual body of the church and themselves, and between one another as members of this body. Traces of this are also found in later times in the daily assembling of the churches for the purpose of hearing the Scriptures read, and of celebrating the communion. Although, in order to meet the wants of human nature generally, consisting as it does of sense as well as soul, and those of a large body of Christians in particular, who were only in a state of education, and were to be brought up to the ripeness of Christian manhood, men soon selected definite times [beside the authorized Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week] for religious admonitions, and to consecrate them to a fuller occupation with religious things, as well as to public devotion, with the intention, that the influence of these definite times should animate and sanctify the rest of their lives, and that Christians who withdrew themselves from the 968distractions of business on these days, and collected their hearts before God in the stillness of solitude, as well as in public devotion, might make these seasons of service to the other parts of their life; yet this was in itself, and of itself, nothing unevangelical. It was only a dropping down from the purely spiritual point of view, on which even the Christian, as he still carries about two natures in himself, cannot always maintain himself, to the carnal; a dropping down which became constantly more necessary, the more the fire of the first animation and the warmth of the first love of the Christians died away. It was no more unevangelic than the gradual limitation of the exercise of many rights, belonging to the common priesthood of all Christians, to a certain class in the church, which circumstances rendered necessary. But just as the unevangelic made its appearance, men supposed certain days distinguished from others, and hallowed by divine right, when they introduced a distinction between holy and common days into the life of the Christian, and in this distinction forgot his calling to sanctify all days alike. When the Montanists wished to introduce and make imperative new fasts, which were fixed to certain days, the Epistle to the Galatians was very properly brought to oppose them; but Tertullian, who stood on the boundary between the original pure evangelic times and those when the intermixture of Jewish and Christian notions first took place, confuses here the views of the two religions, because he makes the evangelical to consist, not in a wholly different method of considering festivals altogether, but in the celebration of different particular festivals; and he makes the Judaizing, which the Apostle condemns, to consist only in the observation of the Jewish instead of the peculiarly Christian festivals. The weekly and the yearly festivals originally arose from the self-same fundamental idea,

which was the centre point of the whole Christian life; the idea of imitating Christ, the crucified and the risen; to follow him in his death, by appropriating to ourselves, in penitence and faith, the effects of his death, by dying to ourselves and to the world; to follow him in his resurrection, by rising again with him, by faith in him and by his power, to a new and holy life, devoted to God, which, beginning here below in the seed, is matured in heaven. Hence the festival of joy was the festival of the resurrection; and the preparation for it, the remembrance of the sufferings of Christ, with mortification and crucifixion of the flesh, was the day of fasting and penitence. Thus in the week the Sunday was the joyful festival; and the preparation for it was a day of penitence and prayer, consecrated to remembrance of the sufferings of Christ and the preparations for them, and this was celebrated on the Friday; and thus also the yearly festivals were to celebrate the resurrection of Christ, and the operations of the Redeemer after he had risen again; the preparation for this day was in commemoration of the sufferings and fastings of our Saviour. Allusion is made to Sunday under the character of a festival, as a symbol of a new life, consecrated to the Lord in opposition to the old Sabbath, in the epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians: "If they who were brought up under the Old Testament have attained to a new hope, and no longer keep [Jewish] Sabbaths holy, but have consecrated their life to the day of the Lord, on which also our life rose up in him, how shall we be able to live without him?" Sunday was distinguished as a day of joy by the circumstances, that men did not fast upon it, and that they prayed standing up and not kneeling, as Christ had raised up fallen man to heaven again through his resurrection. And farther: two other days in the week, Friday and Wednesday, particularly the former, were consecrated to the remembrance of the sufferings of Christ, and of the circumstances preparatory to them; congregations were held on them, and a fast till three o'clock in the afternoon, but nothing was positively appointed concerning them; in respect to joining in these solemnities every one consulted his own convenience or inclination. Such fasts, joined with prayer, were considered as the watches of the milites Christi [soldiers of Christ] on their post by the Christians, who compared their calling to a warfare, the militia Christi, and they were stationes, and the days on which they took place were called dies stationum, [day of their stations.] The churches, which were a graft of a Christian on a Jewish spirit, although they received the Sunday, retained also that of the Sabbath; and from them the custom spread abroad in the oriental church, of distinguishing this day, as well as the Sunday, by not fasting and by praying in an erect posture; in the western churches, particularly the Roman, where opposition to Judaism was the prevailing tendency, this very opposition produced the custom of celebrating the Saturday in particular as a fast day. This difference in customs would of course be striking, where members of the oriental church spent their

Sabbath day in the western church. It was only too soon that men lost sight of the principle of the apostolic church, which retained the unity of faith and spirit in the bond of love, but allowed all kinds of difference in external things; and then they began to require uniformity in these things. The first yearly festivals of the Christians proceeded from similar views; and at first the contrast which had in early times the most powerful influence on the developement as well of the churchly life, as of the doctrines of Christianity, is peculiarly prominent; I mean the contrast between the Jewish churches and those of the Gentile converts. The former retained all the Jewish festivals as well as the whole ceremonial law; although by degrees they introduced into them a Christian meaning which spontaneously offered itself. On the contrary, there was probably no yearly festival at all, from the beginning, among the Heathen converts; for no trace of any thing of the sort is found in the whole of the New Testament. The passover of the Old Testament was easily ennobled and converted to a passover which suited the New Testament, by merely substituting the idea of deliverance from spiritual bondage, that is, from the slavery of sin, for that of deliverance from earthly bondage. The paschal lamb was a type of Christ, by whom that deliverance was wrought. These representations went on the supposition, that Christ had partaken his last meal with his disciples, as a proper passover, at the very time that the Jews were celebrating theirs. This passover was, therefore, always celebrated on the night between the fourteenth and fifteenth of the Jewish month Nisan, as a remembrance at the same time of the last supper of Christ. This was the fundamental notion of the whole Jewish Christian passover, on which all the rest was built. The day following this passover was consecrated to the remembrance of the sufferings of Christ, and the third day from it to the remembrance of his resurrection. On the contrary, in the greater number of Heathen churches, as soon as men began to celebrate yearly festivals, (a time which cannot be determined very precisely,) they followed the method observed in the weekly festivals. They appointed one Sunday in the year for the festival of the resurrection, and one Friday as a day of penitence and fasting preparatory to this Sunday, in remembrance of the sufferings of Christ; and they gradually lengthened this time of penitence and fasting, as a preparation for that high and joyful festival. In these churches they were more inclined to take up a kind of antithetical turn against the Jewish festivals, than to graft Christian ones upon them. It was far from their notions to think of observing a yearly passover with the Jews. The following was the view which they took of the matter: "Every typical feast has lost its true meaning by the realization of that which is typified; in the sacrifice of Christ, the Lord's Supper, as the new covenant, has taken the place of that of the old covenant." This difference of outward customs between the Jewish Christian churches and the churches allied to them on the one hand, and the Heathen Christian churches founded by St. Paul on

the other, existed at first without its being supposed that external things of this nature were of importance enough to lead to a controversy. A fast formed the introduction to the passover; and this was the only fast formally established by the church. The necessity of this fast was deduced from Matthew ix, 15; but it was by a carnal interpretation of the passage, and an application of it quite contrary to its real sense. For it does not relate to the time of Christ's suffering, but to the time when he should be with his disciples no more. As long as they enjoyed his society they were to give themselves up to joy, and to be disturbed in it by no forced asceticism. But a time of sorrow was to follow this time of joy, although only for a season, after which a time of higher and imperishable joy, in invisible communion with him, was to follow, John xvi, 22. The duration of this fast, however, was not determined; the imitation of the temptation of our Lord for forty days introduced the custom of fasting forty hours in some places, which afterward was extended to forty days; and thus the fast of forty days, the quadragesimal fast, arose. The festival of pentecost, Whitsuntide, was closely connected with that of the resurrection; and this was dedicated to commemorating the first visible effects of the operations of the glorified Christ upon human nature, now also ennobled by him, the lively proofs of his resurrection and reception into glory; and therefore Origen joins the festivals of the resurrection and of pentecost together as one whole. The means of transition from an Old Testament festival to one befitting the New Testament, were here near at hand. The first fruits of harvest in the kingdom of nature; the first fruits of harvest in the kingdom of grace; the law of the letter from Mount Sinai--the law of the Spirit from the heavenly Jerusalem. This festival originally embraced the whole season of fifty days from Easter, and was celebrated like a Sunday, that is to say, no fasts were kept during the whole of it, and men prayed standing, and not kneeling; and perhaps also in some places assemblies of the church were held, and the communion was celebrated every day. Afterward, two peculiar points of time, the ascension of Christ and the effusion of the Holy Spirit, were selected from this whole interval. These were the only festivals generally celebrated at that time, as the passage cited from Origen proves. The fundamental notion of the whole Christian life, which referred every thing to the suffering, the resurrection, and the glorification of Christ, as well as the adherence, or, on the other hand, the opposition, to the Jewish celebration of festivals, were the cause that these were the only general festivals. The notion of a birth-day festival was far from the ideas of the Christians of this period in general; they looked upon the second birth as the true birth of men. The case must have been somewhat different with the birth of the Redeemer; human nature was to be sanctified by him from its first developement; but then this last notion could not at first come so prominently forward among the early Christians, because so many of them were first converted to Christianity when well advanced in years, after

some decisive excitement of their life; but then it may have entered generally into domestic life, though at first gradually. Nevertheless, we find in this period apparently one trace of Christmas as a festival. Its history is intimately connected with the history of a kindred festival; the festival of the manifestation of Jesus in his character of Messiah, his consecration to the office of Messiah by the baptism of John, and the beginning of his public ministry as the Messiah, which was afterward called Epiphany, the ἑυρητη τῶν ἐπιφανίων, or τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, [the festival of Epiphany, or of the appearance of Christ.] We find in later times that these festivals extended themselves in opposite directions, that of Christmas spreading from west to east, and the other from east to west. Clemens of Alexandria merely relates, that the Gnostic sect of the Basilidians celebrated the festival of the Epiphany at Alexandria in his time. We can hardly suppose that this sect invented the festival, although they may have had some dogmatical reason for celebrating it; for it is highly improbable that the catholic church should have afterward received a festival from the Gnostics; and these Gnostics most probably received it from the Jewish Christian churches in Palestine or Syria. For this time of our Saviour's life would appear the most important to the notions of the Jewish Christians; and the Gnostics would afterward explain it according to their own ideas.

The character of a spiritual worship of God distinguished the Christian worship from that of other religions, which consisted in symbolical pageantry and lifeless ceremonies. As a general elevation of spirit and sanctification of heart was the object of every thing in this religion, instruction and edification, through a common study of the divine word, and through prayer in common, were the leading features in the Christian worship. And in this respect it might in its form adhere to the arrangements made about the congregations in the Jewish synagogues, in which also the element of a spiritual religious worship was the prevailing ingredient. As the reading of portions of the Old Testament had formed the ground work of religious instruction in the Jewish synagogues, this custom also passed into the Christian congregations. First the Old Testament, and especially the prophetic parts of it, were read as things that pointed to the Messiah; then followed the Gospels, and after that the epistles of the Apostles. The reading of the Scriptures was of still greater consequence then, because it was desirable that every Christian should be acquainted with them; and yet, by reason of the rarity and dearness of manuscripts, and the poverty of a great proportion of the Christians, or perhaps also because all were not able to read, the Bible itself could not be put into the hands of all. Frequent hearing was therefore with many to supply the place of their own reading. The Scriptures were therefore read in the language which all could understand, and that was, in most parts of the Roman empire, the Greek or

the Latin. In very early times different translations of the Bible into Latin were in existence; as every one who knew a little of Greek, found it needful to have his own Bible in his own mother tongue. In places where the Greek or the Latin language was understood only by a part of the church, that is to say, by the educated classes, while the rest understood only their native language, as was the case in many Egyptian and Syrian towns, church interpreters were appointed, as in the Jewish synagogues, and they immediately translated what had been read into the language of the country, so that it might be intelligible to all. After the reading of the Scripture there followed, as there had previously in the Jewish synagogues, short, and at first very simple, addresses in familiar language, the momentary effusions of the heart, which contained an explanation and application of what had just been read. Justin Martyr expresses himself thus on the subject: "After the reading of the Scriptures, the president instructs the people in a discourse, and incites them to the imitation of these good examples." Among the Greeks, where the taste was more rhetorical, the sermon from the very earliest times was of a more lengthened kind, and formed a very important part of the service. Singing also passed from the Jewish service into that of the Christian church. St. Paul exhorts the early churches to sing spiritual songs. What was used for this purpose were partly the Psalms of the Old Testament, and partly songs composed with this very object, especially songs of praise and thanks to God and Christ; and these, we know, Pliny found to be customary among the Christians. In the controversies with the Unitarians, about the end of the second century, and the beginning of the third, the hymns, in which from early times Christ had been honoured as a God, were appealed to. The power of church singing over the heart was soon recognized; and hence those who wished to propagate any peculiar opinions, like Bardasanes, or Paul of Samosata, endeavoured to spread them by means of hymns. In compliance with the infirmities of human nature, composed as it is of sense and spirit, the divine Founder of the church, beside his word, ordained two outward signs, as symbols of the invisible communion which existed between him, the Head of the spiritual body, and the faithful, its members; and also of the connection of these members, as with him, so also with one another. These were visible means to represent the invisible, heavenly benefits to be bestowed on the members of this body through him; and while man received in faith the sign presented to his senses, the enjoyment of that heavenly communion and those heavenly advantages was to gladden his inward heart. As nothing in all Christianity and in the whole Christian life stands isolated, but all forms one whole, proceeding from one centre, therefore, also, that which this outward sign represented must be something which should continue through the whole of the inward Christian life, something which, spreading itself forth from this one moment over the whole Christian life, should be capable of being especially excited again

and promoted in return, by the influence of isolated moments. Thus, baptism was to be the sign of a first entrance into communion with the Redeemer, and with the church, the first appropriation of those advantages which Christ has bestowed on man, namely, of the forgiveness of sins and the inward union of life, which proceeds from it, as well as of the participation in a sanctifying divine Spirit of life. And the Lord's Supper was to be the sign of a constant continuance in this communion, in the appropriation and enjoyment of these advantages; and thus were represented the essentials of the whole inward Christian life, in its earliest rise and its continued progress. The whole peculiar spirit of Christianity 971 was particularly stamped in the mode in which these external things were administered; and the mode of their administration in return exerted a powerful influence on the whole nature of the Christian worship. The connection of the moments, represented by these signs, with the whole Christian life, the connection of inward and divine things with the outward act was present to the lively Christian feelings of the first Christians.

WRITING. In regard to alphabetic writing, all the ancient writers attribute the invention of it to some very early age, and some country of the east; but they do not pretend to designate precisely either the time or the place. They say, farther, that Cadmus introduced letters from Phenicia into Greece, if we may credit the Parisian Chronicle, B. C. 1519, that is, forty-five years after the death of Moses. Anticlides asserts, and attempts to prove, that letters were invented in Egypt fifteen years before Phoroneus, the most ancient king of Greece; that is, four hundred and nine years after the deluge, and in the one hundred and seventeenth year of Abraham. On this it may be remarked that they might have been introduced into Egypt at this time, but they had been previously invented by the Phenicians. Epigenes, who, in the estimation of Pliny, is weighty authority, informs us that observations, made upon the heavenly bodies for seven hundred and twenty years at Babylon, were written down upon baked tiles; but Berosus and Critodemus, also referred to by Pliny, make the number of years four hundred and eighty. Pliny from these statements draws the conclusion that the use of letters, as he expresses it, must have been eternal, that is, beyond all records. Simplicius, who lived in the fifth century, states, on the authority of Porphyry, an acute historian, that Callisthenes, the companion of Alexander, found at Babylon a record of observations on the heavenly bodies for one thousand nine hundred and three years. Of course the record must have been begun B. C. 2234, that is, the eighty-ninth year of Abraham. This statement receives some confirmation from the fact that the month of March is called Adar in the Chaldaic dialect; and at the time mentioned, namely, the eighty-ninth year of Abraham, the sun, during the whole month of March, was in the sign of the zodiac called Aries, or the Ram. The word Adar means the same with Aries. But, as letters would be



unquestionably first used for the purposes of general intercourse, they must have been known long before they were employed to transmit the motions of the stars. Of this we have an evidence in the bill of sale, which, as we have reason to suppose from the expressions used in Gen. xxiii, 20, was given to Abraham by the sons of Heth. Hence it is not at all wonderful that books and writings are spoken of in the time of Moses, as if well known, Exodus xvii, 14; xxiv, 4; xxviii, 9–11; xxxii, 32; xxxiv, 27, 28; Numbers xxxiii, 2; Deut. xxvii, 8. Nor is it a matter of surprise that long before his time there had been public scribes, who kept written genealogies: they were called by the Hebrews שטררים, Exod. v, 14; Deut. xx, 5–9. Even in the time of Jacob, seals, upon which names are engraved in the east, were in use, Gen. xxxviii, 18; xii, 42; which is another probable testimony to the great antiquity of letters.

Letters, which had thus become known at the earliest period, were communicated by means of the Phœnician merchants and colonies, and subsequently by Egyptian emigrants, through all the east and the west. A strong evidence of this is to be found in the different alphabets themselves, which betray by their resemblance a common origin. That the posterity of the Hebrew patriarchs preserved a knowledge of alphabetical writing during their abode in Egypt, where essentially the same alphabet was in use, is evident from the fact, that the Hebrews while remaining there always had public genealogists. The law, also, was ordered to be inscribed on stones; a fact which implies a knowledge of alphabetical writing. The writing thus engraven upon stones is designated by its appropriate name, namely, חרות, Exodus xxxii, 16, 32. Not a few of the Hebrews might be unable to read and write, Judges viii, 14; but those who were capable of writing wrote for others, when necessary. Such persons were commonly priests, who, as they do to this day in the east, bear an inkhorn in their girdle, Ezek. x, 2, 3, 11. In the inkhorn were the materials for writing, and a knife for sharpening the pen, Jer. xxxvi, 23. The rich and noble had scribes of their own, and readers also; whence there is more frequent mention made of hearing than of reading, 1 Kings iv, 3; 2 Kings xii, 10; Isa. xxix, 18; Jer. xxxvi, 4; Rom. ii, 13; James v, 11; Rev. i, 3. The scribes took youth under their care, who learned from them the art of writing. Some of the scribes seem to have held public schools for instruction; some of which, under the care of Samuel and other prophets, became in time quite illustrious, and were called the schools of the prophets, 1 Sam. xix, 16, &c; 2 Kings ii, 3, 5; iv, 38; vi, 1. The disciples in these schools were not children or boys, but young men, who inhabited separate edifices, as is the case in the Persian academies. They were taught music and singing, and without doubt writing also, the Mosaic law and poetry. They were denominated, in reference to their instructors, the sons of the prophets;

teachers and prophets being sometimes called fathers. After the captivity there were schools for instruction either near the synagogues or in them.

The materials and instruments of writing were, 1. The leaves of trees. 2. The bark of trees, from which, in the process of time, a sort of paper was manufactured. 3. A table of wood, πίναξ, לוח, Deut. ix, 9; Ezek. xxxvii, 5; Luke i, 63. In the east, these tables were not covered with wax as they were in the west; or at any rate very rarely so. 4. Linen was first used for the object in question at Rome. Linen books are mentioned by Livy. Cotton cloth also, which was used for the bandages of Egyptian mummies, and inscribed with hieroglyphics, was one of the materials for writing upon. 5. The paper made from the reed papyrus, which, as Pliny has shown, was used before the Trojan war. 6. The skins of various animals; but they were poorly prepared for the purpose, until some improved methods of manufacture were invented at Pergamus, during the reign of Eumenes, about B. C. 300. Hence the skins of animals, prepared for writing, are called in Latin *pergamena*, in English parchment, to this day, from the city Pergamus. They are sometimes denominated in Greek, μεμβράνα, 2 Tim. iv, 13. 7. Tables of lead, עפרת, Job xix, 24. 8. Tables of brass, δέλτοι χαλκαί. Of all the materials, brass was considered among the most durable, and was employed for those inscriptions which were designed to last the longest, 1 Macc. viii, 22; xiv, 20–27. 9. Stones or rocks, upon which public laws, &c, were written. Sometimes the letters engraved were filled up with lime, Exod. xxiv, 12; xxxi, 18; xxxii, 19; xxxiv, 1; Deut. xxvii, 1–9; Joshua viii, 32; Job xix, 24. 10. Tiles. The inscriptions were made upon the tiles first, and afterward they were baked in the fire. They are yet to be found in the ruins of Babylon; others of later origin are to be found in many countries in the east. 11. The sand of the earth, in which the children in India to this day learn the art of writing, and in which Archimedes himself delineated his mathematical figures, John viii, 1–8. If in Ezekiel iii, 1, and in Revelation x, 9, we are informed that books were eaten, we must remember that the descriptions are figurative, and that they were eaten in vision; and consequently we are not at liberty to draw the conclusion from these passages, that any substance was used as materials for writing upon, which was at the same time used for food. The representations alluded to are symbolic, introduced to denote a communication or revelation from God.

As to the instruments used in writing, when it was necessary to write upon hard materials, as tables of stone and brass, the style was made of iron, and sometimes tipped with diamond, Jer. xvii. 1. The letters were formed upon tablets of wood, (when they were covered with wax,) with a style sharpened at one end, broad and smooth at the other; by means of which the letters, when badly written, might be rubbed out and the wax smoothed down. 2. Wax, however, was but rarely used for the purpose of covering

writing tables in warm regions. When this was not the case, the letters were painted on the wood with black tincture or ink. 3. On linen, cotton cloth, paper, skins, and parchment, the letters were painted with a very small brush, afterward with a reed, which was split. The orientals use this elegant instrument to the present day instead of a pen. Ink, called יִיָּ, is spoken of in Num. v, 23, as well known and common, Jer. xxxvi, 18, and was prepared in various ways, which are related by Pliny. The most simple, and consequently the most ancient, method of preparation was a mixture of water with coals broken to pieces, or with soot, with an addition of gum. The ancients used other tinctures also; particularly, if we may credit Cicero and Persius, the ink extracted from the cuttle fish, although their assertion is in opposition to Pliny. The Hebrews went so far as to write their sacred books in gold, as we may learn from Josephus compared with Pliny.

Hieroglyphics, that is, sacred sculptures or engravings, received that appellation, because it was once, and indeed till very lately, thought, that they were used only to express, in a manner hidden from the vulgar, what was exclusively religious; and which it was thought proper to conceal from all but the learned. The fact, however, is, that the hieroglyphic was a kind of picture writing, which passed through various modifications, and was applied alike to sacred and to civil purposes; to the emblazonment of the attributes of idols, the exploits of warriors, and the events of illustrious history. Rudiments of the same art have been found among almost all savages. Among the semi-civilized Mexicans history was pictorial: and in Ceylon and Continental India the same vehicle of instruction is made use of on the walls of their temples, to convey moral lessons, or to indicate the character and exploits of their deities. In Egypt, however, the art was carried into a more perfect system, and was more ostensibly set before the public eye on the massive and almost eternal monuments which cover the country. There, too, it ascends to ages of the world with which the Scriptures have made us familiar, and stands associated with royal dynasties, and vicissitudes of conquest, more intimately blended with that stream of civil history, along the margin of which European education conducts us. These mystic characters have acquired an adventitious interest also, from the circumstance that the key to them was for so many ages lost. This knowledge perished among that people themselves, the records of whose kings and conquests lay hid under the inexplicable symbol, or the fanciful representation of letters and sounds which were still familiar to the lips of those to whom the signs had become wholly unmeaning. Age after age they were gazed at by the curious; conjectures respecting their nature and use were offered by the learned, some absurd and some approaching the truth, but all failing to throw light upon a mystery, which at length was surrendered, by common consent, to the receptacle of lost and irrecoverable knowledge. Whether the hieroglyphics were symbols only,

or words, or picturesque alphabetical characters, or expressed the popular tongue, or one known only to the priests, were questions answered at random by the prompt and dogmatic; and even the more modest and probable solutions of the cautious had so little collateral evidence to support them, that they led to no result. As to their intent, one thought that they involved the mysteries of magic; another, that they were a form of the Chinese language; a third, that they veiled the doctrines of the true patriarchal religion; a fourth, that they enveloped the dogmatic arcana of the Egyptian priesthood. The great point, however, to be determined was, whether the hieroglyphics were the signs of a language; that is, of the sounds of any language; and, if so, whether the language was now known, or knowable, from books still extant. Each of these points was of equal importance; for in vain would it have been ascertained that these signs represented the sounds of a tongue once spoken, if that tongue had perished from the earth. Clement of Alexandria, who lived about the end of the second century, asserted that the Egyptians had three modes of writing,--the epistolographic, or common characters; the hieratic, or sacerdotal, employed chiefly by the priesthood in writing books; and the hieroglyphic, used on public monuments. The symbolical he again distributes into imitative, which represent the plain figure of an object, as a circle to express the sun, and a half circle the moon; tropical,--which have recourse to analogy for the representation of the object; and enigmatical,--as "a serpent, to signify the oblique course of the stars." This writer could not so accurately have expressed the truth of the case, unless he had known much more than he has written; and we may presume, that if he had been more liberal in his communications, the present age would not have had the honour of throwing open the gate to this branch of ancient learning. The notion which has generally prevailed, that by whatever rule the hieroglyphics were composed, they were invented by the Egyptian priests to conceal their wisdom from the vulgar, was combated by Bishop Warburton, with his usual acuteness. According to him, the first kind of hieroglyphics were mere pictures; because the most natural way of communicating our conceptions by marks or figures was, to trace out the images of things. But the hieroglyphics invented by the Egyptians were an improvement on this rude and inconvenient essay toward writing; for they contrived to make them both pictures and characters. He proceeds to other observations, which have lost their interest in consequence of the recent discoveries; but he argues conclusively, that hieroglyphics could not, in a vast number of cases, have been resorted to for purposes of secrecy, since they were employed to record openly and plainly their laws, history, and all kinds of civil matters. This, as a general view, has been proved to be correct; but still no key to the reading of these characters was found. The figures of deities might, in many instances, be deciphered by their attributes; other symbols were not difficult to explain, as they spoke a

universal language. Thus two hands, one holding a bow, and another a shield, suggested a battle; an eye and a sceptre, a monarch of intelligence and vigilance; a ship and a pilot, the governor of a state if associated with a man, the ruler of the universe if associated with a deity. A lion was a natural emblem of strength and courage; a bullock, of agriculture; a horse, of liberty; a sphynx, of subtlety. But still those hieroglyphics were in the greatest number which appeared to represent letters; and many might prove, at the same time, both emblematic and alphabetical. Approaches to the truth of the case had been, indeed, made. Warburton, from an attentive perusal of what Clemens Alexandrinus had said on the subject, had, in fact, concluded, in a way highly creditable to his acuteness, that hieroglyphics were a real written language, applicable to the purposes of history and common life, as well as to those of religion; and that, among the different sorts of hieroglyphics, the Egyptians possessed those which were used phonetically, or alphabetically, as letters; but, till recently, the means of following out this ingenious and correct conjecture were wanting to the learned. The first effectual step was taken by M. Quatremere, who proved, in his work *Sur la Langue et Littérature de l’Égypte*, [Concerning the Language and Literature of Egypt,] that the Coptic, a language of easy attainment, at least to a considerable extent, was the language of the ancient Egyptians. The second favouring circumstance of modern times was, the publication of the researches made as to the monuments of Egypt by the literary men and artists who accompanied the French expedition to that country. Previous to this, the specimens which had been brought to Europe were few, and the impressions and the fac similes of them incorrect. Some, too, were imitations, and others spurious. In the works published in France after this expedition, the representations of Egyptian monuments were numerous; and the inscriptions were given with perfect exactness and fidelity. Still, however, those would have remained as unintelligible as the originals but for the discovery of the Rosetta stone, now among the Egyptian antiquities in the gallery of the British museum. This stone was dug up by the French, near Rosetta, and contained an inscription in three sets of characters: one in hieroglyphics; a second in a sort of running hand, called enchorial, that is, in the common characters of the country; and a third in Greek. The latter appearing, from the disposition of the whole, to be a translation of the enchorial inscription, as that was of the hieroglyphic, the importance of this stone was at once seen by the French savans; but by the fortune of war, it was taken, with other valuables, by the British troops, and was sent to this country. The Antiquarian Society had it immediately engraved; and the fac similes, which were circulated through Europe attracted great attention. Dr. Young has, however, the honour of being the discoverer of the nature and use of the hieroglyphical inscription. M. de Sacy, and more especially Mr. Akerblad, a Danish gentleman, made some progress in identifying the sense of several parts of the second inscription,

or that in demotic or enchorial characters, but made no progress in the hieroglyphics; and it was left for British industry to convert to permanent profit a monument which had been a useless, though a glorious, monument of British valour. The inscription upon this celebrated stone proved to be a decree of the Egyptian priests, solemnly assembled in the temple, to record upon a monument, as a public expression of their gratitude, all the events of the reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes; his liberality to the temples and to the gods; his success against his rebellious subjects; his clemency toward some of the traitors; his measures against the fatal consequences of excessive inundations of the Nile; and his munificence toward the college of the priests, by remitting the arrears of several years' payment of taxes. It was an important circumstance, that the whole concludes by ordering that this decree "shall be engraved on a hard stone in sacred characters, in common characters, and in Greek." By this it was ascertained that the second and third inscriptions were translations of the first; and that the second inscription was in the common character of the country. It was this that led Akerblad to the investigation of the enchorial text, in order to discover its alphabet; in which he partially succeeded. His labours were, however, for some time unnoticed; but in 1814, Dr. Young published, in the *Archæologia*, an improvement on the alphabet of Akerblad, and a translation of the Egyptian inscription. Difficulties of no ordinary kind, beside those arising from the mutilated state of the stone, presented themselves to all who had applied to make out even the second, or enchorial inscription.

"The method," says the Marquis Spineto, "pursued by our learned men in this Herculean task of deciphering the Rosetta stone, deserves to be noticed; it may serve to give you a proper idea of the infinite labour to which they have been obliged to submit; a labour which at first seemed calculated to deter the most indefatigable scholar. Figure to yourself, for a moment, the fashion introduced of writing the English language with the omission of most of its vowels, and then suppose our alphabet to be entirely lost or forgotten, a new mode of writing introduced, letters totally different from those we use, and then conceive what our labour would be, if, after the lapse of fifteen hundred years, when the English language, by the operation of ages, and the intercourse with foreigners, was much altered from what it now is, we should be required, by the help of a Greek translation, to decipher a bill of parliament written in this old, forgotten, and persecuted alphabet, in every word of which we should find, and even this not always, the regular number of consonants, but most of the vowels left out. And yet this is precisely what our learned antiquarians have been obliged to do. The Egyptians, like most of the orientals, left out many of the vowels in writing. The enchorial, or demotic alphabet, which they used, has been laid aside since the second or third century of our era. From that

time to this, that is, for nearly sixteen hundred years, the Coptic alphabet has been used; and yet in this Coptic language, and in these very enchorial or demotic characters, was engraved on the Rosetta stone the inscription which they have deciphered.”

The steps of this interesting process are given by Dr. Young, in the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica. The substance is as follows: “As the demotic characters showed something like the shape of letters, it was shrewdly suspected that they might have been used as an alphabet. By comparing, therefore, its different parts with each other, and with the Greek, it was observed that the two groups in the fourth and seventeenth lines of the Greek inscription, in which Alexander and Alexandria occur, corresponded with two other groups in the second and the tenth line of the demotic inscription. These two groups, therefore, were considered as representing these two names, and thus not less than seven characters, or letters, were ascertained. Again: it was observed that a small group of character occurs very often in almost every line. At first it was supposed that this group was either a termination, or some very common particle; and after some words had been identified, it was found to mean the conjunction and. It was then observed, that the next remarkable collection of characters was repeated twenty-nine or thirty times in the enchorial inscription; and nothing found to occur so often in the Greek, except the word king, which with its compounds, is repeated about thirty-seven times. A fourth assemblage of characters was found fourteen times in the enchorial inscription, agreeing sufficiently well in frequency with the name of Ptolemy, which occurs eleven times in the Greek, and generally in passages corresponding to those of the enchorial text, in their relative situation; and, by a similar comparison, the name of Egypt was identified. Having thus obtained a sufficient number of common points of subdivision, the next step was to write the Greek text over the enchorial, in such a manner that the passages ascertained should coincide as nearly as possible; taking, however, a proper care to observe that the lines of the demotic or enchorial inscription are written from right to left, while those of the Greek run in a contrary direction from left to right. At first sight this difficulty seemed very great; but it was conquered by proper attention and practice; because, after some trouble, the division of the several words and phrases plainly indicated the direction in which they were to be read. Thus it was obvious that the intermediate parts of each inscription stood then very near to the corresponding passages of the other.”

By means of the process above mentioned, Ackerblad, De Sacy, and Dr. Young, among whom a correspondence had been carried on, obtained a sort of alphabet from the enchorial characters, which might aid them in future researches. This result was published by Dr. Young in 1814. The

examination of another stone at Menoup, containing an inscription in enchorial and in Greek characters, enabled Dr. Young to confirm the accuracy of former discoveries, and to add several new characters to the enchorial or demotic alphabet. Dr. Young next turned his attention to the hieroglyphics; and, though not with equal success, yet so as to demonstrate that they were phonetic or alphabetical, and to spell several proper names. The difficulty here, indeed, was how to begin; but his success opened a certain way to future progress; and it was upon Dr. Young's discovery that Champollion afterward engrafted his system, 975 and was enabled to carry his researches into Egyptian antiquities and Egyptian hieroglyphics, to an extent which is now deeply engaging the attention of the literary world.

Two practical ends appear to have been answered already by the deciphering of the mystic monuments of Egypt. The first is, that the inscriptions which have been read by Champollion, afford assistance in settling some questions of ancient chronology; the other is, that important collateral proof has been afforded of the historical accuracy of the Old Testament, and the antiquity of its books. It is presumptive in favour of the genuineness and antiquity of the writings of Moses, that such proper Egyptian names as are found in no other ancient writings beside his own, such as On, and Rameses, and Potipherah, and Asenath, should now be read in hieroglyphic characters on monuments still standing in the same country. But the confirmatory evidence goes still farther. In one inscription the names of two of the Pharaohs, Osorhon and Scheschonk, are exhibited. Of the characters which compose this legend some are phonetic, some figurative, and some symbolic. The whole reading in Coptic, is, "Ouab an Amon-re soten annenoute Osorhon pri (or pre) ce or ci an ouab an Amon-re Souten Scheschonk-re Soten Nebto, (Amonmai Osorchon,)" &c. The meaning of which is, "The pure by Amon-re, king of the gods, Osorhon deceased, son of the pure, by Amon-re, king of the gods, Scheschonk deceased, son of king of the world, (beloved by Amon-re, Osorchon,) imparting life, like the sun, for ever." This Osorhon seems to have been the Zarah, or Zarach, the king of Ethiopia, recorded in the Second Book of Chronicles, who, with a host of a thousand thousand and three hundred chariots, came to make war against Asa, the grandson of Jeroboam, and was defeated at Mareshah. Although the Greek historians have never mentioned either the name or exploits of Osorhon, this fact is attested by an hieroglyphical manuscript, published by Denon. It is a funeral legend, loaded with figures, on and round which there are several hieroglyphical inscriptions. With respect to the other Pharaoh, Champollion, speaking of the temple of Karnac, says, "In this marvellous place I saw the portraits of most of the ancient Pharaohs, known by their great actions. They are real portraits, represented a hundred times on the basso-relievos of the outer and inner walls. Each of them has his peculiar physiognomy, different from



that of his predecessors and successors. Thus, in colossal representations, the sculpture of which is lively, grand, and heroic, more perfect than can be believed in Europe, we see the Pharaoh Mandouei combating the nations hostile to Egypt, and returning triumphant to his country. Farther on, the campaigns of Rhamses Sesostris; elsewhere Sesonchis, or Shishak, dragging to the feet of the Theban Trinity, Ammon, Mouth, and Khous, the chiefs of thirty conquered nations, among which is found, written in letters at full length, the word Joudahamalek, that is, the kingdom of the Jews, or the kingdom of Judah. This is a commentary on the fourteenth chapter of the First Book of Kings, which relates the arrival of Shishak at Jerusalem, and his success there. Thus the identity between the Egyptian Sheschonk, the Sesonchis of Manetho, and the Sesac, or Schischak of the Bible, is confirmed in the most satisfactory manner.”

YEAR. The Hebrews had always years, of twelve months each. But at the beginning, and in the time of Moses, these were solar years, of twelve months; each having thirty days, except the twelfth which had thirty-five. We see, by the reckoning that Moses gives us of the days of the deluge, Gen. vii, that the Hebrew year consisted of three hundred and sixty-five days. It is supposed that they had an intercalary month at the end of one hundred and twenty years; at which time the beginning of their year would be out of its place full thirty days. But it must be owned, that no mention is made in Scripture of the thirteenth month, or of any intercalation. It is not improbable that Moses retained the order of the Egyptian year, since he himself came out of Egypt, was born in that country, had been instructed and brought up there, and since the people of Israel, whose chief he was, had been for a long time accustomed to this kind of year. But the Egyptian year was solar, and consisted of twelve months of thirty days each, and that for a very long time before. After the time of Alexander the Great, and the reign of the Grecians in Asia, the Jews reckoned by lunar months, chiefly in what related to religion, and the order of the festivals. St. John, in his Revelation, xi, 2, 3; xii, 6, 14; xiii, 5, assigns but twelve hundred and sixty days to three years and a half, and consequently just thirty days to every month, and just three hundred and sixty days to every year. Maimonides tells us, that the years of the Jews were solar, and their months lunar. Since the completing of the Talmud, they have made use of years that are purely lunar, having alternately a full month of thirty days, and then a defective month of twenty-nine days. And to accommodate this lunar year to the course of the sun, at the end of three years they intercalate a whole month after Adar; which intercalated month they call Ve-adar, or the second Adar.

The beginning of the year was various among different nations: the ancient Chaldeans, Babylonians, Medes, Persians, Armenians, and Syrians, began their year about the vernal equinox; and the Chinese in the east, and Latins

and Romans in the west, originally followed the same usage. The Egyptians, and from them the Jews, began their civil year about the autumnal equinox. The Athenians and Greeks in general began theirs about the summer solstice; and the Chinese, and the Romans after Numa's correction, about the winter solstice. At which of these the primeval year, instituted at the creation, began, has been long contested among astronomers and chronologers. Philo, Eusebius, Cyril, Augustine, Abulfaragi, Kepler, Capellus, Simpson, 976Lange, and Jackson, contend for the vernal equinox; and Josephus, Scaliger, Petavius, Usher, Bedford, Kennedy, &c, for the autumnal. The weight of ancient authorities, and also of argument, seems to preponderate in favour of the former opinion. 1. All the ancient nations, except the Egyptians, began their civil year about the vernal equinox: but the deviation of the Egyptians from the general usage may easily be accounted for, from a local circumstance peculiar to their country; namely, that the annual inundation of the Nile rises to its greatest height at the autumnal equinox. 2. Josephus, the only ancient authority of any weight on the other side seems to be inconsistent with himself, in supposing that the deluge began in the second civil month, Dios, or Marheshvan, rather than in the second sacred month; because Moses, throughout the Pentateuch, uniformly adopts the sacred year; and fixes its first month by an indelible and unequivocal character, calling it Abib, as ushering in the season of green corn. And as Josephus calls the second month elsewhere Artemisius, or Iar, in conformity with Scripture, there is no reason why he should deviate from the same usage in the case of the deluge. 3. To the authority of Josephus, we may oppose that of the great Jewish antiquary, Philo, in the generation before him; who thus accounts for the institution of the sacred year by Moses:--"This month, Abib, being the seventh in number and order according to the sun's course, or civil year, reckoned from the autumnal equinox, is virtually the first, and is therefore called 'the first month' in the sacred books. And the reason, I think, is this: because the vernal equinox is the image and representative of the original epoch of the creation of the world. Thereby God notified the spring, in which all things bloom and blossom, to be an annual memorial of the world's creation. Wherefore this month is properly called the first in the law, as being the image of the first original month, stamped upon it, as it were, by that archetypal seal." 4. The first sacrifice on record seems to decide the question. The time of the sacrifice of Cain and Abel appears to have been spring; when Cain, who was a "tiller of the ground," brought the first fruits of his tillage, or a sheaf of new corn; and Abel, who was "a feeder of sheep," "the firstlings of his flock," lambs: and this was done "at the end of days," or "at the end of the year;" which is the correct meaning of the phrase מִן הַיָּמִים, and not the indefinite expression, "in process of time," Gen. iv, 3. It is a remarkable proof of the accuracy of Moses, and a confirmation of this expression, that he expresses the end of the civil year,

or “ingathering of the harvest,” by different phrases, בצאת השנה, “at the going out of the year,” Exod. xxiii, 16; and תקופת השנה, “at the revolution of the year,” Exod. xxxiv, 22; as those phrases may more critically be rendered. But, in process of time, it was found that the primeval year of three hundred and sixty days was shorter than the tropical year; and the first discovery was, that it was deficient five entire days, which therefore it was necessary to intercalate, in order to keep up the correspondence of the civil year to the stated seasons of the principal festivals. How early this discovery and intercalation was made, is nowhere recorded. It might have been known and practised before the deluge. The apocryphal book of Enoch, which probably was as old as the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch, stated that “the archangel Ariel, president of the stars, discovered the nature of the month and of the year to Enoch, in the one hundred and sixty-fifth year of his age, and A. M. 1286.” And it is remarkable, that Enoch’s age at his translation, three hundred and sixty-five years, expressed the number of entire days in a tropical year. This knowledge might have been handed down to Noah and his descendants; and that it was early communicated indeed to the primitive Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Chinese, we learn from ancient tradition.

This article would be rendered too prolix were we to notice the various inventions of eminent men in different ages to rectify the calendar by adjusting the difference between lunar and tropical years; which at length was effected by Gregory XIII. in 1583. This Gregorian, or reformed Julian year, was not adopted in England until A. D. 1751, when, the deficiency from the time of the council of Nice then amounting to eleven days, this number was struck out of the month of September, by act of parliament; and the third day was counted the fourteenth, in that year of confusion. The next year, A. D. 1752, was the first of the new style. Russia is the only country in Europe which retains the old style.

The civil year of the Hebrews has always begun at autumn, at the month they now call Tisri, which answers to our September, and sometimes enters into October, according as the lunations happen. But their sacred years, by which the festivals, assemblies, and all other religious acts, were regulated, begin in the spring, at the month Nisan, which answers to March, and sometimes takes up a part of April, according to the course of the moon. See Months.

Nothing is more equivocal among the ancients, than the term year. It always has been, and still is, a source of disputes among the learned, whether on account of its duration, its beginning, or its end. Some people heretofore made their year consist only of one month, others of four, others of six, others of ten, and others of twelve. Some have divided one of our

years into two, and have made one year of winter, another of summer. The beginning of the year was fixed sometimes at autumn, sometimes at the spring, and sometimes at midwinter. Some people have used lunar months, others solar. Even the days have been differently divided: some people beginning them at evening, others at morning, others at noon, and others at midnight. With some the hours were equal, both in winter and summer; with others, they were unequal. 977They counted twelve hours to the day, and as many to the night. In summer the hours of the day were longer than those of the night; but, on the contrary, in winter the hours of the night were longer than those of the day.

While the Jews continued in the land of Canaan, the beginnings of their months and years were not settled by any astronomical rules or calculations, but by the phasis, or actual appearance of the new moon. When they saw the new moon, they began the month. Persons were therefore appointed to watch on the tops of the mountain for the first appearance of the moon after the change. As soon as they saw it, they informed the sanhedrim, and public notice was given by lighting beacons throughout the land; though after they had been often deceived by the Samaritans, who kindled false fires, they used, say the Mishnical rabbins, to proclaim its appearance by sending messengers. Yet as they had no months longer than thirty days, if they did not see the new moon the night following the thirtieth day, they concluded the appearance was obstructed by the clouds, and, without watching any longer, made the next day the first of the following month. But after the Jews became dispersed through all nations, where they had no opportunity of being informed of the first appearance of the new moon, as they formerly had, they were forced to make use of astronomical calculations and cycles for fixing the beginning of their months and years. The first cycle they made use of for this purpose was of eighty-four years. But that being discovered to be faulty, they came afterward into the use of Meto's cycle of nineteen years, which was established by the authority of Rabbi Hillel Hannasi, or prince of the sanhedrim, about A. D. 360. This they still use, and say it is to be observed till the coming of the Messiah. In the compass of this cycle there are twelve common years, consisting of twelve months, and seven intercalary years, consisting of thirteen months. We find the Jews and their ancestors computing their years from different eras, in different parts of the Old Testament; as from the birth of the patriarchs, for instance, of Noah, Gen. vii, 11; viii, 13; afterward from their exit out of Egypt, Num. xxxiii, 38; 1 Kings vi, 1; then from the building of Solomon's temple, 2 Chron. viii, 1; and from the reigns of the kings of Judah and Israel. In latter times the Babylonish captivity furnished them with a new epocha, from whence they computed their years, Ezek. xxxiii, 21; xl, 1. But since the times of the Talmudical rabbins, they have constantly used the era of the creation.

There is not a more prolific source of confusion and embarrassment in ancient chronology, than the substitution of the cardinal numbers, one, two, three, for the ordinals, first, second, third, &c, which frequently occurs in the sacred and profane historians. Thus Noah was six hundred years old when the deluge began, Gen. vii, 6; and presently after, in his six hundredth year: confounding complete and current years. And the dispute whether A. D. 1800, or A. D. 1801, was the first of the nineteenth century, should be decided in favour of the latter; the former being in reality the last of the eighteenth century; which is usually, but improperly, called the year one thousand eight hundred, complete; whereas it is really the one thousandth, eight hundredth; as in Latin we say, Anno Domini millesimo octingentesimo. There is also another and a prevailing error, arising from mistranslation of the current phrases, μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, &c, usually rendered, "after eight days," "after three days," &c; but which ought to be rendered "eight days after," "three days after," as in other places, μετὰ τινὰς ἡμέρας, μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας, which are correctly rendered "some days after," "not many days after," in our English Bible, Acts xv, 36; Luke xv, 13, the extreme days being included. Such phrases seem to be elliptical, and the ellipsis is supplied, Luke ix, 28, speaking of our Lord's transfiguration, μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ὥσει ἡμέραι ὀκτώ: "After these sayings, about eight days," or rather about the eighth day, counted inclusively; for in the parallel passages, Matt. xvii, 1, Mark ix, 2, there are only "six days," counted exclusively, or omitting the extremes. Thus, circumcision is prescribed, Gen. xvii, 11, when the child is "eight days old;" but in Lev. xii, 3, "on the eighth day." And Jesus accordingly was circumcised, ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτώ, "when eight days were accomplished," Luke ii, 21; whereas John the Baptist, τῇ ογδοῇ ἡμέρᾳ, "on the eighth day." The last, which was the constant usage, explains the meaning of the former. This critically reconciles our Lord's resurrection, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, "three days after," according to Matt. xxvii, 63; Mark viii, 31; with his resurrection, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, "on the third day," according to Matt. xvi, 21; Luke ix, 22; and according to fact: for our Lord was crucified on Good Friday, about the third hour; and he arose before sunrise, πρωῒ, "early," on Sunday; so that the interval, though extending through three calendar days current, did not in reality amount to two entire days, or forty-eight hours. This phraseology is frequent among the most correct classic writers. Some learned commentators, Beza, Grotius, Campbell, Newcome, render such phrases, "within eight days," "within three days;" which certainly conveys the meaning, but not the literal translation, of the preposition μετὰ, "after." In memory of the primeval week of creation, revived among the Jews, after their departure from Egypt, their principal festivals, the passover, pentecost, and tabernacles, lasted a week each. They had weeks of seven years a piece, at the term of which

was the sabbatical year; as also weeks of seven times seven years, that were terminated by the year of jubilee; and finally weeks of seven days. And it is remarkable that, from the earliest times, sacrifices were offered by sevens. Thus, in the patriarch Job's days, "seven bullocks and seven rams were offered up for a burnt offering" of atonement, by the divine command, Job xiii, 8. The Chaldean diviner, Balaam, built seven altars, and prepared seven bullocks and seven rams, Num. 978xxiii, 1. And the Cumæan sibyl, who came from Chaldea, or Babylonia, gives the same directions to Æneas, that Balaam did to Balak:

Nunc grege de intacto septem mactare juvencos  
Præstiterit, totidem lectas, de more, bidentes.  
"Seven bullocks, yet unyoked, for Phœbus choose,  
And for Diana seven unspotted ewes."  
Dryden.

And when the ark was brought home by David, the Levites offered seven bullocks and seven rams, 1 Chronicles xv, 26. And hence we may account for the peculiar sanctity of the seventh day, among the older Heathen writers, even after the institution of the Sabbath fell into disuse, and was lost among them.

The Fallow or Sabbatic Year. Agricultural labour among the Jews ceased every seventh year. Nothing was sown and nothing reaped; the vines and the olives were not pruned; there was no vintage and no gathering of fruits, even of what grew wild; but whatever spontaneous productions there were, were left to the poor, the traveller, and the wild beast, Lev. xxv, 1–7; Deut. xv, 1–10. The object of this regulation seems to have been, among others, to let the ground recover its strength, and to teach the Hebrews to be provident of their income and to look out for the future. It is true, that extraordinary fruitfulness was promised on the sixth year, but in such a way as not to exclude care and foresight, Lev. xxv, 20–24. We are not to suppose, however, that the Hebrews spent the seventh year in absolute idleness: they could fish, hunt, take care of their bees and flocks, repair their buildings and furniture, manufacture cloths of wool, linen, and of the hair of goats and camels, and carry on commerce. Finally, they were obliged to remain longer in the tabernacle or temple this year, during which the whole Mosaic law was read, in order to be instructed in religious and moral duties, and the history of their nation, and the wonderful works and blessings of God, Deut. xxxi, 10–13. This seventh year's rest, as Moses predicted, Lev. xxvi, 34, 35, was for a long time neglected, 2 Chron. xxxvi, 21; after the captivity it was more scrupulously observed.

As a period of seven days was every week completed by the Sabbath, so was a period of seven years completed by the sabbatic year. It seems to

have been the design of this institution, to afford a longer opportunity than would otherwise have been enjoyed for impressing on the memory the great truth, that God the Creator is alone to be worshipped. The commencement of this year was on the first day of the seventh month Tishri, or October. During the continuance of the feast of tabernacles this year, the law was to be publicly read for eight days together, either in the tabernacle or temple, Deut. xxxi, 10–13. Debts, on account of there being no income from the soil, were not collected, Deut. xv, 1, 2; they were not, however, cancelled, as was imagined by the Talmudists, for we find in Deut. xv, 9, that the Hebrews are admonished not to deny money to the poor on account of the approach of the sabbatical year, during which it could not be exacted; but nothing farther than this can be educed from that passage. Nor were servants manumitted on this year, but on the seventh year of their service, Exodus xxi, 2; Deut. xv, 12; Jer. xxxiv, 14.

The Year of Jubilee followed seven sabbatic years; it was on the fiftieth year, Lev. xxv, 8–11. To this statement agree the Jews generally, their rabbins, and the Caraites; and say farther, that the argument of those who maintain that it was on the forty-ninth, for the reason that the omission to till the ground for two years in succession, namely, the forty-ninth and fiftieth, would produce a famine, is not to be attended to. It is not to be attended to, simply because these years of rest being known long beforehand, the people would of course lay up provision for them. It may be remarked farther in reference to this point, that certain trees produced their fruits spontaneously, particularly the fig and sycamore, which yield half the year round, and that those fruits could be preserved for some months; which explains at once how a considerable number of the people might have obtained no inconsiderable portion of their support. The return of the year of jubilee was announced on the tenth day of the seventh month, or Tishri, October, being the day of propitiation or atonement, by the sound of trumpet, Lev. xxv, 8–13; xxvii, 24; Num. xxxvi, 4; Isa. lxi, 1, 2. Beside the regulations which obtained on the sabbatic year, there were others which concerned the year of jubilee exclusively: 1. All the servants of Hebrew origin on the year of jubilee obtained their freedom, Lev. xxv, 39–46; Jer. xxxiv, 7, &c. 2. All the fields throughout the country, and the houses in the cities and villages of the Levites and priests which had been sold on the preceding years, were returned on the year of jubilee to the sellers, with the exception of those which had been consecrated to God, and had not been redeemed before the return of the said year, Lev. xxv, 10, 13–17, 24–28; xxvii, 16–21. 3. Debtors, for the most part, pledged or mortgaged their lands to the creditor, and left it to his use till the time of payment, so that it was in effect sold to the creditor, and was, accordingly, restored to the debtor on the year of jubilee. In other words, the debts for which land was pledged were cancelled; the same as those of persons who had recovered

their freedom after having been sold into slavery, on account of not being able to pay. Hence it usually happened in the later periods of Jewish history, as we learn from Josephus, that, at the return of jubilee, there was a general cancelling of debts.

ZABII, or ZABÆANS, or ZABIANS, or SABIANS. The Sabians mentioned in Scripture were evidently a nation, or perhaps a wandering horde, such as fell upon Job's cattle, Job i, 15; men of stature, Isa. xiv, 14; a people afar off, Joel iii, 8. But we speak here of the Zabians as a sect, probably the first corrupters of the patriarchal religion; and so called, as is believed, from tsabiim, the "hosts," that is, of heaven; namely, the sun, moon, and stars, to whom they rendered worship; first immediately, and afterward through the medium of images; this particularly distinguished them from the magi, whose idolatry was confined to the solar orb, and its earthly representative, the fire. If the above derivation be right, the Zabians were originally Chaldeans, though afterward the same sect arose in Arabia. Their study of the heavenly bodies led them, not only to astronomy, but to astrology, its degenerate daughter, which was for many ages the favourite pursuit of the oriental nations.

The following account is abridged from Dr. Townley's "Essays;"--The Zabii, or Zabians, were a sect of idolaters who flourished in the early ages of the world, considerable in their numbers, and extensive in their influence. The denomination of Zabii, given to these idolaters, appears to have been derived from the Hebrew צבא, a host; with reference to the צבא השמים or, host of heaven, which they worshipped; though others have derived it from the Arabic tsaba "to apostatize," "to turn from one religion to another;" or from צב"י, or the Arabic Tsabin, "Chaldeans," or "inhabitants of the east." Lactantius considers Ham, the son of Noah, as the first seceder from the true religion after the flood; and supposes Egypt, which was peopled by his descendants, to have been the country in which Zabaism, or the worship of the stars, first prevailed. That the worship of the heavenly bodies prevailed in the east at a very early period, is certain from the words of Job, who thus exculpates himself from the charge of idolatry: "If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand; this also were an iniquity to be punished by the judge: for I should have denied the God that is above," Job xxii, 26–28. It would appear that the idolatrous opinions of the Zabii originated with the posterity of Ham, at a very early period after the flood, in Egypt or Chaldea; but spread so rapidly and extensively, that in a very short time nearly the whole of the descendants of Noah were infected with their pestiferous sentiments and practices. Maimonides says, "This people," that is, the Zabii, "had filled the whole world." Their first and principal adoration was directed to



the host of heaven, or the stars. They were ignicolæ, or “worshippers of fire.” The city of Ur, in Chaldea, seems to have had its name from the inhabitants being devoted to the worship of fire. They dedicated images to the sun and the other celestial orbs, supposing that, by a formal consecration of them to those luminaries, a divine virtue was infused into them, by which they acquired the faculty of understanding, and the power of conferring prophecy and other gifts upon their worshippers. These images were formed of various metals, according to the particular star to which any of them was dedicated. They also regarded certain trees as being appropriated to particular stars, and, when idolatrously dedicated, as being possessed of very singular virtues. From these opinions sprang the adoption of astrology by them, in all its various forms. They maintained the doctrine of the eternity of the world. “All the Zabii,” says Maimonides, “believe in the eternity of the world; for, according to them, the heavens are God.” Holding the eternity of the world, they easily became Pre-Adamites, affirming that Adam was not the first man. They also fabled concerning him, that he was the apostle of the moon, and the author of several works on husbandry. Of Noah, they taught, that he was a husbandman, and was imprisoned for dissenting from their opinions. They add, that Seth was another of those who forsook the worship of the moon. They held agriculture in the highest estimation, regarding it as intimately connected with the worship of the heavenly bodies. On this account, it was deemed criminal, by the major part of them, to slay or feed upon cattle. Goats were also reputed to be sacred animals, because the demons whom they worshipped were said to appear in the woods and deserts in the forms of goats or of satyrs. Of their superstitious practices, some were dangerous, as the sacrifices of lions, tigers, and other wild beasts. Certain of their rites were cruel, as the passing of their children through the fire, and branding themselves also with fire. Some of their practices were loathsome and disgusting; such as eating blood, believing it to be the food of demons, &c. Others were frivolous and tedious; as offering bats and mice to the sun, various and frequent ablutions, lustrations, &c. Some of them were obscene and beastly, as the rites practised on engrafting a tree, or to obtain rain. Many of the rites were magical. These Maimonides divides into three kinds:--“The first is that which respects plants, animals, and metals. The second consists in the limitation and determination of the times in which certain works ought to be performed. The third consists in human gestures and actions, as leaping, clapping the hands, shouting, laughing, lying down, or stretching at full length upon the ground, burning particular things, raising a smoke, and, lastly, repeating certain intelligible or unintelligible words. Some things cannot be completed without the use of all these rites.” It is generally acknowledged that some traces of Zabianism are still to be found both among the Hindoos and Chinese in the east, and the Mexicans and other nations in the south. The Guebres, or Parsees, who

inhabit Persia, and are scattered through various parts of Hindostan, are the acknowledged worshippers of fire, or the supreme Deity under that symbol. "That the Persians," says Hyde, "were formerly Sabians or Zabii, is rendered probable by Ibn Phacreddin Angjou, a Persian, who, in his book 'Pharhangh Gjhanghiri,' treating of the Persians descended from Shem, says in the preface, 'Their religion, at that time, was Zabianism; but at length they became magi, and built fire temples.' And the author of the book 'Mu'gjizat Pharsi,' adopts the same opinion: 'In ancient times, the Persians were of the Zabian religion, worshipping the stars, until the time of Gushtasp, son of Lohrasp.' For then Zoroaster reformed their religion." The modern Sabians, who inhabit the country round about Mount Libanus, believe the unity of God, but pay an adoration to the stars, or the angels and intelligences which they suppose reside in them, and govern the world under the supreme Deity. They are obliged to pray three times a day, and they fast three times a year. They offer many sacrifices, but eat no part of them; and abstain from beans, garlic, and some other pulse and vegetables. They greatly respect the temple of Mecca and the pyramids of Egypt, fancying these last to be the sepulchres of Seth, and of Enoch and Sabi, his two sons, whom they look on as the first propagators of their religion. At these structures, they sacrifice a cock and a black calf, and offer up incense. Their principal pilgrimage, however, is to Haran, the supposed birth place of Abraham. Such is the account of this sect given by Sale, D'Herbelot, and Hyde.

ZACCHEUS, chief of the publicans; that is, farmer general of the revenues, Luke xix, 1, &c. This is all that is known concerning this person. See Publicans and Sycamore.

ZADOK, son of Ahitub, high priest of the Jews, of the race of Eleazar. At the death of Ahimelech, or Abiathar, he came to the pontificate, A. M. 2944. For some time there were two high priests in Israel, 2 Sam. viii, 17; xv, 24, &c; xix, 11, 12; 1 Kings i, 8, &c. After the death of David, 1 Kings ii, 35, Solomon excluded Abiathar from the high priesthood, because he espoused the party of Adonijah, and made Zadok high priest alone.

ZAMZUMMIM, or ZUZIM, a gigantic race of people, who, together with the Rephaim and Emim, men of like stature, occupied, in the time of Abraham, the country east of Jordan and the Dead Sea, where they were routed by Chedorlaomer, and from which they were afterward expelled by the Ammonites, Deut. ii, 20, 21. These, together with the Anakim, another family of giants, were all evidently of a race foreign to the original inhabitants of the countries where they were found; they were probably tribes of invading Cushites. The Vulgate and the Septuagint say, they were conquered with the Rephaim in Ashteroth-Karnaim. The Chaldee

interpreters have taken Zuzim in the sense of an appellative, for stout and valiant men; and the Septuagint have rendered the word Zuzim, ἔθνη ισχυρὰ, robust nations. We meet with the word Zuzim only in Gen. xiv, 5.

**ZEAL.** The original word, in its primary signification, means heat; such as the heat of boiling water. When it is figuratively applied to the mind, it means any warm emotion or affection. Sometimes it is taken for envy: so we render it, Acts v, 17, where we read, “The high priest, and all that were with him, were filled with envy,” ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου: although it might as well be rendered, “were filled with zeal.” Sometimes it is taken for anger and indignation; sometimes, for vehement desire. And when any of our passions are strongly moved on a religious account, whether for any thing good, or against any thing which we conceive to be evil, this we term religious zeal. But it is not all that is called religious zeal which is worthy of that name. It is not properly religious or Christian zeal, if it be not joined with charity. A fine writer (Bishop Sprat) carries the matter farther still. “It has been affirmed,” says he, “no zeal is right, which is not charitable, but is mostly so. Charity, or love, is not only one ingredient, but the chief ingredient, in its composition.” May we not go farther still? May we not say, that true zeal is not mostly charitable, but wholly so? that is, if we take charity, in St. Paul’s sense, for love; the love of God and our neighbour. For it is a certain truth, although little understood in the world, that Christian zeal is all love. It is nothing else. The love of God and man fills up its whole nature. Yet it is not every degree of that love to which this appellation is given. There may be some love, a small degree of it, where there is no zeal. But it is, properly, love in a higher degree. It is fervent love. True Christian zeal is no other than the flame of love. This is the nature, the inmost essence of it. Phinehas is commended for having expressed much zeal against those wicked persons that violated the law of the Lord, Num. xxv, 11, 13; and in Psalm lxix, 9, the psalmist says, “The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up;” my earnest desire to have all things duly ordered about thy worship, and my just displeasure and indignation at all abuses in it, have wasted my natural moisture and vital spirits.

**ZEBOIM,** one of the four cities of the Pentapolis, consumed by fire from heaven, Gen. xiv, 2; xix, 24. Eusebius and St. Jerom speak of Zeboim as of a city remaining in their time, upon the western shores of the Dead Sea. Consequently, after the time of Lot this city must have been rebuilt near the place where it had stood before. Mention is made of the valley of Zeboim, 1 Sam. xiii, 18, and of a city of the same name in the tribe of Benjamin, Neh. xi, 34.

**ZEBULUN,** the sixth son of Jacob and Leah, Gen. xxx, 20. He was born in Mesopotamia, about A. M. 2256. His sons were Sered, Elon, and Jahleel,

Gen. xlvi, 14. Moses acquaints us with no particulars of his life; but Jacob, in his last blessing, said of Zebulun, "Zebulun shall dwell at the haven of the sea; and he shall be for a haven of ships; and his border shall be unto Zidon," Gen. xlix, 13. His portion extended along the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, one end of it bordering on this sea, and the other on the sea of Tiberias, Joshua xix, 10, &c. In the last words of Moses, he joins Zebulun and Issachar together, saying, "Rejoice Zebulun, in thy going out, and Issachar in thy tents. They shall call the people unto the mountain, there shall they offer sacrifices of righteousness. For they shall suck of the abundance of the seas, and of treasures hid in the sand," Deut. xxxiii, 18; meaning, that these two tribes being at the greatest distance north, should come together to the temple at Jerusalem, to the holy mountain, and should bring with them such of the other tribes as dwelt in their way; and that being situated on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, they should apply themselves to trade and navigation, and to the melting of metals and glass, denoted by those words, "treasures hid in the sand." The river Belus, whose sand was very fit for making glass, was in this tribe. When the tribe of Zebulun left Egypt, it had for its chief Eliab the son of Elon, and comprehended fifty-seven thousand four hundred men able to bear arms, Num. i, 9–30. In another review thirty-nine years afterward, this tribe amounted to sixty thousand five hundred men of age to bear arms, Num. xxvi, 26, 27. The tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali distinguished themselves in the war of Barak and Deborah against Sisera, the general of the armies of Jabin, Judges iv, 5, 6, 10; v, 14, 18. It is thought these tribes were the first carried into captivity beyond the Euphrates by Pul and Tiglath Pileser, kings of Assyria, 1 Chron. v, 26. They had also the advantage of hearing and seeing Jesus Christ in their country, oftener and longer than any other of the twelve tribes, Isa. ix, 1; Matthew iv, 13, 15.

ZECHARIAH, king of Israel, 2 Kings xiv, 29. He succeeded his father Jeroboam II. A. M. 3220. He reigned but six months, and was murdered.

2. Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, high priest of the Jews; probably the same as Azariah, 1 Chron. vi, 10, 11. He was put to death by the order of Joash, A. M. 3164, 2 Chron. xxiv, 20–22. Some think this is the Zacharias mentioned Matt. xxiii, 35.

3. Zechariah, the eleventh of the twelve lesser prophets, was the son of Barachiah, and the grandson of Iddo. He was born during the captivity, and came to Jerusalem when the Jews were permitted by Cyrus to return to their own country. He began to prophesy two months later than Haggai, and continued to exercise his office about two years. Like his contemporary Haggai, Zechariah begins with exhorting the Jews to proceed in the rebuilding of the temple; he promises them the aid and protection of God,

and assures them of the speedy increase and prosperity of Jerusalem; he then emblematically describes the four great empires, and foretels the glory of the Christian church when Jews and Gentiles shall be united under their great High Priest and Governor, Jesus Christ, of whom Joshua the high priest, and Zerubbabel the governor, were types; he predicts many particulars relative to our Saviour and his kingdom, and to the future condition of the Jews. Many moral instructions and admonitions are interspersed throughout the work. Several learned men have been of opinion that the last six chapters were not written by Zechariah; but whoever wrote them, their inspired authority is established by their being quoted in three of the Gospels, Matt. xxvi, 31; Mark xiv, 27; John xix, 37. The style of Zechariah is so remarkably similar to that of Jeremiah, that the Jews were accustomed to observe, that the spirit of Jeremiah had passed into him. By far the greater part of this book is prosaic; but toward the conclusion there are some poetical passages which are highly ornamented. The diction is in general perspicuous, and the transitions to the different subjects are easily discerned.

**ZEDEKIAH**, or **MATTANIAH**, was the last king of Judah before the captivity of Babylon. He was the son of Josiah, and uncle to Jehoiachin his predecessor, 2 Kings xxiv, 17, 19. When Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, he carried Jehoiachin to Babylon, with his wives, children, officers, and the best artificers in Judea, and put in his place his uncle Mattaniah, whose name he changed into Zedekiah, and made him promise, with an oath, that he would continue in fidelity to him, A. M. 3405, 2 Chron. xxxvi, 13; Ezek. xvii, 12, 14, 18. He was twenty-one years old when he began to reign at Jerusalem, and he reigned there eleven years. He did evil in the sight of the Lord, committing the same crimes as Jehoiakim, 2 Kings xxiv, 18–20; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 11–13; and regarded not the menaces of the Prophet Jeremiah, from the Lord; but hardened his heart. The princes of the people, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, imitated his impiety, and abandoned themselves to all the abominations of the Gentiles. In the first year of his reign, Zedekiah sent to Babylon Elasah, the son of Shaphan, and Gemariah, the son of Hilkiah, probably to carry his tribute to Nebuchadnezzar. By these messengers Jeremiah sent a letter to the captives at Babylon, Jer. xxix, 1–23. Four years afterward, either Zedekiah went thither himself, or at least he sent thither; for the Hebrew text may admit either of these interpretations, Jer. li, 59; Baruch i, 1; Jer. xxxii, 12. The chief design of this deputation was to entreat Nebuchadnezzar to return the sacred vessels of the temple, Baruch i, 8. In the ninth year of his reign, he revolted against Nebuchadnezzar, 2 Kings xxv. It was a sabbatical year, in which the people should set their slaves at liberty, according to the law, Exod. xxi, 2; Deut. xv, 1, 2, 12; Jer. xxxiv, 8–10. Then King Nebuchadnezzar marched his army against Zedekiah, and took all the fortified places of his kingdom,

except Lachish, Azekah, and Jerusalem. He sat down before the last-mentioned city on the tenth day of the tenth month of the holy year, which answers to our January. Some time afterward, Pharaoh Hophrah, king of Egypt, marched to assist Zedekiah, Jer. xxxvii, 3–5, 10. Nebuchadnezzar left Jerusalem, and went to meet him, defeated him, and obliged him to return into Egypt; after which he resumed the siege of Jerusalem. In the mean while, the people of Jerusalem, as if freed from the fear of Nebuchadnezzar, retook the slaves whom they had set at liberty, which drew upon them great reproaches and threatenings from Jeremiah, xxxiv, 11, 22. During the siege Zedekiah often consulted Jeremiah, who advised him to surrender, and pronounced the greatest woes against him if he should persist in his rebellion, Jer. xxxvii, 3, 10; xxi. But this unfortunate prince had neither patience to hear, nor resolution to follow, good counsels. In the eleventh year of Zedekiah, on the ninth day of the fourth month, (July,) Jerusalem was taken, 2 Kings xxv, 2–4; Jer. xxxix, 2, 3; lii, 5–7. Zedekiah and his people endeavoured to escape by favour of the night; but the Chaldean troops pursuing them, they were overtaken in the plains of Jericho. He was seized and carried to Nebuchadnezzar, then at Riblah, a city of Syria. The king of Chaldea, reproaching him with his perfidy, caused all his children to be slain before his face, and his eyes to be put out; then loading him with chains of brass, he ordered him to be sent to Babylon, 2 Kings xxv, 4–7; Jer. xxxii, 4–7; lii, 4–11. Thus were accomplished two prophecies which seemed contradictory: one of Jeremiah, who said that Zedekiah should see and yet not see, Nebuchadnezzar with his eyes, Jer. xxxii, 4, 5; xxxiv, 3; and the other of Ezek. xii, 13, which intimated that he should not see Babylon, though he should die there. The year of his death is not known. Jeremiah had assured him that he should die in peace; that his body should be burned, as those of the kings of Judah usually were; and that they should mourn for him, saying, “Ah, lord!” Jer. xxxiv, 4, 5.

ZEPHANIAH was the son of Cushi, and was probably of a noble family of the tribe of Simeon. He prophesied in the reign of Josiah, about B. C. 630. He denounces the judgments of God against the idolatry and sins of his countrymen, and exhorts them to repentance; he predicts the punishment of the Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, and Ethiopians, and foretels the destruction of Nineveh; he again inveighs against the corruptions of Jerusalem, and with his threats mixes promises of future favour and prosperity to his people; whose recall from their dispersion shall glorify the name of God throughout the world. The style of Zephaniah is poetical; but it is not distinguished by any peculiar elegance or beauty, though generally animated and impressive.

ZERUBBABEL, or ZEROBABEL, was son of Salathiel, of the royal race of David. St. Matthew, i, 12, and 1 Chron. iii, 17, 19, make Jeconiah king of Judah to be father to Salathiel; but they do not agree as to the father of Zerubbabel. The Chronicles say Pedaiah was father of Zerubbabel; but St. Matthew, St. Luke, Ezra, and Haggai, constantly make Salathiel his father. We must therefore take the name of son in the sense of grandson, and say that Salathiel having educated Zerubbabel, he was always afterward looked upon as his father. Some think that Zerubbabel had also the name of Sheshbazzar, and that he has this name in Ezra i, 8. Zerubbabel returned to Jerusalem long before the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes. He returned at the beginning of the reign of Cyrus, A. M. 3468, fifteen years before Darius. Cyrus committed to his care the sacred vessels of the temple with which he returned to Jerusalem, Ezra i, 11. He is always named first, as being the chief of the Jews that returned to their own country, Ezra ii, 2; iii, 8; v, 2; he laid the foundations of the temple, Ezra iii, 8, 9; Zech. iv, 9, &c; and restored the worship of the Lord, and the usual sacrifices. When the Samaritans offered to assist in rebuilding the temple, Zerubbabel and the principal men of Judah refused them this honour, since Cyrus had granted his commission to the Jews only, Ezra iv, 2, 3.

ZIKLAG, a city of the Philistines, first assigned to the tribe of Judah, and afterward to that of Simeon, Joshua xv, 31; xix, 5; but it does not appear that the Philistines were ever driven out; as, when David fled into their country from Saul, Achish gave the city to him, 1 Sam. xxvii, 5, 6. It was afterward burned by the Amalekites, 1 Sam. xxx, 1. But it appears to have been rebuilt, as the author of the First Book of Samuel, when relating its being given to David, adds, that it pertained to the kings of Judah in his time.